

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION

SECTION 29 HEARING

"IN CAMERA"

DATE: 27-05-1997
NAME: JOHAN LUDWIG DU PREEZ
HELD AT: JOHANNESBURG

CHAIRPERSON: This is a Section 29 hearing and it relates to your involvement in the Stanza Bopape case. There will be some questions put to you about your own career in the Police Service.

Before we begin, I would like you to put your full names on record please.

JOHAN LUDWIG DU PREEZ: (sworn states)

CHAIRPERSON: I would like to introduce to you the members of the panel. On my extreme right hand wide, I have Mr Wilson Magadla, the Deputy Director of the National Investigation Unit. Mr Piers Pigou a member of our Investigation Unit, Colonel Fanie Killian, a member of the Unit. Mr Hugh Lewin, a member of the Human Rights' Violations Committee, Mr Kobus Swartz, a member of our Investigation Unit, Mr Malan, a member of our Investigation Unit, Prof Janice Grobbelaar, a member of our Research team in this office. Could you confirm that Mrs Van der Walt and Mr Prinsloo act for you please?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON: Is there any statement that you would like to make to the Commission before we begin these proceedings?

MR DU PREEZ: No.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Before we begin, let me just explain. You can leave these on all the time. The rest of us will swop around as and when we ask you questions. There is an interpretation service available to you, so if questions are put to you in English, then the translation will be available through the earphones over these.

CHAIRPERSON: Fanie?

MR KILLIAN: Mr Du Preez, are you currently a serving member of the South African Police Service?

CHAIRPERSON: Do you want to - you see it is not necessary if Mr Killian.

MR KILLIAN: Mr Du Preez, are you currently still in the service of the South African Police Service?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: What is your current rank?

MR DU PREEZ: I am an Inspector.

MR KILLIAN: Stationed where?

MR DU PREEZ: I am involved with Internal Security at Gauteng at the Braamfontein Provincial Head Office. We report under their office, although our offices are at Eikenhof.

MR KILLIAN: Are you aware of the case of Stanza Bopape?

MR DU PREEZ: I am.

MR KILLIAN: At the time of the incident, relating to the death of Stanza Bopape, were you stationed at the Sandton Security Branch office?

MR DU PREEZ: Our offices were at Sandton, although it resorted under the Johannesburg Security Branch, it was not a separate, it was a sub-branch of the Johannesburg Security Branch.

I want to add that this would rather have been a sort of investigative team that was put together to provide services from that point. It was not actually a part of the Security Branch proper.



MR KILLIAN: At what time subsequent to the arrest or during the arrest of Stanza Bopape, did you become involved in the matter?

MR DU PREEZ: It was on Sunday the 12th of June, when I became aware of the Stanza Bopape matter. I was not in any way involved in his arrest or detention.

MR KILLIAN: Good then, this was a Sunday. Were you at your offices or at your house?

MR DU PREEZ: I was at home.

MR KILLIAN: From whom did you receive any request?

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot recall exactly who contacted me. It is something which I have reflected on considerably, but it must have been either Colonel Van Niekerk or possibly the previous Warrant Officer Mostert.

I cannot in honesty tell you exactly who contacted me that morning, but it must have been one of the persons at the offices who phoned me.

MR KILLIAN: What was the request to you?

MR DU PREEZ: The request was whether I had access to an electric shocking device, since they were involved in a questioning and they needed this device.

MR KILLIAN: Did they indicate why they would need this device during this questioning?

MR DU PREEZ: No, not at that time.

MR KILLIAN: What deduction did you make?

MR DU PREEZ: My deduction was that they intended using this during the questioning of the person in detention.

MR KILLIAN: Since the person in detention would have been unwilling to reply to them as they expected?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: What was the constituent elements of this shocking device? I don't want you to explain this to me technically, but just in layman's language.

MR DU PREEZ: It would be like a small power generator, it works with a little sling. It has a coil and that generates power. You have power points which you would attach some strings to.

MR KILLIAN: Would this be an old telephone component?

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot recall whether that particular device was part of a telephone, although it is possible to have similar components in a telephone. An old farm telephone.

MR KILLIAN: The request to you whether you had access to such a device, was that the request?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes.

MR KILLIAN: How did you respond to this?

MR DU PREEZ: I did indicate that I had access.

MR KILLIAN: Where was this instrument kept?

MR DU PREEZ: I knew of a device at the offices in Sandton.

MR KILLIAN: What was the purpose with keeping this device at the office of the Security Branch?

MR DU PREEZ: The intention was to use this during questioning sessions should a person being questioned, not be forthcoming and providing full cooperation.

MR KILLIAN: In such instances, this device would then be used to convince this person to be more forthcoming and to force this person to say what you expected this person to say?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: This would then have been common practice in the Security Branch at that time? During questioning, if persons did not respond positively on questions, where persons were not forthcoming and cooperative, to use this device to convince persons or to force persons to say what you expect of them to say?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: You then took this device to John Vorster Square is that correct?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: Who did you find at John Vorster Square?

MR DU PREEZ: I must explain that at John Vorster Square, if you go to the offices of the Security Branch, you have to go through the cellar, a parking cellar. There would be a security gate with a bell, you would ring the bell.

MR KILLIAN: So there was controlled access, you cannot simply enter there if they don't allow you in?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: Okay.

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot recall exactly who allowed me in, but in the offices I found Colonel Van Niekerk. The then Lieutenant Zeelie, the then Warrant Officer Mostert and Constable Engelbrecht, as well as the deceased Stanza Bopape. I did not know him at that time.

MR KILLIAN: On your arrival, to whom did you report with this device?

MR DU PREEZ: I first went up to see exactly who would have been there, what the circumstances were. I then when to Colonel Van Niekerk, I assume, since he was the senior member present I would have reported to him.

I then returned to collect the device and took it up to the office.

MR KILLIAN: Are you saying to me that you first went up without the device. You then returned, collected the device and brought it back?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct. In the preparation of this device to apply this device on the person of the person under questioning, on that particular day, Bopape, there was a chair removed from Colonel Van Niekerk's office. It was placed in the corridor, passage.

Bopape was requested to leave the office. His shirt was taken off and he was then placed on this chair in the passage way and then he was tied to the chair.

Canvass straps were used.

MR KILLIAN: That was provided by logistics?

MR DU PREEZ: I am not sure whether this was provided by logistics. It appeared to me like the green canvass straps that

one would use to make belts for a person. This was tied, put around the person's body, legs and arms.

MR KILLIAN: So the arms were tied to the armrests of the chair and around his torso his was tied to the chair?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I cannot tell you whether this was tied around the chair or exactly how he was tied onto the chair so that he had to keep or stay in this sitting position.

MR KILLIAN: What was the intention of doing this in the passage way rather than in the office?

MR DU PREEZ: The office of Colonel Van Niekerk or where Colonel van Niekerk was sitting, was a very small office with not much room. You must remember that we were four or five persons and to gain more space, they moved to the corridor.

It was then easier to move outside of the office to place the chair there, there was more room.

MR KILLIAN: So the person is sitting down, he is tied to the chair and the top of his body is bare, is that correct? What then happens next?

MR DU PREEZ: I want to just return to an earlier question. The points of the wires attached to the device, were then wrapped in some sort of material or some cloth or some material, it might have been ... (tape ends) ... on the person and this is why the wire was wrapped in this way.

It was then wet for better conduction. I cannot recall who might have taken the notes because there would normally be a person taking notes during questioning. The purpose of questioning after all, is to gain information from the person so you would take down notes.

I held the device, the previous Constable Engelbrecht held the wires. He stood in front of Bopape.

MR KILLIAN: Who did the questioning? Since this action that is now being done is intended to gain information from this person who is being questioned, you are drawing information from this person by frightening or scaring the person. Who is doing the actual questioning?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have said already, I cannot recall exactly who did the actual questioning at that time. It might have been Colonel van Niekerk or it might have been Mostert or Zeelie. I cannot exactly remember and I cannot tell you exactly who at that moment would have asked the questions.

MR KILLIAN: If Mostert claims not to have been involved in the questioning of Bopape at all, would you differ from him?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I cannot really answer on that. On that particular Sunday I only became involved in the matter on that Sunday. If he had not questioned him prior to this, I would not know, I cannot differ from him.

MR KILLIAN: In your presence, I am referring to your actual presence? Mostert has said that he was not involved in the questioning whatsoever, that he was only involved in booking out Bopape and taking him to the office, but that he was not at all involved in the questioning.

MR DU PREEZ: That is not true.

MR KILLIAN: That is what he has in fact said.

MR DU PREEZ: I note that you have a typed version.

MR KILLIAN: Yes, I have notes and he says that he was not at all involved in the questioning.

MR DU PREEZ: There might be confusion.

MR KILLIAN: He says that they booked him out of the cells, but Mostert's version is that he was never involved in the questioning of Bopape.

