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 101 04 JUNE 2013 PAGES 10730 TO 10874



© REALTIME TRANSCRIPTIONS

64 10<sup>th</sup> 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



			D 10700
1	Page 10730 [PROCEEDINGS ON 4 JUNE 2013]	1	Page 10732 the fact, the need for accurate and up-to-date information
	[10:06] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes in		in an operation of the kind that we are debating. Do you
2		2	remember that?
3	our new venue, beginning our second century of hearings. I	3	
4	hope we won't get to 199 but it's a very auspicious place	4	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Are these the 10 points
5	to start the new century in Centurion. Mr Tip, I	5	that you led as your key 10 points?
6	understand you wanted to say something?	6	MR MPOFU: Ja, these are the 10 points
7	MR TIP SC: Yes, thank you, Chair. It's	7	that you and I agreed could be extracted from the
8	an unfortunate thing to have to say on the first day that	8	prescripts viewed as a whole. You remember we extracted 10
9	we are at our new venue but there was an incident that	9	points which you and I had agreed on in April, when we
10	everyone I think will have become aware of yesterday, at	10	started?
11	Marikana, which fills one with profound dismay and that was	11	GENERAL PHIYEGA: This is why I'm asking
12	a shooting incident at the Western Platinum office of NUM	12	whether it's the 10 points –
13	whilst, I understand, there was a meeting in progress of	13	MR MPOFU: Yes, it's the –
14	the local branch structures. Chair, one person lost his	14	GENERAL PHIYEGA: - that you mentioned.
15	life and a second one is in hospital apparently with	15	MR MPOFU: Yes.
16	critical injuries and I thought it appropriate that that	16	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I noted them.
17	should be placed before the Commission. I may add that, to	17	MR MPOFU: Alright, well, when you do
18	the best of my knowledge at present, there is nothing to	18	that then I have to refer you – the reason why I had wanted
19	suggest that the incident was in any way committed,	19	us to agree on those 10 points is so that I don't every
20	connected with the work of the Commission and that is all	20	time have to read the prescripts to say these are the
21	that I would want to say about that at this stage.	21	points that come from the prescripts but we'll do it the
22	CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Tip. I hope	22	long way. If you go to FF1 –
23	the last comment you made is correct, that there is no	23	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, wouldn't it be
24	connection. I would like, on behalf of the Commission, to	24	quicker if you referred the witness to the passage in the
25	extend our condolences to the family and loved ones of the	25	record –
25	extend our conditioners to the family and loved ones of the	23	
	Page 10731		Page 10733
1	Page 10731 deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to	1	Page 10733 MR MPOFU: Oh yes.
_	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to	1 2	MR MPOFU: Oh yes.
2	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish		MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went
2 3	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from	2	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,
2 3 4	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you.	2 3 4	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her.
2 3 4 5	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see	2 3 4 5	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes.
2 3 4 5 6	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed.	2 3 4 5 6	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of
2 3 4 5 6 7	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's the best way. General, I'm trying to short circuit things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed.You remember, in one of them I even remember
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed.You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed. You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed.You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree.Rememberthose 10 points? I will in due course find the exact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed. You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree. Rememberthose 10 points? I will in due course find the exactpassage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed. You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree. Rememberthose 10 points? I will in due course find the exactpassage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more thanhaving to read it out to you because I just don't have it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's the best way. General, I'm trying to short circuit things. When I cross-examined you in April and when I started now last week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that you had agreed. You remember, in one of them I even remember you went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" it won't record, you have to agree or not agree. Remember those 10 points? I will in due course find the exact passage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more than having to read it out to you because I just don't have it in front of me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed.You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree.Remember I opoints? I will in due course find the exactpassage.I'm hoping to rely on your memory more thanhaving to read it out to you because I just don't have itin front of me.CHAIRPERSON:Mr Mpofu, if there is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you, Chairperson. There was just one issue that I wanted to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed. You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree. Rememberthose 10 points? I will in due course find the exactpassage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more thanhaving to read it out to you because I just don't have itin front of me.CHAIRPERSON:Mr Mpofu, if there is aspecific prescript, as you call it, which you want to put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you, Chairperson. There was just one issue that I wanted to round up that we were busy with. I don't want to spend	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's the best way. General, I'm trying to short circuit things. When I cross-examined you in April and when I started now last week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that you had agreed. You remember, in one of them I even remember you went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" it won't record, you have to agree or not agree. Remember those 10 points? I will in due course find the exact passage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more than having to read it out to you because I just don't have it in front of me. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, if there is a specific prescript, as you call it, which you want to put to her now, won't you read that one out?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you, Chairperson. There was just one issue that I wanted to round up that we were busy with. I don't want to spend much time on it so I'll just explain to you where I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's the best way. General, I'm trying to short circuit things. When I cross-examined you in April and when I started now last week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that you had agreed. You remember, in one of them I even remember you went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" it won't record, you have to agree or not agree. Remember those 10 points? I will in due course find the exact passage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more than having to read it out to you because I just don't have it in front of me. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, if there is a specific prescript, as you call it, which you want to put to her now, won't you read that one out? MR MPOFU: Ja.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you, Chairperson. There was just one issue that I wanted to round up that we were busy with. I don't want to spend much time on it so I'll just explain to you where I'm coming from with it. You remember one of the 10 points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR MPOFU:Oh yes.CHAIRPERSON:Where you previously wentthrough the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall,she agreed with what you put to her.MR MPOFU:She did, yes.CHAIRPERSON:That would save a bit oftime, I think.MR MPOFU:Yes, yes. Alright,Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that'sthe best way.General, I'm trying to short circuit things.When I cross-examined you in April and when I started nowlast week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that youhad agreed. You remember, in one of them I even rememberyou went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" itwon't record, you have to agree or not agree. Rememberthose 10 points? I will in due course find the exactpassage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more thanhaving to read it out to you because I just don't have itin front of me.CHAIRPERSON:MR MPOFU:Ja.CHAIRPERSON:MR MPOFU:Ja.CHAIRPERSON:And if she disagrees she'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	deceased and I would be grateful, Mr Tip, if you'd see to it that that message is conveyed to them and also to wish the other gentleman who was injured a speedy recovery from the injuries that he sustained. Thank you. MR TIP SC: Chair, I shall certainly see to it that those remarks are conveyed. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. National Commissioner, you are still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I understand you still have questions to ask in cross-examination. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you very much Chairperson. Good morning, General. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Good morning, Advocate. MR MPOFU: When we broke on Wednesday, I think – CHAIRPERSON: Tuesday, actually. MR MPOFU: Tuesday, yes. Thank you, Chairperson. There was just one issue that I wanted to round up that we were busy with. I don't want to spend much time on it so I'll just explain to you where I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU: Oh yes. CHAIRPERSON: Where you previously went through the prescripts and where, as far as I can recall, she agreed with what you put to her. MR MPOFU: She did, yes. CHAIRPERSON: That would save a bit of time, I think. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. Alright, Chairperson, I don't have it at hand now but I think that's the best way. General, I'm trying to short circuit things. When I cross-examined you in April and when I started now last week, I revisited the issue of the 10 points that you had agreed. You remember, in one of them I even remember you went "hm-mm" and I said no, if you say "hm-mmm" it won't record, you have to agree or not agree. Remember those 10 points? I will in due course find the exact passage. I'm hoping to rely on your memory more than having to read it out to you because I just don't have it in front of me. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, if there is a specific prescript, as you call it, which you want to put to her now, won't you read that one out? MR MPOFU: Ja.

1	Page 10734 then we can carry on.	1	Page 10736 reference I want to refer you to is that you say, "The mine
2		2	management informed the SAPS delegation that there were
3	MR MPOFU: Thank you. Alright, I'll read them out in turn and then I will put to you what is the	3	ongoing clashes between members of two labour unions, AMCU
4	clear implication of those prescripts. The first one is	4	and the NUM." Did you -
5	FFF1, 3.1 or rather 3.3.1 and it says, "Situational	5	CHAIRPERSON: Let's put this in context.
6	appropriateness is the assessment by the operational	6	This is the discussion which took place on the evening of
7	commander of a public order situation and the taking of the	7	Monday the 13th –
8	most appropriate action at that time," with the emphasis on	8	MR MPOFU: 13th, correct.
9	the last three words. Remember we are discussing the	9	CHAIRPERSON: - when the National
10	accuracy and to the minute accuracy of information. And	10	Commissioner rushed off to Lonmin in consequence of what
11	then the next one, 3.3.2 is a bit long so I'll just read	11	had happened earlier that day.
12	it. It says, "The situation in which these interventions	12	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.
13	will take place must be also considered. Thus the	13	CHAIRPERSON: And she had a meeting,
14	operational commander must consider the situation at that	14	firstly a meeting I think with her senior officers and
15	specific moment and in that specific area in terms of the	15	thereafter a meeting with Lonmin and this passage relates
16	legal provisions. It is the operational commander's	16	to that meeting with Lonmin.
17	responsibility to take into account the situational	17	MR MPOFU: Thank you. I'm sorry,
18	appropriateness. To do this correctly, the operational	18	Chairperson. That's correct, yes. Ja, you were told that
19	commander needs continuous and accurate information on the	19	there were ongoing clashes between members of two labour
20	situation at all times." Thank you, and then the last one	20	unions, AMCU and the NUM.
21	is SS2 which is standing order 262. It says at 9.4	21	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes.
22	thereof, the first one says "The C-JOC" – or rather, "The	22	MR MPOFU: Yes. Well, would you – what
23	appointed C-JOC is responsible for a well-planned and co-	23	would your reaction be if I say that statement is not
24	ordinated action for the duration of an operation." And	24	correct, that there were no clashes between AMCU and NUM?
25	then the important part which I'm going to read out is 2,	25	MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Mr Mpofu -
	Page 10735		Page 10737
1	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the	1	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the
2	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says,	2	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she
2 3	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for	2 3	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct.
2 3 4	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute,	2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes.
2 3 4 5	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance	2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to
2 3 4 5 6	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really?
2 3 4 5 6 7	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON:I don't understand how thewitness can answer. You're putting to her that what shewas told by Lonmin was not correct.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:And you're asking her tocomment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really?Perhaps you should put the question –MR MPOFU:Well, she can –CHAIRPERSON:- more specificallydirecting her to a particular area of concern that you'rebusy with at the moment.MR MPOFU:Okay. Well, the area ofconcern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out– the area of concern is that the police were acting on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON:I don't understand how thewitness can answer. You're putting to her that what shewas told by Lonmin was not correct.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:And you're asking her tocomment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really?Perhaps you should put the question –MR MPOFU:Well, she can –CHAIRPERSON:- more specificallydirecting her to a particular area of concern that you'rebusy with at the moment.MR MPOFU:Okay. Well, the area ofconcern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out– the area of concern is that the police were acting on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position. MR MPOFU: Chair, if you'll bear with me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well okay, in that –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position. MR MPOFU: Chair, if you'll bear with me. Getting used to this place is a bit of a challenge. Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well okay, in that – CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position. MR MPOFU: Chair, if you'll bear with me. Getting used to this place is a bit of a challenge. Yes, in paragraph 17 of your statement which is FFF2 – sorry,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well okay, in that – CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you should say that, Mr Mpofu –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position. MR MPOFU: Chair, if you'll bear with me. Getting used to this place is a bit of a challenge. Yes, in paragraph 17 of your statement which is FFF2 – sorry, Chair – well, that version of your statement –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well okay, in that – CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you should say that, Mr Mpofu – MR MPOFU: Yes, that's true. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"For the purposes of pre-planning the C-JOC must follow the following procedure" and I'll jump 1 to 3. Number 4 says, "Implement an effective information gathering system for the operation to proactively gather up-to-the-minute, relevant and accurate information, enlisting the assistance of –" and so on. Yes, and the simple question is, from what I've read it's obvious, isn't it, that the prescripts require not only accurate but up-to-the-minute information in the course of an operation, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes. MR MPOFU: And therefore if - you and I have already gone through the one situation where the information relied on even to trigger stage 3, let's say may not have been accurate, namely the so-called breaking of the promise by Mathunjwa. Agreed? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not agree because it is exactly the point of difference between the police and your position. MR MPOFU: Chair, if you'll bear with me. Getting used to this place is a bit of a challenge. Yes, in paragraph 17 of your statement which is FFF2 – sorry, Chair – well, that version of your statement – CHAIRPERSON: Well, I think 17 is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON: I don't understand how the witness can answer. You're putting to her that what she was told by Lonmin was not correct. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And you're asking her to comment. Well, what sort of comment can she make really? Perhaps you should put the question – MR MPOFU: Well, she can – CHAIRPERSON: - more specifically directing her to a particular area of concern that you're busy with at the moment. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, the area of concern is that the police – I thought I had laid that out – the area of concern is that the police were acting on the basis of information which was not accurate. That's what we are discussing right now. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, it's still not clear to us which information was incorrect. MR MPOFU: Okay. Well okay, in that – CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you should say that, Mr Mpofu – MR MPOFU: Yes, that's true. That's true, correct. Well, I've already said the one about

<b>—</b>		1	
	Page 10738		Page 10740
1	time there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and the NUM.	1	other witnesses but if you're going to cross-examine this
2	I'm putting that to you.	2	witness on every piece of hearsay in her statement, even if
3	MR BURGER SC: Chair, I object to that	3	it has no bearing on anything she did or didn't do, then I
4	question.	4	don't think the time of the Commission will be gainfully
5	CHAIRPERSON: Yes.	5	employed. Let's ask the witness the question as I
6	MR BURGER SC: That's not the evidence	6	formulated it. This piece of information, National
7	before the Commission and in any event the comment of this	7	Commissioner, you were given, that according to Lonmin
8	witness on that version put, is irrelevant.	8	there had been ongoing clashes between members of two
9	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also turned on	9	unions, AMCU and NUM, it's suggested that that piece of
10	his light.	10	information is incorrect because according to the case that
11	MR SEMENYA SC: Well, I still don't know	11	Mr Mpofu is putting up, members of AMCU as such who weren't
12	why it is contended that the information isn't correct.	12	involved in any clashes – but the point of the question I'm
13	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think the	13	asking you is, did that information that you were given,
14	question is rather vague, the way you've phrased it, to say	14	erroneous or not, have any influence on anything that you
15	the information is incorrect without indicating in what	15	did or didn't do in the period after you received it on the
16	respect the information is incorrect. Otherwise you elicit	16	evening of the 13th of August?
17	the objection from Mr Burger but there's a further point,	17 18	GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, Judge. [10:26] MR MPOFU: Okay, I'm going to put the
18 19	of course, and that is what is the purpose of getting this		other statement similarly and ask you the same as the Judge
20	witness to comment? It may be that there is a relevance that you haven't yet made apparent but may I suggest,	19 20	and then I'll as you the real question which I want to ask
20	reformulate the question in a more focused way and then	20	you at the end. Your statement goes on to say, "The
22	perhaps we can proceed.	22	management further stated that the clashes had already
23	MR MPOFU: Okay, Chairperson. Firstly,	23	claimed the lives of nine people, as we were briefed by the
24	let me deal with the issue of relevance. I'm reading from	24	police." In other words, the clashes between AMCU and NUM
25	the witness's own statement. If it was irrelevant, why was	25	had already claimed nine lives. Well, first of all I'm
	Page 10739		Page 10741
1	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can	1	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the
2	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement,	2	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that
2 3	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained	2 3	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer –
2 3 4	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do	2 3 4	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it
2 3 4 5	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by	2 3 4 5	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those
2 3 4 5 6	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it	2 3 4 5 6	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on
2 3 4 5 6 7	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to	2 3 4 5 6 7	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA:</u> I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA:</u> I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. <u>MR MPOFU</u> : Yes. No, I agree with you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA:</u> I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. <u>MR MPOFU:</u> Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information – MR MPOFU: Well –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the cause of that were the clashes between AMCU and NUM and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - whether it caused her to do or not do certain things and then there would be a direct connection between the information and the kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the cause of that were the clashes between AMCU and NUM and that was not the cause of those clashes, that's exactly the point I'm making. CHAIRPERSON: The point I put to you, Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - whether it caused her to do or not do certain things and then there would be a direct connection between the information and the kind of evidence she can give. There's a good deal of hearsay in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the cause of that were the clashes between AMCU and NUM and that was not the cause of those clashes, that's exactly the point I'm making. CHAIRPERSON: The point I put to you, Mr Mpofu, is surely it's only relevant to know what that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - whether it caused her to do or not do certain things and then there would be a direct connection between the information and the kind of evidence she can give. There's a good deal of hearsay in her statement, statements will presumably be repeated by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the cause of that were the clashes between AMCU and NUM and that was not the cause of those clashes, that's exactly the point I'm making. CHAIRPERSON: The point I put to you, Mr Mpofu, is surely it's only relevant to know what that information, if it was erroneous or even if it wasn't, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	it put in her statement? That's the whole point. How can I do better than cross-examine her on her own statement, really? All I'm saying is that the information contained in her statement, insofar as it suggests that – and I do acknowledge that it was second-hand information given by other people but I'm saying that information, insofar as it was given to her and it was important enough for her to include in her statement, reflected factually incorrect content in the sense that, to answer Mr Semenya's question, in the sense that there is no evidence that there were clashes between AMCU and the NUM. And I don't want to go through all – we've gone through this with Mr Zokwana and various, and Mr Mathunjwa and it is clear that the unions per se, at least AMCU has said that it played no role whatsoever in – CHAIRPERSON: I would've thought the better way to do it is to ask this witness what importance, if any, she attached to this information – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - whether it caused her to do or not do certain things and then there would be a direct connection between the information and the kind of evidence she can give. There's a good deal of hearsay in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	putting to you that that was incorrect and to follow the Judge's example, did that play any role in anything that the police did? And maybe to – sorry, before you answer – to pre-empt Mr Semenya's question, in what respect was it inaccurate? I'll put to you that at least five of those nine people, I won't even go to the others, were killed on the 13th and the NUM and AMCU had no role to play in those or the clashes between the two of them. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it is important, Adv Mpofu, to say to you that when nine lives are lost, whether it's on the 10th or the 9th or the 13th or the 16th or whatever, it's a very important issue for the police so we would have to concern ourselves with those nine lives that were lost, do our investigations and see what's happening. This is how far it would affect me and we would want to know what is the cause of that. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I agree with you 100%. That's exactly my worry, that you were told that the cause of that were the clashes between AMCU and NUM and that was not the cause of those clashes, that's exactly the point I'm making. CHAIRPERSON: The point I put to you, Mr Mpofu, is surely it's only relevant to know what that

1	Page 10742	1	Page 10744
1	do because she can't, from her own knowledge, comment on	1	in paragraph 24 of your statement which says that – and
2	the accuracy of the information. MR MPOFU: No.	2	this is not from the mine, it's from Mbombo – "She relayed"
3		3 4	– CHAIRPERSON: 24?
4	5		
5	information she got. It's important to know whether that	5	MR MPOFU: 24, yes Chairperson. It's – CHAIRPERSON: Just to put it again in
6	information influenced her in her subsequent conduct.	6	1 5
7	That's the only aspect, surely, on which she can	7	context -
8	meaningfully help us.	8	MR MPOFU: It's General Mbombo.
9	MR MPOFU: Yes, Chair –	9	CHAIRPERSON: It's something that she was
10	CHAIRPERSON: Shouldn't you concentrate	10	told by Lieutenant-General Mbombo, that's the Provincial
11	your questions on that aspect?	11	Commissioner of North-West, on the afternoon or possibly
12	MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, exactly.	12	even early evening of the 16th August after the shootings on
13	I'm going to, following your example and putting that	13	the 16th had taken place.
14	question but I'm going to put the inaccuracies first if –	14	MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson.
15	and then I have a theory as to the importance or non-	15	And supposing this one merely as an inaccuracy, so I'm
16	importance.	16	conceding the point that the Chairperson has made that it
17 18	CHAIRPERSON: Why not list the inaccuracies as you contend they are –	17 18	was said after the first, so obviously it didn't influence what actions you took but she said that, she relayed that
19	MR MPOFU: Yes.	19	the police had also been fired at and that the police had
20	CHAIRPERSON: List the inaccuracies for	20	shot and killed a number of protesters, which later turned
20	her benefit –	20	out as 34, in private defence. The reason why I'm saying
22	MR MPOFU: That's what I'm doing.	22	that's inaccurate is that the police's own version accepts
23	CHAIRPERSON: And then put the question	23	that about 10, if I'm not mistaken, of the people shot at
24	that I've suggested.	24	scene 2 may not have been shot in self-defence.
25	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	25	CHAIRPERSON: It is the police's version,
	······································		
	Page 10743		Page 10745
1	Page 10743 Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair.	1	Page 10745 as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr
1 2		1 2	5
	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair.		as I understand it from the opening statement and $\T{Mr}$
2	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was	2	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the
2 3	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I	2 3	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were
2 3 4	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already	2 3 4	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the
2 3 4 5	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people.	2 3 4 5	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well –
2 3 4 5 6 7	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not	2 3 4 5 6 7	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, in that right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, is that right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of the evidence but what's the point of taking the point up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, is that right? MR MPOFU: Yes. The faceless people,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of the evidence but what's the point of taking the point up with the present witness who merely says what she was told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, is that right? MR MPOFU: Yes. The faceless people, yes. Yes, and the last one is also an inaccuracy but it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of the evidence but what's the point of taking the point up with the present witness who merely says what she was told by the Provincial Commissioner who, in any event, will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, is that right? MR MPOFU: Yes. The faceless people, yes. Yes, and the last one is also an inaccuracy but it's a more complicated one and it probably falls under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of the evidence but what's the point of taking the point up with the present witness who merely says what she was told by the Provincial Commissioner who, in any event, will be coming to give evidence at some stage in the near future?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Alright, I'm going to list them, all five of them, Chair. As I said, the first one we dealt with last week which was the fact that Mathunjwa had made a promise which he did not make. The second one is the fact that there were ongoing clashes between AMCU and NUM. The third one is the one I was dealing with now that those clashes had already claimed, in other words cost, the lives of nine people. The fourth one is, fourth inaccuracy is the fact, "The mine management further stated that the protesters were not their employees." We already know that you, the police contested that successfully. That's the – CHAIRPERSON: That misinformation, if it was misinformation, it appears to have been, played no role in anything which she did or didn't do because her senior officers were able to demonstrate to Lonmin by reference to the photographs and so on, that their members were indeed involved. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: So that one has got no, is not causally connected with anything she did or didn't do, is that right? MR MPOFU: Yes. The faceless people, yes. Yes, and the last one is also an inaccuracy but it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as I understand it from the opening statement and Mr Semenya will confirm this if I'm correct, that they claim that all 34 people who were shot on the 16th by members of the police service were shot in circumstances where the policemen – they were all men – policemen concerned were acting in private defence. That's their case, as I understand it. MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: Is that correct, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: That is correct, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: That's one of the issues that we are called upon to decide. The present witness will not be able to assist us, I don't think, in any way in deciding that question because she wasn't there but she made statements thereafter, based on the information she had received but I don't see how, even – I understand from your point of view, your argument is that this information was either totally or partially incorrect, that's your case and that's something that you'll argue fully at the end of the evidence but what's the point of taking the point up with the present witness who merely says what she was told by the Provincial Commissioner who, in any event, will be

	Page 10746		Page 10748
1	problem with this whole debate. My learned friend, if he	1	Mbombo and others – about what the protesters wanted as at
2	puts factual inaccuracies, can only put it on the basis	2	about 13:45, which was to the minute information of what
3	that that's his version. I don't for a moment accept these	3	was happening and that the police ignored the Bishop, to
4	as factual inaccuracies. In fact, my people haven't given	4	put it mildly. You are aware of that?
5	evidence yet. General Mpembe hasn't given evidence yet.	5	CHAIRPERSON: Before you answer, National
6	Whether this is the result of a turf war between NUM and	6	Commissioner, Mr Semenya wishes to say something.
7	AMCU –	7	MR SEMENYA SC: The question again,
8	CHAIRPERSON: General Mbombo.	8	Chair, it's unclear whether this is reference to the Bishop
9	MR BURGER SC: Mbombo. Whether this is	9	saying the people want water and food. Which part is
10	the result of a turf war between two unions is very much a	10	wrong?
11	live debate, from my perspective. So my learned friend can	11	MR MPOFU: Okay. Let me preface this by
12	put these, quote, "inaccuracies" as his version and no	12	taking you back to what I said earlier. Your prescripts
13	more.	13	say that you need to know accurate and to the minute
14	MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, Chairperson,	14	information. I'm saying to you, part of the most important
15	CHAIRPERSON: I think impliedly, to be	15	to the minute information which might have even averted the
16	fair, that's what he was doing. He perhaps didn't say it	16	massacre, was the fact that the Bishop had interacted with
17	expressly but I understood that and if there was anyone	17	the strikers and they had basically sent him to management
18	here who didn't so understand it, they will now so	18	with a message which he wanted to relay, not only to
19	understand it.	19	management but also to the police but the police ignored
20	MR MPOFU: Yes.	20	him. That is a crucial part of the to the minute reality
21	CHAIRPERSON: Please proceed in a focused	21	of what was happening, do you understand?
22	way on this point.	22	CHAIRPERSON: How can this witness help
23	MR MPOFU: Yes. Mr Chairperson, yes,	23	us on that issue?
24	Chairperson not only do I put it on the basis that it's my	24	MR MPOFU: Well –
25	version, I go further. I put it on the basis that it is	25	CHAIRPERSON: We've had the evidence of
1	Page 10747	1	Page 10749
1	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people	1	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the
2	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU	2	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop
2 3	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM.	2 3	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that
2 3 4	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's	2 3 4	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point?
2 3 4 5	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version –	2 3 4 5	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest
2 3 4 5 6	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well –	2 3 4 5 6	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this
2 3 4 5 6 7	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an	2 3 4 5 6 7	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know what happened. The Bishop was here, he was cross-examined,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. The further point, General, that I want to put to you is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know what happened. The Bishop was here, he was cross-examined, we'll hear the police when they come. This is wasting time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. The further point, General, that I want to put to you is that part of the to-the-minute information included the fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know what happened. The Bishop was here, he was cross-examined, we'll hear the police when they come. This is wasting time and I seek a ruling. MR MPOFU: Well, Mr – I've already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. The further point, General, that I want to put to you is that part of the to-the-minute information included the fact that, for example, Bishop Seoka had had a discussion with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know what happened. The Bishop was here, he was cross-examined, we'll hear the police when they come. This is wasting time and I seek a ruling.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	nobody's version in these proceedings that the five people killed on the 13th were as a result of clashes between AMCU and NUM. CHAIRPERSON: Well, apparently it's Lonmin's version – MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: - and Lonmin haven't had an opportunity to lead evidence yet so Mr Burger says – MR MPOFU: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: - we can't make a finding at this stage in anticipando, as it were, before he's even been given a chance to lead any evidence and that must be right, so – MR MPOFU: Yes, well – CHAIRPERSON: It's not a matter of moment for the moment – MR MPOFU: No, no. CHAIRPERSON: It's clear your version is different from his. Let's just carry on, on that basis. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. The further point, General, that I want to put to you is that part of the to-the-minute information included the fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Bishop, we're going to have the evidence of the Provincial Commissioner about her dealings with the Bishop but how can the National Commissioner help us on that point? MR MPOFU: Chairperson, with the greatest respect, this is the witness who has said to this Commission that one of the key things for their acting is the accuracy of information. I'm busy showing her that they acted or might have acted on information which was inaccurate. How can the witness, who is the National Commissioner of Police, not be able to comment as to whether that is, as she says, in conformity with the prescripts for which she thanked the people or it is not? MR BURGER SC: Chair, then I formally object to the question on the basis you've put to my learned friend and I request a ruling. This is quite irrelevant, what this witness's version on a contentious issue in this case is. She wasn't there, she didn't know what happened. The Bishop was here, he was cross-examined, we'll hear the police when they come. This is wasting time and I seek a ruling. MR MPOFU: Well, Mr – I've already answered the objection but I don't know how, Mr Burger is

	Page 10750		Page 10752
1	CHAIRPERSON: Come on, Mr Mpofu, that	1	uphold you –
2	answer isn't worthy of you. The witness has already said	2	MR MPOFU: Yes.
3	that she wasn't there. It's never been suggested that she	3	CHAIRPERSON: - and make a finding
4	was, so I think we can take it as a given that she wasn't	4	accordingly. If you are wrong, we'll make a finding the
5	there.	5	other way but nothing this witness can say will help us in
6	MR MPOFU: Well, then she may have been	6	making that finding because her knowledge in the matter is
7	told. She wasn't there for everything, then Chairperson,	7	based on hearsay and she has no particular expertise or
8	why is she here? She wasn't there the whole day, then why	8	anything of that kind which can assist us in resolving the
9	does she have to say anything about the 16th?	9	factual dispute that would arise in consequence of the
10	CHAIRPERSON: At the end of the day this	10	argument that you're going to put up before us.
11	commission will have to decide certain factual issues and I	11	MR MPOFU: Ja.
12	regret to say that the views of the National Commissioner	12	CHAIRPERSON: So it's on that basis that
13	on those factual issues which relate to points that arose	13	I rule that the evidence is irrelevant.
14	when she wasn't present, in respect of which she has no	14	MR MPOFU: Okay.
15	special knowledge, will cut no ice with the Commission at	15	CHAIRPERSON: And I suggest you move on
16	all and will be ignored. So let us not indeed even elicit	16	to a point that has more relevance than the ones you're
17	information or evidence from her which will merely be	17	busy with at the moment.
18	ignored.	18	MR MPOFU: Okay. Well, General,
19	MR MPOFU: Okay, let me –	19	unfortunately the only thing I can ask you is simply that
20	CHAIRPERSON: So the ruling I give is in	20	whether, or rather say to you what I'm going to argue and
21	favour of Mr Burger.	21	ask for your comment, which is that if the police acted on
22	MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you. I'll go back,	22	inaccurate and not to the minute information, that would
23	step back. Do you know that Bishop Seoka tried to	23	have caused disastrous consequences if the factual basis
24	intervene and to prevent the massacre? Do you know,	24	was incorrect. Or maybe to put it in the reverse, the
25	General?	25	reason why these prescripts that I read to you put so much
	Page 10751		Page 10753
1	CHAIRPERSON: There's some static on the	1	emphasis on the accuracy of up to the minute information is
2	line. I don't know what's happening. It's someone's cell	2	exactly to avert a situation where the police act on an
3	phone, so everyone who has a cell phone please turn it off	3	incorrect factual basis and cause a disaster.
4	otherwise, unless it's someone whose presence is essential	4	[10:46] CHAIRPERSON: I have received a note
5	for the ongoing work of the Commission, I'll ask for that	5	informing me that a group of injured people who are
6	person to be removed from the room. So whether the witness	6	represented by Mr Mpofu want to sit in the chamber, despite
7	knows about whether Bishop Seoka's intervention clearly	7	limited space. There are 31 in number and – are there 31
8	will depend on hearsay, it will depend on something that	8	seats available?
9	she was told or something which she read in the newspaper.	9	MR SETATI: [Inaudible]
10	Again I don't understand any relevance of her comments upon	10	CHAIRPERSON: There have been,
11	whether he was present or whether he wasn't or what exactly	11	arrangements have been made for them to sit in a room
12	he did or tried to do.	12	across the courtyard where there'll be a television
13	MR MPOFU: Fine, Chair.	13	screening of what's happening.
14	CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps you can explain	14	MR SETATI: [Inaudible] they are saying
15	that to me before I rule on it?	15	they cannot watch the screen while they are [inaudible].
16	MR MPOFU: No, obviously I don't think I	16	CHAIRPERSON: Well, that's a matter which
17	can even go that far to explain. If the witness knows now	17	we'll deal with when we get there. There is accommodation
18	that there was something which could have prevented the	18	for the people who want to come in and I suggest if they
19	massacre and that is irrelevant, well, then I'll just move	19	want to come in, they should come in and if they don't want
20	to something else. I don't know how that could ever be	20	to come in they can stay out.
21	irrelevant.	21	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chair.
22	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, the witness's	22	MR SETATI: Excuse me, Chairperson.
23	knowledge of these matters is a matter for her herself. If	23	Chairperson, it's me.
24	it could have prevented the massacre, it's a matter you	24	CHAIRPERSON: I was looking for a light
25	will argue in due course. If you are correct we will	25	but I fear your computer's top may have blocked the light
-	RCHIVE FOR JUSTICE		

		r	
	Page 10754		Page 10756
1	so I couldn't – I was looking for a microphone light. Is	1	argument, I would think, but – there will be an argument
2	your microphone on? Well, your computer is blocking it, I	2	but I take it he'll have a factual basis. It may be based
3	can't see. Alright yes, please proceed.	3	on circumstantial, arguments based on circumstantial
4	MR SETATI: Chairperson, you know, I	4	evidence, not necessarily direct evidence but certainly
5	think the best thing to do – we have suggested that they	5	circumstantial evidence to establish that. Whether the
6	wait for the adjournment, the tea adjournment, then what we	6	argument is good or bad is something we can't decide now.
7	will do, we'll add an extra row of chairs, you know, the	7	So that's your point, is it, Mr Mpofu?
8	free chairs that side and I think that will accommodate	8	MR MPOFU: That's all, Chairperson, and
9	them.	9	I'm moving on to something else.
10	CHAIRPERSON: I'm told there are 31	10	CHAIRPERSON: I regret to say in all the
11	outside and there are 31 chairs available now. I don't	11	excitement about the adequacy of the seating for people who
12	know why they're not inside here.	12	want to come in, I think I missed the answer if there was
13	MR SETATI: I am sure we do have that	13	one. So would ask the National Commissioner to please
14	number of chairs and I'm not – what I'm not sure of is that	14	repeat it, if she gave it, or to give it for the first time
15	whether they will fit inside but we will try to fit a last	15	if she didn't.
16	row –	16	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think listening to
17	CHAIRPERSON: As far as I can see, making	17	the argument that is going around, the issue of accurate,
18	a quick estimate, I would guess there are 31 chairs. If	18	to the minute information, that matter is going to be
19	they didn't come on time before we started, I'm not sure	19	argued. There'll be a standpoint of the police, there is
20	that they can demand that we stop proceedings to	20	your standpoint and those that were there, I think General
21	accommodate them because they happen to be late but if they	21	Annandale has started talking about some of it, General
22	want to come in they can come in, as long as they do so	22	Mbombo is coming, General Mpembe is coming, so there would
23	quietly. Let's carry on.	23	be an argument on that matter and there would be
24	MS MOTLOENYA: I'm sorry, Chair, while Mr	24	disagreement.
25	Setati is making arrangements for the injured, can they	25	MR MPOFU: Thank you very much, General,
	Page 10755		Page 10757
1	also keep in mind that the family members will be attending	1	we will have that argument, I can assure you.
2	the Commission tomorrow and I think –	2	Incidentally, have you found whether or not there was a
3	CHAIRPERSON: The Commission won't be		
	CHAIRPERSON. THE COMMISSION WORL DE	3	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made
4	sitting tomorrow but –	3 4	
4 5			recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made
	sitting tomorrow but -	4	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked,
5	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday.	4 5	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was
5 6	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the	4 5 6	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it?
5 6 7	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the	4 5 6 7	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in
5 6 7 8	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment.	4 5 6 7 8	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording.
5 6 7 8 9	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair.	4 5 6 7 8 9	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the
5 6 7 8 9 10	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything	4 5 7 8 9 10	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case the disaster, as he uses	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be evidence – MR MPOFU: Amorgst other things, yes,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself. CHAIRPERSON: Have you given us copies or
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be evidence – MR MPOFU: Amongst other things, yes, Chair.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself. CHAIRPERSON: Have you given us copies or not?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be evidence – MR MPOFU: Amongst other things, yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And there'll be evidence	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself. CHAIRPERSON: Have you given us copies or not? MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be evidence – MR MPOFU: Amongst other things, yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And there'll be evidence to that effect, Chair?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself. CHAIRPERSON: Have you given us copies or not? MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: So you're giving us now?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	sitting tomorrow but – MS MOTLOENYA: I mean on Thursday. CHAIRPERSON: The question of the arrangements for the family will be discussed during the adjournment. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's anything we need discuss here in the auditorium. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MS MOTLOENYA: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I was seeking clarity. Is Mr Mpofu's case that the disaster, as he uses the word, was caused by the failure to take up to the minute, accurate information? Is that his case? CHAIRPERSON: I think that is his case. MR MPOFU: No - MR SEMENYA SC: And there will be evidence – MR MPOFU: Amongst other things, yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And there'll be evidence	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	recording of Mr Lepaaku's funeral where you allegedly made the statement that SAPS should not be sorry? I've asked, my learned friend could not find it but he said he was going to ask you. Have you found it? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have indicated in this Commission that we didn't have that recording. MR MPOFU: No, that's – well, that's the first time you are making that indication. And are you also equally saying that there's no recording in existence of your press conference on the 17th and that of General Mbombo - a SAPS recording, I am asking? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've also said yes, we don't have. MR MPOFU: There is – Chairperson, if I may ask a document which will be an exhibit, I had given it to Mr Semenya last week so that he, insofar as it relates to the record, rather to the recording, so that he could satisfy himself. CHAIRPERSON: Have you given us copies or not? MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson.

		r –	
	Page 10758		Page 10760
1	CHAIRPERSON: And your learned friends	1	had the Sesotho portions – is it Sesotho, is it?
2	for the –	2	MR MPOFU: Ja.
3	MR MPOFU: Just one line, Chairperson.	3	CHAIRPERSON: The vernacular portions, if
4	CHAIRPERSON: Okay, but your learned	4	we had them translated as well.
5	friends, have they also got copies or been given copies?	5	MR MPOFU: I'm hoping that – yes, we
6	MR MPOFU: They will –	6	will. Thank you, Chairperson, that's a valid point but I'm
7	CHAIRPERSON: I see. That's being	7	hoping to test the interpretations with the witness.
8	attended to, good.	8	CHAIRPERSON: I can't remember what the
9	MR MPOFU: Yes. If there are some –	9	first language of the National Commissioner is. I seem to
10	CHAIRPERSON: Ms Pillay, am I correct in	10	remember it was Sepedi, but let's ask her. What is your
11	thinking that FFF20 – sorry, FFF30 is the next exhibit?	11	home language or your mother tongue, National Commissioner?
12	MS PILLAY: That's correct, Chair.	12	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sepedi.
13	CHAIRPERSON: Is it the transcript of the	13	CHAIRPERSON: Sepedi. Now Sepedi of
14	Rylands video, Mr Mpofu, is that how I describe it? Mr	14	course is northern Sotho and presumably someone who speaks
15	Mpofu? Mr Mpofu?	15	Northern Sotho can understand 95% of something in Southern
16	MR MPOFU: Yes?	16	Sotho, is that –
17	CHAIRPERSON: Do I describe this as	17	MR MPOFU: Correct, Chairperson. Most of
18	transcript of Rylands video?	18	the experts we get in the courts only know about 80% of
19	MR MPOFU: Yes, correct, Chairperson.	19	what they're talking about, but for background let's start
20	Transcript Rylands video 26 maybe to be exact, in case	20	with the – before we even go to the Sotho can you look at
21	there's another one later. Is it 25? Oh, there's also a	21	entry 00:42 to 00:46? I'm sorry, do you have the same
22	25. 26, Chairperson.	22	document? GGG36.1, the new one that's just arrived now.
23	CHAIRPERSON: Oh, alright. It will be	23	Yes, that one. If you can read for us against the entry
24	marked exhibit FFF30.	24	00:42 to 00:46.
25	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	25	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I read that,
	Page 10750		Page 10761
1	Page 10759 MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear,	1	Page 10761 Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to
1	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear,	1	Page 10761 Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read?
		-	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to
2	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain	2	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read?
2 3	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video.	2	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the
2 3 4	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 –	2 3 4	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one
2 3 4 5	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just	2 3 4 5	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at
2 3 4 5 6	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1.	2 3 4 5 6	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS PILLAY:Chair, just to be clear,there is another exhibit of a transcript of CaptainRyland's video.MR MPOFU:That's why this one is 20 –MS PILLAY:That's GGG36. I'm justwondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1.MR MPOFU:Oh yes.MS PILLAY:To keep it with the othertranscript.MR MPOFU:I would agree with that,Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS PILLAY:Chair, just to be clear,there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video.That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY:MR MPOFU:That's GGG36. I'm justwondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU:Oh yes. To keep it with the otherMS PILLAY:To keep it with the othertranscript.I would agree with that,Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part.MS PILLAY:MS PILLAY:GGG36.1.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS PILLAY:Chair, just to be clear,there is another exhibit of a transcript of CaptainRyland's video.MR MPOFU:That's why this one is 20 –MS PILLAY:That's GGG36. I'm justwondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1.MR MPOFU:Oh yes.MS PILLAY:To keep it with the othertranscript.MR MPOFU:I would agree with that,Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. Theonly difference is that here we've translated the Sesothopart.MS PILLAY:GGG36.1.CHAIRPERSON:I actually wasn't on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. I'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to refer you – just for background, sorry General, this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I see that, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to refer you – just for background, sorry General, this transcript as Ms Pillay has correctly pointed out, was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I see that, I want to be clear. Is it the translation you gave me as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to refer you – just for background, sorry General, this transcript as Ms Pillay has correctly pointed out, was given but obviously whoever was doing the transcription	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I see that, I want to be clear. Is it the translation you gave me as homework and you asked me to go and listen to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to refer you – just for background, sorry General, this transcript as Ms Pillay has correctly pointed out, was given but obviously whoever was doing the transcription could not, either could not understand the Sesotho part and we've just inserted those. It's in the same genre as what you and I discussed at the beginning about –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I see that, I want to be clear. Is it the translation you gave me as homework and you asked me to go and listen to? MR MPOFU: Yes, it's part – the Rylands
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MS PILLAY: Chair, just to be clear, there is another exhibit of a transcript of Captain Ryland's video. MR MPOFU: That's why this one is 20 – MS PILLAY: That's GGG36. 1'm just wondering if we shouldn't make this GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Oh yes. MS PILLAY: To keep it with the other transcript. MR MPOFU: I would agree with that, Chairperson. It's actually the same conversation. The only difference is that here we've translated the Sesotho part. MS PILLAY: GGG36.1. CHAIRPERSON: I actually wasn't on the microphone – I'm sorry, I've changed the exhibit description now to exhibit GGG36.1. MR MPOFU: Yes. Right, I'm just going to refer you – just for background, sorry General, this transcript as Ms Pillay has correctly pointed out, was given but obviously whoever was doing the transcription could not, either could not understand the Sesotho part and we've just inserted those. It's in the same genre as what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Judge, can I just – what is this that you're asking me to read? CHAIRPERSON: This is a transcript of the soundtrack of a video taken by Captain Rylands who is one of the members of the police service who was present at scene 2. We've seen the video already, we listened to the soundtrack but the point being made is that there were portions of the soundtrack in the vernacular which were not translated, so they've had it transcribed again with the portions of the vernacular. I can't remember whether the portions in the Afrikaans vernacular were translated but certainly the portions in the Sesotho vernacular weren't. The passage he wants you to look at, at the same time I'll read, it reads, "Ryland" which I take it indicates the Captain's voice, "Pyp hom live, daai enetjie, pop hom live." Is that correct, is that the passage you want? MR MPOFU: That's the one, Chairperson. Can you see that part, General? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Before I see that, I want to be clear. Is it the translation you gave me as homework and you asked me to go and listen to? MR MPOFU: Yes, it's part – the Rylands videos, yes, were part of the homework about a week or so

1	Page 10762	1	Page 10764
1	listen, I didn't hear. I think it's important for me to do that, to tell you that when I listened, I did my homework	1	argument. And this one fortunately we don't need Mr Burger's assistance. The next one is 02:15 which - up to
2			-
3	and I didn't understand. So you are saying somebody has a better ear, this is the person with the better ear.	3 4	02:30. I'll read it out just out of respect for you. "That motherfucker, I shot him at least 10 times. He keeps
4			•
5	MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay General, let me explain how we are proposing to do this. First I gave you	5 6	coming and coming. These things of 17 magazines keeps" – and then there someone else speaks. That's the second one
6 7	the homework.	7	that I'm referring you to.
8	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes.	8	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –
		。 9	
9 10	MR MPOFU: And then, as I say, I gave the transcript to your legal team last week so that they	9 10	CHAIRPERSON: Is Captain Ryland going to come?
10		10	
	themselves could go to the people upstairs and listen and	12	5
12	satisfy themselves. So it's either they have done that or	12	so directed Chair, but the basis of my objection now is, I
13	they have not done it. If they have done it then they		really don't know where Mr Mpofu is going but if this
14	would, they are satisfied that this is what reads, it says	14	witness is not able to understand and what prompted these
15	on the tape. If they have not done so then obviously they	15	comments, her evidence would be again totally irrelevant.
16	are taking the risk that maybe later they'll find there is	16 17	CHAIRPERSON: I think that we're going to
17 18	someone, as you put it, with a better ear in which case	17 18	get the question about the highest standards of professionalism at the end but -
	we'll deal with it but for now just deal with it on the		•
19 20	basis that this is the transcript. If that is wrong, for	19 20	MR MPOFU: Yes – CHAIRPERSON: Am I right? You're reading
20 21	some reason, we will apologise to the Commission and all sorts of things will happen but that's why we took those	20 21	CHAIRPERSON: Am I right? You're reading a bit of – you're reading some passages which you think,
22	precautions. Thank you. So –	22	you're going to submit reflect badly on the policemen
22	GENERAL PHIYEGA: But Judge, I just want	22	concerned –
23	to say it is important for me as a witness to actually say	23	MR MPOFU: Yes.
24	I did my homework, I took what you gave me, I listened and		CHAIRPERSON: And then you're going to –
20	Tala my nonework, Flook what you gave me, Flistened and	25	And then you're going to
	Page 10763		Page 10765
1	Page 10763 indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me.	1	Page 10765 the punch line or the final culminating question is going
1 2	5	1 2	
	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me.		the punch line or the final culminating question is going
2	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you,	2	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of
2 3	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that	2 3	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional –
2 3 4	<ul> <li>indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you,</li> <li>I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we</li> </ul>	2 3 4	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you,</li> <li>I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you,</li> <li>I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So</li> <li>I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's –
2 3 4 5 6 7	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first	2 3 4 5 6 7	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you,</li> <li>I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So</li> <li>I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I am, can tell us what either of those words mean in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: - they're in accordance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I am, can tell us what either of those words mean in the context.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: - they're in accordance with the highest standards of professionalism. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I am, can tell us what either of those words mean in the context. MR BURGER SC: We're dealing with POP,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: - they're in accordance with the highest standards of professionalism. I think that's his point. It's marginally relevant but I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I am, can tell us what either of those words mean in the context. MR BURGER SC: We're dealing with POP, it's probably pop.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: - they're in accordance with the highest standards of professionalism. I think that's his point. It's marginally relevant but I'm inclined to think, in the interests of moving on, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	indeed the inaudible places remained inaudible to me. MR MPOFU: Yes. No, in fairness to you, I did say to Mr Semenya when I gave him the document that even for us, when we played it on a sort of normal TV we couldn't pick up those parts, we had to use earphones. So I can believe what you're saying but for now I think let's just move on. All those will be done - we can't do them right now – will be done in time. So okay, I'll just read out the part and then I'll ask you the question. The first one is the one that the Judge has already read, "Pyp hom live daai enetjie, pop hom live." CHAIRPERSON: It says "pyp" as the first word and "pop" as the second. MR MPOFU: Ja, "pop hom." CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure if that was a misprint or whether "pyp" was said the first time and "pop" was said the second time. MR MPOFU: Yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: I'm not quite sure. Perhaps Mr Burger, who's a better Afrikaans linguist than I am, can tell us what either of those words mean in the context. MR BURGER SC: We're dealing with POP,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the punch line or the final culminating question is going to be, is that in accordance with the highest standards of professional – MR MPOFU: Something like that. CHAIRPERSON: - professionalism, you know, is that right? Well, let's – MR MPOFU: Best of responsible policing. CHAIRPERSON: Let's get that over with as quickly as we can. [11:05] MR SEMENYA SC: Well, Chair, shouldn't the witness first tell us whether, when she made that statement, all these utterances were known to her? CHAIRPERSON: No, no – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Semenya, that's not Mr Mpofu's point. Mr Mpofu, as I understand it, doesn't suggest that the witness knew all the things that he put to her. What he's asking her is whether she still says- MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: - they're in accordance with the highest standards of professionalism. I think that's his point. It's marginally relevant but I'm

		I	
	Page 10766		Page 10768
1	anyway, let him – is that right, am I right, Mr Mpofu?	1	it says – [speaking Sesotho]. This is very vulgar, it
2	MR MPOFU: You have –	2	refers to your private parts. And then he says to that
3	CHAIRPERSON: You don't suggest for a	3	person – "[speaking Sesotho], go down." He was insulting a
4	moment that this witness knew about the Rylands video and	4	person who was seated there, your, referring to his private
5	what was on it when she made the statement she made?	5	parts and then saying to this person, "Go down, [speaking
6	MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson, that's why I	6	Sesotho]."
7	had to play 16 for her to show the dragging, to show the	7	CHAIRPERSON: Could you then please
8	boots, to show all those things. If I thought she knew all	8	translate that into Xhosa for the benefit of those who want
9	those things already I wouldn't have played it for her.	9	the Xhosa interpretation?
10	Alright, the next one. The next one was just the one below	10	MR MPOFU: But the last line is –
11	that - [Reading Sesotho]. Now we'll take it – this is the	11	[speaking Sesotho] – and I'll also read it in full for
12	part where they say –	12	trans – rather, for context. "Blom, blom, ready the
13	CHAIRPERSON: He translated it into, from	13	position, boss. Hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons
14	Sesotho into Xhosa.	14	aanval, die ding vang ons sommer so. Wie Sebatchane, hy
15	MR MPOFU: He has already.	15	slaat hom tien, hy is die mag", the "mag" or the "mag" –
16	CHAIRPERSON: Are you still busy with it,	16	the "mag" yes, "hy het die mag leeggemaak maar hy kom nog
17	translating it into isiXhosa?	17	steeds." "Mag" I assume is magazine.
18	MR MAHLANGU: We are still busy with the	18	CHAIRPERSON: Translate the Afrikaans
19 20	last sentence. CHAIRPERSON: When you've done that would	19 20	into English and then also into Xhosa and I suspect that "mag" there is probably an abbreviation for the English
20	CHAIRPERSON: When you've done that would you be kind enough to help those of us who are	20	word "magazine" but you'll know better than I.
22	linguistically challenged in another direction, by	22	MR MAHLANGU: If I may say, Mr
23	translating it into the English please?	23	Chairperson, this sounds like the Afrikaans spoken by the
24	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Mr Mahlangu.	24	coloured population of the Western Cape. The word "blom"
25	CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible]	25	usually means sit but I cannot say in this context this was
			5
	Page 10767		Page 10769
1	Page 10767 MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes.	1	Page 10769 sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss."
2	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible]	1 2	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here,
	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes.		sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang
2	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him,	2	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us?
2 3 4 5	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it	2 3	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so."
2 3 4 5 6	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then	2 3 4 5 6	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete.	2 3 4 5 6 7	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." That one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it, leave it." And then "Unknown," another person, "Ja, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another one of those terms used there, "en hy het die mag
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it, leave it." And then "Unknown," another person, "Ja, that muti shit does not work here, baba" – [Speaking Sesotho].	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another one of those terms used there, "en hy het die mag leeggemaak." He emptied his magazine, "maar hy kom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it, leave it." And then "Unknown," another person, "Ja, that muti shit does not work here, baba" – [Speaking Sesotho]. MR MAHLANGU: The translation in English would be, "There's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it. Ja, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien," that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another one of those terms used there, "en hy het die mag leeggemaak." He emptied his magazine, "maar hy kom steeds," but he is still coming.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it, leave it." And then "Unknown," another person, "Ja, that muti shit does not work here, baba" – [Speaking Sesotho]. MR MAHLANGU: The translation in English would be, "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it. Ja, that muti shit does not work here, baba." Baba means father but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another one of those terms used there, "en hy het die mag leeggemaak." He emptied his magazine, "maar hy kom steeds," but he is still coming. MR MPOFU: Thank you. General, I just want to try and save time. I'll round off, I'll ask you a kind of rounded question that covers all the statements and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR MAHLANGU: Into Xhosa first, yes, yes. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MAHLANGU: Yes. In English this would be, "Yô, yô, Pat, I have blasted him, I have blasted him, jong. I have blasted him, yes, yes. "I don't see how it could be if I could hit him with a knob stick" – and then the sentence is not complete. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'm happy with that translation, save to remind the tribunal that earlier on the witness had agreed to a closer interpretation which was, "I have blown him apart" but "I have blasted him," I'm happy with that. Right, then the next one – GENERAL PHIYEGA: It's very confusing. MR MPOFU: - is at 2:00 to 3:00 and just for context I'll read the whole thing and Mr Mahlangu will help us with the other part. "There's muti there, there's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it, leave it." And then "Unknown," another person, "Ja, that muti shit does not work here, baba" – [Speaking Sesotho]. MR MAHLANGU: The translation in English would be, "There's muti there. Ja, all over the body. Leave it, leave it. Ja, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sitting here. "Blom, blom, ready the position, boss." That's how it reads and then he says, "Hierdie, Here, hierdie, het jy gesien hoe die ding ons aan, die ding vang ons sommer so." Did you see how this thing attacked us? This thing just comes. "Die ding vang ons sommer so." This thing just catches up – yes, like this, or unaware. "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." that one is not really - "Wie Sebatchane, hy slaat hom tien." Sebatchane hit him 10 times. "Hy het die mag leeggemaak," he emptied his stomach but he – CHAIRPERSON: I suspect it may be the magazine of the firearm. MR MAHLANGU: Die mag, not die maag. Die mag, ja. He emptied his magazine – CHAIRPERSON: Maybe Captain Rylands when he comes, can tell us how he understood it but I suspect that he emptied his magazine – MR MAHLANGU: Yes, "mag" here is another one of those terms used there, "en hy het die mag leeggemaak." He emptied his magazine, "maar hy kom steeds," but he is still coming. MR MPOFU: Thank you. General, I just want to try and save time. I'll round off, I'll ask you a

	Page 10770		Page 10772
1	the Commission that those statements, including those made	1	tea adjournment now.
2	in Sesotho, are vulgarities, as Mr Mahlangu has suggested,	2	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.
3	which have no place in a humane police service that you and	3	[COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
4	the SAPS legal team have made us to believe you were	4	[11:48] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes.
5	running.	5	National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu.
6	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Judge, let me just put	6	MR MPOFU: Thank you, thank you,
7	it this way before I answer that question. I have a	7	Chairperson. Commissioner, before we move on I just want
8	problem with all these versions of information as presented	8	to once again clarify the question I'm putting to you. In
9	to me to respond to. First there was the translation which	9	paragraph 39 of the opening statement of the police among
10	I was given too, which had a lot of gaps. I was asked to	10	other things it says, "The South African Police Service is
11	go and listen, which I did and again I came out unclear.	11	committed to humane policing, in a humane," I suppose, it's
12	Today there's a version her that sounds more like Fanagolo	12	spelt human but I'm sure they meant humane. "Humane
13	that is being presented to us and perhaps at some point	13	policing in a humane society." You yourself have thanked
14	really if one is to start commenting and putting opinions	14	the police for what they did and you have described their
15	on the matter, we may need people with better equipment,	15	work as the best of responsible policing. And all I'm
16	ability to read this type of thing and then maybe we can	16	putting to you is that in the same way as the images that I
17	respond to those. At this point in time I find it very	17	showed you of policemen placing a boot on somebody's body,
18	difficult to accept the statement that has been read to me.	18	dragging people, laughing around them and all the things
19	MR MPOFU: Yes. Thank you, General. No,	19	that we dealt with when we resumed our cross-examination,
20	that's understandable but you see how these things work is	20	that the statement - those were actions, physical actions.
21	that you are a very busy person, we don't want to bring you	21	Now I'm showing you verbal actions, if you like, which fall
22	back here in two months' time just for the sake of	22	into the same genre, as I said, and what I'm putting to you
23	listening to this. So for now please just believe that the	23	is that if these statements are indeed as they appear in
24	question is simply as follows. If these translations are	24	the document in front of you then they do not, A, represent
25	correct and that "if" depends on if Mr Semenya for some	25	a commitment to humane policing in a humane society or the
	Page 10771		Page 10773
1	Page 10771 reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one	1	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to
1 2	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as	1 2	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that?
	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one		best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to
2	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that	2	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my
2 3	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I	2 3	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that?</li> <li>GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> </ul>
2 3 4	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty	2 3 4	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that?</li> <li>GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: So going back to where we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you,</li> <li>Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place.</li> <li>And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into.</li> <li>As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA:</u> Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally and objectively. I'm saying to you, this version, this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there, now that I've pointed all these things to you is your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally and objectively. I'm saying to you, this version, this translation, I am very concerned to put my comment on these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there, now that I've pointed all these things to you is your answer that you're not prepared to withdraw, qualify your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally and objectively. I'm saying to you, this version, this translation, I am very concerned to put my comment on these type of issues. I wouldn't even mind coming back if we have had people who have listened to this, all these versions and have given us a translation, then I can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there, now that I've pointed all these things to you is your answer that you're not prepared to withdraw, qualify your statements about gratitude for whatever happened and thank
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally and objectively. I'm saying to you, this version, this translation, I am very concerned to put my comment on these type of issues. I wouldn't even mind coming back if we have had people who have listened to this, all these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there, now that I've pointed all these things to you is your answer that you're not prepared to withdraw, qualify your statements about gratitude for whatever happened and thank you for what you did? You're not prepared to do that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reason – I can be 1000% sure about this – if he speaks one word that is incorrect, him and I will sit down and as colleagues we'll agree and we'll inform the Commissioners and so on and so on. So take that for granted that that will happen. In fact he doesn't even have to listen. If I listen to and find something wrong, I will – I am duty bound to come and say no, that word was not correct and so on, so accept all that. Now if, after all those processes, these translations are found to be correct, would you agree that they display vulgarities which have no place in the humane and compassionate police and all the other things that you said the police are doing? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, I think the "if" factor will remain a very serious bother for me in answering questions in this Commission because the "if" factor, you know, you are actually saying being the National Commissioner I must make very serious comments about things that I would have considered very rationally and objectively. I'm saying to you, this version, this translation, I am very concerned to put my comment on these type of issues. I wouldn't even mind coming back if we have had people who have listened to this, all these versions and have given us a translation, then I can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	best of responsible policing and it's nothing for you to direct your gratitude towards. What do you say to that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I shall say to you, Advocate, that there is a lot that I have to express my gratitude to in terms of the operation that took place. And I shall also say in a large operation such as that one there may be one or two errors and those we will look into. As this Commission finishes we will look at those errors but ordinarily the operation was indeed delivered in a humane manner. MR MPOFU: So going back to where we started, you and I accept I think as Mr Semenya has pointed out and the Chairperson has confirmed, I accept that all the things that I've shown you, starting with the material from the videos to this, were not things that you necessarily knew when you made your statement of gratitude and best of responsible policing, what have you. The question I'm asking you is now, as you are sitting there, now that I've pointed all these things to you is your answer that you're not prepared to withdraw, qualify your statements about gratitude for whatever happened and thank you for what you did? You're not prepared to do that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I am not because

FOR JUSTICE

RCHIVE

1	Page 10774 MR MPOFU: Thank you.	1	Page 10776 COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: My next question to
2	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I get the	2	you, Mr Mpofu, was going to be are you suggesting that the
3	impression you've taken the point as far as you can. I can	3	commanders that have been named are the persons who knew
4	understand that there are points you may wish to advance in	4	about this?
5	argument but whether they are good points or bad points –	5	MR MPOFU: Maybe my next question will
6	MR MPOFU: Is another matter.	6	clarify, Commissioner Hemraj. The proposition that I'm
7	CHAIRPERSON: It's not appropriate to	7	putting to you really is this, that to your knowledge, to
8	decide now but I imagine you've got the material upon which	8	your knowledge members of the police who were present
9	you'll base the argument.	9	during the operation knew some of the policemen would be so
10	MR MPOFU: Yes.	10	affected by the killing of other policemen that they would
11	CHAIRPERSON: So may I suggest you move	11	not be able to function normally to the extent that is
12	on to another point?	12	expected of them.
13	MR MPOFU: Yes Chair, that question was	13	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –
14	meant exactly for that purpose. And I put it to you that	14	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Mr Semenya?
15	this kind of behaviour and language portrays not a so-	15	MR SEMENYA SC: We still require
16	called compassionate and humane police force but one that	16	specificity. We had General Annandale there, it was not
17	was motivated by anger, malice and even a sense of revenge.	17	put to him that he knew that those people would, because of
18	What do you say to that?	18	the events of Monday, kill the others.
19	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I have disagreed and I	19	CHAIRPERSON: I seem to remember that
20	shall continue to disagree because I do not believe that we	20	when he was asked a question along those lines and he said
21	as police had what you are putting forward.	21	he couldn't say, the Provincial Commissioner might be able
22	MR MPOFU: And do you remember before we	22	to but if he couldn't and it's a matter for the Provincial
23	moved to what I call the next game changer, do you remember	23	Commissioner, I don't see the point in asking this witness
24	where we started with this was that the events of the 13th,	24	the question. But Mr Mpofu aren't you asking this question
25	in particular the killing of the policemen, are what	25	of the wrong witness?
1	Page 10775 produced this sort of brutality, for lack of - well I don't	1	Page 10777 MR MPOFU: Okay, once again I have to
2	think it's anything short of that - and strong language and	2	show my hand. I have to say where I'm going with this.
3	unlawful actions and what I want to put to you is that the	3	You have testified that you approved the opening statement
4	police themselves knew that some of the policemen would be	4	of the police, correct?
5	so affected by the killing of their fellow policemen that	5	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes.
6	they would lose their professionalism or that they would no	6	MR MPOFU: In that statement, paragraph
7	longer be able to function as expected. What do you say to	7	35 says the following: "When police officers are targeted
8	that?	8	the police service steps in, suppressing the human response
9	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr Mpofu, when you	9	of the moment in order to render a professional service."
10	say the police knew, exactly who are you referring to?	10	
	say the police knew, exactly who are you referring to:	10	Suppressing the human response of the moment in order to
11	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the	11	Suppressing the human response of the moment in order to render a professional service. "Some members who may have
11	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the	11	render a professional service. "Some members who may have
11 12	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the	11 12	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the
11 12 13	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their	11 12 13	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were
11 12 13 14	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on	11 12 13 14	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what
11 12 13 14 15	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on.	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that,	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that, Chair, the word leadership does not answer Commissioner	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might suppress the human response of the moment in order to
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that, Chair, the word leadership does not answer Commissioner Hemraj's enquiry. We want to be able to bring those	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might suppress the human response of the moment in order to render a professional service.
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that, Chair, the word leadership does not answer Commissioner Hemraj's enquiry. We want to be able to bring those witnesses so that they can refute the allegations that is	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might suppress the human response of the moment in order to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, that opening
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that, Chair, the word leadership does not answer Commissioner Hemraj's enquiry. We want to be able to bring those witnesses so that they can refute the allegations that is being put to them. To just say the leadership knew, to me	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might suppress the human response of the moment in order to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, that opening statement contends to the contrary and I don't understand
<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	MR MPOFU: Okay let me say SAPS or the leadership of SAPS on the ground knew that because of the killing of the policemen in particular, some of their members would be so affected as not to be able to carry on their duties as expected and that these were just demonstrations thereof. What do you say to that? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you have your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: I was going to say that, Chair, the word leadership does not answer Commissioner Hemraj's enquiry. We want to be able to bring those witnesses so that they can refute the allegations that is	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	render a professional service. "Some members who may have been affected by the death of their colleagues in the events of 13th August, of Monday 13th August 2012, were removed from Marikana and posted elsewhere." That's the statement which you approved. The statement doesn't say who or all these things that Mr Semenya is asking but what it does say is that some of the members were removed from Marikana because of the knowledge that the death of their colleagues would have so affected them that it might suppress the human response of the moment in order to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, that opening