MRS VAN DER WALT: I think you are making a mistake Mr Killian, since it was exactly his testimony, Mostert's testimony therefore, that he himself and Constable Engelbrecht took care of the questioning on the Saturday as well as on the Sunday. And that is also the testimony of Colonel Van Niekerk that he himself, that is Colonel Van Niekerk did not do the questioning, that Zeelie also did not do the questioning.

The only remaining persons who could have done the questioning, would then have been Mostert and Engelbrecht.

MR PRINSLOO: Mr Chairman, it appears that Mostert was not involved in the questioning of Nkosi. He was not at all involved in the questioning of Nkosi.

MR KILLIAN: I think it is the other way around, but if you want to place it on record that he was involved in the questioning of Bopape, I would welcome this.

MRS VAN DER WALT: You are without question mistaken.

MR KILLIAN: You then want to place it on record?

MR PRINSLOO: That was the actual testimony.

MR KILLIAN: Okay, we continue Mr Du Preez. When you arrived on the scene and you found this man being placed on the chair, what physical condition was he in?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, it is a long time ago I can't state in particular as what his state of mind was.

MR KILLIAN: No, I am asking physically. Physically what was he like?

MR DU PREEZ: I can't say. Normal, normal.

MR KILLIAN: Uninjured?

MR DU PREEZ: I can't remember that clearly that far back, but I can't remember him having physical injuries, open wounds if I think carefully about it. It might prompt my memory, but I can't tell the Committee here today that the man had no injuries or that he could have had injuries. I can't tell you. I don't know.

MR KILLIAN: In how many instances of questioning where shock apparatus was involved, were you present when a person died?

MR DU PREEZ: That was the only one.

MR KILLIAN: Then this should have made a particular impression on your mind?

MR DU PREEZ: I beg your pardon?

MR KILLIAN: It should have made a particular impression on your mind.

MR DU PREEZ: It did.

MR KILLIAN: And then you should remember it clearly.

MR DU PREEZ: Yes sir, I can remember the incident, but fine detail whether he had an injury, whether he had a bruise, whether he had a black mark, I can't remember. I don't remember whether you personally had been involved in an incident or similar, where somebody had died.

If you could tell me about ten years ago in particulars, then you've got a good memory. I can't remember the particulars. It is something that you remember, but you try to get out of your system. It is not something that you want to be reminded of every day.

MR KILLIAN: Why do you want to get rid of it in your mind, why do you want to free your mind of the memory of this matter?

MR DU PREEZ: I think any normal person has a conscience which they have to live with. I can't speak on your behalf but to me it is something that I don't want to remember every day.

MR KILLIAN: So please explain to us your actions during the application of this apparatus?

MR DU PREEZ: As I said, I did the preparations of this apparatus, Engelbrecht held the wires. I can't remember what exactly he did. I was involved with the apparatus, I turned the handle to generate the shocks, the electric current.

MR KILLIAN: And what was Engelbrecht doing while you were turning the handle?

MR DU PREEZ: Well, as I said he stood in front of me. He had the wires in his hands and he rubbed them over Bopape's trunk, his torso.

MR KILLIAN: If you were to think back now, how many times did he rub these two wires wrapped in this material, over the torso of Bopape's while you were turning the handle?

MR DU PREEZ: While I was turning the handle, I take it he moved it around all the time.

MR KILLIAN: What would you say, how many times did he move it over his body?

MR DU PREEZ: It is difficult.

MR KILLIAN: But it sounds to me as if you don't press it against the person's body, you move it over the person's body?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, it could be a movement. You could press it against the person, I can't tell you specifically how many times he moved it, whether he pressed it against his body. It is something I can't say in detail.

MR KILLIAN: For how long were you turning the handle without interruption?

MR DU PREEZ: Well, I have to tell you that you don't turn the handle without interruption. I will explain to you.

The main purpose as I said to you was to communicate with the person, to hear when the person would be prepared to divulge the information. So the normal procedure would be to turn the handle a number of times and then to ask him would you like to speak to me, is there anything you would like to tell me.

And depending on what the person's reply would be, we would continue.

MR KILLIAN: So basically it boils down to the fact that these actions of turning with interruptions and communicating with the person and then turning the handle again, communicating again, was aimed at forcing him to talk?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: That was the whole purpose?

MR DU PREEZ: That was the whole purpose of the excursion.

MR KILLIAN: So what happened in the process of turning and shocking etc, and how many times did you turn and stopped, etc?

MR DU PREEZ: I would say two, three times possibly that he had this series of turning actions.

MR KILLIAN: And then every time that you stopped, what was his reaction?

MR DU PREEZ: Well, he did not divulge any information.

MR KILLIAN: Did he keep quiet, did he say he didn't know, what information did he tender?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't know, I can't remember. I can't tell you that he said he didn't know, I can't tell you whether he kept quiet. I can't tell you but I can say that his reaction would have been negative, because that is why we continued.

MR KILLIAN: So how many times did this process continue, or how many times did you continue, repeat this?

MR DU PREEZ: Well, it could have been two, three, four times, but it was not a long period of time. It was if I remember correctly, it was a matter of a few minutes.

MR KILLIAN: The duration of each of these shock periods, how long would that have been?

MR DU PREEZ: Ten, twenty seconds. I would say a number of seconds, but not like minutes on end. I am sorry I am demonstrating like that, but I am trying to remind myself. I don't want to sound disjunct in my report, but it was just a matter of seconds, not minutes.

MR KILLIAN: And during the last generation of a current, what happened then?

MR DU PREEZ: During the generation of the current? Well, the same as in the previous sessions of turning the handle, there was no difference really.

MR KILLIAN: But how did the person react, Stanza, how did he react?

MR DU PREEZ: Well, it is a shock, the muscles contract so I would say that he reacted like a person who was being given electrical shocks.

MR KILLIAN: And at what stage did he die?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I only discovered that there was a problem when I stopped administering the shocks and he fell forward. I saw that he did not react on I can't remember who was speaking to him. But to return to myself, I realised that there was something wrong.

I unfastened the velcro straps, I took Bopape off the chair.

MR KILLIAN: Did you lay him down in the passage?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes. I did that and then I started meagre first aid. I wasn't trained in first aid.

MR KILLIAN: Would you say mouth to mouth and heart massage?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, and heard message to see if he would start breathing again because I saw that he wasn't breathing. So the first reaction was to try and resuscitate him, to start breathing.

MR KILLIAN: So, when everybody there realised that this man had died, what was the first reaction of the persons around and who showed the first reaction to these events?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I cannot remember but I can tell you that my reaction was shock. In plain Afrikaans, I was knocked flat because I had a dead man on my hands, what now?

I was shocked, that was my reaction. What the other people felt or what their particular reactions had been, I can't tell but it was agreed.

MR KILLIAN: Who took over the situation after this initial shock had penetrated to everybody?

MR DU PREEZ: I would say Colonel Van Niekerk, because he was the senior person present. He took over the situation then, he took it under his control. What happened then, the deceased was removed from the passage, pulled into the office.

MR KILLIAN: How was he laid down there?

MR DU PREEZ: How do you mean that?

MR KILLIAN: Was he put on his back, on his side, straight legs, bent legs, or how?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I would say that he was first placed down in a stretched out position, and at a later stage, I pushed the legs of the deceased, I pulled them towards his chest.

His knees, I pulled his knees up. I don't want to run ahead of the story, but when it was decided that the body would have to be disposed of, I did that. That it would have to be transported in order to be able to place the body in a vehicle, I pulled the knees up to the chest so that one could put him in the boot of the vehicle. We all know about rigour mortis.

MR KILLIAN: How long after he died, did you do this?

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot indicate the passage of time, but it would have been some while after.

MR KILLIAN: Do you know at about what time he died?

MR DU PREEZ: I would say that it would have been during the course of the morning. I was contacted, I went to John Vorster Square so let's say it could have been anywhere between ten and twelve o'clock. I know that this is a considerable period of time.

MR KILLIAN: But it was in the morning, is that correct?

MR DU PREEZ: That is, yes it must have been during the morning.

MR KILLIAN: Were you present when the body was removed and taken down to the parking area to place it in the vehicle?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, I was present.

MR KILLIAN: At what time did that occur?

MR DU PREEZ: That would have been much later. It would have been in the later afternoon, early evening. This was during June, so by about half past five it already starts getting dark.

I don't want to commit myself to a particular time, but I would say that it was late afternoon when the deceased was taken from the offices at the top, down to the vehicle.

MR KILLIAN: What covered the body?

MR DU PREEZ: I found black garbage bags, I actually went and purchased this at a shop and his body was placed in these bags and he was transferred in these bags.

MR KILLIAN: Were they opened up or were they used in their original form and placed over the body?

MR DU PREEZ: I can tell you that the bag covered his head and shoulders. A normal bag without it having been changed in any way.