Page 1078         Page 1078           2         obleague. The only proposition I'm putting is that if the 2         I killed popile, innocent popile and so and so on, so           2         world how been so affected by the desht of their 4         Colleagues, as it says hore, to such an oxtont that they 5         So and so on, so           4         colleagues, as it says hore, to such an oxtont that they 5         So and so on, so         2           5         associal been so affected by the desht of their 5         So and so on, so         2           6         protosianial arkor, then I' the argent on the bit bit 10         5         So and their the popisition you are putting, on the proposition you are putting.           6         change 2, name change to the extent that they dramad or such agrame change to the extent that they dramad or such agrame change to the extent that they dramad or such agrame change to the widen shall be the popies of th			I	
2         while realized even before the 16th that some of their own whild have been an affected by the death of their vertices of a says here. O such an extent that they been approximate and the terms of the form of the form of constraints across the same of a professional sorte. Then it we then the the knowledge of this witness when she approved the statement at least, if a no other time, the proposition that - the grand or the big proposition which 1 put in terms of what 1 call grame of a such again changer to the constraint the weak of the same or changer 2, namely that the daths of police on the 13th three 13 such agains changer to the constraint the weak of the same of the same of professionalism from the police to the 13 such agains changer to the constraint the weak of the vulgarities and 14 the brutility that is shown to the withess. 15 CHAIRPERSON: If M [MoIL], I don't soe the 16 nexus behave what was described in the passage you are 17 from the oponing statement and what we see here in GGG30. 18 because the picture that one saw on the wide was a 19 situation whore it is contraded by the police to the 19 situation whore it is contraded by the police to the 19 situation whore it is contraded by the police to the State 10 describe they responded. Now if people, even if they 21 calcurates accounted that in sol-defore or private 23 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they 24 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they 24 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they 25 CHAIRPERSON: If a difference or private 26 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they 26 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they 27 or chairy course of the socie or the socie or the 31th 28 advaps speak the English that Dector Bowdere would approve 29 or chairy course of the socie or the socie or the 31th 29 advaps speak the English that Dector Bowdere would approve 30 define they week there substratind the 31 advaps speak the English that Dector Bowdere would app		<u> </u>		5
3         undit have been so affected by the death of their         3         into IL. Tharfs not the proposition fun putting. Iffe           4         colleagues, asil axys here, to such an extent that they         5         imply saying that - and Tm not even saying iffs the sole           6         professional service, then it was then to be knowledge of         5         cause.           7         this withness when she approved the statem that least, if         7         proposition what put represention your are putting, not the proposition your are putting, not the your and your observes and the proposition your are putting, not the your and your observes and the proposition your and your observes are proposition your are putting, not the they were there were being attacked.           1         they being attacked a sacuming for the moment that they are yound. They your proposition your and your observes.         1         1           1         they lease in a privat				
4         adiaguies, as it asys here, to such an extent that they         4         simply saying that - and I'm not even saying it's the sole           5         had to be removed because they may not be able to render as         5         cause.           6         no other time, the proposition you are putting, not the proposition you are putting,         1         fill like to know what           7         they with each be approved the statement at least. if         7         proposition you are putting,           8         no other time, the proposition you are putting,         1         fill like you are putting,           9         many time time, the proposition you are putting,         1         1           10         changer 2, namely that the datask of putties and         1         1           11         such and make sy all the valugatiles and         1         1         1           12         errowed the sense of professionalism. The police to the         1         1         1           13         evaluation the sy and the valugatiles and         1         1         1         1           14         intertime where the walugatiles and         1         1         1         1         1         1           15         for the secone that set and the origon and         1         1         1			2	
5         had to be removed because they may not be able to render at professional service, then it was then to the knowledge of this witness when she approximation that is the production you are putting.         CHAIRPEESON: 12 differences proposition which put in terms of what I call game to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to some of polices on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were to changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the town was described in the passage you road to the burbality that I've shown to the withors so to the burbality that I've shown to the withors so to mombers of the police what was described in the passage you road to the some abays of the police whot was a station where it is contended by the police that the defore they responded. New if people, oren if they adverse there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 14th they's being attacked - assuming for the moment that they's being attacked - assuming for the moment that they will reace in a paticular way. And they mightri always speak the English that they denote adverse mouth that you would find used in police drawing rooms but to notwer and you would find used in police drawing rooms but to notwer acting under stateled or not appender of the runders and the same at they and they be profession at were on the scene on the 13th or a notwer acting under stateled or not adverse the you would find used in police drawing rooms but to how can you show or base a contention that this behalviou;	3	-	3	
6         professional service, then it was then to the knowledge of 7         6         CHAIRPERSON:         If like to know what 7           7         this witness when she approved that - the grand of the big 9         proposition you are putting.         9         putting but the proposition you are putting.           9         changer 2, namely that it he deaths of palce on the 13th were 13         schem that they had to do adents of palce on the 13th were 14         MR MPOU:         Schem that its its eace cause for them behaving 13           16         changer 2, namely that it he deaths of palce on the 13th were 14         the brutality that I've shown to the witness.         11         I'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying its 13         unprofessionally. All I'm saying, Chair, is this, that the 14           16         changer 2, saying, Chair, is this, that the 16         of the polce on that they daid the passage you crad 15         of the polce on the 3th, area won the wide was a 15         of the polce on the 3th, area won the wide was a 16           17         rom the opening statement and what we see here in GGG36.1         17         removed and what I'm poing to argue diviously at the 17         no was a divide the same or private 24         the same inability to render a professional service that 25           26         there on the 3th, are at scare 2 on the 16th and 24         the yre being attacked - assuming for the moment that 25         the same inability to render a professional service. 26           26	4		4	simply saying that - and I'm not even saying it's the sole
7         this witness when she approved the statement at least, if         7         proposition you are putting, not the proposition you are putting,           8         not other time, the proposition that - the grand or the tig         8         putting but the proposition you are putting.           9         proposition which I put in terms of what I call grame         10         de-ascribe the one that's ascribed to mot saying is           11         such a game changer to the extent that they dant from mot polices to the         11         His say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying is           12         removed the sense of professionalism from the police to the         11         His say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying is           13         cotant that they dant Composition you are putting.         His witheness         11           14         the trutiality that I've shown to the witness.         11         His say what I'm putting out I'm outsaying. Chari, statewes and           15         of this witness so affected some of them that they even had         16         to be removed and what I'm act say on of those           18         wood splayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         17         the subscont displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.           19         memore and that is act-adcence or private         14         that I's always speech was caused by the fact that thes           10         chrourstances in w	5		5	
a         no other time, the proposition that - the grand or the big         putting but the proposition you are putting.           b         proposition which I put in terms of what I call game         MR MPOU:         Yes. Weil, Tris have to           i         mouth at the deaths of police on the 13th were         MR MPOU:         Yes. Weil, Tris have to           i         mouth at the deaths of police on the 13th were         deacette the one that sacched to mn first and then           i         mouth at the deaths of police on the 13th were         deacette the one that sacched to mn first and then           i         mouth at the deaths of police on the 13th were         deacette the one that sacched to mn first and then           i         mouth at the deaths of police one awo in the video was a         unprocessionally. All I'm saying, Chair, is this, that the           i         mouth at the police that the police who were there were being attackd.         in the police that were being attackd.         wore motivated inter alia, I'm prepared to concide that, by           i         mouth at the grand or or that         defence they responded. Now if people, even if the         is that they duath I'm oning asymic prevention at the stand then I cant respect the vidnes the understand           i         defence they responded. Now if people, even if the         is that they duath they were at a stackd.         is that they duath they duath they duath at its duath at a sthe deathore on the stand then           <	6		6	
9         proposition which I put in terms of what I call game         9         MR MPOFU:         Yes. Well, I first have to           10         changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were         10         de-ascribe the one that's ascribed to the first and then           11         such agame changer to the velim that they edided or         11         ascribe the one that's ascribed to the most were           12         removed the sense of professionalism from the police to the         that I's the sole cause for them behaving         12           13         unprofessionality. All I'm saying, Chair, is this, that the         14         killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and           14         the brutality that I've shown to the witness.         14         killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and           15         of this witness a affected some of them that they even had         to the remove and what I'm going to argue obviously at the           16         of the witness is affected some of them that they even had         to dis that they didn't emove enough. That some of those           18         weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and         12         thas been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.           19         they respond. Now of pope, covel         adarked - assuming for the moment that         14         then I don't think, it may be my fault but I'D or 10 and           11<	7		7	
10       changer 2, namely that the deaths of police on the 13th were       10       de-ascribe the one that's ascribed to me first and then         11       such a game changer 10 the extent that they denuded or       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       12       such a game changer 10 the extent that they denuded or       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       12       such a game changer 10 the extent that they denuded or       11       11       11       12       statist the sole cause for them behaving         13       extent that they had to do and say all the vulgarities and       14       the bruaility that the sole of othes       14       14       the bruaility that the sole of othes       15       15       this the sole cause for them behaving       15       of this vulgar ebhaviour that they een hade       16       16       16       16       16       17       rom the opening statement and what we see here in GGG36.1       17       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16       16	8		8	
11       such a game changer to the extent that they denuded or       11       I'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying is         12       removed the sense of professionalism from the police to the       11       I'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying         13       extent that they had to do and say all the vulgarities and       11       I'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying         14       the brutality that I've shown to the witness.       11       I'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying         15       CHARPERSON:       M'r Mpfu, I don't see the       14       Ithis i'll say what I'm putting. Also what I'm not saying is         16       nexus between what was described in the passage you rand       14       Ithis witness so affected some of them that they delough the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         13       situation where it is conneched by the police that the       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14       14	9		9	
12       removed the sense of professionalism from the police to the 13       extent that they had to do and say all the vulgarities and 14       12       that it's the sole cause for them behaving 13       upprofessionally. All I'm saying. Chair, is this, that the 14         14       the bruilability that I've show to the witness.       14       killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and 15         15       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Mpfu, I don't see the 16       is witness so affected some of them that they even had 16       to the knowledge of themselves and 17         16       nexus between what was described in the passage you real 17       is witness so affected some of them that they even had 16       to the knowledge of themselves and 17         17       use of the police who were three were being attacked.       and will be contended that in self-defence or private 20       the the they divide there on the 13th, are a scene 2 on the 16th and 21       they react in a particular way. And they mightint 23       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the 24       121.08]       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand 24         14       they will react in a particular way. And they mightint 23       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve 34       ithen 1 don't understand will we great at all. All MI'''         15       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, 34       ithe they were not that scene and that they see attacked, assume 34       the defal of then'coleagues that thay 34       ithen			10	
13       extent that they had to do and say all the vulgarities and         14       the brutality that it ve shown to the witness.         15       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr MpOL, I dorth see the         16       nexus between what was described in the passage you read       15       of this witness on affected some of them that they even had         16       nexus between what was described in the passage you read       16       to be removed and what I'm going to argue obviously at the         17       from the opening statement and what we see here in GGG3.1       in shat they didn't remove anough. That some of those         18       who the police who were there were being attacked.       10       were motivated inter alia, I'm prepared to concede that, by         20       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       21       tabe ambility to render a porfessional service that         23       weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and       21       tabe ambility to render a porfessional service that         24       they will react in a particular way. And they mightin't       abways speech was caused by the fact that these       21       title on't understand the proposition youre putting -         24       they will react in a particular way. And they mightin't       abways speech was caused by the fact that these       11       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         24       popo	11		11	
14       the brutality that I've shown to the witness.         15       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Mpolu, I don't see the         16       nexus between what was described in the passage your edits       16       to this witness so affected some of them that they even had         18       because the picture that one saw on the video was a       17       end is that they didn't remove enough. That some of these         19       situation where it is contended by the police that the       10       10       weren't there on the 31b, are at scene 2 on the 16th and         20       members of the police who were there were being attacked.       weren't there on the 31b, are at scene 2 on the 16th and       12       12       12       12       12       14       killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and         21       station where it is contended by the police that the       14       killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and         22       defence the yresponde. Now if people, even if they       were motivated inter alia. I'm prepared to concede that, by         23       that is contended that in self-defence or private       14       the scene inability to render a professional service.         24       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       14       the I don't think, it may be my fault but if on't understand it         25       thas verse acting in that this behaviour, fee no	12		12	that it's the sole cause for them behaving
15       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Mpofu, I don't see the       15       of this witness so affected some of them that they even had         16       nexus between what was described in the passage you read       16       to be cremoved and what I'm going to argue obviously at the         18       because the picture that one saw on the video was a       16       to this witness so affected some of them that they even had         19       situation where it is contended by the police that the       17       of is that they didn't remove enough. That some of those         20       members of the police whores there were boing attacked.       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         21       And it will be contended that in self-defence or private       11       has been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.         22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if the moment that       12       has been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.         23       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       15       MR MPOFU:       Okay.         24       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand it         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdier would appreciate it.       5       MR MPOFU:       Okay.         5       how any ou show or base a contention that this behaviour,       <	13	extent that they had to do and say all the vulgarities and	13	unprofessionally. All I'm saying, Chair, is this, that the
16       nexus between what was described in the passage you read       16       to be removed and what I'm going to argue obviously at the         17       from the opening statement and what we see here in GGG36.1       ie dis that they didn't remove enough. That some of those         18       because the picture that one saw on the video was a       ie dis that they didn't remove enough. That some of those         19       situation where it is contended by the police that the       ie dis that they didn't remove enough. That some of those         20       members of the police who were there were being attacked.       ie dis hast they didn't remove enough. That some of those         21       and it will be contended that in self-defence or private       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they         22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –         224       weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and       istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –         23       istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –       istill don't understand the I can't expect the withess to understand it         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdier would approceate it.       not this vugar speech was caused by the fact that these         9       people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th 'The       next sample proposition to you and         10	14	-	14	killing of the police, to the knowledge of themselves and
17       from the opening statement and what we see here in GGG36.1       17       end is that they didn't remove enough. That some of those         18       because the picture that one saw on the video was a       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         19       situation where it is contended by the police that the       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         19       members of the police who were there were being attacked.       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         20       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       20       the same inability to render a professional service that         21       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       21       13       till don't understand the proposition you're putting –         24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         25       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       26       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       10       MR MPOFU:       Okay, thank you, Chair.       20         3       atwars, seek the English that Doctor Bowder would approve       1       then I don't they, thank you, Chair.       2       10       MR MPOFU:       Nea, or Arre       1         4       of or that you would fi	15	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I don't see the	15	of this witness so affected some of them that they even had
18       because the picture that one saw on the video was a       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         19       situation where it is contended by the police that the       18       who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed         20       members of the police who were there were being attacked.       20       the same inability to render a professional service that         21       And it will be contended that in self-defence or private       21       has been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.         22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       21       has been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.         23       theyris to fing attacked - assuming for the moment that       21       has been displayed, yes. Thank you, Chair.         24       theyris policin any our p			16	
19       situation where it is contended by the police that the         20       members of the police who were there were being attacked.         21       And it will be contended that in self-defence or private         22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they         23       weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and         24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that         25       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the         26       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then         1       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then         2       they will react in a particular way. And they mighth't         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approvid         4       of or that you would find used in politie drawing rooms but         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,         6       nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm         10       mR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not,         11       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those         15       things that Have shown to the General, assuming all those         16       displayed of dragging people, of insutting them, of all thow         17       that they were acting under self-defence, a	17		17	
20       members of the police who were there were being attacked.       20       the same inability to render a professional service that         21       And it will be contended that in self-defence or private       20       the same inability to render a professional service that         22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       22       [12:08] CHAIRPERSON:       The afraid you've lost me.         24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       21       Istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –         24       they responded. Now if people, even if they       22       Istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –         25       chain service that       23       Istill don't understand the proposition you're putting –         26       rot curumstances in which they were there and so on - then       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         2       of or that you would find used in polic drawing rooms but       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         3       always speek the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve       4       would appreciate it.         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         6       nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understand theo       1       would appreciate	18	because the picture that one saw on the video was a	18	who displayed the vulgar behaviour that I have displayed
<ul> <li>21 And it will be contended that in self-defence or private</li> <li>22 defence they responded. Now if people, even if they</li> <li>23 weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and</li> <li>24 they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that</li> <li>25 that's correct, something we may have to find as to the</li> <li>26 that's correct, something we may have to find as to the</li> <li>27 Page 10779</li> <li>28 or that's correct, something we may have to find as to the</li> <li>29 Page 10779</li> <li>20 CHAIRPERSON: And if I don't understand</li> <li>21 that is correct, something we may have to find as to the</li> <li>25 CHAIRPERSON: And if I don't understand it</li> <li>26 understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it</li> <li>27 or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but</li> <li>28 how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,</li> <li>29 this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these</li> <li>20 or ot that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but</li> <li>21 how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,</li> <li>29 this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these</li> <li>20 or ot may our show or base a contention that this behaviour,</li> <li>20 MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not,</li> <li>21 Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got</li> <li>21 Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got</li> <li>20 things. I'm saying that ther behaviour that I have</li> <li>21 dings that I have shown to the General, assuming all those</li> <li>21 things to be so, do not display the requisite</li> <li>22 professionalism from a police force that is atlacked or not</li> <li>23 or texen an if', that the people were soft hem.</li> <li>24 that necessarily they were present on he 13th. I will show</li> <li>24 that necessarily they were present on he 13th. I will show</li> <li>25 they were not here's aid to the police bus in case</li> <li>26 or HAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you'li</li> <li>27 that necessarily they were</li></ul>	19	5 .	19	
22       defence they responded. Now if people, even if they       22       (12:08)       CHAIRPERSON:       I'm afraid you've lost me.         23       weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and       MR MPOFU:       Okay.         24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       MR MPOFU:       Okay.         25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         26       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then       Page 10779         1       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then       1       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approved       4       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but         4       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       5       MR MPOFU:       Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,       6       General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and         7       you can agree or disagree.       If members of the police were       8       of the view that some of their numbers whe ado to be removed         10       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not,       1       demonstrates that they knew that that         16       chalysteffeeteeteeteeteeteeteeteeteeteeteeteet	20			-
23       weren't there on the 13th, are at scene 2 on the 16th and       23       1 still don't understand the proposition you're putting –         24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       23       1 still don't understand the proposition you're putting –         25       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       24       MR MPOFU: Okay.         26       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         27       chrounderstand the proposition you're putting –         28       chrounderstand the proposition you're putting –         29       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         20       chrounderstand       24         21       chrounderstand       25       CHAIRPERSON:         22       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       5       MR MPOFU:       Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay         22       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       5       MR MPOFU:       Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay         3       euterstand the proposition to you and       general, i'm going to put a simple proposition to you and       you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were         4       not more properly.       10       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not,         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It'	21	-	21	
24       they're being attacked - assuming for the moment that       24       MR MPOFU:       Okay.         25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         26       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         27       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then       Page 10779         28       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve       then I don't think, It may be my fault but if I don't         3       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these       pople, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The         3       nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the       for the view that some of their numbers were so affected by         9       question properly.       0       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not,         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got       of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by         13       putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those         14       things to b so, do not display the requisite       masset from this witness. It is the police case, it's         16       th	22	defence they responded. Now if people, even if they	22	-
25       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         25       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         26       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         27       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       25       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         26       that's correct, something we may have to find as to the       26       CHAIRPERSON:       And if I don't understand         27       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't       3       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         28       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,       6       General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and         29       you can agree or disagree. If members were so affected by       9       the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed         10       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not.       10       and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that         11       chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. I's got       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to <tr< td=""><td>23</td><td></td><th></th><td></td></tr<>	23			
Page 10779       Page 10779         1       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then         2       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approval         4       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,         6       this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these         7       people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The         8       nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the         9       question properly.         10       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not,         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got       10         12       orlying is this, assume that they were attacked, assume       11         14       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those       15         15       things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have       16         16       displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the         17       things to be so, do not display the requisite         18       things to be so, do not display the requisite         19       professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not	24			5
1       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         2       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve         3       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve         4       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,       ft is vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these         6       people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The       8       General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and         7       you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were       of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by         9       question properly.       10       and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to         12       nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm       12       be removed were being removed, among other things, because         13       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those       16       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair -	25	that's correct, something we may have to find as to the	25	CHAIRPERSON: And if I don't understand
1       circumstances in which they were there and so on - then       1       then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't         2       they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't       always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve         4       of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but       3       either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I         5       how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,       6       General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and         6       this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these       6       General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and         7       you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were       8       of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by         9       question properly.       10       MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not,       10       and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got       11       demonstrates that they knew that those         18       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those       16       MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –         16       displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the       16       CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned         17       your light on.       18       MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –				
<ul> <li>they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't</li> <li>always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve</li> <li>of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but</li> <li>how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,</li> <li>this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these</li> <li>people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The</li> <li>nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the</li> <li>question properly.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not,</li> <li>Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got</li> <li>nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm</li> <li>that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those</li> <li>things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have</li> <li>displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the</li> <li>things to be so, do not display the requisite</li> <li>professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not</li> <li>attacked. So the issue of whether they re attacked doesn't</li> <li>chair necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show</li> <li>attacked. So the issue of whether they reattacked doesn't</li> <li>chair nembers said to the police just in case</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> </ul>		Doco 10770		Dogo 10701
<ul> <li>always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm that they were acting under self-defence, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have that they show to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked doesn't come into it, number one, Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually. Chair, that one of the Captains when he was they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not actually. Chair, that one of the Captains when he was there into it, number one, Number two, I'm not suggesting the infing the TRT members said to the police just in case they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> </ul>	1	<u> </u>	1	
<ul> <li>4 of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but</li> <li>5 how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,</li> <li>6 this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these</li> <li>7 people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The</li> <li>8 nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the</li> <li>9 question properly.</li> <li>10 MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not,</li> <li>11 Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got</li> <li>12 nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm</li> <li>13 putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume</li> <li>14 that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those</li> <li>15 things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have</li> <li>16 displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the</li> <li>17 things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those</li> <li>18 things to be so, do not display the requisite</li> <li>19 professionalism from a police force that is attacked doesn't</li> <li>21 come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting</li> <li>22 that necessarily they were present on the 13th. T will show</li> <li>23 actually. Chair, that one of the Captains when he was</li> <li>24 briefing the TRT members Said to the police just in case</li> <li>25 they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> </ul>		circumstances in which they were there and so on - then		then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't
5how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, 65MR MPOFU:Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay6this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The a nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly.5MR MPOFU:Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay10MR MPOFU:No, no I'm afraid you're not, 117you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were 811Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume 1410and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service.15things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually. Chair, that one of the Captains when he was their fing the TRT members said to the police just in case they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have to they w	2	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't	2	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it
6this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly.6General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by 910MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, 11No, no I'm afraid you're not, 1210and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service.13putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was6General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree.25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have6General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree.10MR SEMENYA SC: professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're	2 3	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve	2 3	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I
7people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly.7you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed10MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, 1110and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service.13that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was the ywere not there on the 13th, remember these people have10NR SEMENYA SC: NF Semenya, you'll remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but	2 3 4	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it.
8       nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the 9 question properly.       8       of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by 9 the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that         10       MR MPOFU:       No, no I'm afraid you're not, 11       10       and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that         11       Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got 12       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to 12         12       nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm 14       that they were acting under self-defence, assume 14       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to 12         14       that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those 15       things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have 16       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to 12         14       that saying that their behaviour that I have 16       11       demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to 12         16       things to be so, do not display the requisite 19       professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not 20       11       MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires 19       no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's 10       11         12       that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show 21       20       11       MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires 10	2 3 4 5	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour,	2 3 4 5	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay
9question properly.9the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed10MR MPOFU:No, no I'm afraid you're not,10and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that11Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got11demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to12nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm12be removed were being removed, among other things, because13putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume13of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17your light on.18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires18things to be so, do not display the requisite19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's19on teven an "if," that the people were removed who were20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't2021that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show2322that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show2324briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case2425they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have2526they wer	2 3 4 5 6	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these	2 3 4 5 6	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and
10MR MPOFU:No, no I'm afraid you're not,10and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that11Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got11demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to12nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm12be removed were being removed, among other things, because13putting is this, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume13of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24in even that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they we	2 3 4 5 6 7	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The	2 3 4 5 6 7	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were
11Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got11demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to12nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm12be removed were being removed, among other things, because13putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume13of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those17your light on.18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting22believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.22that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll23that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show23cHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in ca	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by
12nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm12be removed were being removed, among other things, because13putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume13of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those17your light on.18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting22So they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them.23actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed
13putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume13of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those17your light on.18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting21believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.23ctually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that
14that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those14inability to render a professional service.15things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have15MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those17your light on.18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting21believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.22that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll23briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to
16displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the16CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya, you've turned17things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those17your light on.18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting21believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.23actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because
<ul> <li>17 things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those</li> <li>18 things to be so, do not display the requisite</li> <li>19 professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not</li> <li>20 attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't</li> <li>21 come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting</li> <li>22 that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show</li> <li>23 actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was</li> <li>24 briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case</li> <li>25 they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential
18things to be so, do not display the requisite18MR SEMENYA SC:That contention requires19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting21believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.22that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll23briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service.
19professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.20that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have19no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.23CHAIRPERSON: remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –
20attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't20not even an "if," that the people were removed who were21come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting21believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.22that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show22So they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them.23cHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case2425they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have2526and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned
<ol> <li>come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting</li> <li>that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show</li> <li>actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was</li> <li>briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on.
<ul> <li>that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show</li> <li>actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was</li> <li>briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case</li> <li>they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have</li> <li>so they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll</li> <li>remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this</li> <li>and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires
23actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was23CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's
24briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case24remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this25they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have25and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were
25 they were not there on the 13th, remember these people have 25 and I seem to remember Adv Jele asked him a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th. So they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them.
ARCHIVE FOR JUSTICE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th. So they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them. CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	circumstances in which they were there and so on - then they will react in a particular way. And they mightn't always speak the English that Doctor Bowdler would approve of or that you would find used in polite drawing rooms but how can you show or base a contention that this behaviour, this vulgar speech was caused by the fact that these people, or some of them were on the scene on the 13th? The nexus seems to be missing unless I'm not understanding the question properly. MR MPOFU: No, no I'm afraid you're not, Chairperson. That is not what I'm putting. It's got nothing to do with the present at all, at all. All I'm putting is this, assume that they were attacked, assume that they were acting under self-defence, assume all those things. I'm saying that their behaviour that I have displayed of dragging people, of insulting them, of all the things that I have shown to the General, assuming all those things to be so, do not display the requisite professionalism from a police force that is attacked or not attacked. So the issue of whether they're attacked doesn't come into it, number one. Number two, I'm not suggesting that necessarily they were present on the 13th. I will show actually, Chair, that one of the Captains when he was briefing the TRT members said to the police just in case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then I don't think, it may be my fault but if I don't understand then I can't expect the witness to understand it either. So if you could put it with greater clarity, I would appreciate it. MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay General, I'm going to put a simple proposition to you and you can agree or disagree. If members of the police were of the view that some of their numbers were so affected by the death of their colleagues that they had to be removed and posted elsewhere, then I will argue that that demonstrates that they knew that those members who had to be removed were being removed, among other things, because of what is said in paragraph 35, namely the potential inability to render a professional service. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya, you've turned your light on. MR SEMENYA SC: That contention requires no answer from this witness. It is the police case, it's not even an "if," that the people were removed who were believed may have been affected by the events of the 13th. So they were not part of the 16th operation, some of them. CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, you'll remember that Major-General Annandale was asked about this

	Page 10782		Page 10784
1	questions about the debriefing and it turned out there are	1	MR MPOFU: No, I'm not talking about-
2	two types of debriefing. The one kind is what one can call	2	CHAIRPERSON: We may well discover that
3	sort of emotional debriefing where they interviewed people	3	he was somewhere else because the Provincial Commissioner
4	who had been involved in the incident to see whether they	4	sent him there for the very reason - so he's a bad example
5	were emotionally affected, whether they traumatised and	5	actually –
6	those were given therapy in some cases and in other cases	6	MR MPOFU: No -
7	actually removed from the operation for the many reasons	7	CHAIRPERSON: - to illustrate your point.
8	that are set out in paragraph 35. Now it may be that you	8	MR MPOFU: No, that's a misunderstanding,
9	will want to argue that the choice of those to be removed	9	Chair, on your part, with respect. I'm not talking about
10	wasn't done adequately, there were some others who should	10	the 16th. I'm not talking about the 16th –
11	have been removed, but I'm not sure that this witness can	11	CHAIRPERSON: There's another point that
12	answer that question. Maybe you must – remember he also	12	I'm reminded – Merafi's statement doesn't say he made death
13	said that this was a matter that fell under the Provincial	13	threats. My recollection of his statement was that he
14	Commissioner, do you remember, when he was asked about that	14	heard the death threats and therefore he considered it
15	and these are questions you may well wish to ask the	15	appropriate for steps to be taken that those death threats
16	Provincial Commissioner and when you ask them I'll allow	16	weren't implemented.
17	them, but I don't know that this witness can help us very	17	MR MPOFU: No.
18	much.	18	CHAIRPERSON: So –
19	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I'll	19	MR MPOFU: No, that's also incorrect.
20	leave it but for the record let it be shown that I'm only	20	That's Vermaak, you're mistaking it with Vermaak. That's
21	asking this witness insofar as she has confirmed to this	21	not correct, Chair. What happened –
22	Commission that she approved the statement and therefore to	22	CHAIRPERSON: Does Merafi say in his
23	her knowledge these things happened, but I won't pursue it	23	statement that he threatened to kill –
24	any further. That's all I'm doing.	24	MR MPOFU: No.
25	CHAIRPERSON: We know that she approved	25	CHAIRPERSON: - Mpembe. He doesn't say
		1	
	Page 10783		Page 10785
1	Page 10783 the statement, you've established that and that may well	1	Page 10785 that.
1 2	5	1 2	
	the statement, you've established that and that may well		that.
2	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto,	2	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says
2 3	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now –	2 3	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi –
2 3 4	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on.	2 3 4	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi
2 3 4 5	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next	2 3 4 5	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact.
2 3 4 5 6	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point.	2 3 4 5 6	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't
2 3 4 5 6 7	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be giving us evidence, direct evidence of these propositions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something – MR MPOFU: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be giving us evidence, direct evidence of these propositions he's making?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something – MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: - but my recollection is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be giving us evidence, direct evidence of these propositions he's making? CHAIRPERSON: No, well, I've told you he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something – MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: - but my recollection is that Merafi was not there on the 16th.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be giving us evidence, direct evidence of these propositions he's making? CHAIRPERSON: No, well, I've told you he doesn't of course have to give direct evidence, provided
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the statement, you've established that and that may well form a basis of argument at a later stage ex post facto, but anyway you've now – MR MPOFU: I'll move on. CHAIRPERSON: - move on to the next point. MR MPOFU: I'll move on. Thank you, Chairperson. No, before I move on, just would you also accept – I'm going to also argue that there is a direct link between the killing of the policemen specifically and the death threats that were made to General Mpembe. In other words, what I'm saying is that people like Merafi who threatened to kill Mpembe would not have threatened to kill him had it not been for the fact that their colleagues, policemen had been killed - in other words, if it was civilians who had been killed. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something – MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: - but my recollection is that Merafi was not there on the 16th. MR SEMENYA SC: Exactly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. MR MPOFU: He doesn't. Vermaak says Merafi – CHAIRPERSON: I know – I know, but Merafi hasn't come here. You can't put it as a statement of fact. You could say possibly that Vermaak says it but you can't put it higher than that, can you? MR MPOFU: Okay. Vermaak says that Merafi wanted to kill Mpembe. You remember we've gone through that. CHAIRPERSON: You've got your light on, what do you want to say? MR SEMENYA SC: That is misquoting the evidence of, the statement of Colonel Vermaak. MR MPOFU: Okay. MR SEMENYA SC: But most importantly, Chair, Mr Mpofu cannot keep disguising irrelevant questions by stating that that is his argument. Is he going to be giving us evidence, direct evidence of these propositions he's making? CHAIRPERSON: No, well, I've told you he doesn't of course have to give direct evidence, provided there's evidential material which gives rise to a

	Page 10786		Page 10788
1	it's a ruling I've made several times, it's no good asking	1	CHAIRPERSON: I immediately realised that
2	this witness for her views on certain things because if	2	it was a very explosive situation and I telephoned the
3	these are matters that we have to decide, her views, with	3	Provincial Commissioner and informed her of the threat and
4	great respect, are irrelevant. That's why, on a number of	4	informed her further that I was going to remove him from
5	occasions, I've upheld objections that the cross-	5	the scene. I went directly to him, informed him that I was
6	examination is not appropriate because it's irrelevant.	6	going to remove him from the scene because of the threat to
7	Obviously it doesn't mean the witness, that Mr Mpofu can't	7	his life. I arranged for a Nyala vehicle with two members
8	argue these points later if there's circumstantial evidence	8	to take him away to the ops. That's the passage that we've
9	that supports the proposition he's putting up but that's a	9	had before –
10	different matter.	10	MR MPOFU: Thank you –
11	MR SEMENYA SC: No, we concede, Chair.	11	CHAIRPERSON: Now I've translated it for
12	If that is circumstantial evidence then we'll be pointed to	12	you and for the witness.
13	it, that based on A and B and C, that the argument will	13	MR MPOFU: Thank you –
14	rest on A, B and C to contend why –	14	CHAIRPERSON: Okay, now that doesn't say
15	MR MPOFU: Okay –	15	of course that Merafi was one of the threateners.
16	MR SEMENYA SC: Then the witness would be	16	MR MPOFU: Well, General Annandale
17	able to respond to it.	17	confirmed that – but that's not important. "Die lede," he
18	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I don't want to	18	said "die lede," I don't care who it is, "die lede" -
19	hamper your cross-examination because I know you've got a	19	CHAIRPERSON: No – no, "lede" are the
20	difficult duty to discharge and you must be given every	20	members.
21	opportunity but the fact is, when evidential material is	21	MR MPOFU: Ja.
22	before the Commission such as statements, paragraphs in the	22	CHAIRPERSON: You put directly to the
23	opening statement, evidence of other witnesses and so on,	23	witness that the evidence was, and you said Lieutenant-
24	you don't have to repeat it to this witness to get her	24	Colonel Vermaak said it, that one of those who threatened
25	views, for the reasons I've explained in the past. It can	25	to kill General Mpembe was Merafi –
1	Page 10787 still be open to you to argue the point and if a witness	1	Page 10789 MR MPOFU: Yes.
2	comes who is directly affected with the proposition you're	2	CHAIRPERSON: I've just read that passage
3	putting, you can ask the witness, so –	3	to you to indicate that that proposition was inaccurate and
4	MR MPOFU: That I appreciate,	4	certainly Major-General Annandale who wasn't there, he was
5	Chairperson, and honestly I don't want to belabour this	5	in the JOC the whole time, wasn't able to add anything
6	point. All I'm doing is what has been done since this	6	
	Commission started, of putting a proposition that comes		further – in fact he wasn't there at the time, that was on the 13th –
7		7	
8	from the police statements themselves and which actually we	8	MR MPOFU: Ja.
9	have done, we've dealt with this issue with this witness.	9	CHAIRPERSON: He wasn't even there at the
10	All I'm saying is that if you go to Vermaak, Chairperson,	10	time. Major-General Annandale wasn't able to take that any
11	paragraph 5, you'll see that he says, "Van die lede het	11	further. So that's the high-water mark of that allegation
12	saam met my teruggeloop en was baie ontsteld gewees en aan	12	and the proposition you put to the witness was incorrect
13	my gemeld dat hulle Generaal-Majoor Mpembe kwalik neem vir	13	because it went beyond that.
14	die lede wat dood is en dat hy verkeerde opdragte gegee	14	MR MPOFU: That's fine. Chairperson, I
15	het. Hulle het aan my gesê dat" –	15	know what Annandale said, I don't want to go there. Let's
	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Mpofu, this	16	leave it at "die lede." Do you know that some of the
16			members, nameless, wanted to kill Mpembe?
16 17	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read	17	members, nameless, wanted to kill wpembe:
		17 18	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you
17	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read		-
17 18	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with	18	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you
17 18 19	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with me were some who were very upset or disturbed and who	18 19 20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you in two ways. One, I would know that as reports as I read
17 18 19 20	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with me were some who were very upset or disturbed and who mentioned to me that they were very angry with Major-	18 19 20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you in two ways. One, I would know that as reports as I read the statement that is done by Vermaak and that you are also
17 18 19 20 21	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with me were some who were very upset or disturbed and who mentioned to me that they were very angry with Major- General Mpembe for the members who were dead and that he'd	18 19 20 21	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you in two ways. One, I would know that as reports as I read the statement that is done by Vermaak and that you are also saying that, is "die lede" nameless, and you say they are
<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with me were some who were very upset or disturbed and who mentioned to me that they were very angry with Major- General Mpembe for the members who were dead and that he'd given wrong instructions. They said to me that Major-	18 19 20 21 22	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you in two ways. One, I would know that as reports as I read the statement that is done by Vermaak and that you are also saying that, is "die lede" nameless, and you say they are nameless. And thirdly, that General Mbombo is here or is going to come here, she is the one who was phoned by
<ol> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	passage is being read in Afrikaans. I think it's been read in English already. Among the members who walked back with me were some who were very upset or disturbed and who mentioned to me that they were very angry with Major- General Mpembe for the members who were dead and that he'd given wrong instructions. They said to me that Major- General Mpembe today would go and lie together with these	<ol> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'm going to answer you in two ways. One, I would know that as reports as I read the statement that is done by Vermaak and that you are also saying that, is "die lede" nameless, and you say they are nameless. And thirdly, that General Mbombo is here or is

			5
1	Page 10790 MR MPOFU: General, let's make this very	1	Page 10792 agree that a large percentage of the work that the police
2	easy. The only proposition I am putting to you is that the	2	do, involves disputes of some sort between alleged victims
3	threats that were made to Mpembe, it was said that he	3	and alleged perpetrators and those kinds of parties,
4	should, "saam met daardie lede op die grond gaan lê," that	4	correct?
5	he, Mpembe, should be lying down together with those	5	GENERAL PHIYEGA: There are also those
6		6	
	members who are dead. And the only simple proposition I'm		issues, among others. MR MPOFU: And it would be in those
7	putting to you is that those death threats were made	7	
8	because members, other members of the police had been	8	typical situations of conflict or dispute that the police
9	killed, not because civilians were killed. It was, the	9	need to display their impartiality the most, correct?
10	threats were directly linked met "saam met die lede op die	10	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think overall they
11	grond." Do you understand?	11	must show impartiality.
12	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think I've given you	12	MR MPOFU: And you would know, as a
13	my understanding of this.	13	social scientist, that in a society there is what some
14	MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you. We'll leave	14	might call an inherent conflict between capital and labour,
15	that for argument if that's your final answer. Now, going	15	so to speak, between business people and workers, if you
16	back to the 10 principles and once again, if you somehow	16	don't want to use the grand terms.
17	don't remember that we agreed on this, I will take you to	17	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Maybe I don't
18	the prescripts but is it correct that you and I have agreed	18	understand the context of what you are asking.
19	that one of the most important principles coming out of the	19	[12:28] MR MPOFU: Do you know or don't you know
20	prescripts is that the police should act impartially.	20	as a person who has studied social sciences, that there is,
21	Agreed?	21	in situations such as the one that we are discussing here,
22	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do.	22	a situation of conflict between what some call capital and
23	MR MPOFU: And the very first words of	23	labour or, to put it in simple English, between the working
24	section 218 of the Constitution, which has been retained,	24	people and those that own the means of production. I don't
25	say that – where it talks about the responsibilities of the	25	know if that's simple English.
	Page 10791		
1	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the	1	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand.
2	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you	2	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now
	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be		GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation
2 3 4	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial,	2 3 4	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin
2 3 4 5	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service."	2 3 4 5	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct?
2 3 4 5 6	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first	2 3 4 5 6	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very
2 3 4 5 6 7	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality.	2 3 4 5 6 7	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very shaded question that you are asking me. Are you asking me
2 3 4 5 6	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that?	2 3 4 5 6	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employer
2 3 4 5 6 7	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very shaded question that you are asking me. Are you asking me whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employer and the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if you could take it a little bit further so that I can answer you properly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you aware
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language].	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you aware
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute.There
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute.Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talkwithin the agreed structures in place between the workers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute.Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talkwithin the agreed structures in place between the workers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute.Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talkwithin the agreed structures in place between the workersand the employer.That's the evidence thus far before the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph 34.4 of the police opening statement which says, "When	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very shaded question that you are asking me. Are you asking me whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employer and the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if you could take it a little bit further so that I can answer you properly, what would have been the nature of the conflict? MR MPOFU: Okay. Yes, were you aware that there was a wage dispute as between those two parties? MR BURGER SC: I object to that question. There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. There was an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talk within the agreed structures in place between the workers and the employer. That's the evidence thus far before the Commission.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph 34.4 of the police opening statement which says, "When death, injury or damage results from internecine conflict	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very shaded question that you are asking me. Are you asking me whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employer and the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if you could take it a little bit further so that I can answer you properly, what would have been the nature of the conflict? MR MPOFU: Okay. Yes, were you aware that there was a wage dispute as between those two parties? MR BURGER SC: I object to that question. There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. There was an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talk within the agreed structures in place between the workers and the employer. That's the evidence thus far before the Commission. MR MPOFU: Do you know, General, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph 34.4 of the police opening statement which says, "When death, injury or damage results from internecine conflict among any constituencies, the police service steps up and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do understand. MR MPOFU: And in this, taking it now away from the esoteric level, in this particular situation you were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonmin and the protesters, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's a very shaded question that you are asking me. Are you asking me whether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employer and the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if you could take it a little bit further so that I can answer you properly, what would have been the nature of the conflict? MR MPOFU: Okay. Yes, were you aware that there was a wage dispute as between those two parties? MR BURGER SC: I object to that question. There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. There was an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talk within the agreed structures in place between the workers and the employer. That's the evidence thus far before the Commission. MR MPOFU: Do you know, General, that another work for a strike is an industrial dispute?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph 34.4 of the police opening statement which says, "When death, injury or damage results from internecine conflict among any constituencies, the police service steps up and conducts itself impartially."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Yes, I do understand.MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talkwithin the agreed structures in place between the workersand the employer. That's the evidence thus far before theCommission.MR MPOFU:Do you know, General, thatanother work for a strike is an industrial dispute?CHAIRPERSON:I don't know that that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	National Commissioner, "Subject to section 214 and the directions of the Minister referred to in 216" – which you can ignore – "the National Commissioner shall be responsible for, (a) the maintenance of an impartial, accountable, transparent and efficient police service." The very first one of about 12 or 13 sections, the first word that is imposed upon you is the duty for impartiality. Do you accept that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do. MR MPOFU: And section 195(1)(d) of the Constitution, which Mr Semenya read to you in chief, also requires for the public service to be impartial, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: [African language]. MR MAHLANGU: That is true. MR MPOFU: And section 25 of the Act which, going down the ladder of the prescripts, also prescribes for impartiality, so does – just to save time – paragraph 2.2.5 of FFF1 and so does para, sorry, paragraph 34.4 of the police opening statement which says, "When death, injury or damage results from internecine conflict among any constituencies, the police service steps up and conducts itself impartially." MR MAHLANGU: That is the truth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU:And in this, taking it nowaway from the esoteric level, in this particular situationyou were aware that there was a dispute as between Lonminand the protesters, correct?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think it's a veryshaded question that you are asking me.Are you asking mewhether there was conflict between Lonmin as the employerand the protesters as employees and perhaps maybe if youcould take it a little bit further so that I can answer youproperly, what would have been the nature of the conflict?MR MPOFU:Okay. Yes, were you awarethat there was a wage dispute as between those two parties?MR BURGER SC:I object to that question.There's no evidence that there was a wage dispute. Therewas an unprotected strike and the strikers wouldn't talkwithin the agreed structures in place between the workersand the employer. That's the evidence thus far before theCommission.MR MPOFU:Do you know, General, thatanother work for a strike is an industrial dispute?CHAIRPERSON:I don't know that that isentirely accurate. There are various kinds of industrial

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

	Page 10794		Page 10796
1	[inaudible].	1	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Advocate, it is
2	GENERAL PHIYEGA: My response to you is	2	important to contextualise the involvement of the police
3	that we were there as the police to deal with an	3	and I will again repeat that our involvement as police was
4	unprotected strike.	4	because there was an unprotected strike. The drivers
5	MR MPOFU: Yes and if someone was more	5	thereof are another thing. The causes, the underlying
6	verbose they could express exactly what you are saying to	6	causes thereof are another thing but what brings us there
7	say you were there for an unprotected industrial dispute,	7	as police, what puts us in that scene is because there is
8	correct?	8	an unprotected illegal strike.
9	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I don't have the	9	MR MPOFU: Yes. No, I don't want to be
10	capacity to extend my mind to that but I know that we were	10	sidetracked into labour law definitions but I'm sure you
11	there to deal with an unprotected strike.	11	know also as a person who has been in management and in HR,
12	MR MPOFU: Alright, look, I'm not going	12	that the unprotectedness of a strike is not a matter for
13	to argue semantics with you. I put it to you that you were	13	policing, it's a matter for collective bargaining at best
14	informed, according to your own statement and the	14	or at worst for the labour law, the Labour Court to either
15	statements of many other witnesses, during the briefing of	15	dismiss the unprotected strikers or not.
16	two things and I'm still dealing with the first one. It	16	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think it's important
17	was said to you that there's a conflict between the NUM and	17	also again for me to mention that in public order, part of
18	AMCU - we've dealt with that in another context – and it	18	ensuring that there's public order is that economic
19	was also said to you that there's a dispute about wages	19	activity must take place, social life must continue,
20	with the employees. And further on it was said to you,	20	property of people must be taken care of, all those.
21	what Mr Burger is saying is correct, that the employees	21	People should have the freedom to do what they are supposed
22	wanted to negotiation with the employer and the employer	22	to be doing. In whatever area they find themselves, we are
23	said it could not negotiate with faceless people. It was	23	coming there to ensure that that happens, that public order
24	in that context that the whole issue of faceless people was	24	is restored and the normal life of that community can
25	raised. So you knew that there was this wage dispute.	25	continue as it goes. So the issues, Chair, bargaining and
	Page 10795		Page 10797
1	Page 10795 MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put	1	Page 10797 whatever, really are not the issues that we concern
1 2	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not	1 2	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore
_	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put		whatever, really are not the issues that we concern
2	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation	2	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore
2 3	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers	2 3	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of
2 3 4	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation	2 3 4	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and
2 3 4 5	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually	2 3 4 5	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go.
2 3 4 5 6	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless	2 3 4 5 6	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and	2 3 4 5 6 7	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that?</li> <li>GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: That's the question –</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr Burger has kindly told us, about whether or not these strikers could negotiate outside the collective bargaining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he describe as a wage dispute? Insofar as it was a wage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr Burger has kindly told us, about whether or not these strikers could negotiate outside the collective bargaining systems without the union, given that although there was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he describe as a wage dispute? Insofar as it was a wage dispute would you agree, says he, that it was the police's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr Burger has kindly told us, about whether or not these strikers could negotiate outside the collective bargaining systems without the union, given that although there was a two-year agreement, warra-warra, all those things, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he describe as a wage dispute? Insofar as it was a wage dispute would you agree, says he, that it was the police's duty to act impartially as between the two contesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr Burger has kindly told us, about whether or not these strikers could negotiate outside the collective bargaining systems without the union, given that although there was a two-year agreement, warra-warra, all those things, that there were disputes about wages, principally, and about how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he describe as a wage dispute? Insofar as it was a wage dispute would you agree, says he, that it was the police's duty to act impartially as between the two contesting parties. I think that's your question, Mr Mpofu.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR BURGER SC: What my learned friend put is not correct. The evidence is that Lonmin could not negotiate principally because the unprotected strikers wanted to negotiate outside established wage negotiation structures. They couldn't do that because contractually they were bound to the existing structures. The faceless comment is taken out of context. That came about on the evidence thus far, that the strikers wouldn't disclose who they speak for, whether it's a trade union or not, and there was a suspicion that there were non-Lonmin employees in the crowd. It's in that context that there was a reference to faceless people but my learned friend should put it on that basis and not on the narrow basis he's done. MR MPOFU: Okay. Okay, for the sake of progress I'll put it on the wide or narrow basis that Mr Burger is suggesting, that you and the rest of the world, for that matter, knew that there was a dispute or a number of disputes about wages – another one is the one that Mr Burger has kindly told us, about whether or not these strikers could negotiate outside the collective bargaining systems without the union, given that although there was a two-year agreement, warra-warra, all those things, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	whatever, really are not the issues that we concern ourselves with as the police. We are there to restore stability, public order and to ensure that the rights of people in their various shapes, social, economic and religious, continue to go the way it's supposed to go. MR MPOFU: Okay, maybe it's better if I put it to you that in the context of the dispute or the disputes that existed as between Lonmin and the employer, rather the employees, the protesters, even confining it to the basis that Mr Burger has articulated, the duty of the police was to act impartially vis-à-vis or as between those two parties, those protagonists in that dispute or disputes. Do you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've heard, I wait for the question. MR MPOFU: That's the question – CHAIRPERSON: He's asked a question. The question is, do you agree that it was the duty of the police to act impartially between the two sides of what he describe as a wage dispute? Insofar as it was a wage dispute would you agree, says he, that it was the police's duty to act impartially as between the two contesting

FOR JUSTICE

RCHIVE

1	Page 10798 already indicated that the impartiality principle is fully	1	Page 10800 thus far, to address an unprotected illegal strike.
2	embraced and yes, it continues to be embraced by the	2	CHAIRPERSON: An unprotected illegal
3	police.	3	strike, if it goes no further and it's peaceful, would
4	MR MPOFU: Okay, I'm now going to put to	4	presumably be qualified as an industrial dispute. If, of
		4 5	
5	you a proposition at the end of which I will suggest		course, it goes beyond that and there's a breakdown in law
6	whether or not, or what I will argue as to whether or not	6	and order because there's violence, intimidation, murder,
7	this very and sacrosanct principle of impartiality was	7	damage to property and so on, then that would be a
8	observed but before I do that I want, once again taking	8	different matter and then it would be appropriate for the
9	advantage of your experience in industry, you are aware	9	police to come, I would have thought.
10	that collective bargaining is a process that involves the	10	MR BURGER SC: Chair, no, we don't have
11	negotiation of that tension that I referred to between	11	to be in a philosophical debate on that. We know the
12	employers and employees and that - we were given a very	12	evidence before the Commission, nine people are dead at
13	rudimentary lesson by Mr Magidiwana on this – that on the	13	that stage or people have been killed, by the 16th nine are
14	one hand the employers withdraw their labour to hurt the	14	dead. This is not an innocent unprotected strike, this is
15	employer, the employees, to hurt the employer's profit-	15	violence in the community, this is a mine at a standstill
16	making or chimneys, as Mr Magidiwana put it – and the	16	and that's the evidence. I'm not putting any words before
17	employer on the other side has got the capacity to act	17	anybody and in that context, to put it that there was an
18	against the employees by locking them out of their	18	industrial strike is not correct and my learned friend
19	premises, that that is, those are the powerhouses that are	19	should –
20	at play in the process known as collective bargaining. You	20	CHAIRPERSON: Industrial dispute. Well,
21	know that, correct?	21	there may well have been an industrial dispute but
22	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes, I do.	22	superadded would have been other factors such as the ones I
23	MR MPOFU: Yes. And you would agree, I	23	mentioned, which constituted a breakdown in law and order
24	am sure, that the spirit of our law and in particular	24	and the real question is whether it would have been
25	section 23(5), I think, of the Constitution which enshrines	25	appropriate for the police to come in circumstances where
	Page 10799		Page 10801
1	the right for everyone to bargain collectively, that spirit	1	there was a breakdown in law and order, where people had
	5 5 5 1		
2	is that that power play that you and I agree upon is best	2	
2 3	is that that power play that you and I agree upon is best left to the relative power of the parties. In other words,		been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged,
3	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words,	2	
3 4	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to	2 3	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not?
3	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the	2 3 4	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed –
3 4 5 6	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and	2 3 4 5	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's
3 4 5 6 7	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that	2 3 4 5 6	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's –
3 4 5 6 7 8	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being
3 4 5 6 7	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's –
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not?</li> <li>MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's</li> <li>Mr Mpofu's question but that's –</li> <li>[12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them, namely Lonmin and you were briefed by only one of them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the Commissioners. What I'm saying, Chair, and I think the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them, namely Lonmin and you were briefed by only one of them. MR BURGER SC: Perhaps my learned friend can tell us what the industrial dispute is he referred to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the Commissioners. What I'm saying, Chair, and I think the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them, namely Lonmin and you were briefed by only one of them. MR BURGER SC: Perhaps my learned friend	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the Commissioners. What I'm saying, Chair, and I think the Chairperson has put it correctly, the evidence is that there was a dispute, a wage dispute. There's no doubt
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them, namely Lonmin and you were briefed by only one of them. MR BURGER SC: Perhaps my learned friend can tell us what the industrial dispute is he referred to. We've had that skirmish. I thought he accepted my definition which takes an industrial dispute out of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the Commissioners. What I'm saying, Chair, and I think the Chairperson has put it correctly, the evidence is that there was a dispute, a wage dispute. There's no doubt about that. What Mr Burger is correctly saying is that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	left to the relative power of the parties. In other words, if the union is weak, well, then they have themselves to blame if they are overpowered, so to speak, and if the employer somehow is weak then it has itself to blame and that our entire ethos, constitutional ethos, is that that is a power play that is best left to the parties. GENERAL PHIYEGA: Ja, I take it those are philosophical points of departure for bargaining and all those things but we as police don't get involved in it. MR MPOFU: Thank you. Now knowing that, all that, is it correct that when you arrived at the site of this industrial dispute you only visited one of the parties to the conflict – CHAIRPERSON: What date was that? MR MPOFU: On the 13th, thank you, Chairperson. You only visited one of the parties to that conflict or the protagonists, as I would have called them, namely Lonmin and you were briefed by only one of them. MR BURGER SC: Perhaps my learned friend can tell us what the industrial dispute is he referred to. We've had that skirmish. I thought he accepted my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been murdered – killed, anyway – property had been damaged, threats of violence had been uttered, other people had been injured. That's the real question, is it not? MR BURGER SC: Indeed – CHAIRPERSON: I'm not suggesting that's Mr Mpofu's question but that's – [12:47] MR BURGER SC: No – no, but what is being explored is, as I understand it, is the unfairness of talking to only one side to a dispute whereas I say the true facts are, the question is do you have to negotiate with unprotected strikers in the view of nine corpses or are you entitled to talk only to the employer, that's the question. CHAIRPERSON: You've heard the debate, I think the question could be reformulated in a manner which avoids those difficulties which are there. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm afraid - let me maybe make an attempt to address you and the Commissioners. What I'm saying, Chair, and I think the Chairperson has put it correctly, the evidence is that there was a dispute, a wage dispute. There's no doubt about that. What Mr Burger is correctly saying is that there was that dispute and more, which I'm comfortable with

		1	
	Page 10802		Page 10804
1	pushing it too far, one. Two, I said to this witness, the	1	it is busy with another point and that's on the 13th before
2	very first question or first two questions I asked her, I	2	McIntosh came and said all that to the people on the
3	said please understand that we are coming from the point of		koppie, whether it was impartial on the part of the police
4	view that the presence of the police there we're not taking	4	only to speak to Lonmin and not try to hear the other side.
5	any issue because of the things that the Chairperson has	5	I think that's his question, is that right?
6	correctly pointed out. So I'm not there, I'm not saying	6	MR MPOFU: That's right, specifically to
7	they should not have come, I'm talking about the behaviour,	7	the witness.
8	impartially or otherwise once they had come. Not whether	8	CHAIRPERSON: Okay, well let's hear what
9	they should have come or should have left it at all, that's	9	the witness has to say.
10	not what I'm questioning. Thank you, Chairperson.	10	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Let me start off by
11	CHAIRPERSON: Reformulate your question	11	saying I don't see impartiality there and I'll explain why
12	that takes on board the factors that you've mentioned and	12	I'm saying that.
13	we'll get the answer of the witness.	13	MR MPOFU: Yes, in fairness to you I'm
14	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chair.	14	sure you –
15	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, Chair, just so	15	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Can I answer?
16	that we follow, is a proposition being made that when the	16	CHAIRPERSON: No, let her explain. She's
17	National Commissioner got to Marikana between half past six		busy with her answer, let's give her the chance to finish
18	and seven she ought not to have spoken to Lonmin alone, to	18	her answer -
19	maintain the prescript of impartiality?	19	MR MPOFU: - I won't help.
20	CHAIRPERSON: I don't know about alone, I	20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Thank you for allowing
21	think Mr Mpofu's point is - whether it's a good or a bad	21	me to answer.
22	point is another matter but his point seems to be that	22	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu's point was you
23	regard being had to the fact that there were at least two	23	said impartiality when you meant partiality. I think you
24	antagonists, it was a departure from the principles of	24 25	meant to say I don't see evidence of partiality in what
25	impartiality only to speak to the Lonmin side and not to	25	happened and let me explain.
	Page 10803		Page 10805
1	Page 10803 speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a	1	Page 10805 GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay.
1 2		1 2	
	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a		GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay.
2	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have	2	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: Please explain.
2 3	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that	2 3	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: Please explain. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'll put it in my own
2 3 4	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's	2 3 4	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: Please explain. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'll put it in my own language. I do not believe that I stood with the one party
2 3 4 5	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts	2 3 4 5	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: Please explain. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'll put it in my own language. I do not believe that I stood with the one party there and I will explain why I say so.
2 3 4 5 6	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his	2 3 4 5 6	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Okay. CHAIRPERSON: Please explain. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I'll put it in my own language. I do not believe that I stood with the one party there and I will explain why I say so. CHAIRPERSON: The witness is answering,
2 3 4 5 6 7	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the	2 3 4 5 6 7	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipeline
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening -	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh repeatedly said and we've seen it in transcripts, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with thestrikers.My intervention is not an isolated intervention,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh repeatedly said and we've seen it in transcripts, that we're not concerned about your disputes with your employer,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with thestrikers.My intervention is not an isolated intervention,it's part of the police intervention and throughout our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh repeatedly said and we've seen it in transcripts, that we're not concerned about your disputes with your employer, we're concerned about the weapons you've got, we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with thestrikers.My intervention is not an isolated intervention,it's part of the police intervention and throughout ourinvolvement we've worked with all the stakeholders.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh repeatedly said and we've seen it in transcripts, that we're not concerned about your disputes with your employer, we're concerned about the weapons you've got, we're concerned about the weapons you've got, we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.doing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with thestrikers.My intervention is not an isolated intervention,it's part of the police intervention and throughout ourinvolvement we've worked with all the stakeholders.Andit's for that reason any debate and view that says there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	speak to the other side. Whether that's a bad point or a bad point is for the witness to answer but I would have thought that that's the question. He's not suggesting that they had to have a meeting of the two together, what he's suggesting is that having heard the Lonmin side, attempts should have been made to hear the other side. That's his question. Whether it would have been appropriate in the circumstances is a matter the witness will be able to tell us. Isn't that so? MR SEMENYA SC: But, Chair, the evidence, as we already know, even people like McIntosh were brought specifically to talk to the other side. CHAIRPERSON: But McIntosh only came the following day. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, that's why I'm asking whether on the evening - CHAIRPERSON: That's the way I understand the question. Mr Mpofu can correct me if I'm wrong. On the 13th, it was confined to the 13th as I understand it. We all know that McIntosh came the following day. McIntosh repeatedly said and we've seen it in transcripts, that we're not concerned about your disputes with your employer, we're concerned about the weapons you've got, we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Okay.CHAIRPERSON:Please explain.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I'll put it in my ownlanguage.I do not believe that I stood with the one partythere and I will explain why I say so.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:The witness is answering,it's her fullest right to do so in Sepedi, then I think youmust interpret it for the benefit of the Xhosa speakers inthe auditorium so they can hear or understand also whatshe's saying.I don't they all are bilingual, I don'tthink all the Xhosa speakers here can also speak Sepedi.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I come to Marikana onthe 13th when this event, when this process had firststarted from the 10th and a lot is happening in the pipelineand being part of large operation I do not operate alone, Ilink up and leverage what my other team members have beendoing.If we want to park on the 13th itself, there hadbeen a lot of engagement with the strikers by the policeand many other people during the day.There had beenengagement by the commanders on the ground with thestrikers.My intervention is not an isolated intervention,it's part of the police intervention and throughout ourinvolvement we've worked with all the stakeholders.

	Page 10806		Page 10808
1	MR MPOFU: Yes you see, General, once	1	CHAIRPERSON: There were other people,
2	again I'll give you the benefit of the doubt as it were	2	well they were on the way back to the koppie.
3	because you had not been there before but I'm telling you	3	MR MPOFU: Still eight kilometres.
4	now, I'm putting it to you, sorry, that as at the 13th when	4	CHAIRPERSON: They'd been to the koppie
5	you got there, there had been or rather there's no evidence	5	and they were on the way back to the koppie. They were
6	of any contact between the police and the strikers. So	6	among – they were strikers, part of the striking group.
7	take that as a -	7	Your point is that there was no attempt as far as we know
8	CHAIRPERSON: That's not correct, Mr	8	on the evidence to communicate with the remainder on the
9	Mpofu.	9	koppie. And the real question is and those facts are
10	GENERAL PHIYEGA: That's not true.	10	before us, the real question is what are her comments on
11	CHAIRPERSON: The evidence indicates that	11	your suggestion that police displayed lack of required
12	at least those people who were at the railway line and who	12	impartiality by acting in that way. Is that not your
13	were addressed by and in fact engaged in a debate with	13	question?
14	General Mpembe, had been fully addressed by him.	14	MR MPOFU: That is it.
15	MR MPOFU: Ja, that's fine.	15	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, now you heard my
16	CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure whether there	16	attempt to reformulate Mr Mpofu's question, are you able to
17	was at that stage any contact that we know about between	17	answer it?
18	the commanders of the police and those, and the others on	18	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I do not see any act of
19	the koppie but certainly the group who were involved in the	19	partiality on our side. As I've said this is a broader
20	engagement, if one calls it that, on the afternoon of the	20	context, I look at the day, I look at the evening and even
21	13th had been addressed by General Mpembe by the railway	21	the people I met, was it the executive or the board or
22	line and had exchanged views with him and so on.	22	whatever of Lonmin. I met a few people because I wanted to
23	MR MPOFU: Fair enough.	23	understand what was happening and I had the context of what
24	CHAIRPERSON: So the question isn't	24	was happening during the day. So I don't see the argument
25	correct.	25	that you're putting forward to me.
	Page 10807		Page 10809
1	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you.	1	Page 10809 MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it
2	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception	2	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you -
	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General		MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you
2 3 4	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence	2 3 4	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw
2	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the	2	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the
2 3 4 5 6	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie.	2 3 4	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday
2 3 4 5	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I	2 3 4 5	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, may we not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the question so framed, let's get the witness's comment. What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, may we not perhaps approach it differently? The point you're trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the question so framed, let's get the witness's comment. What do you say about that, National Commissioner?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, may we not perhaps approach it differently? The point you're trying to make is you say the police didn't act with the necessary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the question so framed, let's get the witness's comment. What do you say about that, National Commissioner? <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : Judge, I really am -
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, may we not perhaps approach it differently? The point you're trying to make is you say the police didn't act with the necessary impartiality and you concede that the police did speak to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the question so framed, let's get the witness's comment. What do you say about that, National Commissioner? <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA:</u> Judge, I really am - you know from the bottom of my heart I do not see the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Ja, fair enough, thank you. There is no evidence that as at the 13th, with the exception of the 120 or so people who were addressed by General Mpembe some eight kilometres away, there is no evidence that there had been any contact between the police and the protestors at the koppie. GENERAL PHIYEGA: And this is why, when I answered you now I said freeze the day on the 13th and I was going to tell you that earlier that day the police commanders that were there were talking to the strikers. MR MPOFU: Yes, I've asked you now the question accommodating that fact. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I really don't understand. We're going to be spending a whole lot of time, Chair, really achieving with respect very little. There's no point in putting a proposition that excludes this evidence, the consequences be the other – MR MPOFU: No. MR SEMENYA SC: It's just axiomatic. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, may we not perhaps approach it differently? The point you're trying to make is you say the police didn't act with the necessary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Yes, I think let's confine it to you - CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt you but the point that concerns me is that is it fair to draw the curtain, put the curtain down as it were on the question of partiality or impartiality on the Monday evening because it is correct that the police spoke to Lonmin people on the Monday night, but isn't it appropriate to have regard to what they did on the Tuesday to decide whether they acted impartially? I don't how practical it would have been for them to have tried to establish contact after they'd spoken to the Lonmin people, to establish contact with the strikers at that point. We know what they did the next day, so in the context, the broad context of looking at what happened on the 13th and the 14th together, was there partiality? Now you may contend there was still a lack of the requisite impartiality at that stage but I would have thought a fair question would incorporate both what the police did on the 13th and the 14th. So the question so framed, let's get the witness's comment. What do you say about that, National Commissioner? <u>GENERAL PHIYEGA</u> : Judge, I really am -

		1	
	Page 10810		Page 10812
1	we could not talk peace, encourage people to strive for	1	issue and to you I'm going to put fewer, maybe eight or so,
2	peace if we were not talking to all the stakeholders	2	some of which are new and others are overlapping. So it
3	because it would be anomalous to -	3	was in that context that I was asking you the first
4	MR MPOFU: Okay, General -	4	question and the question really relates to the section
5	CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the lunch	5	218. Section 218 of the Constitution that I read to you
6	adjournment now. If you still contend that the police	6	referred to you as the National Commissioner specifically.
7	showed a lack of the requisite impartiality by only	7	The other section on impartiality I concede relates to the
8	speaking to Lonmin on the Monday night and not attempting	8	police in general but that one relates to you. So having
9	to speak to the strikers that same night instead of the	9	given that background, which hopefully will shorten things,
10	following day, then you can proceed with the point after	10	I just want to ask you whether it is so or not so that on
11	lunch.	11	the 13th you, as National Commissioner, only were present at
12	MR MPOFU: Chairperson, just for the - to	12	the Lonmin premises and you were briefed by Lonmin
13	make it clear, I've never said anything about the police, I	13	representatives and nobody else from the other side, as it
14	was talking about the 13th and this witness whether she was	14	
15	briefed and attended to Lonmin only, but we'll deal with it	15	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Burger?
16		16 17	MR BURGER SC: Chair, may I object in
17 18	[COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [14:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission will now	17 18	principle to this line of questioning. As I understand my learned friend he wants to debate eight factual situations
19	resume. We understand that the National Commissioner	19	with the witness as being indicative of a relationship.
20	sometimes has urgent matters to attend to by telephone and	20	Now with great respect, what this witness's view is on what
20	she's in another building, so we quite understand. In	20	has to be made of that relationship would be irrelevant.
22	future we will make a practice of only coming in to resume	22	That's for the Commission to decide. To the extent that
23	when we are informed that the witness is at the witness	23	these are factual statements, the witness can't add to it.
24	table, but don't feel upset about it, we quite understand.	24	What the spirit of the Constitution is or what her
25	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Thank you.	25	statutory duties under the Constitution might be is a
	Page 10811		Page 10813
1	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you	1	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a
2	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath.	2	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what
2 3	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am.	2 3	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no
2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're still	2 3 4	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and
2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.	2 3 4 5	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.	2 3 4 5 6	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):	2 3 4 5 6 7	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am. CHAIRPERSON: And Mr Mpofu, you're still cross-examining. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you, Chairperson. I just want to say, Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in future" to talk about but –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.GENERAL PHIYEGA:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillCHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillCross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.Mandar Mandar	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.GENERAL PHIYEGA:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillCross-examining.And Mr Mpofu, you're stillMANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorter this portion of my cross-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillCross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.Kenter SonKenter Son	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorter this portion of my cross-examination for two reasons.Firstly, let me explain to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross-examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain toyou where it comes from. You remember I had asked you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.GENERAL PHIYEGA:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.And Mr Mpofu, you're stillCROSS-exaMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross-examination for two reasons.Firstly, let me explain toyou where it comes from.You remember I had asked you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross-examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain toyou where it comes from. You remember I had asked you toread our opening statement and one of the points raisedthere is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON:But I have to remind youthat you're still under oath.GENERAL PHIYEGA:I am.CHAIRPERSON:And Mr Mpofu, you're stillcross-examining.MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA:s.u.o.CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.):Yes, thank you, Chairperson.I just want to say,Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "infuture" to talk about but –CHAIRPERSON:To some extent it's in yourhands, Mr Mpofu.MR MPOFU:Thank you, Chairperson.General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross-examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain toyou where it comes from. You remember I had asked you toread our opening statement and one of the points raisedthere is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxicrelationship between Lonmin and the police, remember that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection. CHAIRPERSON: No, I know it's your objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am. CHAIRPERSON: And Mr Mpofu, you're still cross-examining. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you, Chairperson. I just want to say, Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in future" to talk about but – CHAIRPERSON: To some extent it's in your hands, Mr Mpofu. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross- examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain to you where it comes from. You remember I had asked you to read our opening statement and one of the points raised there is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxic relationship between Lonmin and the police, remember that in the statement? 9.3 or so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection. MR BURGER SC: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am. CHAIRPERSON: And Mr Mpofu, you're still cross-examining. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you, Chairperson. I just want to say, Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in future" to talk about but – CHAIRPERSON: To some extent it's in your hands, Mr Mpofu. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross- examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain to you where it comes from. You remember I had asked you to read our opening statement and one of the points raised there is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxic relationship between Lonmin and the police, remember that in the statement? 9.3 or so. GENERAL PHIYEGA: 9.3.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection. CHAIRPERSON: No, I know it's your objection. MR BURGER SC: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: I understand your objection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am. CHAIRPERSON: And Mr Mpofu, you're still cross-examining. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you, Chairperson. I just want to say, Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in future" to talk about but – CHAIRPERSON: To some extent it's in your hands, Mr Mpofu. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross- examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain to you where it comes from. You remember I had asked you to read our opening statement and one of the points raised there is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxic relationship between Lonmin and the police, remember that in the statement? 9.3 or so. GENERAL PHIYEGA: 9.3. MR MPOFU: Yes 9.3, yes. That's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection. CHAIRPERSON: No, I know it's your objection. MR BURGER SC: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: I understand your objection is based on the fact that he introduces his first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON: But I have to remind you that you're still under oath. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I am. CHAIRPERSON: And Mr Mpofu, you're still cross-examining. MANGWASHI VICTORIA PHIYEGA: s.u.o. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR MPOFU (CONTD.): Yes, thank you, Chairperson. I just want to say, Chairperson, the witness I'm sure hopes there's no "in future" to talk about but – CHAIRPERSON: To some extent it's in your hands, Mr Mpofu. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. General, I'm going to shorten this portion of my cross- examination for two reasons. Firstly, let me explain to you where it comes from. You remember I had asked you to read our opening statement and one of the points raised there is the allegation about the toxic collusion, toxic relationship between Lonmin and the police, remember that in the statement? 9.3 or so. GENERAL PHIYEGA: 9.3. MR MPOFU: Yes 9.3, yes. That's the subject I'm busy with now and the reason I'm going to run	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	matter for legal interpretation. Who she spoke to is a factual inquiry, she can clearly be asked on that but what my learned friend, as I understand it and I mean him no disservice, wishes to do is to argue his closing speech and ask the comments of the witness on his closing speech. Now I can't wait for the opportunity to deal with that closing speech in my closing speech but that's the forum for it and that's where we'll debate the merits or the demerits of conclusions to be drawn from facts. This is not the place nor the witness for that, so on that general basis I raise an objection to this line of questioning. CHAIRPERSON: Of course he can ask questions about factual propositions upon which he's going to base his argument, clearly he can do that, I think you concede that. MR BURGER SC: But that's not my objection. CHAIRPERSON: No, I know it's your objection. MR BURGER SC: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: I understand your objection is based on the fact that he introduces his first proposition by reference to statutory provisions,

	Page 10814		Page 10816
1	can be the subject of argument and interpretation. That's	1	your evidence, if there's anything you disagree with or
2	your main objection.	2	anything you feel requires, in the context, explanation or
3	MR BURGER SC: Well, I'm really objecting	3	elaboration, do so. I think if you do it that way -
4	to the second question in the line. The second question	4	MR MPOFU: Ja.
5	is, on the 13th is it so you only spoke to Lonmin? Now	5	CHAIRPERSON: - you're going to have less
6	she's given the evidence. Whether she agrees with it or	6	displeasure from Mr Burger than would otherwise be the
7	not, we're not interested in, it's on the record. To ask	7	case.
8	her that is unnecessary, it's time wasting. What the	8	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I was
9	argument is, that do you agree that that's indicative of a	9	more worried about the displeasure from you, Chairperson,
10	certain relationship, that's my problem.	10	because one day you told me it has to be a question not a
11	MR MPOFU: Okay.	11	statement but it's fine, I'll do it like that. You,
12	CHAIRPERSON: Perhaps he can reformulate	12	General, also acquiesced or agreed with the fact that the
13	the question with the benefit of having received guidance	13	police had decided to set up the JOC at the Lonmin
14	from you on the point.	14	premises, correct? I'll avoid the "correct," that's one of
15	MR MPOFU: Chair, I prefer the guidance	15	the propositions on which I'm going to rely and – well, I
16	that I got from you, Chairperson, which is that –	16	think we need to punctuate it with whether you agree or -
17	CHAIRPERSON: Don't spurn Mr Burger's	17	CHAIRPERSON: Having put the basis, if
18	guidance, I'm sure he can be a useful guide in some	18	she disagrees –
19	respects.	19	MR MPOFU: Okay, thank you.
20	MR MPOFU: Ja, I'm sure he can, Chair,	20	CHAIRPERSON: I think we can rely on the
21	but I'd rather stick to asking the factual basis of what I	21	National Commissioner to be sufficiently -
22	will argue one day, as he correctly puts it. And	22	MR MPOFU: Silence means consent, okay.
23	Chairperson it would be unfair to argue those things having	23	Number 3, the next basis on which I'm going to rely is that
24	not put them to the witness. The witness might well say,	24	the police conducted meetings in which their plans were
25	you know what, Mr Mpofu, on my way back from Lonmin I	25	discussed in the company of private individuals who worked
	Page 10815		Page 10817
1	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know	1	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that
2	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the	2	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier.
	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness.		for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far
2 3 4	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can.	2 3 4	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses,
2 3	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair.	2 3	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them
2 3 4	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here.	2 3 4	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses,
2 3 4 5	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we knowthat it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to thewitness.CHAIRPERSON:Be as focused as you can.MR MPOFU:Yes, I will, Chair.CHAIRPERSON:Remember everyone is here.MR MPOFU:Yes. Yes, thank you,	2 3 4 5	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans.
2 3 4 5 6	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja.
2 3 4 5 6 7	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to	2 3 4 5 6 7	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a series of facts or propositions, none of which she can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very objection. We are now going to have eight pieces of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a series of facts or propositions, none of which she can disagree with because they're based on she's said already,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very objection. We are now going to have eight pieces of evidence which is before the Commission –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a series of facts or propositions, none of which she can disagree with because they're based on she's said already, you don't have to ask her every time is that right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very objection. We are now going to have eight pieces of evidence which is before the Commission – MR MPOFU: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a series of facts or propositions, none of which she can disagree with because they're based on she's said already, you don't have to ask her every time is that right. Perhaps you can preface it by saying I'm putting a number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very objection. We are now going to have eight pieces of evidence which is before the Commission – MR MPOFU: No. MR BURGER SC: - read to the witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	popped in and spoke to so-and-so. I mean I think we know that it didn't happen but it's only fair to put it to the witness. CHAIRPERSON: Be as focused as you can. MR MPOFU: Yes, I will, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Remember everyone is here. MR MPOFU: Yes. Yes, thank you, Chairperson. So really the only issue was that you yourself did not speak, or rather you only spoke to representatives of Lonmin and got a briefing from them on the 13th. Fact, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: It is correct and I've answered you earlier on to say it's within the milieu of a broader operation and the police did talk to other stakeholders. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, I think part of Mr Burger's complaint is, when you put a proposition it's based upon something she's said already, you then say is that correct and then she says yes and we know it's correct because she's said it already. So I think if you put a series of facts or propositions, none of which she can disagree with because they're based on she's said already, you don't have to ask her every time is that right. Perhaps you can preface it by saying I'm putting a number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for Lonmin who were, in a way, party to the dispute that you and I have spoken about earlier. CHAIRPERSON: - actually correct. As far as I can see from the statements of the Lonmin witnesses, they say that on several occasions the police asked them please to leave because they were going to discuss the plans. MR MPOFU: Ja. CHAIRPERSON: And they then left. So I don't know that that proposition can be put in an unqualified a fashion as you have done. MR MPOFU: Yes. Obviously I'm referring to the other occasions when they did not do that but the Chairperson is correct. And specifically I'll refer you to paragraph 49 of Botes' statement which says – I'll just read it out to you – "On 16 August 2012 I had arrived at the SAPS JOC fairly early in the morning. From discussions I overheard I gathered that the SAPS had formulated a plan to proceed with disarming the group at the koppie." MR BURGER SC: Chair, but this is my very objection. We are now going to have eight pieces of evidence which is before the Commission – MR MPOFU: No.

1         put before the Commission yet.         1         I'm going to put and then I'm going to put and proposition to           2         MR MPOFU:         It hasnt.         2         you, is that the police shared their radios and other means           3         CHAIRPERSON:         He hasnt given evidence:         3         of commission and - before, i'm quite confident on           4         that, it was read out and that if Botes is going to say that?         in this Commission and - before, i'm quite confident on           6         MR BURGER SC:         That gassage was read out and that if Botes is going to say that?           7         in this commission and - before, i'm quite confident on         access to radios and so on - 'SAPS reported' - this safer she says she had?           8         that, it was read out and that if Botes is going to say that?         there were approximately 2 000 persons at the top           10         How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the         context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the           11         reformulate this question till the cows come home, the         debate is in order to substantiate a relationship. Weil           12         represent the that's my objection.         16         Commissioner - tou se water cannons, rubber builets and           14         reformulate this question till the cows come home, the         General NPOFU:         Yes.           12		Page 10818		Page 10820
2       MR MPOFU:       It hasn't.       2       you, is that the police shared their radios and other means.         3       CHAIRPERSON:       He hasn't given evidence         4       yet. The statement was pub before us but hat particular         5       min and for that proposition I rely on the statement.         6       MR BURGER SC:       That passage was read out         7       in this commission and – before, I'm quite confident on         8       that, it was read out but that's not my objection. What if       at 14:22 SAPS reported - this is after she says she had         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,         11       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       14         14       reformulate this question lill the cows come home, the       14         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       14         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, hes already put of         17       heils to disperse the crowd."         18       MR MPOFU:       Yes.         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       15         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Mrs Semenya wants to say	1 put	-	1	5
3       CHAIRPERSON:       He hasn't given evidence       3       of communication with private individuals working for         4       yet. The statement was put before us but that particular       5       of communication with private individuals working for         5       passage wasn't highlighted or referred to, so –       6       MR BURGER SC:       That passage was read out         7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       6       paragraph for you. She says that, 'on the 14th August 2012         7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       8       access to radios and so on – 'SAPS reported' – this faster she says she had         8       that, It was read out and what' If Botes is going to say that, 'on the 14th August 2012       1       at 14:22 SAPS reported' – this is after she says she had         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       10       kopple and that they needed instructions on whether or not         11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       that there were approximately 2 000 persons at the top         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       14       Inderstood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         13       that the guestion lill the cows come hore, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         14       Indersto		-	2	
4       yet. The statement was put before us but that particular       5       passage wasn't highlighted or referred to, so –         6       MR BURGER SC: That passage was read out       6       paragraph for you. She says that, "on the 14th August 2012         7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       8       that, it was read out but that's not my objection. What if         9       it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?       10       koppie and that they needed instructions 'on whether or not         11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       this is relevant what the writness says on that, so we calculate this question till the cows come home, the       11       the should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Weil,       11       to the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         13       that is reported and that's my objection.       14       14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Weil, he's already put of       14       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         16       full repositions.       12       MR MPOFU: Yes.       14       12 spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, If I do the other         17       the like to alsersere triutowas bas to adispan to going to argue, that <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>3</td><td></td></td<>			3	
5       passage wasn't highlighted or referred to, so –       5       submitted by Lonmin of Amanda van der Merwe. I'll read on         6       MR BURCER SC:       That passage was read out       6         7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       7         8       that, it was read out but that's northy objection.       7       at 14:22 SAPS reported " - this is after she says she had         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       10       kopple and that they needed instructions 'on whether or not         11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       they should shoot at them all?. I' I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       14       they should shoot at them all?. I' I can finish, Mr         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understoad this mainstructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question.       14       14       14         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       14       14         17       his gropositions.       14       1 spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td></td>		5	4	
6       MR BURGER SC: That passage was read out       6       paragraph for you. She says that, "On the 14th August 2012         7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       8       tat 14:22 SAPS reported - this is after she says she had         8       that, it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?       1       1       1       tat 14:22 SAPS reported - this is after she says she had         9       it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <td>, j</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	, j			
7       in this Commission and – before, I'm quite confident on       7       at 14:22 SAPS reported - this is after she says she had         8       that, it was read out but that's not my objection. What if       9       access to radios and so on - SAPS reported and 1 recorded         9       it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?       9       that there were approximately 2 000 persons at the top         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       1       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       11       they should shoot at them all."." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       11       they should shoot at them all."." If I can finish, Mr         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       13       it on the log sheet as 1 was instructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       16       Commissioner - I dom't know which         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       Commissioner - I dom't know things that         17       file Sheeneyson:       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair -				-
8       that, it was read out but that's not my objection. What if       9       it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       10       kopple and that there were approximately 2 000 persons at the top         11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr       11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       14         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       Commissioner - "to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       his propositions.       19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other         10       four are subject to the same criticism.       19       Watchai respect of those, the last two things that the         22       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       11         23       something.       Semething.       12       if Lonmin knew as long as since the 14th that the		1 5		
9       it was read out and what if Botes is going to say that?       9       that there were approximately 2 000 persons at the top         10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       10       kopple and that they needed instructions on whether or not         11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       12       Mahlangu? "This report came via SAPS radio and I recorded         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         15       debate is irrelevant what the witness says on that; so we can       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       Commissioner - 10 use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       nor are subject to the same criticism.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       16       three i just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENVA SC:       The statement doesn't say       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         23       something.       MR SEMENVA SC:       The state				
10       How can this witness contribute? If it isn't done in the       10       kopple and that they needed instructions 'on whether or not         11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       they should shoot at them all'." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       11       they should shoot at them all'." If I can finish, Mr         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       13       it on the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       15       authorisation from the Commissioner' – I don't know which         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       15       commissioner – 'to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       his propositions.       14       I deixe to disperse the crowd."       18       [14:/22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       14       I deixe to alsymmet and that's my doing or argue, which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we				-
11       context that, General, I'm going to use that as one of the       11       they should shoot at them all." If I can finish, Mr         12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       12       Mahlangu? "This report came via SAPS radio and I recorded         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       13       it on the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       commissioner - 'to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       his propositions.       17       the like to disperse the crowd."       18         18       MR MPOFU:       Yes.       18       I4122] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair -       21       which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we         23       orarather as long as since the 14th that the bargaining what-do-you-       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       25       int the morning tha				
12       arguments in order to substantiate a relationship. Well,       12       Mahlangu? "This report came via SAPS radio and I recorded         13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       12       it on the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       13       it on the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         17       his propositions.       14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         18       MR MPOFU: Yes.       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested       15         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       16       Commissioner - 'to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         10       the SEMENYA SC:       Chair -       20       there l just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       fel Lonmin knew as long as ince the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discusse				
13       that's irrelevant what the witness says on that, so we can       13       it on the log sheet as I was instructed to do. I         14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       15       authorisation from the Commissioner* – I don't know which         17       his propositions.       14       Inspect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       Ispoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       12       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       21       which se anch nore serious proposition. Given that we as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 14th that the police were,         2       MR MPOFU:       Chairperson, two things.       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the polawas not a display of				-
14       reformulate this question till the cows come home, the       14       understood this to mean that the SAPS had requested         15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       15       authorisation from the Commissioner" - 1 don't know which         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       15       authorisation from the Commissioner" - 1 don't know which         17       his propositions.       16       Commissioner - 'to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         18       MR MPOFU:       Yes.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       17       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair -       20       three I just want to put to you what 'm going to argue,         23       something.       22       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power       24         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       25       if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that -         25       that the police plans were discussed       nor rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,       2         2       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       3       long as 6 o'clock in the morning that,       3 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
15       debate is irrelevant and that's my objection.       15       authorisation from the Commissioner" - I don't know which         16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       Commissioner - "to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       his propositions.       18       MR MPOFU: Yes.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       Ispoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair -       21       which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we         23       something.       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       16       cor rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,         2       MR MPOFU:       Botes.       2       quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, as         3       General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present       4       retorical question but I'm going		5		
16       CHAIRPERSON:       Well, he's already put of       16       Commissioner – "to use water cannons, rubber bullets and         17       his propositions.       17       the like to disperse the crowd."         18       MR MPOFU:       Yes.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair –       21       which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we         22       AMR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       1       or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,         2       MR MPOFU:       Botes.       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to         3       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       4       move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
17       his propositions.       17       the like to disperse the crowd."         18       MR MPOFU: Yes.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON: Let's see whether the other       19       I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       four are subject to the same criticism.       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         23       something.       21       which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we         23       something.       22       have agreed, you and I, that the bargaining what-do-you-         24       MR SEMENYA SC: The statement doesn't say       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       what-do-you-call –       25       if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that –       26         2       MR MPOFU: Botes.       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the police evere, and that it had been discussed.       1       or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were, and that's a         3       gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       1       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would       5 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
18       MR MPOFU:       Yes.       18       [14:22] And in respect of those, the last two things that         19       CHAIRPERSON:       Let's see whether the other       19       I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other         20       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair –       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair –       20       which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we         22       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Semenya wants to say       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         23       something.       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       25       or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,         2       MR MPOFU:       Botes.       2       or rather as long as it were, then what incentive would         3       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       4       move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would         4       as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       1       or rather as long as it were, then what incentive would		5.1		
19CHAIRPERSON:Let's see whether the other20four are subject to the same criticism.19I spoke to you, Botes and Van der Merwe, if I do the other21MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –20three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,22CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya wants to say22which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we23something.22call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power24MR SEMENYA SC:The statement doesn't say2425that the police plans were discussed in the presence of25if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that -2MR MPOFU:Botes.1or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,3MR SEMENYA SC:- people. The statement,3long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to4as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a1or rather as long as as it were, then what incentive would5function of him being present when the plans were discussed4move into phase 3 as it were, then what police's7MR MPOFU:Chairperson, two things.8ereeral Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present9at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I1CHAIRPERSON:I's just a proposition, Mr11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was11CHAIRPERSON:I's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.12Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she13CHAIRPERSON: </td <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>-</td>		•		-
20       four are subject to the same criticism.       20       three I just want to put to you what I'm going to argue,         21       MR SEMENYA SC:       Chair –       21         22       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Semenya wants to say       23         23       something.       23       call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       24       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       26       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         26       MR MPOFU:       Botes.       2       quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, a         3       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to         4       as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to         5       function of him being present when the plans were discussed.       7       MR MPOFU:       Chairperson, two things.         8       General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present       9       vere planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining     <				
21MR SEMENYA SC: CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say something.21which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we have agreed, you and I, that the bargaining what-do-you- call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power24MR SEMENYA SC: that the police plans were discussed in the presence of21which is a much more serious proposition. Given that we have agreed, you and I, that the bargaining is a matter of power relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that -2MR SEMENYA SC: MR MPOFU: a s I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a function of him being present when the plans were discussed a and that it had been discussed.Page 10819 13MR POFU: General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present 9at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I 101010think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the 11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was 1211CHAIRPERSON: 12It's just a proposition, Mr 1213CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.			19	
22       CHAIRPERSON:       Mr Semenya wants to say       22       have agreed, you and I, that the bargaining what-do-you-         23       something.       23       mR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       have agreed, you and I, that the bargaining what-do-you-         24       MR SEMENYA SC:       The statement doesn't say       24       relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that         25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       Page 10819       Page 10819         1       what-do-you-call –       1       or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were, quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, a         3       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       3       long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to         4       as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       5       function of him being present when the plans were discussed       4       move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would         5       function of him being present when the plans were discussed.       7       MR MPOFU:       Chairperson, two things.       6         8       General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present       9       positions against the protesters and was not a display of impartiality.         10       think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the       10 <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td>		-		
<ul> <li>23 something.</li> <li>24 MR SEMENYA SC: The statement doesn't say</li> <li>25 that the police plans were discussed in the presence of</li> <li>26 that the police plans were discussed in the presence of</li> <li>27 that the police plans were discussed in the presence of</li> <li>28 that the police plans were discussed in the presence of</li> <li>29 that the police plans were discussed in the presence of</li> <li>20 Page 10819</li> <li>21 what-do-you-call –</li> <li>22 MR MPOFU: Botes.</li> <li>3 MR SEMENYA SC: - people. The statement,</li> <li>4 as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a</li> <li>5 function of him being present when the plans were discussed</li> <li>6 and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>7 MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.</li> <li>8 General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present</li> <li>9 at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>10 think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>11 Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>23 call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power</li> <li>24 relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that</li> <li>25 if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to a say it were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> </ul>			21	
24MR SEMENYA SC: that the police plans were discussed in the presence of24relations between the two parties, I'm going to argue that if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that –25that the police plans were discussed in the presence of25if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that –26mathematical degree plansPage 1081911what-do-you-call –1or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were, quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, at long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would 53MR SEMENYA SC: function of him being present when the plans were discussed 6and that it had been discussed.37MR MPOFU: MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.6rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's action in allowing these people to be privy to what they were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining positions against the protesters and was not a display of impartiality.10think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the 1010CHAIRPERSON: the admits it's a rhetorical question so she 131113CHAIRPERSON: CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13CHAIRPERSON: they have to answer it, so let's move on.	22	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya wants to say	22	
25       that the police plans were discussed in the presence of       25       if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that –         20       Page 10819       Page 10819         1       what-do-you-call –       1       or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,         2       MR MPOFU:       Botes.       1         3       MR SEMENYA SC:       - people. The statement,       3         4       as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a       1       or rather as long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to         5       function of him being present when the plans were discussed       1       move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would         5       function of him being present when the plans were discussed.       6       rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's         7       MR MPOFU:       Chairperson, two things.       7       action in allowing these people to be privy to what they         8       General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present       9       positions against the protesters and was not a display of         10       think it's GG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the       11       CHAIRPERSON:       It's just a proposition, Mr         12       Botes.       13       CHAIRPERSON:       Yes. Mr Semenya, what do       13       doesn'	23 som	ething.	23	call-it, collective bargaining is a matter of power
Page 10819Page 108191what-do-you-call –1or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,2MR MPOFU:Botes.23MR SEMENYA SC:- people. The statement,34as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a3Iong as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to5function of him being present when the plans were discussed5they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a6and that it had been discussed.6rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's7MR MPOFU:Chairperson, two things.7action in allowing these people to be privy to what they8General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present9positions against the protesters and was not a display of10think it's GG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the10impartiality.11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was11CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.	24	MR SEMENYA SC: The statement doesn't say	24	
1what-do-you-call –1or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,2MR MPOFU:Botes.2quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, a3MR SEMENYA SC:- people. The statement,3long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to4as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a5function of him being present when the plans were discussed4move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would5function of him being present when the plans were discussed6rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's7MR MPOFU:Chairperson, two things.6action in allowing these people to be privy to what they8General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present9positions against the protesters and was not a display of10think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the10impartiality.11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was11CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.	25 that	the police plans were discussed in the presence of	25	if Lonmin knew as long as 6 o'clock in the morning that –
1what-do-you-call –1or rather as long as since the 14th that the police were,2MR MPOFU:Botes.2quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, a3MR SEMENYA SC:- people. The statement,3long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to4as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a5function of him being present when the plans were discussed45function of him being present when the plans were discussed.6and that it had been discussed.67MR MPOFU:Chairperson, two things.6action in allowing these people to be privy to what they8General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present9action in allowing these people to be privy to what they9at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I9positions against the protesters and was not a display of10think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the1CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.		Page 10810		Dago 10831
2MR MPOFU: MR SEMENYA SC: as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a function of him being present when the plans were discussed and that it had been discussed.2quote/unquote, "planning to go into them all" and, two, a long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a e rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's action in allowing these people to be privy to what they were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining positions against the protesters and was not a display of timpartiality.1Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was Botes.11CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do11CHAIRPERSON: Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she thave to answer it, so let's move on.	1 what		1	
3MR SEMENYA SC: as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a function of him being present when the plans were discussed and that it had been discussed.3long as 6 o'clock on the 16th that the plan was there to move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a 6 and that it had been discussed.7MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.6rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's action in allowing these people to be privy to what they were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining positions against the protesters and was not a display of impartiality.9at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the Botes.9NR APPERSON: Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was Botes.11CHAIRPERSON: CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she Burger. Ha admits it's on let's move on.	2	MR MPOFU: Botes.	2	
<ul> <li>4 as I gathered, how he gathered is not necessarily a</li> <li>5 function of him being present when the plans were discussed</li> <li>6 and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>7 MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.</li> <li>8 General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present</li> <li>9 at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>10 think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>11 Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>4 move into phase 3 as it were, then what incentive would</li> <li>5 they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>6 rhetorical question but I'm going to argue that police's</li> <li>7 action in allowing these people to be privy to what they</li> <li>8 were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining</li> <li>9 positions against the protesters and was not a display of</li> <li>10 impartiality.</li> <li>11 CHAIRPERSON: It's just a proposition, Mr</li> <li>12 Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> </ul>	3	MR SEMENYA SC: - people. The statement,	3	
<ul> <li>function of him being present when the plans were discussed</li> <li>and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.</li> <li>General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present</li> <li>at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>Botes.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to negotiate with the protesters and that's a</li> <li>they have to answer it, so let's move on.</li> </ul>	4 as l		4	
<ul> <li>and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>MR MPOFU: Chairperson, two things.</li> <li>General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present</li> <li>at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>Botes.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>and that it had been discussed.</li> <li>chairperson, two things.</li> <li>action in allowing these people to be privy to what they</li> <li>were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining</li> <li>positions against the protesters and was not a display of</li> <li>impartiality.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: It's just a proposition, Mr</li> <li>doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.</li> </ul>			5	•
7MR MPOFU: General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was7action in allowing these people to be privy to what they were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining positions against the protesters and was not a display of impartiality.11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was Botes.11CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.			6	
<ul> <li>8 General Annandale has testified that Mr Botes was present</li> <li>9 at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>10 think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>11 Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>12 Botes.</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> </ul> <ul> <li>8 were planning to do, disturbed the collective bargaining</li> <li>9 positions against the protesters and was not a display of</li> <li>10 impartiality.</li> <li>11 CHAIRPERSON: It's just a proposition, Mr</li> <li>12 Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> </ul>			7	
<ul> <li>9 at the 6 o'clock meeting. Secondly, we know that from, I</li> <li>10 think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the</li> <li>11 Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was</li> <li>12 Botes.</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>9 positions against the protesters and was not a display of</li> <li>10 impartiality.</li> <li>11 CHAIRPERSON: It's just a proposition, Mr</li> <li>12 Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she</li> <li>13 CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Mr Semenya, what do</li> <li>14 doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.</li> </ul>	8 Gene		8	
10think it's GGG40, the whiteboard where the attendees at the Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was10impartiality.11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was11CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.12Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.		-		
11Provincial JOC were, that one of their names there was11CHAIRPERSON:It's just a proposition, Mr12Botes.12Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.				
12Botes.12Burger. He admits it's a rhetorical question so she13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.				
13CHAIRPERSON:Yes. Mr Semenya, what do13doesn't have to answer it, so let's move on.				
1.14 VOU SAV ABOUT What Mr Mpotu says? I 1.14 MR BURGER SC: As long as she needn't		say about what Mr Mpofu says?	14	MR BURGER SC: As long as she needn't
15     MR SEMENYA SC:     But it doesn't –     15     answer I don't have an objection, sir.	-			C C
16 CHAIRPERSON: I gathered, it's ambiguous 16 MR MPOFU: We're also going to put that				-
17 but I must confess my impression of reading it was that he 17 the police used equipment, including aircraft, which		<b>C C</b>		
				belonged to one of the parties in the dispute in which one
19 he was there a good deal of the time when he wasn't asked – 19 of them was a party.		-		
20       I think let him put his eight –         20       CHAIRPERSON:		-		
		/ d		
200 1 30 1 1 CA 1 / h	200	35.90		
h l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l		In 11 preserver of a local sector		
				-
	» //	VI 10 - 11		
25 MR MPOFU: Thank you. And the next one 25 provided by Lonmin and the police used a helicopter, a	20		20	provided by commin and the police used a helicopter, a