Similarly at his legs, at his feet, I can't tell you exactly how many bags I had used, but I want to believe that I probably used three bags, but I made sure that his body did not show at any point.

The main reason why I covered him, was as we all know, we all know about forensic signs, I wanted to ensure that there would be no blood or hair remaining in the boot of the vehicle, after the body had been disposed of.

MR KILLIAN: I am listening to what you are telling me, you are talking about blood and hair, where would this blood have come from?

MR DU PREEZ: Let me rather phrase it in this way, any bodily fluids, whether it was urine or spit or blood or I probably expressed myself poorly. Let me put it this way, any traces that the body had been transported in the boot, had to be removed or prevented.

MR KILLIAN: While taking all of these precautions, there already would have been an arrangement with the Eastern Transvaal Branch that they would dispose of this body and in such a way that this body could never be found again?

MR DU PREEZ: I believe that by that time, the arrangements had been made, although I was not involved in the arrangements as such.

I would therefore not be able to tell you exactly. If there had been a decision to transport him in a particular vehicle, then I am sure that the arrangements would have been made already.

MR KILLIAN: You were present, you were involved in carrying the body down to the cellar where the vehicle was parked and Colonel Van Niekerk made a report to you after having returned from General Erasmus. Erasmus personally visited the offices?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct, he visited the offices.

MR KILLIAN: So, the planning of the disposal of the body would have been discussed at that point?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't think so. If you say the planning ...

MR KILLIAN: The planning had been made?

MR DU PREEZ: What was conveyed to us, Mostert, Engelbrecht and myself were sitting in an office, we did not converse with the General, the officer spoke to him.

We were simply told that we had to put the deceased in the vehicle and take him to the Eastern Transvaal?

MR KILLIAN: Eastern Transvaal or Bronkhorstspuit?

MR DU PREEZ: If I am talking about the Eastern Transvaal, that would have been the section Eastern Transvaal Security Branch.



MR KILLIAN: So you would include all of that area?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, I would. Whether they had said specifically Bronkhorstspuit or not, I can't tell you, although it appeared later that we in fact went to Bronkhorstspuit.

MR KILLIAN: You ended your trip at Bronkhorstspuit and the body was transferred at that point, is that correct?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR KILLIAN: The planning of how and whom would dispose of the body, that must have been discussed on route to Bronkhorstspuit?

MR DU PREEZ: Myself and the previous Constable Engelbrecht were in a vehicle on our own and Colonel Van Niekèrk, Mr Zeelie and Mr Mostert were in a different vehicle, also containing the deceased, in Mr Zeelie's vehicle. They would have discussed in that car ...

MR KILLIAN: I am sure I can't ask of you, but what did you discuss in your vehicle?

MR DU PREEZ: If I can recall exactly, we did not discuss what would have happened to the body. The events of the day, I assume we would have considered. You are driving along, you are going to some unknown point.

It is a traumatic experience, I can't tell you that we were sitting and jabbering away. If we did talk to each other, it would have been due to the traumatic nature of the event. I suppose we discussed it, we would have asked ourselves questions about the consequences of the event and the consequences for the future, that would have been normal.

MR KILLIAN: We've often heard how the body was transferred and I am not going to deal with this in detail, but a final question, until the point when you provided the instrument to John Vorster Square for use on Bopape, on how many previous occasions have you used the same instrument for questioning?

MR DU PREEZ: Personally having used it?

MR KILLIAN: Where you were present during questioning or where you provided the device for questioning?

MR DU PREEZ: This device was not my personal device for providing.

MR KILLIAN: No, that is not what I have said.

MR DU PREEZ: I don't want to say that this was a common occurrence, but it was a general practice.

MR KILLIAN: Could you give us some sort of indication, ten, twenty, thirty, hundred, hundred and fifty?

MR DU PREEZ: No, not that many. I was involved during that time in particular investigations. Should a person have been arrested and should you not have a particular task, you might be put into a group responsible for the questioning of a person or persons.

I cannot tell you today how many individual persons I questioned, or how many persons I could say were shocked with this device.

MR KILLIAN: Let me make it easy for you. This device was reasonably available, or readily available?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, it was readily available. It was available if anyone wanted to use it, they could use it.

MR KILLIAN: And it was common or general practice when a person had to be questioned and the person did not want to

answer, did not want to cooperate then the device would have been used to convince the person?

MR DU PREEZ: That is the case.

MR KILLIAN: Thank you, that is all.

MR MALAN: Mr Du Preez, I want to just get clarity. As I understand this, you did not only use the old telephone device but there were other similar power generators that might have been used. Is there a possibility that Stanza might have been shocked with another type of device than the telephone kind of device?

MR DU PREEZ: Not in my presence.

MR MALAN: So the device used on Stanza would it exactly, or specifically have been an old telephone dynamo or might it have been a similar kind of generator?

MR DU PREEZ: I can't tell you exactly, if you show me a telephone today, I can tell you it was like that. I cannot however tell you that the device used would have been a different kind of generator or whether it would have been removed from a telephone.

MR MALAN: The next question that I want to ask is, there was a blanket used. Can you recall what the situation was with regard to this blanket, where did you obtain this blanket, what happened to the blanket afterwards and so forth?

MR DU PREEZ: No.

MR MALAN: If you think back, how did you carry the body to the boot of the vehicle?

MR DU PREEZ: If my memory does not fail me, we used a carpet, a piece of carpet. And the deceased was placed on this piece of carpeting and taken down to the vehicle.

I don't know if you had ever been on the 10th floor of John Vorster Square, but there is a kind of safe door that you had to use for entrance and access, so I assume he would have been picked up to carry through that door, but if I can recall exactly, I think it was on this piece of carpeting that he was sort of dragged on the carpeting.

Why I am saying this is that after the deceased was placed in the boot of the vehicle, on the 10th floor there is a kind of a broom cupboard, I would have taken the broom to clean up, to remove the dust from the bottom of the carpet so that it would not be dust all over the office the next day when people came to the offices. That is why I think they used that piece of carpeting.

MR MALAN: Can you recall whether Stanza was a heavy person particularly with the carrying down of the body and what difficulties you would have experienced with placing him in the boot, whether it was one or two persons?

MR DU PREEZ: In all honesty, to respond to you today, I cannot even recall what the person's face looked like. It is not a face that I want to remember and I never tried to go and look, so

I cannot tell you whether he was heavy or not. I think or I would say he was a normal sized person.

I am trying to visualise in the passage as he was sitting in the chair, whether he was a tall person or a short person, I cannot recall. I think he would have been a person of medium build, maybe like myself or like yourself.

I saw him for a few hours in my life, I cannot tell you exactly how heavy or light he might have been.

With regard to the second part of the question, you've asked about three questions in one. One or two persons, I might have been walking in front and the carpet or blanket I might have dragged him on that. But at that time, things were going very fast. So you didn't want to be caught doing this.

So you were just walking, you were not looking around, if you had a particular task to do there, you just did that task because you wanted to finish with it and as soon as the body was in the boot of the vehicle, then you would already be almost halfway towards your objective, the body was not longer in the offices.

So I can't tell you exactly how many people carried or anything like that. There were difficulties with placing him in the - whether there were difficulties placing him in the boot, I don't think so. Since at that time you had tremendous adrenalin flowing, you could move mountains if necessary. I don't think

that it would have been like at home if you have difficulty putting two bricks on top of each other.

At that moment, you really moved and you wanted to finish the entire matter as quickly as possible.

MR MALAN: I would like to ask you, I understand that at some stage this incident regarding Stanza Bopape was conveyed to the then General Johan Pretorius. Conveyed is perhaps not the correct word.

You said that you, did you used the words that you went and cleared your conscience?

MR DU PREEZ: Perhaps it would have been my intention but no, the next day - I would just like to sketch the background first. Our offices are in Sandton. A number of members work there with whom you work every day and here I arrived as an outsider, I didn't know what the other members were involved in. I couldn't go and ask them what was going on.

I will explain in this regard again later but at that stage, ex-Colonel Pretorius, at that stage I think he was still a Major, I went and saw him and told him that I had a problem. I would like to speak with him. Later during the day when there was a quiet period, I went to his office and I told him that I had been involved in a questioning the day before, during which a man had died.

I saw that, I wouldn't call it shock dawned on his face, but he was surprised and I asked him for some advice because I said that although the then Brigadier Erasmus, I didn't have regular contact with the people. Perhaps I was grasping at straws.

But I would call it that he turned a cold shoulder on me, but he gave to understand clearly that he didn't want to become involved in the case, because the Divisional Commander already knew about it and there was nothing that he could do about it, he didn't want details. He didn't ask anything about how, who, where. It was clear that he didn't want to become involved.

Although I could say that he didn't chase me away, he was sympathetic if I remember correctly. If I remember correctly he invited me to go and have coffee with him, but it was not as if he was chasing me away, but it was clear that he didn't want to become involved in the case of Stanza Bopape.