		1	
1	Page 10822	1	Page 10824
1	Protea – which was under contract from Protea Coin, it	1	that – of course it's a controversial matter upon which we
2	actually belonged to Protea Coin but it was the subject of	2	will have to decide – whether the police decided or planned
3	a contract between Protea Coin and Lonmin.	3	to kill the people or whether the killing that took place
4	MR MPOFU: Yes, no –	4	was a consequence of, as the police allege, a threatened
5	CHAIRPERSON: That's the correct	5	attack against which they had to defend themselves and
6	formulation.	6	their colleagues.
7	MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson,	7	MR MPOFU: Yes, no –
8	that's correct. The word "belonging" is a bit much in the	8	CHAIRPERSON: You've got trouble with
9	circumstances insofar as the aircraft is concerned.	9	that proposition, if I were you I would withdraw it.
10	Remember I said including aircraft, but the point is that	10	MR MPOFU: Yes, the second proposition
11	other equipment such as the – what do you call it, the $\ensuremath{CCTV}$	11	you can ignore but what I'm going to put to you is that it
12	screens and other materials at Lonmin belonged to Lonmin	12	is the view of the police, at least according to their
13	but as far as the aircraft is concerned the Chairperson is	13	opening statement, that Lonmin's inconsistent approach must
14	right, it was only procured by them, subcontracted from	14	have sent mixed messages to the protesters and that's a
15	Coin.	15	reference to the fact that they had negotiated with the
16	CHAIRPERSON: I don't know if I've been	16	RDOs allegedly in July and that they were refusing now.
17	counting correctly, is that your sixth of the eight	17	That's the view of the police. It is also their view that
18	propositions or seventh?	18	Lonmin created the beast that it later found impossible to
19	MR MPOFU: Well, on our list it's the	19	tame, the beast being the violent strikes that contributed
20	fifth, Chairperson. Maybe I have split some of them or	20	to this tragedy, that was also the view of the police.
21	combined some of them.	21	MR BURGER SC: Is my learned friend now
22	CHAIRPERSON: Okay, carry on –	22	putting indications of a toxic relationship between Lonmin
22	MR MPOFU: There are few left –	23	and the police?
23 24		23	CHAIRPERSON: I thought so. I couldn't
	CHAIRPERSON: Carry on. MR MPOFU: The next one is that the 270	24 25	-
25	WR WPOPD. The next one is that the 270	20	quite understand the last one myself –
	Dago 10932		Dogo 10925
1	Page 10823 or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft	1	Page 10825 MR BURGER SC: I'm lost.
1 2		1 2	
	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft		MR BURGER SC: I'm lost.
2	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the	2	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in
2 3	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press	2 3	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end,
2 3 4 5	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I	2 3 4	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more
2 3 4 5 6	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my	2 3 4 5 6	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't
2 3 4 5	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I	2 3 4 5	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more
2 3 4 5 6 7	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they – MR MPOFU: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they – MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand. MR MPOFU: Well, then I'll break it down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand. MR MPOFU: Well, then I'll break it down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand. MR MPOFU: Well, then I'll break it down CHAIRPERSON: A number of points, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand. MR MPOFU: Well, then I'll break it down - CHAIRPERSON: A number of points, the first one is I'm not sure that they turned a blind eye on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. All I'm saying – CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or so people who were arrested were taken to number 1 shaft at Lonmin and processed there before they were taken to the police station. In addition, your well-known press conference on the 17th of August, the day after the massacre, was held at the Lonmin game farm. And before I come to the last one or the last two, the key point in my argument is that in the eyes of the protesters at least, but also of the reasonable citizen of South Africa, these specific actions would not be viewed as not taking sides or to use one word, exhibits of impartiality. The penultimate one is that the police, although they have given some severe criticisms to Lonmin now after the fact, turned a blind eye to what they saw as offensive behaviour on the part of one of the parties in, for example, dubbing the people as faceless but were prepared to punish perceived offensive behaviour on the part of the other party with death. CHAIRPERSON: No – no, Mr Mpofu, I think that question, that proposition can't stand. MR MPOFU: Well, then I'll break it down CHAIRPERSON: A number of points, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR BURGER SC: I'm lost. CHAIRPERSON: I think we're together in that but let him put his propositions, he's near the end, let's get the comments of the witness and then we can move on. Otherwise we have debates about it, it just takes more time. Let him – but I take your point, the last two don't sound like evidence of toxic collusion. If anything, they - MR MPOFU: No. CHAIRPERSON: - something else but anyway, that's a matter for argument. Mr Mpofu, you've got one more proposition to put, have you? MR MPOFU: Yes. Chairperson, I have to say this now, all I'm saying – obviously I've said, I've even played open cards before. I'm saying despite these criticisms, they did not do a certain thing. So you can't reduce it to an infantile – CHAIRPERSON: No – no. MR MPOFU: - you know, level. Okay. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. All

	Page 10826		Page 10828
1	CHAIRPERSON: Let's have the last	1	time, they went along with Lonmin and acted in a way as if
2	proposition.	2	they had no objection to what Lonmin were doing or not
3	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	3	doing. And he is suggesting that that reticence by the
4	CHAIRPERSON: None of what I've said was	4	police, that failure to communicate this disagreement with
5	on record but just as well.	5	Lonmin on certain points is evidence that there was a kind
6	MR MPOFU: Yes. Thank you, Chairperson.	6	of a collusion between the two. I think that's your point,
7	You – it was also, despite the view of the police that the	7	is it?
8	blame of the two unions is not mitigated by Lonmin's	8	MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair.
9	conduct in fanning the flames of inter-union rivalry, when	9	CHAIRPERSON: Have we now got all your
10	on 23 July it negotiated the wage deal directly with the	10	propositions?
11	workers –	11	MR MPOFU: No, Chair, we've got another
12	MR BURGER SC: I object to this question,	12	one. The last one is something which is a bridge to the
13	it's completely out of order and I'd like a ruling on this.	13	next topic that I'm going to deal with and it is that,
14	This witness cannot help you on it, sir, and to simply	14	significantly, you – I'll connect it to you at the end –
15	allow Mr Mpofu to go on and on and on is unfair to my	15	the Police Minister at least allowed himself to be
16	client.	16	influenced and directed towards certain actions and
17	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, what do you say	17	positions by individuals who happened to be directly in,
18	about the objection to this last point?	18	part of Lonmin, who also happened to be politically
19	MR MPOFU: Well –	19	powerful - which concerns, quote/unquote, were communicated
20	CHAIRPERSON: That may be the view of the	20	to you, according to the Minister.
21	police as stated here –	21	MR BURGER SC: Chair, there's no factual
22	MR MPOFU: Ja.	22	basis for that statement, none whatsoever. This witness is
23	CHAIRPERSON: But does it really advance	23	on record to say that when the Minister spoke to her he
24	the debate on the point that you're busy arguing?	24	didn't mention any names. There was no suggestion that the
25	MR MPOFU: Well –	25	Minister put any pressure on her. There was no suggestion
	Page 10827		Page 10829
1	CHAIRPERSON: And if it does, you could	1	that she put any pressure down the line. General Annandale
2	argue it at the end surely?	2	gave evidence too long, there was no suggestion to him that
3	MR MPOFU: Yes.	3	he had pressure put upon him by anybody from higher up, so
4	CHAIRPERSON: I don't think you should	4	there's no factual basis for this statement and it's, with
5	put it to the witness.	5	respect, out of order to put it to this witness. I've
6	MR MPOFU: Okay.	6	objected before, I repeat my objection.
7	CHAIRPERSON: You've put a number of	7	MR MPOFU: Chairperson –
8	propositions to her –	8	MR SEMENYA SC: More pertinently –
9	MR MPOFU: Chair, I won't put it to the	9	MR MPOFU: Sorry, sorry –
10	witness. All I'm going to do is just to tell you where I'm	10	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu, Mr Semenya wants
11	going with it and as you say, one day it may or not be -	11	to say something too.
12		12	MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Mpofu is not a mind
	all I'm saying is this, the police had valid or invalid	12	•
13	all I'm saying is this, the police had valid or invalid criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the	13	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed
13 14			-
	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the	13	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed
14	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea	13 14	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the
14 15	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to	13 14 15	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that?
14 15 16	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they	13 14 15 16	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson,
14 15 16 17	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all.	13 14 15 16 17	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out
14 15 16 17 18	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning	<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> </ol>	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is
14 15 16 17 18 19	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning semi-automatic rifles is evidence of toxic collusion but	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is correct, it's actually not even the witness, it's me who
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning semi-automatic rifles is evidence of toxic collusion but let me try to reformulate your question. What I understand	<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> </ol>	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is correct, it's actually not even the witness, it's me who said I'm going to assume in her favour that he did not
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning semi-automatic rifles is evidence of toxic collusion but let me try to reformulate your question. What I understand Mr Mpofu to be saying is that we know from the passage he	<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is correct, it's actually not even the witness, it's me who said I'm going to assume in her favour that he did not mention names. That's not the point I'm canvassing. I
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning semi-automatic rifles is evidence of toxic collusion but let me try to reformulate your question. What I understand Mr Mpofu to be saying is that we know from the passage he read from the opening statement that the police were	<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is correct, it's actually not even the witness, it's me who said I'm going to assume in her favour that he did not mention names. That's not the point I'm canvassing. I can't go against my own say-so. The only thing I'm putting
<ol> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	criticisms of the behaviour on each side and that on the one side where they were residing, being served with tea and using equipment and so on they turned a blind eye to those infractions. And on the other half a side they turned semi-automatic rifles, that's all. CHAIRPERSON: I don't know that turning semi-automatic rifles is evidence of toxic collusion but let me try to reformulate your question. What I understand Mr Mpofu to be saying is that we know from the passage he read from the opening statement that the police were critical of Lonmin's conduct at various stages during the	<ol> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	reader, Chair, with respect, that the Minister allowed himself to be influenced. Where is he going to get the evidence to support that? MR MPOFU: Okay. Firstly Chairperson, the factual basis of what I'm putting I'm going to read out from the Minister's statement. Secondly, Mr Semenya is correct, it's actually not even the witness, it's me who said I'm going to assume in her favour that he did not mention names. That's not the point I'm canvassing. I can't go against my own say-so. The only thing I'm putting to the witness and the only thing that connects her with

		T	
1	Page 10830	1	Page 10832
1	CHAIRPERSON: 18 of the Minister's – MR MPOFU: Sorry, of the Minister's	1 2	was the 15th. So if the conversation referred to in para 18 was on the 15th or possibly even the morning of the 16th,
2			
3	statement, yes and before I read it, Chairperson, I just	3	then I'm not sure if there's any causal connection between
4	want to make it clear that when I'm reading it now as I was	4	the discussions because by that time the NIU people, the
5	reading it earlier, you'll remember that I – when I'm	5	STF people, the TRT people, all the other people who were
6	reading it now as I was reading it earlier, I'm assuming in	6	brought to Marikana had already arrived. They'd started
7	the witness's favour that all that was communicated to her	7	coming a day or two before that. I'm not sure if there's a
8	were the concerns without necessarily them being labelled	8	causal connection but anyway. They'd been deployed much
9	as belonging to X or Y, but that the so-called concerns	9	earlier, it would appear, before any conversation took
10	were related to her comes from what I'm going to read which	10	place between the Minister and the National Commissioner
11	I've read before. Paragraph 15, "I am advised that Mr	11	who is reported in the next, well, in para 20, as having
12	Senzeni Zokwana, the president of the National Union of	12	said that the SAPS was already dealing with the matter and
13	Mineworkers, testified before this honourable Commission	13	she gave an assurance that the SAPS was capable of handling
14	that on 12 August" –	14	the matter. So it would appear that there's, if all that's
15	CHAIRPERSON: Has the witness got the	15	correct, there's no causal connection between any telephone
16	statement in front of her?	16	conversation between the Minister and the National
17	MR MPOFU: I'm sorry, yes.	17	Commissioner in relation to the build up of police
18	CHAIRPERSON: FFF29.	18	personnel on the scene and the deployment and so on. So
19	MR MPOFU: It's FFF29, sorry, sorry	19	there are two problems –
20	General. I think she's got it in front of her, ja. "I am	20	MR MPOFU: yes.
21	advised that Mr Senzeni Zokwana, the president of the NUM,	21	CHAIRPERSON: I'll give you a chance to
22	testified before this honourable Commission that, 1. on 12	22	deal with them.
23	August 2012 he had a telephonic conversation with me (the	23	MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you Chairperson.
24 25	Minister) concerning the Marikana incident." 15.2, "During that said conversation he requested that adequate SAPS	24 25	Well, thank you Chairperson, I'm glad that at least I'm privy to the Chairperson's prima facie view on the causal
25	that salu conversation he requested that adequate SAFS	25	
	Page 10831		Page 10833
1	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of	1	connection. I will explain the causal connection.
2	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic	2	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal
	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns		connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you
2 3 4	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that	2 3 4	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper
2 3	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr	2 3 4 5	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the
2 3 4 5 6	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests	2 3 4 5 6	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his
2 3 4 5 6 7	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that	2 3 4 5 6 7	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So -	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic</li> <li>conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that</li> <li>connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr</li> <li>Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests</li> <li>and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that</li> <li>SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them</li> <li>that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as</li> <li>indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National</li> <li>Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to</li> <li>handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what</li> <li>was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic</li> <li>conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that</li> <li>connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr</li> <li>Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests</li> <li>and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that</li> <li>SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them</li> <li>that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as</li> <li>indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National</li> <li>Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to</li> <li>handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what</li> <li>was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's</li> <li>the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement. CHAIRPERSON: Well, there's a further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those are rightful things, well, we'll argue that one day but I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter."</li> <li>18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So -</li> <li>[14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON: Well, there's a further problem and that is that it appeared from some of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those are rightful things, well, we'll argue that one day but I'm entitled certainly to put to the witness those two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement. CHAIRPERSON: Well, there's a further problem and that is that it appeared from some of the evidence we had that Mr Ramaphosa must have communicated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those are rightful things, well, we'll argue that one day but I'm entitled certainly to put to the witness those two propositions, that one, it was from the one side and he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement. CHAIRPERSON: Well, there's a further problem and that is that it appeared from some of the evidence we had that Mr Ramaphosa must have communicated with the Minister on I think the 15th and I can't remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those are rightful things, well, we'll argue that one day but I'm entitled certainly to put to the witness those two propositions, that one, it was from the one side and he acted on it with – together or rather transmitted it as you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	members be deployed at Marikana to avoid a further loss of life." 16, "I (the Minister) also had a telephonic conversation with Mr Cyril Ramaphosa regarding his concerns about Marikana." And it's the next two paragraphs that connect the witness. "I informed both Mr Zokwana and Mr Ramaphosa in response that I would convey their requests and concerns to the National Commissioner and ensure that SAPS was dealing with the matter. I also informed them that I would ensure that SAPS attended to this matter." 18, "Having been alerted to the situation in Marikana as indicated above, I discussed the issue with the National Commissioner and received assurances that SAPS was able to handle the matter." So - [14:41] MR BURGER SC: Chair, Chair, then what was put to the witness was quite improperly put. If that's the basis for what was put as improper pressure on a Minister then perpetuated from the Minister down to the National Commissioner, it is improperly put. I object to it and I invite my learned friend to withdraw that statement. CHAIRPERSON: Well, there's a further problem and that is that it appeared from some of the evidence we had that Mr Ramaphosa must have communicated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	connection. I will explain the causal connection. CHAIRPERSON: [Inaudible] - the causal connection, what Mr Burger complains about is that you suggested, that what you had put constituted improper pressure brought on the National Commissioner by the Minister and then somehow transmitted down and his complaint, as I understand it, related to that phrase "improper pressure." MR MPOFU: Well – CHAIRPERSON: He invited you to withdraw that and reformulate the question in a less objectionable fashion. MR MPOFU: Yes. Well Chairperson, remember the topic we are dealing with. I'm saying the pressure is improper, (a) insofar as it comes from the one side of the dispute which is the Lonmin side, that's the first thing. The second thing which I said is that it's improper insofar as it came from politically powerful individuals who had access to the Minister. So those are matters that we can argue. If someone thinks that those are rightful things, well, we'll argue that one day but I'm entitled certainly to put to the witness those two propositions, that one, it was from the one side and he

		1	
	Page 10834		Page 10836
1	call the political – remember there's a third game changer	1	to influence operational matters from one side of the
2	in my earlier formulation, is exactly the fact that there	2	equation. Remember Chairperson, that it's not a fairly
3	was political pressure put to bear. Whether at the end I	3	simple matter of just the deployment and so on. There's
4	will succeed in that is another matter but I can't be	4	the big question of what I call the characterisation of the
5	disentitled now from putting it to the witness, one. Two,	5	problem at Lonmin. That was also the subject of these
6	coming to your point, Chair, of the causal connection, I	6	communications. Actually it was the major subject that the
7	have –	7	government people, the Minister must be told to stop
8	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry Mr Mpofu, before you	8	characterising this as a labour dispute but to characterise
9	get to the second point –	9	it as, only purely as a criminal matter. That
10	MR MPOFU: Yes.	10	characterisation, Chairperson, is much more cynical than
11	CHAIRPERSON: You've got the first point,	11	meets the eye because remember that the Minister –
12	it suggests an improper pressure. What's improper about	12	CHAIRPERSON: Surely it would be cynical
13	one party to a dispute who complains there's been a	13	to say that this was only a labour dispute. It's true
14	breakdown of law and order, that his side or its side is	14	there were some dead bodies on the ground and there were
15	being subjected to violence, intimidation, damage to	15	some cars that had been burnt –
16	property, murder and so on, in complaining about that to	16	MR MPOFU: Exactly.
17	the police and if he gets the impression that the police	17	CHAIRPERSON: - and there was other
18	are not dealing with it properly, going higher up in the	18	damage that had been done but that doesn't matter, this is
19	police and saying look here, something must be done about	19 20	purely a labour matter. That would be a cynical – MR MPOFU: It is.
20 21	this. Is that improper? Would that not be a perfectly proper approach by the party concerned to endeavour to	20	CHAIRPERSON: - observation, would it
22	protect his rights?	22	not?
22	MR MPOFU: Well Chairperson, with the	22	MR MPOFU: Oh certainly, Chair, and in
23	greatest respect, if it would have been equally accessible,	24	fact this is exactly how it is put in the e-mail in
25	let's put it that way, to the other side to fly about to	25	question. "I've had two discussions with the DG, in each
20		20	
	Page 10835		Page 10837
1	Page 10835 Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for	1	Page 10837 case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold
1 2	6	1 2	0
	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but		case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be
2	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of	2	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the
2 3	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem	2 3	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So
2 3 4	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have	2 3 4	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister	2 3 4 5	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that the Minister – remember the Minister might say later that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying that you may not have other grounds later when the Minister
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that the Minister – remember the Minister might say later that I actually told the witness about these phone calls but I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bod letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying that you may not have other grounds later when the Minister gives evidence, but is there any basis on what's before us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that the Minister – remember the Minister might say later that I actually told the witness about these phone calls but I'm assuming in her favour for now that he didn't mention	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying that you may not have other grounds later when the Minister
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that the Minister – remember the Minister might say later that I actually told the witness about these phone calls but I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying that you may not have other grounds later when the Minister gives evidence, but is there any basis on what's before us at the moment which justifies you in suggesting that the Minister acted in a manner not consistent with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Cape Town and demand a meeting with Ministers and for messages to be passed to the President and the Minister of Police and all that, then of course it would be proper but the point I'm making – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I put a problem to you about it? What exactly should the Minister have received, what kind of representation should the Minister receive from the other side, the side allegedly involved in a breakdown of law and order? Could AMCU have been heard or the non-unionised strikers perhaps because I think it's controversial whether AMCU were involved. Could the non- unionised strikers have phoned the Minister and said look here, there's been a breakdown of law and order here, there have been murders, NUM people have – well, employees of Lonmin have been killed, Lonmin property has been damaged but please listen to our side and don't ask the police to send in more people. I mean surely that would be a totally unrealistic proposition to expect anyone to even consider. MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, I'm sorry. The point is simply this, I'm putting to this witness that the Minister – remember the Minister might say later that I actually told the witness about these phone calls but I'm assuming in her favour for now that he didn't mention names. All I'm putting to her is that she was the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	case I've characterised this as not, and it's put in bold letters, "as not an industrial relations issue but a civil unrest, destabilisation, criminal issue that could not be resolved with political intervention and needs the situation to be stabilised by the police or army." So let's not trivialise this, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: I don't think it's being trivialised. The other point that you have to deal with is what the Minister says in paragraph 21 of his statement. MR MPOFU: I'm going to – CHAIRPERSON: He now makes the point that he regularly receives complaints and requests from members of society regarding policing matters. "In such situations," he says, "I take these up with the National Commissioner in order to ensure that these matters are attended to." And then he says this, "My approach is based on the constitutional segregation of the roles of the Minister of Police from that of the National Commissioner referred to above." Now is there any basis upon which it can be suggested on material before us now, I'm not saying that you may not have other grounds later when the Minister gives evidence, but is there any basis on what's before us at the moment which justifies you in suggesting that the

	Page 10838		Page 10840
1	Police on the one hand and the National Commissioner on the	1	Minister has said, said somewhere in Mpumalanga, "There
2	other?	2	must be a good appreciation of the distinction between the
3	MR MPOFU: Yes –	3	need to use maximum force against violent criminals and
4	CHAIRPERSON: If there isn't any basis	4	minimum force in dealing with fellow citizens. We should
5	for suggesting that then I don't see how you can put it to	5	not have any blurring lines when it comes to command and
6	the witness.	6	control." We have this witness who has said in FFF5 that
7	MR MPOFU: No, there is, Chairperson,	7	maximum force was used and I know there's a debate about
8	two. There are two bases. One of those bases is a matter	8	that and, yes, that is the second basis, that if anyone who
9	that I'm going to come to, which is that when this witness	9	knows that there is this distinction, which is wrong by the
10	says that her statement in paragraph 23, that she's	10	way, should be hell bent in trying to show the Minister and
11	discussed with the Minister the action to be taken – that's	11	the witness that this is a situation that requires maximum
12	her cross-examination that came from Mr Burger – paragraph	12	force according to their wrong formulation and not the one
13	23 of her statement, I'm going to argue that that evidence	13	where you are dealing with fellow citizens. So these are,
14	must be disbelieved and if I have to, obviously I'm not	14	that flying around in aeroplanes to change the
15	going to go through that whole thing about page 7 and what	15	characterisation was not a matter of semantics, it was a
16	have you, I'll assume that the Commission has heard enough	16	matter to prepare the ground and that's the causal
17	of that. So that's the first basis, that if it's going to	17	connection point, to prepare the ground for the murder of
18	be disbelieved then she did discuss this matter at an	18	these people using maximum force as this witness has –
19	operational level with the Minister, that's –	19	CHAIRPERSON: The points you've raised
20	CHAIRPERSON: That's another matter.	20	are all matters for argument. I don't know that it's
21	MR MPOFU: Thank you –	21	appropriate for you to put the arguments to the witness
22	CHAIRPERSON: But you can scarcely put a	22	because I don't know that her answers, with respect, will
23	question to her, a hypothetical question, on the basis that	23	take the matter any further and I say with respect to her.
24	the Commission doesn't believe you and on the basis that	24 25	MR MPOFU: Yes.
25	the Commission makes a finding adverse to your evidence on	25	CHAIRPERSON: But so I'm not disposed to
	Page 10839		Page 10841
1	this particular point, what do you say about that? I don't	1	allow you to ask those questions, but the general
2	think –	2	proposition, the series of propositions you put to her, you
3	MR MPOFU: I'm going there, Chairperson.	3	asked her what does she say about your contention that
4	CHAIRPERSON: No, I don't see how such a	4	there's a toxic collusion - I take it you've now reached
5	question can be put to a witness.	5	the stage where that question can be put, so let me put it
6	MR MPOFU: Yes but –	6	on your behalf. You've heard a series of propositions –
7	CHAIRPERSON: What do you say, cross-	7	MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson, I'm sorry.
8	examining counsel says to the witness, what do you say if	8	If you'd just allow me to put one –
9	the court doesn't believe you when it says you weren't	9	CHAIRPERSON: Alright –
10	there but – and then a question is asked based on the	10	MR MPOFU: No, not a new proposition –
11	hypothesis. A witness would be entitled to refuse, to say	11	CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's –
12	I don't accept the hypothesis, I say my evidence should be	12	MR MPOFU: Just to preface your
13	believed.	13	assistance to me, ja.
14	MR MPOFU: I'm not –	14	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr Mpofu, before
15	CHAIRPERSON: Whether the evidence will	15	you do that, the question about undue influence, are you
16	be believed is a matter that time alone will tell.	16	relying only on the contents of the statement of the
17	MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm not	17	Minister or are there other facts that shore up that
18	addressing the witness right now, I'm addressing you.	18	allegation? I just need to understand that carefully
19	You've asked me whether there's a basis, on the evidence	19	before the question is put, please.
20	before us, on which I will attach the argument and I was	20	MR MPOFU: Ja. Chairperson and
21	answering you. The second basis is that – and this	21	Commissioners, obviously one of the handicaps that I have in this line of questioning is the fact that at least two
22	attaches to the crucial question of characterisation – why	22	in this line of questioning is the fact that at least two
23	is it that this political individual wanted the	23 24	of the dramatis personae that I'm relating to, namely the
24	characterisation to be changed cynically, as we have said?	24	Minister and Mr Ramaphosa, have not yet testified. So
24	Here is the answer and it's before this Commission. The	25	obviously the handican that I have or rather the heat I can
25	Here is the answer and it's before this Commission. The	25	obviously the handicap that I have or rather the best I can

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

401		113310	
	Page 10842		Page 10844
1	do in curing that inherent handicap is to use, (a) the	1	toxic relationship between the police and Lonmin. In fact
2	statement of the Minister and the –	2	I read about it the next day in The Star when the e-mail
3	CHAIRPERSON: The e-mail that Mr	3	was highlighted and I read about this relationship between
4	Ramaphosa wrote –	4	my client and Lonmin in The Star on the front page. We, to
5	MR MPOFU: Which the Minister has now	5	this day, know how The Star got that e-mail. So that was
6	confirmed, at least partially. You must remember when I	6	the first leg he relied upon. Then we had evidence and we
7	said this at the opening address it was still open to	7	had this theme being developed from time to time. We had
8	someone to say, oh, Mpofu has manufactured these e-mails or	8	evidence from this witness indicating that there was no
9	whatever, or there was no such communication. Now we are	9	substance in it and I don't want to repeat her evidence,
10	in a different terrain where the Minister has under oath	10	she's given her evidence. We've received an affidavit from
11	confirmed that such communication occurred and bearing in	11	the Minister indicating that there's no substance
12	mind that what I call those inherent handicaps, at the very	12	whatsoever in this pressure point. The Commissioner asked
13	least, I can't be expected to then recall this witness once	13	today a very valid question, what do you rely upon for your
14	_	14	submission that there was a toxic relationship? What do
15	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Ramaphosa –	15	you rely upon for what submission? We hear it is the e-
16	MR MPOFU: - has testified.	16	mail, which is neutral, and we hear it is the Minister's
17	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Mr Mpofu, I'm sorry.		
17	I don't understand why you can't. If more information	17 18	affidavit, which is neutral. We don't hear anything about NUM having phoned the Minister with a very similar request
19	becomes available which you didn't have at your disposal	19	as every responsible citizen will do, but the fact of the
20	when this witness was being cross-examined you would be	20	matter is that we again today have a whole spiel to this
21	perfectly entitled to get up and say, in the light of this	21	witness suggesting that there was an imbalance in the
22	fresh evidence which takes the matter significantly further	22	relationship, that somehow my client had an improper
23	than it was when the National Commissioner was in the	23	relationship with the police. Based on what? On nonsense.
24	witness box, questions which I couldn't ask her at the time	24	The submission is opportunistic, I say it's irresponsibly
25	because I didn't have this material, then I ask for her to	25	made and it's no good for my learned friend to ride over
	Page 10843		Page 10845
1	come back. If there is such material which justifies her	1	objections, make long speeches and then go on with the next
2	being recalled, you can bring the application and depending	2	question. It's harmful to my client and I invite you to
3	on the strength of the material, the application will	3	protect my client from this type of cross-examination which
4	succeed.	4	has got no factual basis up to now. My learned friend may
5	MR MPOFU: Fair enough. Thank you,	5	come one day, grab a rabbit from a hat and produce evidence
6	Chairperson.	6	to substantiate that. I'll be the first to concede that
7	MR BURGER SC: Chair, may I say	7	it'll then be a responsible submission but if these are the
8	something?	8	two grounds for the submission it's not responsible.
9	MR MAHLANGU: May I just very briefly, I	9	[15:01] MR MPOFU: Well, Chairperson, I think
10	see the people at the back are all looking at me and are	10	that begs the second point which I was making to you about
11	surprised why I am so quiet about all the discussion that	11	the causal connection issue which you raised, validly
12	is taking place. Very briefly.	12	Chairperson, and I'm going to try and put it very
13	MR BURGER SC: Chair, may I say	13	simplistically. The argument is simply this, Chairperson,
14	something? Have you finished? It is now nearly 3 o'clock.	14	that the efforts by politically powerful individuals, which
14	The witness has played no role for the past hour in what is	14	were successful, to change the characterisation by the
16	an inquiry into what happened from the 6th to the 19th.	16	government of the event to a criminal event - strictly
17	This is not a monologue. This is not a forum for one	17	criminal, no labour matter – were intended and did result,
18	party. This is a forum where we have to ascertain the	17	were intended and did result in two things. One, it was to
19	facts and we don't get to the facts but what I want to say	10	convince the Minister, as it is said in one of the e-mails
	is this, this whole debate about improper pressure being		289E where it says, "I've just had a discussion with Susan
20	7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 A	20 21	
21	put on the Minister you will remember arose when we	21	Shabangu in Cape Town. 1 –" this is from Mr Ramaphosa –
22	produced documents, we're one of the few parties, Lonmin,		"She agrees that what we are going through is not a labour
23	who produced documents right up front and we produced the	23	dispute," which is what it was out for at 9 o'clock, "but a
24	Ramaphosa e-mail as we were duty bound to do. That was then used by Mr Mpofu in his opening as the evidence of a	24 25	criminal act." So now we've got the stage for murder set.
	then used by Mir Miporu in his opening as the evidence of a	25	"She will correct her characterisation of what we are
	I K U R I V E FOR JUSTICE	<u> </u>	

		I	
	Page 10846		Page 10848
1	experiencing. 2. She is going into Cabinet and will brief	1	is intimidation, there is violence and there is now killing
2	the President as well and get the Minister of Police, Nathi	2	and he made it absolutely clear that it was not because
3	Mthethwa, to act in a more" – more – "pointed way."	3	there were people striking who had gathered on the koppie.
4	Now if, with the greatest respect, Chairperson,	4	It was not a matter for him that this was a collective
5	that, those actions and the communications have obviously	5	bargaining issue or that it was an issue that Mr Mpofu
6	achieved their intended result as at 3 o'clock on the 15th,	6	inaccurately, incidentally, describes as a wage dispute.
7	had nothing whatsoever to do with the fact that all of a	7	He called for law and order forces because of the killings.
8	sudden on the 16th in the morning it's D-day, warra-warra,	8	Now if that is part of the undue influence that
9	all those things and people get killed in a more pointed	9	people were seeking to exert on the security and police
10	way and are dealt with as criminals with maximum force,	10	establishment of this country then I need to know that and
11	according to this witness, then nothing ever will be	11	I am not deriving that from what Mr Mpofu is saying about
12	connected under the Sun.	12	Mr Ramaphosa and Lonmin. If Mr Zokwana was on a similar
13	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Mpofu –	13	mission, if Mr Zokwana was concerned was to secure murder,
14	MR TIP SC: Chair yes, I unfortunately	14	then that needs to be made clear today and we will
15	need to enter the debate and certainly not with a view to	15	establish in due course why it was not put to Mr Zokwana.
16	prolonging it because it has already been a very extensive	16	CHAIRPERSON: I'll take the tea
17	and less than productive one but I'm drawn into it because	17	adjournment now. Mr Mpofu, you can consider your position.
18	of the treatment that my learned friend Mr Mpofu has given	18	It may well be in the light of submissions that have been
19	to what he calls politically powerful interventions or	19	made that you'd wish to reformulate your question.
20	rather interventions by politically powerful individuals.	20	Basically you want to put to the witness that there was
21	He has focused his submissions on Mr Ramaphosa and hence,	21	improper or undue influence. The complaint relates to what
22	via Mr Ramaphosa, they're directed towards Lonmin, that	22	the allegation of impropriety or undueness rests on.
23	he's drawn our attention to the paragraphs from the	23	Perhaps if you can put that succinctly to the witness –
24	statement of the Minister where the very first person who	24	MR MPOFU: Yes.
25	enters the arena of communications to the police and	25	CHAIRPERSON: You may find a way through
	Page 10847		Page 10849
1	Page 10847 invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and	1	Page 10849 the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other
1 2		1 2	
	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and		the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other
2	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana,	2	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points.
2 3	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the	2 3	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do.
2 3 4	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just	2 3 4	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea
2 3 4 5	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is	2 3 4 5	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it,
2 3 4 5 6	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an	2 3 4 5 6	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an
2 3 4 5 6 7	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now	2 3 4 5 6 7	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones, on the 12th of August, the Minister.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not commissioned statement, amendments on paras 3 and 24,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones, on the 12th of August, the Minister. Now Mr Zokwana has given evidence and his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not commissioned statement, amendments on paras 3 and 24, signed and commissioned statement, scanned document. Now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones, on the 12th of August, the Minister. Now Mr Zokwana has given evidence and his evidence on this topic has been very, very clear and it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not commissioned statement, scanned documents. Now to whom must we say thank you for these documents?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones, on the 12th of August, the Minister. Now Mr Zokwana has given evidence and his evidence on this topic has been very, very clear and it is entirely unchallenged. He seeks police intervention	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not commissioned statement, amendments on paras 3 and 24, signed and commissioned statement, scanned document. Now to whom must we say thank you for these documents? MR MPOFU: To SAPS.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	invitations to the police to secure a proper presence and the effective restoration of law and order, is Mr Zokwana, the president of my client and he does that, not on the 15th, he does that on the 12th and perhaps I can just recapitulate very briefly the essence of it because it is important in the context of the thesis that Mr Mpofu is now placing before the Commission, ultimately with a view to an answer to some set of propositions, that on the 12th Mr Zokwana arrives because he has heard reports about the incident on the morning of the 12th in which two security men were killed and he comes to Lonmin because he is very, very concerned. The first thing that he does is to arrange a meeting with Lonmin and it's a logical and perfectly proper recourse because Lonmin have the security apparatus that is in place and he needs to establish whether or not there is sufficient security. He is not entirely satisfied – I know that I'm repeating things I've said previously, but he then calls the Provincial Commissioner's office. He is not yet satisfied that there has been a sufficient response on the part of the police and he then telephones, on the 12th of August, the Minister. Now Mr Zokwana has given evidence and his evidence on this topic has been very, very clear and it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the problem, because I imagine you want to move on to other points. MR MPOFU: I do. CHAIRPERSON: Well, let's take the tea adjournment, give you a chance to think about it, reformulate your question and we'll resume in quarter of an hour's time. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [15:32] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Major-General, sorry, National Commissioner – the last witness was a Major-General. National Commissioner, you're still under oath. Mr Mpofu, have you found a way out of the thicket in which we were all involved before we took the adjournment? MR MPOFU: Yes, yes Chairperson, I have. It's very simple, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Before you do that, forgive me, when we came back here we found documents on our desk, on the table, statement of the National Commissioner base document, advancement base document, a not signed and not commissioned statement, scanned document. Now to whom must we say thank you for these documents?