MR MALAN: The impression that I get is that he already had knowledge of the incident that had taken place, it wasn't anything new that you conveyed to him?

MR DU PREEZ: Well sir, I ... (tape ends) ... it was a normal thing to have officers' conference in the mornings, so it is possible that he could have read a printed telex regarding the matter of Bopape, the escape of Bopape. But that he had decided not to have anything to do with it, so I can't tell you whether

anybody had, somebody else had informed him regarding the circumstances.

MR MALAN: Thank you then.

MR LEWIN: What was your rank at that stage?

MR DU PREEZ: I was a Sergeant at that date.

MR LEWIN: Why were you of all people asked to bring the apparatus?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, that is a question that I cannot answer. Whether it was fate that decided, I don't know. The only person in the group whom I knew reasonably well, was Warrant Officer Mostert.

We worked together at the Detective Branch at John Vorster Square. I wouldn't like to say that that is the case, I wasn't there, I don't know whether they tried other ways to find other ways out, other means of obtaining such an apparatus, I didn't ask them and question them in this regard. As I said in the beginning, I don't even know who made that call. I also told you that it was not a daily occurrence, but it was commonly used and I can speculate, but I am not here to make speculations.

But from as a last resort, they probably decided to contact me because Mostert probably said contact Du Preez, he might know, he might be able to assist you.

I don't know, I can't give you a specific answer. At that stage, I wasn't on duty on that day, I was studying for an

examination that I had to sit for on the Tuesday so it is a question that remains unanswered also in my own mind, why I specifically was asked.

MR LEWIN: Don't they on the 10th floor had, or have their own machine at the time?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, I don't know. It is not a question that you can ask a person do you have such an apparatus. One has to keep in mind that it was a Sunday, office security was in place when people left, they locked their offices, so I can deduce that the people who were there, did not have access to an apparatus. Whether there was such an apparatus or not, I cannot tell you.

MR LEWIN: Were you known as somebody who was particularly schooled in applying this kind of questioning?

MR DU PREEZ: No sir.

MR LEWIN: Which measures did you take to prevent a deadly measure of shock being applied?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, there are no measures to be taken. It is not a daily occurrence that a person would die during such questioning.

MR LEWIN: But isn't it a daily risk?

MR DU PREEZ: It is a risk on every opportunity. I don't know what your health is like, your condition, it is a risk to work in such a manner with a person. So yes, every single person is a risk.

MR LEWIN: And you were probably aware that he could be used to the utmost level of pain where even a tough person would fold?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes.

MR LEWIN: How far did you have to go in this instance, how high was the resistance?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir, there is no resistance that can be adjusted if I understand you correctly. It is like ohms, etc, there is no adjustment possible. It sends a specific shock current, you can't make it lighter or heavier, it is a standard current.

It is a standard apparatus.

MR LEWIN: Are you aware of certain bodily areas that hold a greater risk than others? Is it worse if you shock a person on the back of his hand, or on his chest?

MR DU PREEZ: I wouldn't say yes, but the back of one's hand is a lot tougher, you get less sensitive, you get sensitive portions of the skin. So, I would say on your chest, over here, the skin is thin if I could refer to it in that manner.

It is like knocking your little toe, it is sore compared to your big toe because it is smaller, so there are more sensitive areas on one's body.

MR LEWIN: But the heart itself is driven electrically to put it in a lay language to you, with nerve impulses carrying electric loads.

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, if you wish to state it like that. I can't tell you that it is so or it isn't.

MR LEWIN: Were those wires specifically rubbed over his heart?

MR DU PREEZ: It was rubbed over his chest, over his torso. I can't say specifically over his heart. I can't tell you. I didn't handle the apparatus myself so I can't tell you specifically what happened on that day.

MR LEWIN: As far as the general culture that existed in the Security Police at the time, when the telephone rang, why didn't you just say that it is against, it is an illegal command, it is against my conscience?

MR DU PREEZ: It doesn't work like that in practice.

MR LEWIN: Why couldn't you stand up for what was right and say you couldn't do it?

MR DU PREEZ: Sir at that stage, it was a narrow situation, a limited situation. It is not today where there is an open society where everybody can say and do like they wish to. It was how would I say, at that stage there wasn't even a trade union in the Police, today we have two trade unions.

You know the Security Branch per se, it was more a matter of like a family, it was not something that you would even think of if somebody called you on a Sunday and asked you to come and assist, that you would say I am studying, go and find

somebody else. It was part of the culture you were to go and do it

MR LEWIN: Even with unlawful actions?

Sir, at that stage, I can tell you if you regarded it as an unlawful action, yes, perhaps, but it was part - you were part of the Police that were basically fighting a war. You fight fire with fire, it was not a matter of sitting with a person who had perhaps committed cheque fraud, who was a highly regarded businessman, who had transgressed a company law, it was a war.

You know, if we were to use the word, if it was a terrorist that was being questioned, then you didn't bandy about pretty words, the idea was to obtain information, what the man's purpose, aims were, why did he return to the Republic, what his task was, whether he was in possession of explosives or arms? That is what it was all about.

One wanted to get the information from him to find out where the investigation was headed. So, you wouldn't reach a point where you would say sorry, I am not on duty or I wouldn't become involved.

MR LEWIN: Do I understand that the general attitude was that it wouldn't take, there was no concern about what was right or wrong, we wanted to get the information?

MR DU PREEZ: Just explain to me lawful and unlawful?

MR LEWIN: The general attitude in the Police was that we would go as far as we had to go, but the information would be obtained?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes. The methods which were applied, one couldn't say that they were unlimited, but there was expected of you in questioning a person, that on the next day or a week later, you would come back and say this man had been involved in these incidents, or that was his target, because that was what it was about in the struggle that was ongoing at the time, to find a counter measure so that you would know how to counter-act the actions.

I am trying to find the correct word, if you can just be patient. You were success orientated and you wanted to complete your task successfully. You weren't concerned about the ways you went about doing this, whether they were right or wrong.

MR LEWIN: Did you make use of that apparatus after this incident again?

MR DU PREEZ: No sir.

MR LEWIN: I have no further questions.

MR PIGOU: Sorry, just a first question on one of your last statements that you were fighting a war. Would you agree that the common terminology within the South African Police Service at the moment against crime is that you are fighting a war against crime?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct.

MR PIGOU: Would you therefore expect the same sort of methods as were used in your war against terrorism to be utilised in the war against crime?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have mentioned earlier, we are now at a stage where there is an entire new order in the country. There is no longer a Police Force, there is now a Police Service.

All of these institutions today, should a person use that kind of methodology, he would be crazy, he would be out of his mind. I understand that you say that there is a war now, but it is not the same circumstances as that which reigned during the 1980's and prior to that.

MR PIGOU: Could you just explain to us in a little bit more detail, about the relationship between yourself and where you were sitting in Sandton and what your responsibilities were, and how those fitted in with the Johannesburg office?

MR DU PREEZ: Mr Chairman, as I have mentioned earlier, the origin of this particular office at Sandton was during 1986 with the calling out of the emergency measures and the investigations related to that, I was not involved in the founding of that office.

I became involved in the work of that office, after I returned from Lebowa where I had done investigations on the so-called necklacing murders in Sekhukhune land and in fact all of Lebowa. Upon my return, there was an investigation under way

with regard to a strike of SARWU, the South African Railway Workers' Union, and there were persons murdered at Cosatu House.

Since some of the suspects came from the Lebowa area, my Commanding Officer at that time, said that this is a person that could assist us and I want to explain that some of our members were used by the Divisional Detective Officer to provide assistance since there was a mass of persons involved who had to be identified. It would have been a very long process.

Detectives were then involved in the investigation of this particular incident. That is how I became involved. Upon my arrival at Sandton, they were engaged in that particular investigation of the Cosatu House incident. Subsequently other strikes also became involved and were investigated.

Since this was of importance for State security, that there would be a calm atmosphere, and this became part of the Security Branch, the persons at John Vorster Square, who were stationed and had offices there, were responsible for the more - were more focused on the investigations, which were not related for instance to strikes.

There had been as it was stated earlier, it was a sub-office, you were not really far away, but you were not in daily contact with the members at John Vorster Square, although once a week, on Fridays if I recall, there were other officers, the Alexandra

office and other offices, and all of these various officers met on a Friday at John Vorster Square and there would then have been a conference that the Divisional Commanding Officer managed or conducted.

We were then informed what happened locally and nationally and if there was information documents made available, then these were made available at that occasion.

That is just the kind of relationship that existed between the various offices.

MR PIGOU: Would your unit up in Sandton that was for instance dealing with trade union matters, report then to the Divisional Commander, you wouldn't have a direct link to for instance Section A of the Security Branch dealing with trade union matters at Head Office?