	Page 10850		Page 10852
1	recall we had requested documents of the statement as and	1	that clarifies the position, that is what I sought and I
2	when they were generated. Those are the documents.	2	appreciate that.
3	CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, and presumably	3	CHAIRPERSON: You've put a long series of
4	you will deal with them in re-examination. Alright, okay	4	propositions, some of which have had to be left out for the
5	thank you. Mr Mpofu, sorry, I interrupted you.	5	moment at least -
6	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. I	6	MR MPOFU: Yes.
7	just want to say that those documents, insofar as they may	7	CHAIRPERSON: - to the witness. The main
8	be dealt with in re-examination, we also just received them	8	concern was the suggestion, putting that there was undue
9	now so obviously we will reserve our rights. But	9	influence or improper pressure. That was the thrust, as I
10	Chairperson, yes, to respond to you or rather to Mr Tip	10	understood it, of Mr Burger's complaint, one of the main
11	through you, Chairperson and Commissioners, unfortunately I	11	ones. Now are you minded to reformulate your question?
12	was interrupted when I was still – Mr Tip is correct – when	12	MR MPOFU: Yes I am, Chairperson, and I'm
13	I was confining my line of questioning to Mr Ramaphosa.	13	not going to put any new propositions, that I promise.
14	However, contrary to what Mr Burger said, I had in reading	14	What I wanted to do is, before the Chairperson was going to
15	the Minister's statement, I deliberately started at 15.1 so	15	crystallise the crux I just wanted to put one, one little
16	as to cover the point that Mr Tip is correctly raising and	16	proposition as a preface, if the Chair doesn't mind. It is
17	the answer is this. The only appellation, as it were, to	17	this –
18	which I will argue Mr Zokwana conforms is the one I've made	18	CHAIRPERSON: Just a little proposition.
19	of politically powerful individuals for the obvious reasons	19	MR MPOFU: Yes. General, the only
20	that were led in the evidence but I absolve him completely	20	connection that you have to this - and I'm sorry because as
21	from the rest of the things that I had observed to you,	21	I've conceded already, I'm putting to you things that other
22	Chairperson, namely the "campaign" to re-characterise the	22	witnesses are going to come and say and what have you,
23	events, one. Two, the desire to bring out the army	23	which is partly unfair because you were obviously not privy
24	although that one is a bit marginal, I'll explain just now.	24	to their communications – the only reason I'm putting this
25	And the desire expressed in the e-mails for maintaining the	25	to you is insofar as you are drawn into those discussions
	Dogo 100E1		Dogo 10053
1	Page 10851 police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails.	1	Page 10853 and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only
1 2	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails.	1	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only
	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act		and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to
2	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr	2	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only
2	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act	2 3	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political
2 3 4	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in	2 3 4	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is
2 3 4 5	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation.	2 3 4 5	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the
2 3 4 5 6	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in	2 3 4 5 6	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is
2 3 4 5 6 7	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7	2 3 4 5 6 7	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's a minor issue. So I hope that deals sufficiently with Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree. CHAIRPERSON: Anything you want to add,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's a minor issue. So I hope that deals sufficiently with Mr Tip' concerns, in other words insofar as some bring him in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree. CHAIRPERSON: Anything you want to add, or are you content to rest with that answer? Anything you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's a minor issue. So I hope that deals sufficiently with Mr Tip' concerns, in other words insofar as some bring him in and some of the issues bring him out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree. CHAIRPERSON: Anything you want to add, or are you content to rest with that answer? Anything you want to add, or are you content to abide by that answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's a minor issue. So I hope that deals sufficiently with Mr Tip' concerns, in other words insofar as some bring him in and some of the issues bring him out. CHAIRPERSON: Ask your question and let's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree. CHAIRPERSON: Anything you want to add, or are you content to rest with that answer? Anything you want to add, or are you content to abide by that answer you've just given?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	police presence at about 800, that's in one of the e-mails. And fourthly, the desire for getting the Minister "to act in a pointed way." So the only common ground, which is Mr Tip's question, is simply the issue of the appellation. However, where I do join issue with NUM in response to these issues is where, is insofar as there is coincidence between the call for the army and the police in the e-mails by Lonmin and a similar call being made in BBB7 where it says that, quote, in the NUM statement, "We call for the deployment of a special task force or the SANDF to deal decisively with the criminal elements in Rustenburg and its surrounding mines" and so on, says the NUM general secretary. And if I'm going to argue any second coincidence it will simply be that there was, whether it was fortuitous or not, but that both Lonmin and the NUM to that extent called for the involvement of the army and in this case it says special task force. The other one didn't, it just said the police but that's a minor, that's a minor issue. So I hope that deals sufficiently with Mr Tip' concerns, in other words insofar as some bring him in and some of the issues bring him out. CHAIRPERSON: Ask your question and let's see whether we, it's – Mr Tip, I beg your pardon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and the following, that I'm going to argue that the only reason why these so-called concerns were communicated to you by the Minister was to transform those political concerns, as I say, into operational action as desired by those politicians. You may once again – all I'm saying is that you were told so that you can operationalise the thing. What motivated the Minister or whoever, I don't expect you to be answerable for. CHAIRPERSON: The question is, you've heard it suggested that it's going to be argued on the basis of what we call circumstantial evidence that there was indirect, sorry, there was undue influence or indirect - or sorry, undue influence or improper pressure brought to bear on you and through you and the whole SAPS as a result of the factors that were relied on. Now what do you say to the proposition that there was improper pressure or undue influence? Would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I do not agree. CHAIRPERSON: Anything you want to add, or are you content to rest with that answer? Anything you want to add, or are you content to abide by that answer you've just given? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't agree.

	Page 10854		Page 10856
1	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	1	MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you, Chairperson.
2	General, we'll leave it at that for argument and that's in	2	The next point is somewhat linked but separate and it is
3	relation to what I call the last point, the political	3	this, I take it that you and I agree that from everything
4	pressure point but in relation to the other six or seven	4	that we've heard from you, from the Minister, from the
5	points I'm going to argue that viewed from the point of	5	Constitution, from the Act, it would be fair to say that
6	view of the protesters and even a neutral citizen, all the	6	you are the conduit or the bridge between the political
7	other things, the use of the radios, the joint use of this	7	sphere and the operational sphere and by that I mean when
8	and that, that I mentioned earlier, I'm going to argue that	8	things have to be transposed from the one sphere to the
9	those were not instances which displayed the requisite	9	other, you stand at the intersection between those two
10	amount of impartiality and that they would be viewed, they	10	spheres. Would that be a fair statement?
11	can be viewed as having taken sides and that's all –	11	MR SEMENYA SC: I don't understand the
12	CHAIRPERSON: Now there are two points	12	question, Chair. All we know are the duties of the
13	about that, Mr Mpofu.	13	National Commissioner of Police and we know what the
14	MR MPOFU: Yes.	14	ministerial responsibilities are under the law.
15	CHAIRPERSON: The first one is whether	15	MR MPOFU: Chairperson, I'm sure the
16	this witness's opinion about that is receivable for the	16	witness understands the question but I'll try and rephrase
17	reasons we discussed before.	17	it. The simple proposition that I'm putting to you, madam,
18	MR MPOFU: Sure.	18	is that in terms of how the relationship is structured as
19	CHAIRPERSON: The second point is that	19	between what we may call the political sphere which is
20	there may be a legal question. Where the law says, where	20	referred to in the Constitution and which you yourself have
21	the Act and the Constitution say that the police must be	21	testified about as being the purview of the Minister, and
22	impartial, does that mean must also appear to be impartial	22	the operational sphere which is the policing side of
23	or is it enough that they are actually impartial, never	23	things, to put it colloquially, the National Commissioner –
24	mind what impression may be created to the contrary? But	24	maybe I shouldn't say you – the National Commissioner,
25	that's also a matter which you will debate at the end of	25	whoever it is, is constitutionally speaking the bridge
	Page 10855		Page 10857
1	Page 10855 the hearing.	1	Page 10857 between those two spheres, between the so-called political
1 2		1	
	the hearing.		between those two spheres, between the so-called political
2	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the	2	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the
2 3 4	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on.	2 3	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which
2 3 4 5	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson.	2 3 4	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct?
2 3 4 5 6	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual	2 3 4 5	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the
2 3 4 5 6 7	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I	2 3 4 5 6 7	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her some answers from her in re-examination –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts to refute the point you're going to argue, I'm sure we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think – MR SEMENYA SC: The evidence has already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts to refute the point you're going to argue, I'm sure we can depend upon him to do so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think – MR SEMENYA SC: The evidence has already been given on this point, that the Minister can speak to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts to refute the point you're going to argue, I'm sure we can depend upon him to do so. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think – MR SEMENYA SC: The evidence has already been given on this point, that the Minister can speak to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts to refute the point you're going to argue, I'm sure we can depend upon him to do so. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: So would you like to move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think – MR SEMENYA SC: The evidence has already been given on this point, that the Minister can speak to the Provincial Commissioner, as he did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the hearing. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: It's not something that the witness can appropriately help us on. MR MPOFU: I concede that, Chairperson. My question to her is limited only to the factual propositions but as far how they can be interpreted, I concede what you're saying Chairperson, namely that I can't ask her that one derives from this – I'm only saying what I'm going to argue. She can – CHAIRPERSON: Well, she's heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And her counsel has also heard what you're going to argue. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: And if he wants to get some answers from her in re-examination – MR MPOFU: He will. CHAIRPERSON: - which refutes or attempts to refute the point you're going to argue, I'm sure we can depend upon him to do so. MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	between those two spheres, between the so-called political advice leadership, all the terms that you used, and the operational sphere. The National Commissioner is, by prescription of the Constitution, the conduit through which those two spheres are connected, correct? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think in the statement that was led by Adv Semenya and yourself too, you clearly articulated the roles, those powers and within that context I understand my role to be, you know, as articulated in that manner. CHAIRPERSON: I think what Mr Mpofu suggests is that if the Minister has got anything to say to the police he says it to you. He doesn't ring up Sergeant Van der Merwe in the Tshwane police station or he doesn't even speak to a Provincial Commissioner, he speaks to you on the basis that you will then take it further insofar as you consider it appropriate with the rest of the service. I think that's basically his point, is that right Mr Mpofu? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chair. GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think – MR SEMENYA SC: The evidence has already been given on this point, that the Minister can speak to the

1	Page 10858		Page 10860
	question –	1	MR MPOFU: No, it doesn't, Chair.
2	MR MPOFU: General –	2	CHAIRPERSON: As a matter of accuracy
3	CHAIRPERSON: - summing up that answer as	3	that's what happened.
4	a springboard to something else, so let's move on.	4	MR MPOFU: No, no, thank you very much,
5	MR MPOFU: Yes, thank you.	5	Chairperson, it's still the political sphere so-called. Do
6	CHAIRPERSON: I'm just going to say – you	6	you understand it now and if you do, do you agree with it?
7	say the Minister can speak to a Provincial Commissioner?	7	[15:32] GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've already answered
8	Alright, okay, that's the evidence but primarily I suppose	8	you on that one to say, it's very consistent with what you
9	the Minister would speak to you. If the Minister has	9	asked about my roles and responsibilities then, today, and
10	something general to say –	10	my answer is still the same on this point in terms of
11	MR MPOFU: Constitutionally.	11	understanding my responsibilities.
12	CHAIRPERSON: - to the police, the	12	MR MPOFU: Okay, I'll move on but I will
13	appropriate person, not necessarily the only person but the	13	argue that you're really evading a simple question which is
14	most appropriate person would be you and I take it from	14	only a stepping stone to what I'm going to put to you. I
15	your evidence it seems that that what happens from time to	15	think the laws, the Act and the Constitution are very clear
16	time in a perfectly proper way, is that correct?	16	as to the role of the National Commissioner, that's why I
17	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Judge, I think this is	17	didn't, I'm removing it to you as such but I'll move on.
18	why I gave the answer the way I did because it was	18	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But she has
19	important for me to say the powers and the roles and the	19	repeatedly said that she's answered that question.
20	responsibilities are clearly articulated on how we relate.	20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Mm.
21	The way it is asked it carries a lot of overtures and	21	MR MPOFU: Well, she –
22	that's why I wanted to constrict myself to what my roles,	22	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And she said –
23	my responsibility, the flow of – and it's very clear. He	23	MR MPOFU: A "yes" would –
24	has asked me about that, I've been led on that and I think	24	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr Mpofu, and she
25	I'd like to keep my answer as that.	25	has said that she stands by her evidence as it was led and
	Page 10859		Page 10861
1	MR MPOFU: Maybe I can assist you by	1	as she was cross-examined. Now how is that evasive?
2	using an example. When on the 17th it was required to	2	MR MPOFU: Well, a question just simply
3	transmit information as to what has happened at the	3	
4	onerational loval namely the tradedy or whatever you call	5	requires a yes in such a simple question. Even if she had
	operational level, namely the tragedy or whatever you call	4	requires a yes in such a simple question. Even if she had answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination
5	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you		
5 6		4	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination
	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you	4 5	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have
6	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in	4 5 6	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone –
6 7	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused	4 5 6 7	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to
6 7 8	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from	4 5 6 7 8	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to
6 7 8 9	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted	4 5 6 7 8 9	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't.
6 7 8 9 10	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm	4 5 7 8 9 10	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure.
6 7 8 9 10 11	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a matter of fact exhibit FFF4 was sent to the Minister of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such as FFF4, insofar as it comes from the ground, from the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a matter of fact exhibit FFF4 was sent to the Minister of International Relations for the eyes of the President, as	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such as FFF4, insofar as it comes from the ground, from the operational sphere. You are the person who would have
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a matter of fact exhibit FFF4 was sent to the Minister of International Relations for the eyes of the President, as it happens, not directly to the Minister of Police.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such as FFF4, insofar as it comes from the ground, from the operational sphere. You are the person who would have transmitted that information upwards or downwards, so to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a matter of fact exhibit FFF4 was sent to the Minister of International Relations for the eyes of the President, as it happens, not directly to the Minister of Police. MR MPOFU: Fair enough.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such as FFF4, insofar as it comes from the ground, from the operational sphere. You are the person who would have transmitted that information upwards or downwards, so to speak.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it, and what I call the political sphere – in this case you had to transmit information to the President – you, in conformity with your duties as I have defined them, caused FFF4 I think to be compiled so that that information from the operational sphere, through you, could be transmitted to your political principals. That's the kind of role I'm explaining, that you are ordinarily speaking the conduit and I accept readily what Mr Semenya is saying, that in real life the police, the Minister might pick up the phone and speak to so-and-so. I'm talking constitutionally as things are set out, that you are generally speaking the main conduit through which the two spheres are conducted as happened on the 17th or on the evening of the 16th. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you. I don't know that it necessarily affects your point but as a matter of fact exhibit FFF4 was sent to the Minister of International Relations for the eyes of the President, as it happens, not directly to the Minister of Police.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	answered it before, I am entitled under cross-examination to ask it again and she can just say yes. We would have long been gone – CHAIRPERSON: You said you were going to argue she's evasive. I take it Mr Semenya is going to argue she isn't. MR MPOFU: I'm sure. CHAIRPERSON: Let's move on. MR MPOFU: Yes. Okay, I'll address this rather – I think one day I've got the right to ask questions which have been asked before but that's another question. The reason I'm asking you that question is whether it would be fair to say that any information, generally speaking, any information that is found in the political sphere – you know what I mean by that, I've defined it – ordinarily would have come via yourself, such as FFF4, insofar as it comes from the ground, from the operational sphere. You are the person who would have transmitted that information upwards or downwards, so to

	Dogo 10942		Dago 10944
1	Page 10862 thought you were going to move on. You've moved on by just	1	Page 10864 questions he asked that – it's the sixth paragraph I think,
2	jumping up and down on the same spot. I suggest you put a	2	the paragraph beginning "How many other people," that's
3	foot forward and move forward in the real sense.	3	going to form the focus of his question I would think,
4	MR MPOFU: Fine, Chairperson, as long as	4	based upon the previous question he's just asked. Is that
5	it's recorded that I still don't have an answer. Your	5	right, Mr Mpofu?
		6	
6	evidence, I asked you when I restarted my cross-examination		<b>5 1</b>
7	if, having considered or rather having heard what you've	7	Yes, yes, I'm afraid Chairperson that is where I'm going
8	heard up to then and up to now, you were prepared to admit	8	but for context can I start at "Nobody expected Marikana?"
9	to any mistake or mistakes that the police might have	9	CHAIRPERSON: I suppose in fairness to
10	committed in the operation and your answer was no. I'm	10	the witness and to those who are listening here who haven't
11	just reminding you. Is that still your answer?	11	got the benefit of the document in front of them, it's
12	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Yes.	12	probably just as well if you read that, ja.
13	MR MPOFU: Now assuming that, well, from	13	MR MPOFU: I promise you Chair, I won't
14	what Commissioner Hemraj, you did answer the question so I	14	ask many questions or any questions about the other part.
15	want to assume in your favour that you've answered it in	15	CHAIRPERSON: You can ask any relevant
16	the affirmative. If indeed you are that conduit then the -	16	questions you like.
17	can I take you to, oh, it doesn't have an exhibit number	17	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chair. Quote,
18	yet, Chairperson, but it's a statement that I gave to you a	18	"Nobody expected Marikana," he said - he being the
19	week ago.	19	President - "but I think you can't fail to appreciate that
20	CHAIRPERSON: It will be exhibit FFF30.	20	Marikana happened in a democratic country. If it was
21	Is that right, Ms Pillay?	21	during apartheid, there were many Marikanas almost on a
22	MR MPOFU: 3-0?	22	daily basis, and there was nothing that anyone could do
23	MS PILLAY: That's correct, Chair.	23	about it whatever. Once this one happened, you saw the
24	MR MPOFU: That is a copy of the article	24	reaction of the country. The churches were there, the
25	from the Mail & Guardian website – rather The Guardian,	25	traditional leaders were there, government was there. We
	Page 10863		Page 10865
1	Page 10863 sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says	1	Page 10865 established the ministerial committee immediately to deal
1 2	•	1 2	5
	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says		established the ministerial committee immediately to deal
2	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working."	2	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of
2	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did –	2	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again,
2 3 4	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article –	2 3 4	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for
2 3 4 5	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's	2 3 4 5	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the
2 3 4 5 6	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article	2 3 4 5 6	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't
2 3 4 5 6 7	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK	2 3 4 5 6 7	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on. MR BURGER SC: Can I just ask, Chair,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there are various other issues which we, if we have time, will or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on. MR BURGER SC: Can I just ask, Chair, what is the question going to be to this witness or is Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there are various other issues which we, if we have time, will or will not deal with but the issue that I want to confine my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on. MR BURGER SC: Can I just ask, Chair, what is the question going to be to this witness or is Mr Mpofu going to read the whole statement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there are various other issues which we, if we have time, will or will not deal with but the issue that I want to confine my question to now is that, firstly, assuming that as I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on. MR BURGER SC: Can I just ask, Chair, what is the question going to be to this witness or is Mr Mpofu going to read the whole statement? CHAIRPERSON: No, he's referred the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there are various other issues which we, if we have time, will or will not deal with but the issue that I want to confine my question to now is that, firstly, assuming that as I have said the information that is available at the political
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	sorry, in the UK, website – which says, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working." We did – CHAIRPERSON: It looks like an article – I'm sorry to interrupt you – it looks like an article, it's taken from the Internet. It looks like an article appearing on the website of The Guardian, that's the UK newspaper on – it looks like the 13th December 2012. Look at the top right-hand corner, is that correct? MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. CHAIRPERSON: Alright. It's an article headed, "Jacob Zuma says response to Lonmin massacre shows democracy is working" and it appears to be a report of an interview between President Zuma and Mr David Smith, who I take it is the Guardian correspondent in South Africa. MR MPOFU: That's correct, Chairperson. Commissioner or General, I will take you to page 2. You'll see that the page numbering is cut out so just go to the second page at the top of which it says "Zuma, meanwhile" and so on and so on. MR BURGER SC: Can I just ask, Chair, what is the question going to be to this witness or is Mr Mpofu going to read the whole statement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	established the ministerial committee immediately to deal with the issue, established a judicial commission of inquiry to make it a point that it does not happen again, but also to say what caused it. Zuma rejected calls for the Police Minister, Nathi Mthethwa, to quit, saying the unrest was caused by a dispute over wages. Now you can't say the Minister of Police is responsible for that, to start the thing. When the workers were striking, they had every other kind of weapon in their hands. In fact long before the shooting, 10 people had died including two policemen, two security policemen" which meant two security guards. "Now all of that is not taken into account." And as the Chairperson indicated, the important paragraph is the one that I'm going to read now. He said, "How many other people would have died if, for example, police did not move to disarm these people? Nobody can tell. At a spur of the moment, a mistake happened. Now if such a mistake happened, you throw the Minister away, I don't know on what basis because there are facts that need to be weighed." Now, the issues that I want to confine - there are various other issues which we, if we have time, will or will not deal with but the issue that I want to confine my question to now is that, firstly, assuming that as I have

		I I	
1	Page 10866 whether you are aware of the mistake that happened at the	1	Page 10868 to go the extra step of unpacking what the so-called
2	spur of the moment in respect of the Marikana tragedy that	1 2	mistake is but if it had emanated from you or in your
2	the President was referring to.	3	presence even, then I would have been entitled to ask you
4	GENERAL PHIYEGA: I don't.	4	
	MR MPOFU: And I read the statement in		the further question as to the nature of the mistake which
5		5	you or someone else transmitted to the President. So
6	much fuller context, in fairness to you as the Chairperson	6	that's all dependent on the question that the Chairperson
7	said, but also to put what the President said in its proper	7	put to you.
8	context and, well, I'm going to put to you that what I'm	8	CHAIRPERSON: She said she doesn't know
9	going to argue insofar as it affects you, is that indeed of	9	what the mistake was.
10	course we agree with the President that the whole thing was	10	MR MPOFU: Yes, that's exactly but I
11	caused by a mistake but more importantly I'm going to argue	11	didn't know she was going to say that.
12	that if you are the "conduit", quote/unquote, that I	12	CHAIRPERSON: No, no, I understand.
13	described earlier, that that information - we know that the	13	Perhaps you can take the point up further, if you consider
14	President was not there – must have come from either	14	it worthwhile, tomorrow morning – I beg your pardon, not
15	yourself or people who had the ear of the people who were	15	tomorrow morning, Thursday morning at 9:30.
16	there who are your soldiers –	16	MR MPOFU: Thank you, Chairperson, I just
17	CHAIRPERSON: I'm not sure that follows.	17	want to indicate that I'm really, the next section is just
18	I think we can assume that the President reads the	18	going to be what I'm going to put. There's one or two
19	newspapers, that he watches the television news programmes	19	things that –
20	and he has a wide variety of sources of information and	20	CHAIRPERSON: What you're saying is that
21	this is his opinion. I'm not sure we can confine it	21	General Mpembe must be ready in the pavilion with his pads
22	necessarily to information he received from the police	22	on, ready to bat quite soon after half past 9.
23	service. Maybe we should ask that question directly.	23	MR MAHLANGU: Chairperson, the
24	MR MPOFU: Yes, that's why I'm asking the	24	Commissioner wants to state something.
25	question.	25	CHAIRPERSON: Oh, sorry.
1	Page 10867 CHAIRPERSON: Alright this view which	1	Page 10869 GENERAL PHIVEGA: Chairperson L have
1	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which	1	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have
2	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur	2	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not
2 3	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your	2 3	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th.
2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received,	2 3 4	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the?
2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that?	2 3 4 5	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't.	2 3 4 5 6	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available.
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON:Alright, this view whichthe President expressed that a mistake happened at a spurof the moment, as he put it, in accordance with yourunderstanding based on all the information you received,would you agree with that?GENERAL PHIYEGA:No, I don't.CHAIRPERSON:You don't. So does it	2 3 4 5 6 7	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON:Alright, this view whichthe President expressed that a mistake happened at a spurof the moment, as he put it, in accordance with yourunderstanding based on all the information you received,would you agree with that?GENERAL PHIYEGA:No, I don't.CHAIRPERSON:You don't. So does itfollow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Chairperson, I haverequested a long time ago when I started that I'm notavailable on the 6th and 7th.MR MPOFU:On the?GENERAL PHIYEGA:On the 6th and 7th I'mnot available.CHAIRPERSON:I'm afraid we weren't toldthat beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn'tobject – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON:Alright, this view whichthe President expressed that a mistake happened at a spurof the moment, as he put it, in accordance with yourunderstanding based on all the information you received,would you agree with that?GENERAL PHIYEGA:No, I don't.CHAIRPERSON:You don't. So does itfollow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofuthat the President did not receive that information fromyou or from the SAPS as far as you are aware?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Chairperson, I haverequested a long time ago when I started that I'm notavailable on the 6th and 7th.MR MPOFU:On the?GENERAL PHIYEGA:On the 6th and 7th I'mnot available.CHAIRPERSON:I'm afraid we weren't toldthat beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn'tobject – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposingGeneral Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON:Alright, this view whichthe President expressed that a mistake happened at a spurof the moment, as he put it, in accordance with yourunderstanding based on all the information you received,would you agree with that?GENERAL PHIYEGA:No, I don't.CHAIRPERSON:You don't. So does itfollow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofuthat the President did not receive that information fromyou or from the SAPS as far as you are aware?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think, Judge, what'sa little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Chairperson, I haverequested a long time ago when I started that I'm notavailable on the 6th and 7th.MR MPOFU:On the?GENERAL PHIYEGA:On the 6th and 7th I'mnot available.CHAIRPERSON:I'm afraid we weren't toldthat beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn'tobject – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposingGeneral Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the halfof Friday we'll be sitting.I know it's not desirablenormally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON:Alright, this view whichthe President expressed that a mistake happened at a spurof the moment, as he put it, in accordance with yourunderstanding based on all the information you received,would you agree with that?GENERAL PHIYEGA:No, I don't.CHAIRPERSON:You don't. So does itfollow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofuthat the President did not receive that information fromyou or from the SAPS as far as you are aware?GENERAL PHIYEGA:I think, Judge, what'sa little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked byAdv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake.I said I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Chairperson, I haverequested a long time ago when I started that I'm notavailable on the 6th and 7th.MR MPOFU:On the?GENERAL PHIYEGA:On the 6th and 7th I'mnot available.CHAIRPERSON:I'm afraid we weren't toldthat beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn'tobject – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposingGeneral Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the halfof Friday we'll be sitting.I know it's not desirablenormally to interpose witnesses but in this case I thinkit's important that we don't waste time.If it's only doneon the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	GENERAL PHIYEGA:Chairperson, I haverequested a long time ago when I started that I'm notavailable on the 6th and 7th.MR MPOFU:On the?GENERAL PHIYEGA:On the 6th and 7th I'mnot available.CHAIRPERSON:I'm afraid we weren't toldthat beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn'tobject – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposingGeneral Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the halfof Friday we'll be sitting.I know it's not desirablenormally to interpose witnesses but in this case I thinkit's important that we don't waste time.If it's only doneon the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't beprejudiced unduly.We're not establishing a precedent, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your question. You see when the Chairperson put that question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5. [16:11] CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr Gumbi is going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your question. You see when the Chairperson put that question which was going to be my next question, there would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5. [16:11] CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr Gumbi is going to ask some questions –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your question. You see when the Chairperson put that question which was going to be my next question, there would have been two possible answers, either that it came from you or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5. [16:11] CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr Gumbi is going to ask some questions – MR SEMENYA SC: I only have one –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your question. You see when the Chairperson put that question which was going to be my next question, there would have been two possible answers, either that it came from you or it didn't come from you, which you've now answered. If it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5. [16:11] CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr Gumbi is going to ask some questions – MR SEMENYA SC: I only have one – CHAIRPERSON: And I have a few questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, this view which the President expressed that a mistake happened at a spur of the moment, as he put it, in accordance with your understanding based on all the information you received, would you agree with that? GENERAL PHIYEGA: No, I don't. CHAIRPERSON: You don't. So does it follow from your answer and what from you said to Mr Mpofu that the President did not receive that information from you or from the SAPS as far as you are aware? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I think, Judge, what's a little bit confusing here is, the question I was asked by Adv Mpofu is whether I know what mistake. I said I don't know what this mistake is. Maybe he knows, he can share what the mistake is because I don't know. He continues talking about a mistake. If he's got a standpoint about what the mistake is, maybe he can explain. I don't have that explanation of what is the so-called mistake. MR MPOFU: Chairperson, for that, I think in fairness I will deviate from tradition and answer your question. You see when the Chairperson put that question which was going to be my next question, there would have been two possible answers, either that it came from you or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	GENERAL PHIYEGA: Chairperson, I have requested a long time ago when I started that I'm not available on the 6th and 7th. MR MPOFU: On the? GENERAL PHIYEGA: On the 6th and 7th I'm not available. CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid we weren't told that beforehand but Mr Semenya, I take it you wouldn't object – at least I hope you wouldn't object to interposing General Mpembe in chief at least on Thursday and the half of Friday we'll be sitting. I know it's not desirable normally to interpose witnesses but in this case I think it's important that we don't waste time. If it's only done on the basis of the evidence-in-chief then you shouldn't be prejudiced unduly. We're not establishing a precedent, I don't want to put pressure on you either of course. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, if it were agreeable to everyone and Mr Mpofu's remaining point is a 30-minuter, I think we'd be better served just to sit until 5. [16:11] CHAIRPERSON: I think Mr Gumbi is going to ask some questions – MR SEMENYA SC: I only have one –

	Page 10870		Page 10872
1	guarantee the curtain will coming down at 5 o'clock.	1	CHAIRPERSON: You could always tell them,
2	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, we will oblige but	2	they can always be told what happened in their absence once
3	I must state that in our estimation this witness has been	3	they've gone, couldn't they? I see people are leaving now
4	in the witness box precisely for this, because there was an	4	anyway, not knowing what we're going to do.
5	interposition of a witness and the cross-examination that	5	MR MPOFU: No, Chairperson, my
6	went with it. We started the cross-examination from the	6	instructions are that we should continue in the normal
7	start and she's still in the witness box even now.	7	course whenever it is suitable to do so.
8	CHAIRPERSON: I'm aware of that. I take	8	CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll carry on
9	it, as long as Mr Mpofu promises not to come up with any	9	until quarter to 5. Oh, you don't want to carry on until
10	more questions based upon what the interposed witness has	10	quarter to 5? Are you prepared to do so?
11	to say and so confines himself to the questions that he's	11	MR MPOFU: Until?
12	already prepared then it shouldn't be a problem. There	12	
12			5
	shouldn't be a problem, Mr Semenya. Only in chief, Mr	13	already, they didn't even know what we were going to do.
14	Semenya.	14	So they've gone, they can be told what – they can later be
15	COMMISSIONER TOKOTA: Mr Mpofu, how long	15	shown the transcripts, if necessary, and it can be
16	do you think it will take you to complete this cross-	16	interpreted to them specially. As soon as we have the
17	examination?	17	transcript, which we'll have I take it by Thursday morning,
18	MR MPOFU: Well, that's a difficult one	18	they can have it translated to them.
19	if you put it in time terms because it depends on the	19	MR MPOFU: No Chairperson, yes, I don't
20	answers. There's one issue which has something to do with	20	think we can read anything from the fact that they have
21	the deployment of the SANDF and then there's a very small	21	left. Once again it's what I call Hobson's choice.
22	issue emanating from the President's thing about the inter-	22	Obviously they would like to be here but they also don't
23	ministerial committee, those are definitely going to be	23	want to be killed when they get home, so –
24	short. And then it's a question of putting a series of	24	CHAIRPERSON: So what do you suggest we
25	propositions, so it shouldn't be long ordinarily but it	25	do?
	Dogo 10071		Dago 10072
1	Page 10871 depends on the answers.	1	Page 10873 MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again,
1	depends on the answers.	1	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again,
2	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has		MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes –
	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has indicated he's going to be half an hour –	2	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry.
2 3 4	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has indicated he's going to be half an hour – MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –	2 3 4	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just
2 3 4 5	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has indicated he's going to be half an hour – MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: And he's given us documents	2 3 4 5	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible].
2 3 4 5 6	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.	2 3 4 5 6	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as
2 3 4 5 6 7	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If s now about 12 minutes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If Sure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'mcHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injury	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.And he's given us documentsMR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If 's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has indicated he's going to be half an hour – MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: And he's given us documents and things to read. MR SEMENYA SC: If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'm sure my prejudice is halved. CHAIRPERSON: It's now about 12 minutes past 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5? I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injury time over which you have no control, I understand that. MR MPOFU: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	depends on the answers. CHAIRPERSON: The problem, Mr Gumbi has indicated he's going to be half an hour – MR SEMENYA SC: Chair – CHAIRPERSON: And he's given us documents and things to read. MR SEMENYA SC: If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'm sure my prejudice is halved. CHAIRPERSON: If 's now about 12 minutes past 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5? I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injury time over which you have no control, I understand that. MR MPOFU: Yes. CHAIRPERSON: But subject to that, do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasCHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.And he's given us documentsMR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you car finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasCHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a third we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm reminded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.And he's given us documentsMR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you car finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured proving who are here and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasCHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of today	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasindicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:It's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's abit of unrest in Marikana, as Mr Tip had indicated in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the adjournment for five minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:If s now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's abit of unrest in Marikana, as Mr Tip had indicated in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the adjournment for five minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS] COMMISSION RESUMES]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasCHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If 's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:MR MPOFU:Yes.MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's abit of unrest in Marikana, as Mr Tip had indicated in themorning and so it might be unfair to continue in theirabsence, at least the primary ones because the bus has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the adjournment for five minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [16:27] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. In
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	depends on the answers.CHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.CHAIRPERSON:CHAIRPERSON:If's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's abit of unrest in Marikana, as Mr Tip had indicated in themorning and so it might be unfair to continue in theirabsence, at least the primary ones because the bus has beenprearranged but speaking for myself, 1 would meet that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the adjournment for five minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [16:27] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. In the light of what Mr Semenya told me, I allowed Adv Hemraj
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	depends on the answers.The problem, Mr Gumbi hasCHAIRPERSON:The problem, Mr Gumbi hasIndicated he's going to be half an hour –MR SEMENYA SC:Chair –CHAIRPERSON:And he's given us documentsand things to read.MR SEMENYA SC:If Mr Mpofu finishes, I'msure my prejudice is halved.If 's now about 12 minutespast 4, do you think you can finish by, say quarter to 5?I understand there's a thing we colloquially call injurytime over which you have no control, I understand that.MR MPOFU:Yes.Yes.CHAIRPERSON:But subject to that, do youthink you can?MR MPOFU:MR MPOFU:Yes.MR MPOFU:Chairperson, if I can justconfer with my attorney.Chairperson sorry, I'm remindedthat some of the injured persons who are here and thepersons that we're acting on behalf of, as of todayobviously have to travel a longer distance and there's abit of unrest in Marikana, as Mr Tip had indicated in themorning and so it might be unfair to continue in theirabsence, at least the primary ones because the bus has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR MPOFU: Chair, let me try again, Chairperson. Thank you, Chairperson. Chairperson, yes – oh, sorry. MR MAHLANGU: The Commissioner is just consulting with [inaudible]. CHAIRPERSON: Commissioner, it looks as if you want to say something. Would you like to turn your microphone on and say what you want to say, if there is something that you wish to say? GENERAL PHIYEGA: I've actually asked somebody to call the office to see if I cannot shift the Thursday issue to the session on Friday and Saturday and finish the thing, Judge, because I do want to finish. CHAIRPERSON: Does that mean we must wait a couple of minutes before you get the message back from your office? Shall we adjourn for five minutes in the hope that within those five minutes we get the information which you seek? GENERAL PHIYEGA: Sure. CHAIRPERSON: Alright, we'll take the adjournment for five minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [16:27] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. In