MR DU PREEZ: No sir.

MR PIGOU: You didn't have that kind of relationship?

MR DU PREEZ: I can say it in this way, in the Police at that time, there was a standard route that was followed and it is still followed today.

That you as a normal member of the Security Branch, would go to your Section Commander. He would report to a Divisional Commander. You have referred to Section A, Trade Union desk, but if there was information with regard to the trade unions, then that document or the piece of information would

have been sent through to the Head Office, we didn't use faxes yet, we used telexes for that.

And there would have been a copy made available for the section working on trade unions, or for instance at that time, on churches or whatever. You made the information which you had gathered, you made it available to the Divisional Commander and it went through the Divisional Commander to the various sections.

I could not walk to person X and tell him I have questioned this person yesterday and he said this or that. Why it did not happen like this, there was a need to know system on which people operated. The information obtained would have been evaluated and then would have been dispersed to the people who needed to have the information available, you couldn't just stroll around and give information to whoever.

MR PIGOU: Who was your Sectional Head?

MR DU PREEZ: The previous Colonel Pretorius. He was stationed at Sandton as the Commanding Officer and at a later stage, when the two Investigative Units were merged, Colonel Van Niekerk became my Commanding Officer and I could track the history like that, but at that time, at the time of the Stanza Bopape incident, the previous Colonel Johan Pretorius would have been my Commanding Officer.

MR PIGOU: Had you worked, or had you received instructions in any kind of investigation from At van Niekerk before?

MR DU PREEZ: Prior to this incident?

MR PIGOU: Yes?

MR DU PREEZ: Not as far as I can recall at the moment off hand.

MR PIGOU: So were you requested or were you ordered by At van Niekerk to come to John Vorster Square with an electric shock machine?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have said, I can't recall who phoned me on that particular day. Had it been Colonel Van Niekerk, I do not believe that he would have given me an order, it would have been a request.

MR PIGOU: But for a matter which you had no idea about, from officers that you weren't working with, you receive a request and you comply?

MR DU PREEZ: We were part of a single office, not in the physical sense, but a single Security Branch. I don't think that this, I don't want to claim that this would not have been extraordinary, but as I have said earlier, I believe that Warrant Officer Mostert whom I knew best of all of this group, if he had, he might have mentioned to someone talk to him, Mostert himself might have phoned me. I can't definitely tell you this way or that

way, I cannot recall exactly who phoned me on this particular occasion.

But to tell you whether this was strange or not, that would just not be a true reflection either way of the facts, whatever I told you.

MR PIGO: So because you were part of a larger Security Branch family, if the request had come from Krugersdorp, from the East Rand, from the Vaal Triangle, you would have complied?

MR DU PREEZ: No. No one there knew me in those areas, no one would have made this request to me, phoned me on a Sunday and asked me to come and help. Had there been such a request, it would have been through the Divisional Commander who would have discussed it with our Divisional Commander and he would then have worked through the command structure to approach me.

Say if a person from the Vaal Triangle, no one from the Vaal Triangle would have made that request directly to me, no.

MR PIGO: Okay, thank you. Where exactly in the offices of Sandton, did you actually get this shock machine from? Did you get it from any one particular office and whose office?

MR DU PREEZ: There was no particular place where this device would have been stored. At Sandton, there were empty offices next to the bathrooms for instance, there is a small little office where there were pipes that went through the office, so you wouldn't exhibit this in your office.

You wouldn't go and collect it from a particular person if you needed it, you would look around and you would look in an empty office or - to just get to my answer, although this is common practice, this wasn't done openly.

You never knew exactly who might visit your office or anything like that, so you did not leave that kind of device in a place where any person would be able to get access to it, there would be access control.

To protect yourself, you would hide this kind of device. Whether I should tell you, what I can tell you is that I did not receive this device from any one particular person, but whether it was in an empty office or in the small office next to the toilets, I can't tell you exactly where of these places it might have been, but it was in one of these two places.

MR PIGOU: So you went to the offices not necessarily knowing that the shocking machine would be there, it could be out on duty somewhere else and you searched, but you are telling this Committee that you cannot remember exactly where you found the shock machine in your offices on that day?

I would like you to remember that this is an advent which has marked your life, where someone has died and you cannot remember that detail, where you found that machine. Did you spend some time looking for it, did you immediately find it? Where did you find that machine?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't know. It would be easy for me to tell you it was in an empty office or something like that, but I cannot in all honesty tell you where I found it.

MR PIGOU: Okay, you said ...

CHAIRPERSON: Were you sure though that you would find the machine?

MR DU PREEZ: Chairperson, as it had been stated to me if I came to the office and I did not find the device.

CHAIRPERSON: But you were certain that you would find it?

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot say that I was entirely certain, but this was a Sunday, there is not going to be activities at that office every Sunday where someone might have used the device. I was fairly convinced that I would be able to obtain the device.

MR PIGOU: You said that if I understand you correctly, that you had direct or indirect experience with this kind of interrogation technique before. Where did you first see the use, let me rephrase that, the use of wrapping pieces of cloth around the end of wires, was this also common practice during these sessions?

MR DU PREEZ: I would say that this was common practice. You must recall that the entire purpose was to prevent any kind of injury since every person under detention would have been visited by a Magistrate, the person would have been taken to a Doctor so there were precautions taken not to injure the person

with the wires, not to leave visible burn marks or anything like that.

This was one of the major factors which would lead to, that had to be taken into account in this kind of interrogation. Any one, whether they had reason or not, made complaints of assault so one made precautions that there would not be any marks left to protect yourself.

MR PIGOUE: Was water applied at all during Mr Bopape's interrogation or any other electric shock interrogation?

MR DU PREEZ: As I said, I had dampened or wet the points to conduct the electricity through the rags.

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, not just to conduct, but to intensify the electric current?

MR DU PREEZ: I wouldn't, I can't say whether it would intensify it. As I said there was no gauge with which to increase or decrease the electric current. I don't know whether water would intensify it as you have stated it, but it would ensure that the electric stream was conducted if you've covered the points in rags, there would be no shock if you don't have some sort of conducive matter. So I can't tell you whether it would have intensified it or even maybe reduced the intensity.

The intention of using the rags was to prevent burn marks.

MR PIGOUE: This is the first time that I have heard of electric shocks being applied in the manner in which they have been

described. The usual prescription of such interrogation/stroke techniques, is that wires whether or not they had cloths on them, are applied to certain sensitive parts of the body, fingers, toes, genitals, ears, etc.

Was this the first time in your experience that you had seen wires being drawn against the torso and the chest like this?

MR DU PREEZ: I cannot tell you whether this was the first time. The techniques which you are describing, I am aware of these, I have heard of these various techniques. I have not personally used these various techniques after that incident.

I made a point after this incident, not to use this particular device again. If you take into account, the question has not yet been asked, but it has ~~been stated to me that~~ the deceased did not want to cooperate and they want to scare him a bit. So if this was an effort to frighten the person a bit, and I understood by this that it would be very light shocks, very light torture in your words, maybe there would have been a degree of cooperation so they only wanted to scare him to convince him that it would be better to cooperate.

I did not have the background information so I can't tell you whether it was intentionally only drawn over his body, or maybe whether this was simply Engelbrecht's normal modus operandi, that that was just the way in which he did this.

I never asked him why he only moved it against the body like this, why he didn't tie it to the fingers or anything like that.

I can't tell you anything about this. I did not find this strange at all.

These were the people who were in charge of the investigation. I am not trying to excuse my own participation, but I was a courier basically, I was not particularly responsible for the interrogation. I could not interfere with their procedures.

I provided the device, I handled the device and that is the end of it.

MR PIGOU: You were aware that they wanted to scare him so you applied your interpretation of wanting to scare him, was to apply light shocks. In your experience is ten to twenty seconds of turning a handle on a dynamo a light shock, in your experience?

MR DU PREEZ: The time elapsed, the period of applying this shock, the number of times I turned the handle, I wouldn't say it was a matter of a light shock, but it is a process that can be extended for quite some time, because what I meant by a light interrogation, was a matter of scaring the person. Arrangements had not been made with me that I would stay on late or for the whole day.

What they said to me was that they wanted to scare him. I turned it as normal ... (tape ends) ... he had to continue. That is what I meant by light shocks.

MR PIGOU: But comparatively in your experience of this kind of interrogation technique, was this more intense or less intense than the norm?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't want to say my experience, the experience I have was here. What I have read in the newspapers and the allegations that I have heard, I would say that this was light.

MR PIGOU: Did Mr Bopape scream during the application of the electric shocks?

MR DU PREEZ: No sir. ~~Not that I can recall.~~ I would say no.

MR PIGOU: You indicated that his muscles contracted, so you visibly saw that?

MR DU PREEZ: I think I said that as an explanation of the result of applying electrical current, I didn't really mean that I had seen his muscles move.

But I was present and I could say yes, or I could say that I don't know. I believe it would be normal for a person's muscles to move under this impulses. So I would take it that his muscles also jerked.

MR PIGOU: So your position if I am right in understanding, is that you weren't involved in any particular questioning, you were

simply to act as a functionary in the interrogation and then after things went wrong and Mr Bopape died, you simply acted on orders to assist in the cover up, is that correct?

MR DU PREEZ: Just repeat?

MR PIGOU: First point, you were simply a functionary in the interrogation, you were not a functionary? You were not aware of what the interrogation was about, the substance of the matter, anything like that? You were simply there to apply the shocks?

MR DU PREEZ: That is correct Mr Chairman. I had been called in for a particular purpose, I was not part of the investigation in the interrogation of Bopape, I had just been contacted on the Sunday and like you say I was just a functionary, an aid. I don't believe they had called me in in particular to apply the shocks.

MR PIGOU: Do you have any idea as to why you were asked to go in a separate car to Bronkhorstspuit with Engelbrecht? What was the point of you going?

MR DU PREEZ: I can't tell you specifically, but because Engelbrecht and I were the two junior members there, we went in one vehicle. We travelled together. If one were to use the expression in for a penny, in for a pound.

We were not given a particular task, or taken along to fulfil a particular function, but here we were stuck with a person who was deceased and you were on the way to hand him over to

somebody else. I don't know whether it was a security measure from their side to take me along with them.

Like I said before, I had gone to purchase the garbage bags, what they discussed there possibly to let me travel with Engelbrecht, if such arrangements had been made. I don't believe if they had trusted me to go with them, I don't think they would have thought up evil deeds behind my back.

You know you are travelling with a body in your car. It is possible that you might have a pilot car, you know the criminals who transport marijuana always make use of this method, they send a vehicle ahead to check for road blocks, but I mean if we were to be stopped, we had appointment certificates, and we would just say we were police and we were on our way, but this was just a matter of getting people to act in unity, in unison and to go together and I think the senior members travelled in one car, and we travelled behind them.

MR PIGOU: Following the Bronkhorstspuit delivery of Mr Bopape's corpse, what was your involvement in subsequent cover up?

MR DU PREEZ: After returning to John Vorster Square, plans were made and instructions were given that his disappearance had to be made look like an escape. My part was that I had to pick up Mr Zeelie.

Mr Zeelie had put on the shoes of the deceased, he had run through the bushes from the point where he had allegedly escaped where a flat wheel had occurred, Mr Zeelie ran through the bushes there to a dirt road, we picked him up there and we drove off from the scene.

I think only Mr Mostert and Mr Van Niekerk and Mr Engelbrecht remained behind. I can't remember clearly whether Engelbrecht remained behind, but I transported Mr Zeelie. I didn't abduct, that was the wrong word. I transported him from that point to report on the alleged escape so that if the police arrived on the scene, we wouldn't be close by.

The tracks or the smell that remained after the shoes had passed over the terrain, I don't know if you know how tracker dogs work but they work purely on smell, that is all part of the cover up, I left.

If I remember correctly, I dropped off Mr Zeelie at John Vorster Square and I returned home. That was my role. I didn't at all make a statement regarding the matter at a later stage, because that would have appeared strange my being from Sandton and not always involved in investigations at the Square, how could I have been involved, it was a Sunday?

I was supposed to be studying for the upcoming examination, how did I become involved in an interrogation? So that was the point where I was left out of the rest of the matters,

that is why I said previously that on the Monday I did not know what the others had done. So that was probably why I had gone to Pretorius and asked him what now. That was the role I played in the cover up with regard to your question, that is my answer.

MR MALAN: Mr Du Preez, sorry to bother you. I want to return to the device. I just want to go back to the machine and if you could, you know, just advise us, tell us a little about it. You talk about okay, you've got two leads.

Where in fact do you wrap the cloth and what are you actually holding?

MR DU PREEZ: Okay, let us assume that the wire in your hand...

MR MALAN: Is it thicker or

MR DU PREEZ: It is a normal electric flex, like an electrician would speak of it.

MR MALAN: For lights and that sort of thing?

MR DU PREEZ: For lighting, plugs, any electrical. Normal electrical flex, electric cord. You get a variety of kinds. The plastic jacket is removed from the wire, you would then have the bare wire exposed and the open section is then wrapped in the material. It is dampened.

You get a variety of kinds of electrical wire. Electrical wire would be electrical wire.

MR MALAN: I am now holding it, how do I make sure that it doesn't shock me?

MR DU PREEZ: You hold it on the plastic section.

MR MALAN: So the end there is exposed?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes.

MR MALAN: And what does it feel like? Let's say this is a latter day or an earlier day, Truth Commission, and Mrs Van der Walt in under interrogation. You are holding the wires and Mr Prinsloo is turning the wheel. What is she going to feel?

You put this on her hand like this. What is she going to feel?

MR DU PREEZ: In Afrikaans we call it the shock bone, you know this little bone in the elbow. If you knock your elbow against something and you get this sort of shock like that, it is pain, but it is not intense pain. It is rather a sort of strange experience. I can't exactly explain it to you.

MR MALAN: Did you try it?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes. At this particular incident, I also took the wires. It is a shock because here the person is dying, now you want to know what is happening, so I held the wires and felt the pain and you get pain in your elbows.

It is a sort of a shake.

CHAIRPERSON: But you of course put it over here?

MR DU PREEZ: I beg your pardon?

CHAIRPERSON: You were actually dragging it across his torso?

MR DU PREEZ: Not myself. I held it in my hands. With all respect, this person has just died, so I wanted to feel what kind of shock this is. I did not intent on holding it on my own chest, then I wouldn't have been here today maybe, who knows.

MR MALAN: I am trying to get some idea of what it must have felt like. Let's take another sort of pain.

MR DU PREEZ: If this did not bring about some pain, it would be no use in convincing anyone. Especially when a person is fanatical about it or deeply convinced about it for all of his life, just to get him to tell you something so that no, I will drop what I have believed all my life and I will help you.

MR MALAN: If for instance I hit you in the nose with the fist, is it the same sort of pain? Is it bearable?

MR DU PREEZ: It all depends with what force you hit. It is very difficult to say. I could stick a pin into you and it would be sore. If you knock your foot, it is pain, but it would be bearable.

CHAIRPERSON: But none of you will know, because you actually never applied it to yourselves?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, that is what I said. I had it in my hands. I don't know, the pain which I felt was in my elbows. It is bearable, it is not normal for a person to have died from this pain.

CHAIRPERSON: But with respect you would not know, since you did not apply this on your own chest, you did not try it out on your own chest?

MR DU PREEZ: That is true, I cannot tell you anything about the intensity of the pain under those circumstances, but as I have said, it was commonly used. The apparatus was used. This was the first time in my personal experience where a person died under its use.

That is why I was so shocked and surprised. Here a person is dying.

MR MALAN: Did you ever hear of a particular manner in which this wires could be used to have other effects on a person? This is strange putting it on his chest because it is usually hands, genitals, or whatever, sensitive parts?

MR DU PREEZ: I will say to you that there are a variety of ways of using these wires. On various occasion there were cases of assaults that were reported where the person claimed that the wires were attached to his finger or to his ears.

MR MALAN: Tied to the legs?

MR DU PREEZ: There were cases where people claimed that the wires were placed under a person's arms. It was a widely used thing if a person was arrested, upon arrest the person would make a case of assault, whether the person was assaulted or not.

There were even booklets available what you should do in detention and one of the things was that you had to make a case of assault. I was warned on many occasions that there are claims that I have assaulted someone.

There are a legion of ways of applying this. It is not limited to a particular methodology.

MR MALAN: Do you know where these machines came from and were they locally manufactured or did they come from outside?

MR DU PREEZ: I can't tell you, I don't know. It had been stated that some of these were removed from farm telephones. Probably these were locally made. If it is the question whether this was purposely manufactured for this use, I would not know.

MR MALAN: How did it look, I mean was it a neat little machine like this or was it ...

MR DU PREEZ: The device which I used, had a normal handle, a sling handle which was a metal frame or body which had a coil inside. It is not an encased apparatus such as the one in the hands of the witness, it was purpose built to shock. I have seen such devices, they used these in bomb disposal these days to generate an electric impulse. But this is very recent technology, and I would not have believed that that was available at that time.

It was simply a power generator, an electrical power generator that was improvised for one or another purpose, it wasn't purpose manufactured for this usage.

CHAIRPERSON: Tell me, when you came into the room, did you look at Stanza Bopape?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, I believe I would have looked at him.

CHAIRPERSON: What sort of state was he in?

MR DU PREEZ: Chairperson, as I have said earlier, I cannot even recall his face today. To tell you in what condition he would have been physically or mentally, I cannot tell you. As I have said earlier, he had no visible injuries.