1	Page 10874 to tell me in the auditorium what you told me outside, Mr	
2	Semenya?	
3	MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Chair. The National	
4	Commissioner will make herself available on Thursday.	
5	CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much,	
6	National Commissioner, we appreciate the gesture you've	
7	made. This is about a valid postponement. The Commission	
8	adjourns until Thursday morning at 9:30.	
9	[COMMISSION ADJOURNED]	
10		
11 12		
10		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
23		
25		
- D	Cross of Zora	
1	As my to The list he	
0	ming home, fine on to have	
2	A. mutty Kelyon oth	
A	RCHIVE FOR JUSTICE	

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page
A	10871:19	agree 10732:19	10819:8 10829:1	10809:8 10840:21
aan 10769:3 10787:12	action 10734:8,24	10733:15,15	anomalous 10810:3	10857:17 10858:13
10787:15	10821:7 10838:11	10735:16 10741:17	<b>answer</b> 10737:2	10858:14
aanval 10768:14	10853:4	10759:10 10771:3,9	10739:9 10741:3	appropriately 10855:4
<b>abbreviation</b> 10768:20	actions 10744:18	10781:7 10785:25	10748:5 10750:2	appropriateness
abide 10853:21	10772:20,20,21	10791:24 10792:1	10756:12 10770:7	10734:6,18
ability 10770:16	10775:3 10823:9	10797:13,18,21	10773:20,24	approve 10779:3
able 10743:15	10828:16 10846:5	10798:23 10799:2	10775:20 10781:19	approved 10777:3,15
10745:14 10749:11	activity 10796:19	10814:9 10816:16	10782:12 10789:18	10778:7 10782:22,25
10764:14 10775:7,14	add 10730:17 10754:7	10853:17,18,23	10790:15 10793:10	approximately 10820:9
10775:21 10776:11	10789:5 10812:23	10856:3 10860:6	10802:13 10803:2	April 10732:9
10776:21 10778:5	10853:19,21	10866:10 10867:5	10804:15,17,18,21	10733:11
10786:17 10789:5,10	addition 10823:3	agreeable 10869:18	10808:17 10821:13	area 10734:15
10803:8 10808:16	address 10800:1	agreed 10731:25	10821:15 10839:25	10737:10,12,14
10831:12	10801:19 10842:7 10861:12	10732:7,9 10733:4,13	10847:8 10850:17	10796:22
<b>absence</b> 10871:23	addressed 10806:13,14	10735:15 10767:10 10790:17,18,21	10853:20,21 10858:3 10858:18,25	<b>arena</b> 10846:25 <b>argue</b> 10745:20
10872:2	10806:21 10807:3	10793:17 10816:12	10850:10,25	10751:25 10752:20
absolutely 10848:2	addressing 10839:18	10755.17 10010.12	10862:11,14 10867:8	10751:25 10752:20
<b>absolve</b> 10850:20	10839:18	agreement 10795:22	10867:20	10782:9 10783:9
accept 10746:3	adequacy 10756:11	agrees 10733:25	answerable 10853:8	10786:8 10787:1
10770:18 10771:8 10773:12,13 10783:9	adequate 10830:25	10814:6 10845:22	answered 10749:23	10794:13 10798:6
10775:12,13 10783:9	adequately 10782:10	aircraft 10821:17	10807:8 10815:13	10801:25 10813:4
10791:8 10839:12	<b>adjourn</b> 10873:16	10822:9,10,13	10860:7,19 10861:4	10814:22,23
accepted 10799:23	ADJOURNED 10874:9	alerted 10831:10	10862:15 10867:24	10820:20,24 10821:6
accepted 10799.23 accepts 10744:22	adjournment 10754:6	<b>alia</b> 10780:19	answering 10771:15	10827:2 10833:20,21
access 10820:8	10754:6 10755:8	allegation 10789:11,25	10805:6 10839:21	10838:13 10850:18
10833:19	10772:1 10810:6	10811:18 10823:24	answers 10840:22	10851:13 10853:1
accessible 10834:24	10848:17 10849:5,14	10841:18 10848:22	10855:18 10867:23	10854:5,8 10855:10
accommodate 10754:8	10873:21	allegations 10775:22	10870:20 10871:1	10855:12,15,21
10754:21	adjourns 10772:3	allege 10824:4	antagonists 10802:24	10860:13 10861:8,9
accommodating	10810:17 10849:8	alleged 10792:2,3	<b>anticipando</b> 10747:11	10866:9,11
10807:12	10873:22 10874:8	allegedly 10757:3	<b>anybody</b> 10800:17 10829:3	argued 10756:19
accommodation	admit 10862:8 admits 10821:12	10824:16 10835:8 <b>allow</b> 10765:25	anyway 10766:1	10853:10 arguing 10826:24
10753:17	Adv 10741:10	10782:16 10826:15	10783:3 10801:2	argument 10745:18
account 10734:17	10781:25 10857:7	10782.10 10820.15	10785:510801:2	10752:10 10756:1,1,6
10865:12	10867:13 10873:24	allowed 10828:15	10872:4	10756:17,23 10757:1
accountable 10791:5 accuracy 10734:10,10	advance 10774:4	10829:13 10873:24	apart 10767:11	10764:1 10774:5,9
10742:2 10749:8	10826:23	allowing 10804:20	apartheid 10864:21	10783:2 10785:18,24
10742.2 10749.8	advancement 10849:20	10821:7	apologise 10762:20	10786:13 10790:15
accurate 10732:1	advantage 10798:9	alright 10732:17	apparatus 10847:14	10808:24 10813:14
10734:19 10735:5,8	adverse 10838:25	10733:8 10734:2	apparent 10738:20	10814:1,9 10823:7
10735:14 10737:15	advice 10857:2	10743:1 10754:3	apparently 10730:15	10825:11 10839:20
10748:13 10755:16	advised 10830:11,21	10758:23 10766:10	10747:4 10821:22	10840:20 10845:13
10756:17 10793:23	Advocate 10731:16	10794:12 10808:15	appear 10772:23	10854:2
achieved 10846:6	10771:13 10773:4	10841:9 10850:4	10832:9,14 10854:22	arguments 10756:3
achieving 10807:15	10796:1	10853:25 10858:8	appeared 10831:22	10818:12 10840:21
acknowledge 10739:5	aeroplanes 10840:14 affect 10741:15	10863:11 10867:1 10872:8 10873:20	<b>appearing</b> 10863:7 <b>appears</b> 10743:13	<b>army</b> 10837:5 10850:23 10851:7,16
acquiesced 10816:12	affidavit 10844:10,17	Amanda 10820:5	10863:13	<b>arose</b> 10750:13
act 10753:2 10790:20	<b>affirmative</b> 10862:16	ambiguous 10820.5	appellation 10850:17	10843:21
10791:15 10797:11	afraid 10779:10	<b>AMCU</b> 10736:3,20,24	10851:4	arrange 10847:12
10797:19,22 10798:17 10807:22	10780:22 10801:18	10738:1 10739:11,14	application 10843:2,3	arranged 10788:7
10798:17 10807:22 10808:18 10845:24	10864:7 10869:7	10740:9,11,24	appointed 10734:23	arrangements
10808.18 10843.24	Africa 10823:8	10741:7,19 10743:5	appreciate 10781:4	10753:11 10754:25
10854:21 10856:5	10863:15	10746:7 10747:2	10787:4 10852:2	10755:7
10860:15	African 10772:10	10794:18 10835:9,11	10864:19 10874:6	arrested 10823:1
acted 10749:9,9	10791:13	amendments 10849:21	appreciation 10840:2	arrived 10760:22
10752:21 10809:10	Afrikaans 10761:11	amount 10854:10	approach 10803:25	10799:13 10817:16
10828:1 10833:24	10763:20 10768:18	anger 10774:17	10807:21 10824:13	10832:6
10837:24	10768:23 10787:17	angry 10787:20	10834:21 10837:16	arrives 10847:9
acting 10737:14	afternoon 10744:11	Annandale 10756:21	appropriate 10730:16	arriving 10799:25
10745:6 10749:7	10806:20	10776:16 10781:24	10734:8 10774:7	<b>article</b> 10862:24
10779:14 10808:12	ago 10761:24 10862:19	10788:16 10789:4,10	10784:15 10786:6	10863:4,5,6,11
ARCHIVE EO	10869:2	10789:15 10811:25	10800:8,25 10803:7	articulated 10797:10

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

10857:8.10 10858:20

10761:21 10770:10

ascertain 10843:18

ascribed 10780:10

asked 10757:4

auditorium 10755:11

10805:9 10874:1

10744:12 10777:13

10777:13 10817:16

August 10740:16

10752:12.23 10753:3

10756:2 10762:19

10764:12 10783:2

10797:10 10813:10

10795:13,13,15

10751:7

bit 10733:6 10734:11

10735:20 10764:21

10793:10 10822:8

10850:24 10867:12

10/61:21 10//0:10	10777:13 10817:16	10/9/:10 10813:10	10850:24 10867:12	10745:25 10746:9
10776:20 10781:24	10820:6 10823:4	10814:21 10816:17	10871:21	10747:8 10749:14,23
10781:25 10782:14	10830:14,23	10816:23 10828:22	<b>blame</b> 10799:5,6	10750:21 10763:20
10797:17 10802:2	10847:21	10829:4,17 10831:16	10826:8	10763:23 10793:14
10807:11 10811:16	auspicious 10730:4	10837:19,22 10838:4	blasted 10767:4,4,5,12	10794:21 10795:1,16
10813:2 10817:5	authorisation 10820:15	10838:17,23,24	<b>blind</b> 10823:13,23	10795:19 10797:10
10819:19 10839:10	available 10753:8	10839:19,21 10840:8	10827:15	10799:21 10800:10
10839:19 10841:3	10754:11 10842:19	10845:4 10853:11	blocked 10753:25	10801:5,8,23
10844:12 10858:21	10865:24 10869:3,6	10857:16 10864:22	blocking 10754:2	10812:15,16
10858:24 10860:9	10874:4	10865:19 10869:14	<b>blom</b> 10768:12,12,24	10813:16,20 10814:3
10861:14,25 10862:6	avert 10753:2	<b>bat</b> 10868:22	10769:1,1	10816:6 10817:20,24
10864:1,4 10867:12	averted 10748:15	<b>BBB7</b> 10851:8	<b>blown</b> 10767:11	10818:6 10821:12,14
10873:10	avoid 10816:14	<b>bear</b> 10735:19 10834:3	blurring 10840:5	10824:21 10825:1
asking 10732:11	10831:1	10853:14	<b>board</b> 10802:12	10826:12 10828:21
10737:5 10740:13	avoids 10801:17	bearing 10740:3	10808:21	10831:14 10833:3
10757:13 10761:1	aware 10730:10	10842:11	<b>bodies</b> 10836:14	10838:12 10843:7,13
10765:18 10773:18	10748:4 10793:4,12	beast 10824:18,19	<b>body</b> 10767:18,23	10850:14 10863:21
10776:23,24	10798:9 10866:1	beg 10851:23 10868:14	10772:17	Burger's 10764:2
10777:16 10782:21	10867:10 10870:8	beginning 10730:3	<b>bold</b> 10837:1	10814:17 10815:17
10786:1 10792:18	axiomatic 10807:19	10759:24 10864:2	<b>boot</b> 10772:17	10852:10
10793:7,7 10803:16		<b>begs</b> 10845:10	<b>boots</b> 10766:8	<b>burnt</b> 10836:15
10812:3 10814:21	<u> </u>	behalf 10730:24	boss 10768:13 10769:1	<b>bus</b> 10871:23
10857:25 10861:15	<b>B</b> 10786:13,14	10841:6 10871:19	Botes 10817:15,25	business 10792:15
10866:24	<b>baba</b> 10767:20,24,24	behaving 10780:12	10818:9 10819:2,8,12	<b>busy</b> 10731:22
aspect 10742:7,11	10767:25	behaviour 10774:15	10820:19	10737:11 10749:8
assessment 10734:6	<b>back</b> 10748:12	10779:5,15 10780:18	<b>bother</b> 10771:14	10752:17 10766:16
assist 10745:14	10750:22,23	10802:7 10823:13,16	<b>bottom</b> 10809:23	10766:18 10770:21
10752:8 10777:25	10770:22 10771:21	10827:13	<b>bound</b> 10771:7 10795:6	10804:1,17 10811:23
10859:1	10773:11 10787:18	<b>belabour</b> 10787:5	10843:24	10826:24
assistance 10735:5	10790:16 10808:2,5	belabouring 10769:25	Bowdler 10779:3	<u> </u>
10764:2 10841:13	10814:25 10843:1,10	<b>believe</b> 10763:6	<b>box</b> 10842:24 10870:4	
assume 10768:17	10849:18 10873:15	10770:4,23 10774:20	10870:7	<b>C</b> 10786:13,14
10779:13,13,14	background 10759:19	10805:4 10838:24	branch 10730:14	Cabinet 10846:1
10829:20 10838:16	10760:19 10812:9	10839:9	break 10823:20	call 10733:21 10774:23
10862:15 10866:18	bad 10756:6 10774:5	<b>believed</b> 10781:21	breakdown 10800:5,23	10778:9 10782:2
assuming 10778:24	10784:4 10802:21	10839:13,16	10801:1 10834:14	10792:14,22
10779:17 10830:6	10803:1,2	belonged 10821:18	10835:9,13 10847:25	10822:11 10834:1
10835:23 10862:13	badly 10764:22	10822:2,12	breaking 10735:14	10836:4 10842:12
10865:23	baie 10787:12	belonging 10822:8	bridge 10828:12	10851:7,8,9 10853:11
assurance 10832:13	bargain 10799:1	10830:9	10856:6,25	10854:3 10856:19
assurances 10831:12	bargaining 10795:20	<b>benefit</b> 10742:21	brief 10846:1	10859:4,5 10871:11
assure 10757:1	10796:13,25	10768:8 10805:8	briefed 10740:23	10872:21 10873:11
attach 10839:20	10798:10,20	10806:2 10814:13	10799:20 10810:15	called 10745:13
attached 10739:18	10799:10 10820:22	10864:11	10812:12	10774:16 10799:19
attaches 10839:22	10820:23 10821:8	<b>bent</b> 10840:10	<b>briefing</b> 10779:24	10848:7 10851:16
attack 10824:5	10848:5	<b>best</b> 10730:18 10733:10	10794:15 10815:10	calls 10806:20
attacked 10769:4	base 10774:9 10779:5	10754:5 10765:7	<b>briefly</b> 10843:9,12	10835:22 10846:19
10778:20,24 10779:13,19,20,20	10813:14 10849:19	10772:15 10773:1,17	10847:5 bring 10770:21	10847:18 10865:4
· · · ·	10849:20 <b>based</b> 10745:16	10796:13 10799:2,8 10841:25	bring 10770:21 10775:21 10843:2	<b>call-it</b> 10820:23 <b>cameras</b> 10821:24
attempt 10801:19				
10808:7,16	10752:7 10756:2,3	<b>better</b> 10739:2,17	10850:23 10851:20 10851:21	campaign 10850:22
attempting 10810:8	10786:13 10813:22	10762:4,4,17		cannons 10820:16
attempts 10803:5 10855:20	10815:18,22,25	10763:20 10765:25 10768:21 10770:15	brings 10796:6 broad 10809:14	<b>canvassing</b> 10829:21 <b>can't</b> 10747:10 10754:3
	10837:16 10839:10			
attend 10810:20 attended 10758:8	10844:23 10864:4 10867:4 10870:10	10797:6 10869:19 <b>beyond</b> 10789:13	broader 10808:19 10815:14	10756:6 10760:8 10761:10 10763:7
10810:15 10831:9		10800:5	broke 10731:17	
10810:15 10831:9	<b>bases</b> 10838:8,8		brought 10803:11	10781:2 10785:5,6
attendees 10819:10	basically 10748:17 10848:20 10857:18	big 10778:8 10836:4	10832:6 10833:5	10786:7 10812:23
attending 10755:1	basis 10737:15 10746:2	<b>bilingual</b> 10805:10 <b>Bishop</b> 10747:23	10852:6 10855:5	10813:6 10823:19 10825:16 10831:24
attention 10846:23	10746:24,25	10748:3,8,16 10749:1	brutality 10775:1	10825:16 10831:24 10834:4 10842:13
attorney 10871:17	10746:24,25	10749:2,19 10750:23	10778:14	10834:4 10842:13 10855:8
	10/4/.19 10/49:15	10777.2,17 10730.23	10770.14	10055.0

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

**RealTime Transcriptions** 

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

Page 2

build 10832:17

**building** 10810:21

Burger 10738:3,6,17

10745:25 10746:9

**bullets** 10820:16

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

			-	Page
capable 10832:13	chance 10747:12	colleague 10778:1	10825:4	communication
capacity 10794:10	10804:17 10832:21	colleagues 10771:3	commission 10730:2,17	10820:3 10835:25
10798:17	10849:5	10777:12,19 10778:4	10730:20,24 10738:7	10842:9,11
Cape 10768:24 10835:1	change 10840:14	10781:9 10783:14	10740:4 10749:7	communications
10845:21	10845:15	10824:6	10750:11,15 10751:5	10836:6 10846:5,25
capital 10792:14,22	changed 10759:16	<b>collective</b> 10795:20	10755:2,3 10757:8	10852:24
<b>Captain</b> 10759:2	10839:24	10796:13 10798:10	10762:20 10770:1	community 10796:24
10761:4 10764:9 10769:15	<b>changer</b> 10774:23 10778:10,11 10834:1	10798:20 10820:23 10821:8 10848:4	10771:15 10772:3,3,4 10773:8 10782:22	10800:15 company 10816:25
Captains 10779:23	characterisation	collectively 10799:1	10786:22 10787:7	compassionate
Captain's 10761:15	10836:4,10 10839:22	colloquially 10856:23	10793:19 10800:12	10771:11 10774:16
cards 10825:15	10839:24 10840:15	10871:11	10810:17,17,18	compiled 10859:8
care 10788:18	10845:15,25	collusion 10811:18	10812:22 10817:22	complaining 10834:16
10796:20	characterise 10836:8	10825:7 10827:19	10818:1,7 10830:13	complains 10833:3
carefully 10841:18	characterised 10837:1	10828:6 10841:4	10830:22 10838:16	10834:13
carries 10858:21	characterising 10836:8	Colonel 10785:14	10838:24,25	complaint 10815:17
<b>carry</b> 10734:1 10747:19 10754:23	<b>chief</b> 10791:11 10869:10 10870:13	10788:24 coloured 10768:24	10839:25 10847:7 10849:8,8,9 10865:2	10833:7 10848:21 10852:10
10747.19 10734.23	chimneys 10798:16	combined 10708.24	10849.8,8,9 10805.2	complaints 10837:12
10822:24 10872:8,9	choice 10782:9	come 10732:21	10874:7,9	<b>complete</b> 10767:7
cars 10836:15	10872:21	10749:20 10750:1	commissioned	10870:16
case 10740:10 10745:6	churches 10864:24	10753:18,19,19,20	10849:21,22	completely 10826:13
10745:19 10749:18	circuit 10733:10	10754:19,22,22	Commissioner 10731:8	10850:20
10755:14,16,17	circumstances 10745:4	10756:12 10764:10	10736:10 10740:7	complicated 10743:24
10758:20 10762:17	10779:1 10800:25	10771:7 10779:21	10744:11 10745:23	computer 10754:2
10779:24 10781:19	10803:8 10822:9	10780:2 10785:5	10748:6 10749:2,3,11	computer's 10753:25
10816:7 10837:1	circumstantial 10756:3	10789:23 10800:9,25	10750:12 10756:13	concede 10780:19
10851:17 10859:5 10869:12	10756:3,5 10785:24 10786:8,12 10853:11	10802:7,8,9 10805:12 10818:14 10823:6	10760:9,11 10771:17 10772:5,7 10775:9,20	10786:11 10807:23 10812:7 10813:15
cases 10739:25 10782:6	citizen 10823:8	10838:9 10843:1	10775:25 10776:1,6	10812:7 10815:15
10782:6	10844:19 10854:6	10845:5 10852:22	10776:21,23	conceded 10852:21
catch 10873:25	citizens 10840:4,13	10861:19 10865:25	10782:14,16 10784:3	conceding 10744:16
catches 10769:6	civil 10837:2	10866:14 10867:24	10788:3 10791:1,3	concentrate 10742:10
category 10743:25	civilians 10783:16	10867:25 10870:9	10802:17 10809:21	concern 10737:10,13
causal 10832:3,8,15,25	10790:9	<b>comes</b> 10769:5,16	10810:19 10812:6,11	10737:14 10741:13
10833:1,2 10834:6	<b>claim</b> 10745:2	10787:2,7 10811:16	10816:21 10820:15	10797:1 10852:8
10840:16 10845:11	claimed 10740:23,25	10830:10 10833:15 10840:5 10847:11	10820:16 10831:7,12	<b>concerned</b> 10745:5
<b>causally</b> 10743:20 <b>cause</b> 10741:16,19,20	10743:7 <b>clarifies</b> 10852:1	10840:3 10847:11 10861:20	10831:18 10832:10 10832:17 10833:5	10764:23 10771:20 10803:22,23,24
10753:3 10780:5,12	clarify 10772:8	comfortable 10801:24	10837:15,18 10838:1	10803.22,23,24
caused 10739:20	10776:6	coming 10731:24	10841:14 10842:23	10847:12 10848:13
10752:23 10755:15	clarity 10755:14	10745:24 10756:22	10844:12 10849:10	concerning 10830:24
10779:6 10859:7	10781:3	10756:22 10764:5,5	10849:11,19	concerns 10809:4
10865:4,6 10866:11	clashes 10736:3,19,24	10769:21 10771:21	10856:13,23,24	10828:19 10830:8,9
causes 10796:5,6	10738:1 10739:11	10790:19 10796:23	10857:3,15,23,24	10831:3,7 10851:20
CCTV 10822:11	10740:8,12,22,24	10802:3 10810:22	10858:7 10860:16,18	10853:2,4
<b>cell</b> 10751:2,3 <b>Centurion</b> 10730:5	10741:8,19,20 10743:5,6 10747:2	10832:7 10834:6 10870:1	10860:22,24 10862:14 10863:17	conclusions 10813:9 condolences 10730:25
century 10730:3,5	clear 10734:4 10737:18	command 10840:5	10868:24 10803.17	conduct 10742:6
certain 10739:21	10739:13 10747:18	commander 10734:7	10873:4,6 10874:4,6	10826:9 10827:23
10750:11 10786:2	10759:1 10761:20	10734:14,19	Commissioners	conducted 10816:24
10814:10 10825:16	10810:13 10830:4	commanders 10776:3	10771:3 10801:20	10859:16
10828:5,16	10847:23 10848:2,14	10805:20 10806:18	10841:21 10850:11	conducts 10791:22
certainly 10731:5	10858:23 10860:15	10807:10	Commissioner's	conduit 10856:6
10756:4 10761:12	10863:25	commander's	10847:18	10857:4 10859:11,16
10789:4 10806:19	<b>clearly</b> 10751:7	10734:16	<b>commitment</b> 10772:25	10862:16 10866:12
10819:18 10831:25	10803:25 10813:2,14	<b>comment</b> 10730:23	committed 10730:19	<b>confer</b> 10871:17
10833:22 10836:23 10846:15	10857:8 10858:20 client 10826:16	10737:6,6 10738:7,19 10742:1 10749:11	10772:11 10862:10 committee 10865:1	<b>conference</b> 10757:12 10823:4
Chairperson's	10844:4,22 10845:2,3	10742.1 10749.11	10870:23	confess 10819:17
10832:25	10847:3	10752:21 10771:20	common 10851:3	confident 10818:7
chairs 10754:7,8,11,14	clients 10872:12	10809:20 10819:24	communicate 10808:8	<b>confine</b> 10809:1
10754:18	closer 10767:10	commenting 10770:14	10827:25 10828:4	10865:20,22
challenge 10735:20	closing 10813:4,5,6,7	comments 10751:10	communicated	10866:21
challenged 10766:22	<b>Coin</b> 10822:1,2,3,15	10764:15 10771:17	10828:19 10830:7	confined 10803:19
<b>chamber</b> 10753:6	<b>coincidence</b> 10851:7,14	10808:10 10813:5	10831:23 10853:2	confines 10870:11
ARCHIVE FO	K JUSIICE		1	1

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page 4
confining 10797:9	10778:19,21	10803:18 10806:8,25	cross-examine 10739:2	dealt 10743:2 10772:19
10850:13	contends 10777:23	10809:7 10815:11,12	10740:1	10787:9 10794:18
<b>confirm</b> 10745:2	<b>content</b> 10739:9	10815:19,19	cross-examined	10846:10 10850:8
10769:25	10853:20,21	10816:14,14 10817:3	10733:11 10749:19	death 10777:12,18
confirmed 10773:13	contention 10779:5	10817:14 10822:5,7,8	10842:20 10861:1	10778:3 10781:9
10782:21 10788:17	10781:18 10841:3	10828:8 10829:19	cross-examining	10783:11 10784:12
10831:25 10842:6,11	contentious 10749:17	10832:15 10845:25	10811:5	10784:14,15 10790:7
<b>conflict</b> 10791:20	<b>contents</b> 10841:16	10850:12 10857:5,19	crowd 10795:11	10791:20 10823:17
10792:8,14,22	contested 10743:11	10858:16 10862:23	10820:17	deaths 10778:10
10793:8,11 10794:17	contesting 10797:22	10863:9,10,16	crucial 10748:20	<b>debate</b> 10746:1,11
10799:15,19	context 10736:5	correctly 10734:18	10839:22	10800:11 10801:15
<b>conformity</b> 10749:12 10859:7	10744:7 10763:22	10759:20 10801:21	crux 10852:15	10805:24 10806:13
conforms 10850:18	10767:16 10768:12 10768:25 10792:18	10801:23 10802:6 10814:22 10821:21	crystallise 10852:15 culminating 10765:1	10812:18 10813:8 10818:15 10826:24
confusing 10767:14	10708.23 10792.18	10814.22 10821.21	curing 10842:1	10818.13 10820.24 10840:7 10843:20
10867:12	10795:11 10797:7	10822.17 10833.23	curtain 10809:5,5	10846:15 10854:25
connect 10828:14	10800:17 10808:20	correspondent	10870:1	debates 10825:5
10831:5	10808:23 10809:14	10863:15	<b>cut</b> 10750:15 10863:18	debating 10732:2
<b>connected</b> 10730:20	10809:14 10812:3	cost 10743:7	cynical 10836:10,12,19	debriefing 10782:1,2,3
10743:20 10846:12	10816:2 10818:11	couldn't 10754:1	cynically 10839:24	deceased 10731:1
10857:5	10847:6 10857:9	10763:5 10795:5	Cyril 10831:3	<b>December</b> 10863:8
<b>connection</b> 10730:24	10864:8 10866:6,8	10824:24 10842:24	<b>C-JOC</b> 10734:22,23	decide 10745:13
10739:22 10832:3,8	contextualise 10796:2	10872:3	10735:1	10750:11 10756:6
10832:15 10833:1,1,3	continue 10774:20	counsel 10839:8		10774:8 10786:3
10834:6 10840:17	10796:19,25 10797:5	10855:14		10809:9 10812:22
10845:11 10852:20	10871:22 10872:6	counting 10822:17	daai 10761:15	10824:2
<b>connects</b> 10829:23 <b>consent</b> 10816:22	<b>continues</b> 10798:2 10867:15	<b>country</b> 10848:10 10864:20,24	10763:11 <b>daardie</b> 10790:4	<b>decided</b> 10816:13 10824:2
consequence 10736:10	continuous 10734:19	couple 10873:15	daily 10864:22	deciding 10745:15
10752:9 10824:4	contract 10822:1,3	course 10733:16	damage 10791:20	decisively 10851:11
consequences 10752:23	contractually 10795:5	10735:9 10738:18	10800:7 10834:15	<b>defence</b> 10744:21
10807:17	contrary 10777:23	10751:25 10760:14	10836:18	10745:6 10778:22
consider 10734:14	10823:24 10850:14	10785:22 10788:15	damaged 10801:2	defend 10824:5
10835:18 10848:17	10854:24	10800:5 10813:12	10835:15	defined 10859:7
10857:17 10868:13	<b>contribute</b> 10818:10	10824:1 10835:3	dat 10787:13,14,15	10861:19
considered 10734:13	contributed 10824:19	10848:15 10866:10	date 10799:16	definitely 10791:25
10771:18 10784:14	control 10840:6	10869:16 10872:7	<b>David</b> 10863:14	10870:23
10862:7 consistent 10837:24	10871:12 controversial 10824:1	<b>court</b> 10796:14	day 10730:8 10736:11	definition 10799:24 definitions 10796:10
10860:8	10835:11	10839:9 courtesy 10851:25	10750:8,10 10803:14 10803:20 10805:19	delegation 10736:2
constituencies	conversation 10759:11	courts 10760:18	10805:20 10805:19	deliberately 10850:15
10791:21	10830:23,25 10831:3	courtyard 10753:12	10808:24 10809:14	delivered 10773:9
constituted 10800:23	10832:1,9,16	cover 10850:16	10810:10 10814:22	demand 10754:20
10833:4	convey 10831:6	covered 10827:24	10816:10 10823:4	10835:1
Constitution 10790:24	conveyed 10731:2,6	covers 10769:24	10827:11 10832:7	demerits 10813:8
10791:11 10798:25	convince 10845:19	cows 10818:14	10833:21 10844:2,5	democracy 10863:2,13
10812:5,24,25	copies 10757:21	created 10824:18	10845:5 10861:13	democratic 10864:20
10813:24 10854:21	10758:5,5	10854:24	dead 10787:21 10790:6	demonstrate 10743:15
10856:5,20 10857:4	<b>copy</b> 10862:24	criminal 10836:9	10800:12,14	demonstrates 10781:11
10860:15	corner 10863:9	10837:3 10845:16,17	10836:14	demonstrations
<b>constitutional</b> 10799:7	corpses 10801:12	10845:24 10851:11	<b>deal</b> 10738:24	10775:16
10837:17,25 constitutionally	<b>correct</b> 10730:23 10735:9 10736:8,18	criminals 10840:3 10846:10	10739:23 10753:17 10762:18,18 10794:3	denuded 10778:11 departure 10799:10
10856:25 10858:11	10736:24 10737:3,23	critical 10730:16	10702.18,18 10794.5	10802:24
10850:25 10858:11	10737:25 10738:12	10827:23	10794.11 10810.15	depend 10751:8,8
constrict 10858:22	10737.23 10738.12	criticism 10818:20	10815.0 10815.15	10855:22
consulting 10873:5	10745:11 10751:25	criticisms 10823:12	10832:22 10837:8	dependent 10868:6
contact 10806:6,17	10758:10,12,19	10825:16 10827:13	10850:4 10851:11	depending 10843:2
10807:5 10809:11,13	10760:17 10761:16	cross 10786:5 10811:14	10865:1,22	depends 10770:25
contained 10739:3	10770:25 10771:7,9	10839:7 10870:16	dealing 10743:6	10870:19 10871:1
CONTD 10731:13	10777:4 10778:25	cross-examination	10763:23 10794:16	deployed 10831:1
10811:7	10784:21 10790:18	10731:11,13	10831:8 10832:12	10832:8
contend 10742:18	10791:12 10792:4,9	10772:19 10786:19	10833:14 10834:18	<b>deployment</b> 10832:18
10786:14 10809:16 10810:6	10793:5 10794:8,21 10795:2 10798:21	10811:7 10838:12 10845:3 10861:4	10840:4,13 <b>dealings</b> 10749:2	10836:3 10851:10 10870:21
contended 10738:12	10799:13 10800:18	10843.5 10801.4	deals 10851:19	der 10820:5,19
		10002.0 10070.0,0		

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

				Page
10857:14	disagree 10774:20	distinction 10840:2,9	economic 10796:18	entirely 10793:23
derives 10855:9	10781:7 10815:22	disturbed 10787:19	10797:4	10821:21 10847:16
<b>deriving</b> 10848:11	10816:1	10821:8 De star 10770-2	effect 10755:24	10847:24
<b>describe</b> 10758:14,17	disagreed 10774:19	<b>Doctor</b> 10779:3	effective 10735:3	entitled 10801:13
10797:20	disagreement 10756:24	document 10757:17	10847:2	10833:22 10839:11
described 10772:14	10828:4	10760:22 10763:3	efficient 10791:5	10842:21 10861:4
10778:16 10866:13	disagrees 10733:24	10772:24 10849:20	efforts 10845:14	10868:3
describes 10848:6	10816:18	10849:20,22	eight 10807:4 10808:3	entry 10760:21,23
description 10759:17	disarm 10865:16	10864:11	10812:1,18 10817:21	equally 10757:11
<b>desirable</b> 10869:11	disarming 10817:19	documents 10843:22	10819:20,23	10834:24
desire 10850:23,25	disaster 10753:3	10843:23 10849:18	10822:17	equation 10799:25
10851:2	10755:14	10849:23 10850:1,2,7	either 10745:19	10836:2
desired 10853:4	disastrous 10752:23	10871:5	10755:25 10759:22	equipment 10770:15
desk 10849:18	disbelieved 10838:14	doesn't 10765:17	10762:12 10763:21	10821:17 10822:11
despite 10753:6	10838:18	10771:5 10784:12,25	10702.12 10703.21	10827:15
-				
10825:15 10826:7	<b>discharge</b> 10786:20	10785:2,22 10786:7	10866:14 10867:23	erroneous 10740:14
destabilisation 10837:3	disclose 10795:8	10788:14 10818:24	10869:16	10741:24
developed 10844:7	discover 10784:2	10819:15 10821:13	elaboration 10816:3	errors 10773:7,8
deviate 10867:20	discuss 10755:11	10836:18 10838:24	elements 10851:11	esoteric 10793:3
de-ascribe 10780:10	10817:6 10838:18	10839:9 10852:16	elicit 10738:16	<b>essence</b> 10847:5
<b>DG</b> 10836:25	discussed 10755:7	10857:13,14 10860:1	10750:16	essential 10751:4
<b>didn't</b> 10740:3,15	10759:24 10816:25	10862:17 10868:8	emanated 10868:2	Essentially 10797:24
10741:25 10743:14	10818:25 10819:5,6	doing 10742:22	emanating 10870:22	establish 10756:5
10743:20 10744:17	10831:11 10838:11	10746:16 10759:21	embraced 10798:2,2	10809:11,12
10746:16,18	10854:17	10771:12 10782:24	emotional 10782:3	10847:15 10848:15
10749:18 10754:19	discussing 10734:9	10787:6 10796:22	emotionally 10782:5	established 10783:1
10756:15 10757:8	10737:16 10792:21	10805:17 10828:2,3	emphasis 10734:8	10795:4 10865:1,2
10762:1,3 10815:2	discussion 10736:6	dood 10787:14	10753:1	establishing 10869:15
10702.1,5 10815.2	10747:23 10843:11	doubt 10801:22	employed 10740:5	establishment
10827.23 10828.24	10747.23 10843.11 10845:20	10806:2	employees 10740.5 employees 10743:10	10848:10
	discussions 10817:17	downwards 10861:22		
10842:25 10851:18			10793:9 10794:20,21	estimate 10754:18
10860:17 10867:24	10832:4 10836:25	dragging 10766:7	10795:10 10797:9	estimation 10870:3
10867:25 10868:11	10852:25	10772:18 10779:16	10798:12,15,18	ethos 10799:7,7
10872:13	disentitled 10834:5	dramatis 10841:23	10835:14	evading 10860:13
<b>die</b> 10768:13,14,15,16	disguising 10785:17	<b>draw</b> 10809:4	employer 10793:8,18	evasive 10861:1,8
10769:3,3,5,9,13,13	dismay 10730:11	drawing 10779:4	10794:22,22 10797:8	evening 10736:6
10769:13,19	dismiss 10796:15	<b>drawn</b> 10813:9	10798:15,17 10799:6	10740:16 10744:12
10787:11,14	disperse 10820:17	10846:17,23	10801:13 10803:22	10803:16 10808:20
10788:17,18,18	display 10771:10	10852:25	employers 10798:12,14	10809:7 10859:17
10789:16,21 10790:4	10779:18 10792:9	drivers 10796:4	employer's 10798:15	event 10738:7
10790:10,10	10821:9	dubbing 10823:14	<b>emptied</b> 10769:9,14,17	10745:23 10805:13
<b>died</b> 10865:10,15	displayed 10779:16	due 10733:16 10751:25	10769:20	10845:16,16
difference 10735:17	10780:18,18,21	10848:15	<b>en</b> 10769:19 10787:12	events 10774:24
10759:12	10808:11 10854:9	duration 10734:24	10787:12,14	10776:18 10777:13
different 10747:19	displeasure 10816:6,9	duties 10775:15	encourage 10810:1	10770:18 10777:13
10786:10 10800:8	disposal 10842:19	10812:25 10856:12	endeavour 10834:21	evidence-in-chief
10780:10 10800:8	disposed 10842:19	10812:23 10830:12	enetjie 10761:15	10869:14
differently 10807:21	<b>dispute</b> 10752:9	<b>duty</b> 10771:6 10786:20	10763:11	evidential 10785:23
<b>difficult</b> 10770:18	10792:8 10793:4,13	10791:7 10797:10,18	engaged 10806:13	10786:21
10786:20 10870:18	10793:15,21 10794:7	10797:22 10843:24	engagement 10805:18	<b>ex</b> 10783:2
<b>difficulties</b> 10801:17	10794:19,25	<b>D-day</b> 10846:8	10805:20 10806:20	exact 10733:16
ding 10768:13,14	10795:17 10797:7,12		English 10766:23	10758:20
10769:3,3,5	10797:20,21	E	10767:3,21 10768:19	exactly 10735:17
direct 10739:22	10799:14,22,24	<b>e</b> 10844:15	10768:20 10779:3	10741:18,20
10756:4 10773:2	10800:4,20,21	ear 10762:4,4,17	10787:18 10792:23	10742:12 10751:11
10783:9 10785:19,22	10801:10,22,22,24,25	10866:15	10792:25	10753:2 10774:14
10785:24	10817:1 10821:18	earlier 10736:11	enlisting 10735:5	10775:10 10783:23
directed 10764:12	10833:16 10834:13	10748:12 10767:10	enquiry 10775:21	10794:6 10834:2
10828:16 10846:22	10836:8,13 10845:23	10807:9 10815:13	enshrines 10798:25	10835:6 10836:16,24
directing 10737:10	10848:6 10865:6	10817:2 10830:5,6	ensure 10796:23	10868:10
direction 10766:22	disputes 10792:2	10817:2 10830:5,0	10797:3 10831:7,9	examination 10786:6
directions 10791:2	10793:24 10795:18	10854:8 10866:13	10837:15	10811:15 10870:17
directly 10787:2	10795:23 10797:8,13	early 10744:12	ensuring 10796:18	examining 10839:8
		-	ensuring 10796:18 enter 10846:15	
10788:5,22 10790:10	10803:22	10817:17		example 10741:2
10826:10 10828:17	disservice 10813:4	earphones 10763:5	enters 10846:25	10742:13 10747:23
10859:22 10866:23	distance 10871:20	easy 10790:2	entire 10799:7	10784:4 10823:14
ARCHIVE FO	R JUSTICE	I		