CHAIRPERSON: But I mean more than likely, he had probably been questioned and beaten around a little bit before you came?

MR DU PREEZ: That is entirely possible.

CHAIRPERSON: And you can't remember whether or not he was in a good shape or not?

MR DU PREEZ: Let me say it in this way, from the office to the passage outside, I did not notice anything out of the ordinary. Such as for instance that he was confused or that he walked in a particular way. As far as I could note, he was normal.

CHAIRPERSON: But I mean it is likely or probable that giving him a shock would be another stage of questioning, probably because in the first session or the second session or the third session, he had not given any answers?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have said earlier yes. What they told me was that they wanted to scare him a bit. I cannot tell you at what stage this would have been.

It is possible that he had some remaining doubts about his particular position. I cannot tell you what his position was or for what purpose he had been arrested. So I cannot tell you what might have been in his mind.

What was said to me was that they wanted to scare him.

CHAIRPERSON: Did they tell you that he was a terrorist before you put this machine on?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't want to tell you before or after the event.

CHAIRPERSON: So it could have been any criminal, any potential criminal they were torturing and you would have been part of that?

MR DU PREEZ: No, I must say to you that the Security Branch did not deal with normal criminal cases, it did not investigate criminal cases. This could not have been a robber or a person who committed a burglary, it could not have been a burglar.

CHAIRPERSON: After the first crank of the machine, did he say anything?

MR DU PREEZ: Allow me just to continue and finish before you continue. I assumed that this was a terrorist or a political, a

person under political detention, otherwise the Security Branch would not have been active.

CHAIRPERSON: Was it normal to torture terrorists?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have said previously, it was quite generally done. There were some of the persons in detention or detainees who were not dealt with in a rough manner, and I have seen this personally.

If you speak to somebody and he just comes forward with whatever information you need, he tells you I did this and I did that and I did this, if a person really believed in something, if this person really believed in what they were doing and believed that they were right, we should not debate now whether what happened was right or wrong, we have passed that stage, that is why we are here today.

But he had as much reason as myself to do his actions.

CHAIRPERSON: But you did not know him, is that not true?

MR DU PREEZ: I said that I did not know him.

CHAIRPERSON: So you did not really know? You have just surmised because he was held by the Security Branch that he might have been a terrorist?

MR DU PREEZ: You would not subject a person to this kind of interrogation for the fun of it. It is not necessary for you to gain detailed information of the background of the person.

If you became involved in the interrogation and you had to ask the questions, then you had to have background with regard to the claims made, but in this particular case it was different, I was not directly involved.

CHAIRPERSON: You decided to become involved when you made the device available?

MR DU PREEZ: That is true, I was involved in that sense.

CHAIRPERSON: You were not just an innocent bystander?

MR DU PREEZ: It is not my intention to now say that I was.

CHAIRPERSON: You were there to crank the machine?

MR DU PREEZ: This was not my single purpose. If I want to say to you today, would I have turned around and walked away? If I had done that, the circumstances now would have been quite different, but I did not think to retract at that stage.

CHAIRPERSON: You just went to lend a hand?

MR DU PREEZ: You can put it like that.

CHAIRPERSON: When you turned the device for the first time, was Stanza crying, did he say anything, did he whimper, was there any response?

MR DU PREEZ: Not while the shocks were applied, no.

CHAIRPERSON: So he didn't say anything?

MR DU PREEZ: During the breaks between the various shocks, he would be given the opportunity to - he was asked what he wanted to do now, did he want to say anything to us, but during

the actual application of the shocks, there would not be an opportunity.

CHAIRPERSON: Did he body jerk in any way?

MR DU PREEZ: As I have said, I assumed that his body would have jerked. He would have had some muscle movement.

CHAIRPERSON: Did the chair jump around?

MR DU PREEZ: No, he was tied down to a very heavy wooden chair. As I have said there were spasms.

CHAIRPERSON: And the second time, was he crying, was he saying anything, did he urinate?

MR DU PREEZ: No.

CHAIRPERSON: You did say that when you picked him up, there were bodily fluids?

MR DU PREEZ: I have said to ensure that no bodily fluids remained in the boot of the vehicle, and I put him in the bags because of that, but I did not say that he had urinated or that there were bodily fluids, that was a preemptive measure that I took. I was not that he had urinated.

I cannot recall that I had to clean the floor, that there were urine on the floor.

CHAIRPERSON: Did you consider that this was a human being?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: And?

MR DU PREEZ: What is your meaning?

CHAIRPERSON: And how did you feel?

MR DU PREEZ: After he died? As I have said earlier to the Committee, that was probably the biggest shock of my life?

CHAIRPERSON: Are you married?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Did you tell your wife?

MR DU PREEZ: Not at that time, no. That is why I wanted to speak to Pretorius, it is not something that you could discuss with your wife.

It is something which you had to deal with personally. You are now faced with a problem and you do not know how to solve this personally. You had to find somebody that you could trust and who could council you, there was not just a clear straight road that you could walk, a straight obvious course of action. You were part of a group of people and you have certain feelings.

You have intense shock. Never since that incident have I had a shock of this degree. I have never believed anything like that subsequently. I don't want to just give you a lot of meaningless words, but I have never lost a close family member, so I don't know whether I could compare the feeling. But it is an indescribable feeling that you experience.

CHAIRPERSON: Where did you learn to do this?

MR DU PREEZ: It is not something that you learn. Before I worked at the Security Branch, whilst still a Detective at John Vorster Square, as a young member, I saw how some of the older persons did the interrogation of suspects in this way, it is something that you just pick up through your career as a police officer.

You are not called in and told look, I want to teach you how to apply these shocks. I am sure there are many people who have had a long police career and who would never have been exposed to this kind of method. It is not something that you learn.

CHAIRPERSON: But where did you learn to wrap the ends of the wires with wet material?

MR DU PREEZ: I really can't tell where I saw this for the first time.

CHAIRPERSON: But you knew that if you did this, it wouldn't leave any marks?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, obviously I would have done.

CHAIRPERSON: That is fairly sophisticated?

MR DU PREEZ: I wouldn't say that, I wouldn't say it was sophisticated, it was a measure of protecting yourself. Where I had seen it the first time, I wouldn't know.

CHAIRPERSON: Whom were you protecting yourself against?

MR DU PREEZ: I don't understand?

CHAIRPERSON: You said that you did this to protect yourself?

MR DU PREEZ: Oh, yes. You know, although many people didn't believe in this, there were matters that were reported against members of the Police Force, that were investigated.

So if a detainee were taken to a Doctor, the Doctor would write this in his report if he found anything like that, or any visible injuries, it would be stated on the form, so this was to protect yourself in case a person would make an allegation against one.

So that there wouldn't be any evidence against one, one would ascertain that no burn marks or injuries were left, otherwise you could hit him over the head with a pick handle.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you enjoy your work now at, I see you are an Inspector in the new Police?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, if I didn't find satisfaction in what I did, and if I didn't find unity in the Force where I was working, then I would have accepted a package or had been medically booked out of the Force, boarded. I am one of the few who remained.

CHAIRPERSON: But you work together with the terrorists now, isn't that the case?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes, that is so. Like I said to you I don't want to become involved in who was wrong and who was right, but as I have stated before since 1990, I was in the Supreme Court before, just before Mr F.W. de Klerk made his speech, we expected small

concessions and then we had this information, we were told that the ANC,PAC etc. had been legalised, it was a difficult process.

After that speech, we still arrested people who were armed, who were walking around with explosives. I mean ... (tape ends) ... and the playing field, or the onslaught from the 1980's to the 1990's, the approach had shifted through 180 degrees.

Where the onslaught which we combatted in 1980's came mainly from the left, in the 1990's and to last year, the onslaught came from the right and in the same way that it was my work in the 1980's to do my job, I am still doing that same job with the proviso that my career is much more important to me, myself and the trauma which I had suffered since 1988.

On the basis of this, I would say it is not worth going to these lengths in interrogating a person and exposing a person to this kind of treatment. The question that I would like to ask myself is whether it was worth the trouble?

CHAIRPERSON: But do you think it is, you see, you say it is not worth it. But it is also wrong to accept that it is not just unlawful, but that you don't treat human beings in that particular fashion?

MR DU PREEZ: Where I stand today, where I realise better what human rights' involve, it is basically a new concept. In the olden days it did not go, it did not concern human rights. We believed that things were correct and right and we did that to

keep the government of the day in place. Perhaps there was a lot of propaganda, I am not in the position to tell, but if we looked at photographs in the newspapers or we arrived on scenes where people had been killed in explosions, this was a shock.

It is something that, well, I wouldn't say that it toughened you, but it blunted your emotions, your feelings. It was part of the struggle. You were standing on the other side. It perhaps gave you greater justification for what you did. Perhaps it was just a matter of salving your conscience, but it would give you some purpose. You wouldn't do it for yourself.

I am not a sadist where I would torture people for the sheer enjoyment thereof. I did it because I believed that it was right. Fortunately for me, unfortunately for the Bopape family, that incident had to occur for me not to withdraw completely and to leave the Police Force, but I probably remained part of it, I wasn't a spectator merely, but I refrained from turning that handle.

MR MAGADLA: Did you at any time get to know as to what Stanza had done, what had he been expected to say he had done to those people or he knew?

MR DU PREEZ: Mr Chairman, I came to understand at a later stage that he had been part of an MK cell which had operated in the Pretoria area, the so-called Maponya cell.

That is as far as I have knowledge. I can't tell you today what his deeds were supposed to have been. I knew he was part of an MK cell.

MR MAGADLA: Would this have been the Maponya cell which resulted in the Maponya person who was killed by the Police when he would not tell them as to how to find Maponya? Maponya who was a member of MK?

MR DU PREEZ: Maponya cell, as far as I knew, was the cell where a person killed himself with a limpet mine, when it exploded at the Sterland complex in Pretoria.

I take it that the person you are referring to, is Japie Maponya. I read about that in the paper, with the Eugene de Kock trial. I take it it is the same person, but I cannot testify that it was the same person.

MR MAGADLA: But you do recall that the brother of that person was killed because he would not reveal as to where that person was, and also he was killed because during the cause of the interrogation on him and the tortures on him, he had been so injured that he could not have been returned to his people, that the solution therefore was that he had to be killed?

MR DU PREEZ: That testimony I read in the press. I did not know about it.

MR MAGADLA: Now, had Stanza Bopape refused to confess or to respond as expected by the interrogators, despite the fact that

he had been tortured the way you have described, what would have happened to him?

MR DU PREEZ: Mr Chairperson, Section 29 at that stage provided for indeterminate or long detention if he hadn't been forthcoming with the truth at that stage, they would have interrogated him again at a later stage.

I can't say what would have happened, it is speculation. Normally if a person didn't want to speak to me today, I had six months time, I would speak to him again tomorrow.

MR MAGADLA: Now, if you had that much time to deal with these people, now what was - how did the need come about that they had to be tortured and to the extent that you have mentioned?

MR DU PREEZ: As I had stated previously, it was expected of one to obtain information as soon as possible depending on each case, where a person was detained, a particular course of action was decided upon. Where a person for example was detained only to aid the Police, one could sit and discuss it with him for about six months, until he made a statement to the effect that he had assisted a person.

In another case, instance, where a person had been arrested for being in possession of arms or where it was suspected that he had been involved, or could have been involved in deeds of

terror, then a more urgent form of interrogation was used and it was approached more urgently.

Not every person who was detained by the Security Police, was assaulted or tortured.

MR MAGADLA: Seeing that you participated in this by supplying the machine and actually operating the machine, and thereafter participated in the cover up whereby you helped to take the body to where you handed it over to some other person, were you at any stage called upon by your immediate superior to account for that action of yours, taking instructions from another unit to instructions which ended up with this type of thing happening? The type of thing for which your immediate superior would have had to account as well?

MR DU PREEZ: You see, I had not been called in to explain to him. The fact that the Divisional Commander had personal knowledge of this matter, probably make it illogical that a subordinate would question him about why he did certain things.

As I had stated previously, if the Divisional Commander knew about something, a subordinate officer couldn't go against his decision. Should a subordinate go against such a decision, it would hold serious repercussions for such a person.

And that is why I believe my Commanding Officer did not want to get involved in this matter.

MR MAGADLA: Was your name amongst the original applicants for amnesty, applicants who applied to the former government, I think they were about 3 000 and some number, was your name amongst those people?

MR DU PREEZ: I did apply for amnesty at that stage. I completed a form for deeds as they had said could lead to criminal charges but I never saw my name in the paper or in the list that was announced after that. On the particular day when those lists had to be handed in, I was in Breë Street on the scene of an explosion. So I don't know whether my form ever reached the offices.

MR MAGADLA: But when you presented your name there to be included in that list, you had Stanza Bopape's case in mind?

MR DU PREEZ: The wording had been very broad. There was no specific mention. At that time if I recall correctly, murder was excluded, it was not part of the ambit of the general amnesty. I did not believe that at that time, Stanza Bopape's case - I would not have been able to get amnesty with regard to the Stanza Bopape incident.

MR MAGADLA: The matters which you had in mind at the time when then you included your name there, have you mentioned those matters in this application?

MR DU PREEZ: No.

MR MAGADLA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Have you applied for amnesty for those matters?

MR DU PREEZ: Ma'am, it is cutting tires and throwing stones through windows. It did not occur to me to have been gross human rights' violations, and I did not apply for amnesty.

This particular incident for which I have applied for amnesty, is to my mind an incident which qualifies for amnesty.

CHAIRPERSON: But you know of course that amnesty really is in respect of matters other than gross human rights' violations, and can be for acts that are considered where you could be charged criminally?

MR DU PREEZ: If you want to state it like that, I suppose that is the case.



CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Any further questions? Not? Thank you very much.

MR PIGOUE: Chairperson, just two questions please. The first is when you were discussing the matter after the death of Mr Bopape in terms of the cover up, was there any mention of the proximity of June, 16th? This happened of June, 12th.

MR DU PREEZ: If I understand you correctly, where the 16th of June played a role in the decision to cover it up, is that your question? Yes, that had been a very sensitive date in the past.

If one had taken the correct route and if one had said that another person has died in detention, whatever the circumstances

might have been, I don't want to speculate on the consequences of the legal inquest, but it might well have led to a large scale of violence.

I would presume that 16th of June did play a role in the decision that was taken.

MR PIGOU: Did interrogations take place in your offices of Sandton as well as the one that you have described to us at John Vorster Square?

MR DU PREEZ: Yes. Both prior to and subsequent to the Stanza incident, there were interrogations. We were an Investigative Unit, so if a person was arrested for any particular case, you would have brought the person to your offices for interrogation.

Let me just finish. It was only at Protea at Soweto where there was a interrogation office that was built with the building of the office building. In most of our other settings, we had to use your office for interrogation.

Prior to the case of Bopape and thereafter, people were in fact questioned, yes.

MR PIGOU: Did Warrant Officer Mostert from the John Vorster Unit ever come to Sandton and interrogate people in Sandton?

MR DU PREEZ: Prior to the Bopape incident? Let me state this clearly, it would probably have been in about 1990 or maybe 1989, I cannot recall exactly, the two offices merged. He would

then probably have interrogated people at those offices, since they shared the offices.

MR PIGOU: Okay, but we have a statement from the man who was arrested with Mr Bopape, a Mr Bheki Nkosi who was held in Sandton cells and in John Vorster cells and was interrogated by Mr Mostert, Mr Syfert, Mr Chris Wilkins, currently at John Vorster Square, in Sandton, on the Monday that you had your conversation with Mr Pretorius. How would you explain that statement?

This statement was made in 1989 following his release from detention, it is a little bit coincidental, is it not that we have this strange situation?

MR DU PREEZ: I do not understand or see the coincidental nature of this. I was not involved in the questioning of Nkosi either prior to the death of Stanza. I cannot tell you whether they were there on the Monday or not.

I cannot even tell you whether I went home early or not on that particular day. If they say that they interrogated him there, then it would be possible. I am not saying that it is impossible.

If at that time he was in custody there, then it is very easy for them to bring him to our office to interrogate him. Why would you want to drive 20, 30 kilometres to John Vorster and question him there and then return him. I mean one police station is as good as another.

If he says he was questioned there, I cannot say that this is true or not. I was not involved.

MR PIGOU: The impression that it has left with me is that there was much more of a relationship between the Sandton office and the John Vorster office than you have actually described to us today, but you don't need to comment on that.

MR DU PREEZ: I would like to.

MR PIGOU: You can comment on it. It is my impression.

MR DU PREEZ: As you have said, that is your impression. As I have said there had been weekly morning conferences, we had tea together. It is not as if there were conflicts or as if there was a sense of apartness, but your day to day task was not of such a nature that it would have been necessary for you.

We all knew one another, there were year end functions. The various offices attended this together, but it was not as if I would have been familiar on a friendly sense with every single person at John Vorster Square. I knew everybody, I greeted them, I knew who they were, they knew who I was, but we did not work closely together on a daily basis.

As I have said earlier, this was the Divisional Commander's right if he wanted to phone and say we need an additional person, then we would have been used. The Regulation 3, the emergency regulation detainees, we often assisted with transporting them

from places of custody although this was not my job. It was not my job to work with him.

So if they gave you work, you did the work. There was a sense of closeness and solidarity. It was not as if they were removed from us. If I gave the impression that we did not cooperate with one another, that is not the case, we did cooperate. But it was not very close.

MR PIGOU: Thank you. I see Mr Prinsloo has run out of paper so I shall finish.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. This session is over.