**RealTime Transcriptions** 

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

				Page
10859:2 10865:15	10795:12 10823:15	10835:23 10862:15	focus 10864:3	function 10775:7
exception 10807:2	facelessness 10823:13	fear 10753:25	focused 10738:21	10776:11 10819:5
exchanged 10806:22	facie 10832:25	feel 10810:24 10816:2	10746:21 10815:4	<b>funeral</b> 10757:3
excitement 10756:11	fact 10732:1 10737:25	<b>fell</b> 10782:13	10740.21 10813.4	further 10738:17
excludes 10807:16	10743:3,4,8 10746:4	<b>fellow</b> 10775:5 10840:4	follow 10735:1 10741:1	10740:22 10743:9
Excuse 10753:22	, ,			10746:22 10743.9
	10747:22 10748:16	10840:13	10802:16 10867:8	
executive 10808:21	10771:5 10779:6	fewer 10812:1	following 10735:2	10782:24 10788:4
exert 10848:9	10783:14 10785:5	FFF1 10732:22	10742:13 10777:7	10789:6,11 10793:10
exhibit 10757:17	10786:21 10789:6	10734:5 10791:18	10803:14,20	10794:20 10800:3
10758:11,24 10759:2	10802:23 10806:13	FFF2 10735:21	10810:10 10853:1	10831:1,21 10840:23
10759:16,17	10807:12 10813:22	FFF20 10758:11	follows 10770:24	10842:22 10857:16
10859:20 10862:17	10815:11 10816:12	FFF29 10830:18,19	10866:17	10868:4,13
10862:20	10823:12 10824:15	FFF30 10758:11,24	food 10748:9	<b>future</b> 10745:24
exhibits 10823:10	10834:2 10836:24	10862:20	foot 10862:3	10810:22 10811:10
existed 10797:8	10841:22 10844:1,19	<b>FFF4</b> 10859:8,20	force 10774:16	
existence 10757:11	10846:7 10859:20	10861:20	10779:19 10840:3,4,7	G
existing 10795:6	10865:9 10872:20	<b>FFF5</b> 10840:6	10840:12,18	<b>gaan</b> 10790:4
expect 10781:2	facto 10783:2	<b>fifth</b> 10822:20	10846:10 10851:10	gainfully 10740:4
10835:18 10853:8	factor 10771:14,16	fills 10730:11	10851:17	game 10774:23
10867:25	factors 10800:22	final 10765:1 10790:15	forces 10848:7	10778:9,11 10823:5
expected 10775:7,15	10802:12 10853:15	find 10733:16 10757:5	forgive 10849:17	10834:1
10776:12 10842:13	facts 10801:11 10808:9	10762:16 10770:17	form 10783:2 10864:3	gaps 10770:10
10864:8,18	10813:9 10815:21	10771:6 10778:25	formally 10749:14	gather 10735:4
experience 10798:9	10841:17 10843:19	10779:4 10796:22	formulated 10740:6	gathered 10817:18
experiencing 10846:1	10843:19 10865:19	10779:110790:22	10817:18 10821:21	10819:4,4,16 10848:3
expertise 10752:7	factual 10746:2,4	finding 10747:10	formulation 10822:6	gathering 10735:3
experts 10760:18	10750:11,13 10752:9	10752:3,4,6 10838:25	10834:2 10840:12	gegee 10787:14
explain 10731:23	10752:23 10753:3	fine 10751:13 10789:14	fortuitous 10851:15	gemeld 10787:13
10751:14,17 10762:6	10756:2 10812:18,23	10806:15 10816:11	fortunately 10764:1	Generaal-Majoor
10751.14,17 10702.0	10750.2 10812.18,25	10862:4	forum 10813:7	10787:13
10805:2,5 10811:15	10813.2,13 10814.21	finish 10804:17	10843:17,18	generally 10859:15
10805.2,5 10811.15	10828.21 10829.4,17 10845:4 10855:6	10820:11 10871:10	forward 10774:21	10861:17
10855:110850:24				
	factually 10739:8	10873:13,13	10795:24 10808:25	generated 10850:2
explained 10786:25	<b>fail</b> 10864:19	<b>finished</b> 10843:14	10862:3,3	genre 10759:23
explaining 10859:11	failure 10755:15	finishes 10773:8	<b>found</b> 10757:2,6	10772:22
explanation 10816:2	10828:4	10871:7	10771:9 10824:18	gentleman 10731:3
10867:18	fair 10746:16 10806:23	firearm 10769:12	10849:12,18	gesien 10768:13
<b>explored</b> 10801:9	10007 1 10000 4 10		100 (1.17	
	10807:1 10809:4,18	<b>fired</b> 10744:19	10861:17	10769:3
explosive 10788:2	10815:2 10843:5	first 10730:8 10734:4	four 10818:20	10769:3 gesture 10874:6
<b>explosive</b> 10788:2 <b>express</b> 10773:4	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25	<b>four</b> 10818:20 <b>fourth</b> 10743:8,8	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15
<b>explosive</b> 10788:2 <b>express</b> 10773:4 10794:6	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9	<b>first</b> 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10850:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8 10845:19 10850:25	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11 10833:12	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17 10873:21	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11 full 10768:11	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10755:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21 10798:12 10812:9
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extra 10754:7 10850:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8 10845:19 10850:25	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11 10833:12 <b>father</b> 10767:24	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17 10873:21 flames 10826:9	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11 full 10768:11 fuller 10866:6	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10755:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21 10798:12 10812:9 10814:6 10818:3
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8 10845:19 10850:25 10851:1,8 F	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11 10833:12 <b>father</b> 10767:24 <b>fault</b> 10781:1	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17 10873:21 flames 10826:9 flow 10858:23	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11 full 10768:11 fuller 10866:6 fullest 10805:7	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10755:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21 10798:12 10812:9 10814:6 10818:3 10820:21 10823:11
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8 10845:19 10850:25 10851:1,8 F faceless 10743:22	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11 10833:12 <b>father</b> 10767:24 <b>fault</b> 10781:1 <b>favour</b> 10750:21	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17 10873:21 flames 10826:9 flow 10858:23 fly 10834:25	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11 fuller 10866:6 fullest 10805:7 fully 10745:20 10798:1	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21 10798:12 10812:9 10814:6 10818:3 10820:21 10823:11 10844:10 10846:18
explosive 10788:2 express 10773:4 10794:6 expressed 10803:25 10850:25 10867:2 expressly 10746:17 extend 10730:25 10794:10 extensive 10846:16 extent 10776:11 10778:4,11,13 10811:11 10812:22 10851:16 extra 10754:7 10868:1 extracted 10732:7,8 eye 10823:13,23 10827:15 10836:11 eyes 10823:7 10859:21 e-mail 10836:24 10842:3 10843:24 10844:2,5 e-mails 10842:8 10845:19 10850:25 10851:1,8 F	10815:2 10843:5 10856:5,10 10859:23 10861:16 <b>fairly</b> 10817:17 10836:2 <b>fairness</b> 10763:2 10804:13 10864:9 10866:6 10867:20 <b>fall</b> 10772:21 <b>falls</b> 10743:24 <b>family</b> 10730:25 10755:1,7 <b>Fanagolo</b> 10770:12 <b>fanning</b> 10826:9 <b>far</b> 10733:3 10741:15 10751:17 10754:17 10774:3 10793:18 10795:8 10800:1 10802:1 10808:7 10817:3 10822:13 10855:7 10867:10 <b>farm</b> 10823:5 <b>fashion</b> 10817:11 10833:12 <b>father</b> 10767:24 <b>fault</b> 10781:1	first 10730:8 10734:4 10734:22 10735:25 10740:25 10742:14 10743:2 10744:17 10756:14 10757:10 10760:9 10762:6 10763:9,12,16 10765:11 10767:1 10770:9 10780:9,10 10790:23 10791:6,6 10794:16 10802:2,2 10805:13 10812:3 10813:22 10823:23 10833:17 10834:11 10838:17 10844:6 10845:6 10846:24 10847:12 10854:15 firstly 10736:14 10738:23 10811:15 10829:16 10865:23 fit 10754:15,15 five 10741:5 10743:1 10747:1 10873:16,17 10873:21 flames 10826:9 flow 10858:23	four 10818:20 fourth 10743:8,8 fourthly 10851:2 framed 10809:20 free 10754:8 freedom 10796:21 freeze 10807:8 fresh 10842:22 Friday 10869:11 10873:12 friend 10746:1,11 10749:16 10757:5 10795:1,12 10799:21 10800:18 10812:18 10813:3 10824:21 10831:19 10844:25 10845:4 10846:18 10851:25 friends 10758:1,5 front 10733:19 10772:24 10830:16 10830:20 10843:23 10844:4 10864:11 full 10768:11 fuller 10866:6 fullest 10805:7	10769:3 gesture 10874:6 gesê 10787:15 getting 10735:20 10738:18 10851:2 gewees 10787:12 GGG36 10759:5 GGG36.1 10759:6,14 10759:17 10760:22 10778:17 GGG40 10819:10 give 10739:23 10745:24 10750:20 10756:14 10785:22 10804:17 10806:2 10832:21 10849:5 given 10739:5,7 10740:7,13 10746:4,5 10747:12 10750:4 10757:17,21 10758:5 10759:21 10770:10 10771:23 10782:6 10786:20 10787:22 10790:12 10795:21 10798:12 10812:9 10814:6 10818:3 10820:21 10823:11

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

10871:5         hamper 10786:19         10860:18,22,24         hypothetical 10838:23         10746:4.           gives 10785:23         hand 10733:9 10777:2         10860:18,22,24         hypothetical 10838:23         10746:4.           giving 10757:24         handicap 10841:25         handicap 10841:25         het 10768:13,16         inaccurate           giving 10757:24         handicap 10841:25         handicap 10841:21         10769:3,9,19         ignore 10791:3         10744:21           gleaned 10731:25         10842:12         handie 10831:13         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10791:3         10746:3,19           10750:22 10739:11         handie 10831:12         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10748:3,19         inaccurate           10750:22 10751:17         hands 10811:12         10786:9 10795:13         illegal 10796:8 10800:1         10753:13           10760:20 10761:21         10766:21 10771:5         10815:2 10865:3         1084:6 10825:3         image 10772:16         10833:2           10770:11 10787:10         10762:21 10771:5         10815:2 10865:3         1084:6 10825:3         imagine 10774:8         incentive 1           10787:23 10789:15         10815:2 10865:3         10846:23 10857:25         10844:1         10863:18 10868:1         10782:4         10782:4           10863:18 10868:1         10782:23	10743:8,23 10741:5
10871:5         hamper 10786:19         10860:18,22,24         hypothetical 10838:23         10746:4, inaccuract           giving 10757:24         handicap 10841:25         10798:14 10833:1         10769:3,9,19         inaccuract         inaccuract           gleaned 10731:25         10842:1         10769:3,9,19         ignore 10791:3         10744:21           gl 0732:22 10739:11         handle 10831:13         he'd 10787:11,15,15         10824:11         10752:22           gl 0732:22 10739:11         handle 10831:13         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10791:3         10744:22           gl 0732:22 10739:11         handle 10831:13         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10748:3,19         inaccuratc           10750:22 10751:17         hands 10811:12         10786:9 10795:13         10756:2         10760:20 10761:21         10766:20 10761:21         10766:21 10771:5         10815:1 10787:23 10789:15         10815:2 10865:3         10846:23 10857:25         10848:16 10825:3         imagine 10774:8         incetnet 91           10797:55 10821:2         happen 10754:21         10787:32 10788:1         10845:11         10863:18 10868:1         10742:23 10787:3         10845:11         10782:23 10784:21         10782:23 10784:21         10785:2           10739:23 10756:6         10863:17,18 10866:1         10863:18 10866:1         10845:12 10755:7	12 7 10743:8,23 5 10741:5
gives 10785:23 10837:22         hand 10733:9 10777:2 10798:14 10838:1         10862:14 10873:24 Hemraj's 10775:21         I         inaccuract 10741:1           giving 10757:24 10785:19         handicap 10841:25         het 10768:13,16         ice 10750:15         inaccuract 10742:1           glad 10832:24 gleaned 10731:25         handicaps 10841:21         10767:11,15,15         inde 10741:3         10744:21           glo 10732:22 10739:11 10750:22 10751:17         handle 10831:13         he'd 10787:21         inaccuract inaccurate         inaccuract           10760:20 10761:21         hands 10811:12         10786:9 10795:13         illegal 10796:8 10800:1         10750:21           10762:11 10768:3,5         happen 10754:21         10786:9 10797:17         10813:13         images 10772:16         images 10772:16           10797:5,5 10821:2         happened 10736:11         10863:24 10864:4         imbalance 10844:21         incident 10           10838:15 10845:1         1084251 0889:317         heigher 10768:13         imediately 10788:1         10847:1           10759:23 10776:6         108463:1 0869:3,17         heigher 10768:13         indef 10768:13         indef 10768:13           10865:18 10868:1         10840:25 10899:3,17         heigher 10768:13         indef 10791:71 10791:911         incident 10           10759:23 10756:6         10843:16 10859:3,17<	10743:8,23 10741:5
10837:22         10798:14 10838:1         Hemraj's 10775:21         I         1         10744:12           giving 10757:24         handicap 10841:25         10842:1         10769:3,9,19         igore 10791:3         10744:12           glad 10832:24         handicaps 10841:21         10769:7,11,15,15         10824:11         10752:22           glad 10731:25         10842:12         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10791:3         10824:11         10752:22           go 10732:22 10739:11         handle 10831:13         he'd 10756:2         10747:11 10765:18         illegal 10796:8 10800:1         10753:12           10760:20 10761:21         nads 10811:12         10784:4 10785:20         10786:9 10795:13         illustrate 10784:7         10794:1           10760:20 10761:21         10865:9         10786:9 10795:13         illustrate 10784:7         10794:1           10770:11 10787:10         10762:21 10771:5         10818:16 10825:3         images 10772:16         10833:2           10777:5,5 10821:2         happend 10736:11         10863:24 10864:4         immediately 10788:1         10847:14           10838:15 10845:1         10782:23 10784:21         10867:16 10870:11         immediately 10788:1         10845:1           10779:5,5 108021:2         happening 10736:11         10863:18 10868:1         10804:25 10809:15	5 10741:5
100511210175124101717151017171510171715giving 10757:2410842:110769:13,16inaccurate10785:1910842:110769:3,9,19ignore 10791:310744:22gleaned 10731:2510842:1210787:11,15,15ignore 10791:310752:22go 10732:22 10739:11handlie 10831:13he'll 10756:210756:610800:110756:210741:6 10746:25handling 10832:13he'll 10756:210756:16,18inacutrate10750:22 10751:17hands 10811:1210784:4 10785:2010756:16,18inacutrate10760:20 10761:2110865:910774:2110797:17 10813:13illugga 10774:810766:2110767:11 10768:3,5happen 10754:2110797:17 10813:13imagine 10774:8incentive110797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:21incident 1010797:5,5 10821:210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:1110864:23 10870:11imbalance 10844:21incident 1010826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:110847:1010838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110769:2,310804:33 10854:22,22incident 1010799:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:110869:31 0864:20,2310854:1710854:1210785:210786:1 10802:21happening 10741:1510844:310807:1210798:1,7 10802:1910854:1210786:1 10802:2110743:3,110751:210844:310809:1210798:1,7 10802:1910865:1010786:1 1	10741:5
10785:19         10842:1         10769:3,9,19         ignore 10791:3         10744:22           glad 10832:24         handicaps 10841:21         10787:11,15,15         ignore 10791:3         10744:22           glad 10732:22 10739:11         handle 10831:13         he'd 10787:21         ignore 10791:3         10752:22           10741:6 10746:25         handling 10832:13         he'l 10765:18         illegal 10796:8 10800:1         10750:16,18           10760:20 10761:21         10865:9         10786:9 10797:13         illustrate 10784:7         10796:2           10770:11 10768:3,5         happen 10754:21         107797:17 10813:13         images 10772:16         10833:2           10770:11 107789:15         10815:2 10865:3         10846:23 1087725         10849:1         incentive 10           10777:5,5 10821:2         happend 10736:11         10867:16 10870:11         immediately 10788:1         10847:10           10833:15 10845:1         10749:19 10773:21         10867:16 10870:11         immediately 10791:4,12         10845:1           10838:15 10803:3,5         10844:21         10782:4         10789:23         10784:22,22         incidental           10863:18 10868:1         10804:25 10809:15         10867:16 10870:11         immediately 10791:4,12         10845:12           10739:23 10756:6	
glad 10832:24 gleaned 10731:25handicaps 10841:21 10842:1210787:11,15,15 he'd 10787:2110824:11 ignored 10748:3,19 10750:22 10739:1110842:12 he'd 10787:2110824:11 ignored 10748:3,1910752:22 inaccurate inaudible10741:6 10746:25 10750:22 10751:17handle 10831:13 hands 10811:12he'l 10756:2 10786:9 10786:9 10786:9 10795:13illegal 10796:8 10800:1 10766:2010756:2 10766:2010756:2 10766:2010760:20 10761:21 10766:35happen 10754:21 10766:21 107768:3,510766:9 10795:13 10815:2 10865:3illustrate 10784:7 10797:17 10813:1310766:2 images 10772:1610833:2 10846:23 10857:2510787:23 10789:15 10826:15 10829:2210815:2 10865:3 10782:23 10784:1110863:24 10864:4 10863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:21 imcelately 10788:110782:4 10847:1010838:15 10845:1 10966:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17 10843:16 10859:3,1710867:16 10870:11 10866:13imgartial 10791:4,12 10867:16 10876:1310865:12 10843:16 1085:2,2210796:25 10800:3,5 10843:16 10864:20,2310864:20,23 10843:16 10859:3,1710869:10768:13 10829:3 10834:18 10867:1 10820:21 10786:2 10877:210828:17,18 10867:1 10820:21 10765:2,22107991:7 10879:2,710828:12 10809:12 10828:12 10809:1210758:8 10774:5 10867:1 10867:2 10872:210765:2,22 10748:3,2 10751:210844:3 10821:1710828:12 10809:6,17 10828:12 10809:6,1710844:25 10784:2510748:3,2 10751:2 10884:31 10805:1410844:3 10844:310881:2 10809:6,17 10884:310881:2 10809:6,17 	
glad 10832:24 gleaned 10731:25handicaps 10841:21 10842:1210787:11,15,15 he'd 10787:2110824:11 ignored 10748:3,19 10750:22 10739:1110842:12 he'd 10787:2110824:11 ignored 10748:3,1910752:22 inaccurate inaudible10741:6 10746:25 10750:22 10751:17handle 10831:13 hands 10811:12he'l 10756:2 10786:9 10786:9 10786:9 10795:13illegal 10796:8 10800:1 10766:2010756:2 10766:2010756:2 10766:2010760:20 10761:21 10766:35happen 10754:21 10766:21 107768:3,510766:9 10795:13 10815:2 10865:3illustrate 10784:7 10797:17 10813:1310766:2 images 10772:1610833:2 10846:23 10857:2510787:23 10789:15 10826:15 10829:2210815:2 10865:3 10782:23 10784:1110863:24 10864:4 10863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:21 imcelately 10788:110782:4 10847:1010838:15 10845:1 10966:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17 10843:16 10859:3,1710867:16 10870:11 10866:13imgartial 10791:4,12 10867:16 10876:1310865:12 10843:16 1085:2,2210796:25 10800:3,5 10843:16 10864:20,2310864:20,23 10843:16 10859:3,1710869:10768:13 10829:3 10834:18 10867:1 10820:21 10786:2 10877:210828:17,18 10867:1 10820:21 10765:2,22107991:7 10879:2,710828:12 10809:12 10828:12 10809:1210758:8 10774:5 10867:1 10867:2 10872:210765:2,22 10748:3,2 10751:210844:3 10821:1710828:12 10809:6,17 10828:12 10809:6,1710844:25 10784:2510748:3,2 10751:2 10884:31 10805:1410844:3 10844:310881:2 10809:6,17 10884:310881:2 10809:6,17 10881:2 10809:6,1710845:16 10	2 10749:10
gleaned 10731:2510842:12he'd 10787:21ignored 10748:3,19inaccuratego 10732:22 10739:11handle 10831:13he'l 10756:210750:16,18inaudible10741:6 10746:25handling 10832:13he's 10747:11 10765:18illegal 10796:8 10800:110753:1210750:22 10751:17hands 10811:1210784:4 10785:2010800:210766:210760:20 10761:2110865:910786:9 10795:13illustrate 10784:710794:110762:11 10768:3,5happen 10754:2110797:17 10813:13imags 10772:1610833:210770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1410838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:610739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:77 10792:9,11include 1010739:23 10756:610865:21 0872:210755:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19include 1010739:23 10774:510867:2 10872:210755:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19include 1010739:23 10756:610748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10872:310785:21084:12 1082:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710819:19 10840:2107	
go10732:22 10739:11 10741:6 10746:25 10750:22 10751:17 10760:20 10761:21 10766:21 10766:21 10766:21 10766:9handle 10831:13 hands 10811:12he'll 10756:2 he's 10747:11 10765:18 10784:4 10785:2010750:16,18 illegal 10796:8 10800:1 10800:2inaudible 10753:12 10800:210760:20 10761:21 10766:21 10768:3,5 10770:11 10787:10 10762:21 10771:510865:9 10762:21 10771:510786:9 10795:13 10786:9 10795:13illustrate 10784:7 images 10772:1610766:22 10796:1310770:11 10787:10 10762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3 10815:2 10865:3ino846:23 10857:25 10846:23 10857:25imagine 10774:8 imagine 10774:8incentive 10 incentive 10 incident 1010787:23 10789:15 10785:15 10821:210789:19 10773:21 10782:23 10784:2110867:16 10870:11 10863:24 10867:16 10870:11 10863:14 10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15 10844:25incentive 10 incident 10 10769:2,310799:23 10756:6 10739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1 10865:17,18 10866:110765:2,22 10752:23 10785:7 10842:21 10755:25ingpartial 10791:4,12 10785:7 10854:23 10854:22,22include 10 include 10 10798:1,7 10802:91 10785:1,7 18 10866:110758:8 10774:5 10867:2 10872:210865:1.4 10786:1 10802:21 10786:1 10802:21ingpartial 10781:7 10786:1 10802:21 10783:13 10805:14ingel 10768:15 10844:310844:25 government 10836:7 10845:2510753:13 10805:14 10881:14ingel 10789:11 10844:3ingel 1082:10 10842:310845:16 10864:25 10845:26ingens 10796:23inger 10799:11 10844:3ingel 21 10809:6,17 10808:12 10809:6,1710845	
10741:6 10746:25 10750:22 10751:17 10760:20 10761:21handling 10832:13 hands 10811:12he's 10747:11 10765:18 10784:4 10785:20illegal 10796:8 10800:1 10800:210753:13 10800:210760:20 10761:21 10762:11 10768:3,5 10770:11 10768:3,5 10770:11 10787:1010865:910786:9 10795:13 10762:21 10771:5illustrate 10784:7 10797:17 10813:1310762:1 10833:210770:11 10787:10 10777:5,5 10821:2 10845:15 10829:2210762:21 10771:5 10815:2 10865:310846:23 10857:25 10846:23 10857:25imagine 10774:8 imagine 10774:8incentive 10 incident 11 10782:41 10863:4410863:18 10868:1 10863:18 10868:110782:23 10784:21 10782:23 10784:2110867:16 10870:11 10871:3,5impendiately 10788:1 10871:3,5incidental incidental 10865:110799:25 10800:3,5 10740:2110843:16 10859:3,17 10865:17,18 10866:1higher 10768:13 10829:3 10834:18impartial 10791:4,12 include 10 10798:2,21 10785:7in843:16 10859:3,17 10845:1210739:23 10756:6 10867:2 10872:210866:17,18 10866:1 10867:2 10872:2higher 10765:7 10843:16 10859:3,17include 10 10798:1,7 10802:19 10786:1 10802:2110741:15 10849:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:2 10748:3,21 10751:2inglighted 10818:5 10804:23 10807:23include 10 10808:12 10809:6,17 10808:12 10809:6,1710844:25 10844:2510753:13 10805:14 10808:23,24high-water 10789:11 high inform 10733:14in808:12 10802:10 10808:12 10802:310	
10750:22 10751:17 10760:20 10761:21hands 10811:1210784:4 10785:2010800:210766:2:10760:20 10761:21 10762:11 10768:3,5 10770:11 10787:1010865:910786:9 10795:13illustrate 10784:710794:110762:11 10768:3,5 10770:11 10787:10happen 10754:2110797:17 10813:13images 10772:1610833:210770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 110797:5,5 10821:2 10826:15 10829:22happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1010863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:610796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:2210739:23 10756:610865:1.7,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210748:3,21 10751:210843:310804:23 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710826:1210786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510804:23 10807:2310855:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23high-man 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect 1	
10760:20 10761:2110865:910786:9 10795:13illustrate 10784:710794:110762:11 10768:3,5happen 10754:2110797:17 10813:13images 10772:1610833:210770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1410863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13ingertial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,222inclined 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:23good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010758:8 10774:510865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792.9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 1087:2310785:710844:2510748:3,21 10751:210844:310802:21include 1010844:2510753:13 10805:14highest 10769:1310802:25 10809:6,17includeing10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect 10	,
10762:11 10768:3,5 10770:11 10787:10happen 10754:2110797:17 10813:13images 10772:1610833:210770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 110787:23 10789:1510815:2 10865:310846:23 10857:2510849:1incident 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1010863:18 10868:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:610796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11included 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23high-water 10789:1110810:7 10812:7incorporation of 10	
10770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 110787:23 10789:1510815:2 10865:310846:23 10857:2510849:1incident 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1010838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22include 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:2good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19include 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporati	10825:20,23
10770:11 10787:1010762:21 10771:510818:16 10825:3imagine 10774:8incentive 110787:23 10789:1510815:2 10865:310846:23 10857:2510849:1incident 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1010838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22include 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:2good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19include 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporationcorporati	10873:5
10787:23 10789:1510815:2 10865:310846:23 10857:2510849:1incident 1010797:5,5 10821:2happened 10736:1110863:24 10864:4imbalance 10844:2110782:410826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1410838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,5impartial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22incident 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:23good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010758:8 10774:510865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7inconsister	
10797:5,5 10821:2 10826:15 10829:22happened 10736:11 10749:19 10773:2110863:24 10864:4 10867:16 10870:11imbalance 10844:21 immediately 10782:110782:4 10867:16 10870:1110838:15 10845:1 10863:18 10868:110782:23 10784:21 10804:25 10809:1510871:3,5 hierdie 10768:13immediately 10782:1 10865:110865:1 incidentalgoes 10740:21 10796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17 10843:16 10859:3,17hierdie 10768:13 10769:2,3impartial 10791:4,12 10854:22,22inclined 10 inclined 10 10785:7good 10731:14,16 10753:8 10774:510865:17,18 10866:1 10865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:17 10865:2,22inory 10791:7 10791:17 10792:9,11 include 10 10758:8 10774:5include 10 include 10 10867:2 10872:210786:1 10802:21 10844:25happening 10741:15 10845:12 10753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:11 10844:310808:12 10809:6,17 10880:12 10809:6,17 10880:12 10809:6,1710844:25 government 10836:7 10845:16 10864:2510796:23 happens 10796:23hit 10767:6 10769:8 hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10	
10826:15 10829:2210749:19 10773:2110867:16 10870:11immediately 10788:110847:1010838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19including10786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:251088:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporal10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10838:15 10845:110782:23 10784:2110871:3,510865:1incidental10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:1510804:25 10809:1510871:3,510865:110865:1goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,1710865:710864:20,2310854:2310785:2good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010786:1 10802:21happening 10741:1510844:310808:23,24inghewater 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10863:18 10868:110804:25 10809:15hierdie 10768:13impartial 10791:4,1210848:6goes 10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:23good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,23highest 10764:1710854:23include 1010739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10765:2,2210791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19including10786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1110819:19 10840:210753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorporation	
goes10740:2110828:17,1810769:2,310804:3 10854:22,22inclined 1010796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,1710843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:22good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19including10786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510804:23 10807:2310802:25 10804:1110819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	<b>y</b> 10757:2
10796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:2good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18higher 10785:710854:2310785:210739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:2highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10796:25 10800:3,510843:16 10859:3,17higher 10785:710854:2310785:2good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18higher 10785:710854:2310785:210739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11include 1010758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:2highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsister10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	765:24
good 10731:14,1610860:3 10864:20,2310829:3 10834:18impartiality 10791:7include 1010739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11included 110758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19includeg 110786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710844:2510753:13 10805:1410844:310804:23 10807:2310865:10government 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10739:23 10756:610865:17,18 10866:1highest 10764:1710791:17 10792:9,11included 110758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19including10786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1710819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10758:8 10774:510867:2 10872:210765:2,2210798:1,7 10802:19including10786:1 10802:21happening 10741:15highlighted 10818:510802:25 10804:1110821:1110819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10786:1 10802:21 10819:19 10840:2happening 10741:15 10748:3,21 10751:2highlighted 10818:5 10844:310802:25 10804:11 10844:310821:11 10804:23 10807:2310844:25 government 10836:7 10845:16 10864:2510753:13 10805:14 10808:23,24high-water 10789:11 hit 10767:6 10769:8 hm-mm 10733:1410802:25 10804:11 10808:12 10809:6,17 10812:710821:11 inconsister incorporation	
10819:19 10840:210748:3,21 10751:210844:310804:23 10807:2310865:1010844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	
10844:2510753:13 10805:14high-water 10789:1110808:12 10809:6,17inconsistergovernment 10836:710808:23,24hit 10767:6 10769:810810:7 10812:7incorporation10845:16 10864:25happens 10796:23hm-mm 10733:1410821:10 10823:10incorrect	7 10822:10
government 10836:7 10845:16 10864:2510808:23,24 happens 10796:23hit 10767:6 10769:8 hm-mm 10733:1410810:7 10812:7 10821:10 10823:10incorporation	)
government 10836:7 10845:16 10864:2510808:23,24 happens 10796:23hit 10767:6 10769:8 hm-mm 10733:1410810:7 10812:7 10821:10 10823:10incorporation	nt 10824:13
10845:16 10864:25 happens 10796:23 hm-mm 10733:14 10821:10 10823:10 incorrect	
19 <b>130</b> 1064555 1 10656515 10659522 1 100-101010 10755514 1 10654510 1 1075651	
5	5,16 10739:8
	0 10741:1
10792:16 harmful 10845:2 hoe 10768:13 10769:3 10791:22 10797:11 10745:19	9 10752:24
granted 10771:4 hasn't 10746:5 10785:5 hom 10761:15,15 10797:19,22 10802:8 10753:3	10771:2
	9 10789:12
gratitude 10773:2,5,16 hat 10845:5 10768:15 10769:7,8 Implement 10735:3 indicate 10	
10773:21,25 haven't 10746:4 home 10760:11 implemented 10784:16 10868:17	
great 10786:4 10812:20 10747:7 10864:10 10818:14 10872:23 implication 10734:4 indicated	
	10798:1
greatest 10749:5 hear 10749:20 10762:1 10761:23 10762:2,7 importance 10739:17 10831:1	10865:13
10834:24 10846:4 10803:6 10804:4,8 10762:25 10742:15,16 10871:3.	21
grond 10790:4,11 10805:9 10844:15,16 honestly 10787:5 important 10734:25 indicates 1	0761:14
ground 10775:12 10844:17 honourable 10830:13 10739:7 10741:10,12 10806:1	
10787:24 10805:20 heard 10784:14 10830:22 10742:5 10748:14 indicating	
10836:14 10840:16 10797:14 10801:15 hope 10730:4,22 10762:1,24 10788:17 10844:8,	
10840:17 10851:3 10803:5 10808:15 10851:19 10869:9 10790:19 10796:2,16 indication	
10861:20 10835:9 10838:16 10873:16 10847:6 10858:19 <b>indication</b>	s 10824:22
grounds 10837:21 10841:6 10847:9 hopefully 10812:9 10865:13 10869:13 indicative	10812:19
10845:8 10853:10 10855:11 hopes 10811:9 importantly 10785:16 10814:9	
group 10753:5 10855:15 10856:4 hoping 10733:17 10866:11 indirect 10	853:12.12
10806:19 10808:6 10862:7,8 10760:5,7 <b>imposed</b> 10791:7 <b>individual</b>	,
10817:19 hearing 10855:1 hospital 10730:15 impossible 10824:18 individual	
	10828:17
	9 10845:14
	0 10850:19
	10793:21,23
	10799:14,22
	10799.14,22
0	
	),21 10837:2
guide 10814:18hell 10840:1010771:11 10772:1110848:21 10852:9industry 1	
Gumbi 10869:21 help 10742:8 10748:22 10772:11,12,12,13,25 10853:13,16 infantile 1	
10871:2 10749:3 10752:5 10772:25 10773:10 improperly 10831:15 influence	0740:14
10766:21 10767:17 10774:16 10831:18 10744:1	
h I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	100.00.1
	5 10848:8,21
10868:22 10869:10 helpful 10759:25 10769:7,8,9,19,20 10781:14 10853:1'	5 10848:8,21 10853:12,13
10871:3 Hemraj 10775:9 10787:14 inaccuracies 10742:14 influenced	5 10848:8,21 10853:12,13
ARCHIVE FOR JUSTICE	5 10848:8,21 10853:12,13

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page 8
10828:16 10829:14	interposed 10870:10	10848:5,5 10851:4,5	10846:9 10847:11	laughing 10772:18
inform 10771:3			10840.910847.11	law 10796:10,14
	interposing 10869:9	10851:19 10853:24		,
information 10732:1	interposition 10870:5	10865:2,22 10870:20	killing 10774:25	10798:24 10800:5,23
10734:10,19 10735:3	interpret 10805:8	10870:22 10873:12	10775:5,13 10776:10	10801:1 10803:24
10735:5,8,13	interpretation	issues 10745:12	10780:14 10783:10	10813:25 10834:14
10737:15,18,25	10767:11 10768:9	10750:11,13	10824:3 10848:1	10835:9,13 10847:2
10738:12,15,16	10813:1 10814:1	10771:21 10792:6	killings 10848:7	10847:25 10848:7
10739:3,5,6,18,22	interpretations	10796:25 10797:1	kilometres 10807:4	10854:20 10856:14
10740:6,10,13	10760:7	10851:6,21 10865:20	10808:3	laws 10860:15
10741:24 10742:2,5,6	interpreted 10855:7	10865:21	kind 10732:2 10739:22	lead 10747:8,12
10745:16,18	10872:16	it'll 10845:7	10752:8 10766:21	leaders 10864:25
10747:22 10748:2,14		<b>I'd</b> 10769:25 10814:21		
	interrupt 10809:3		10769:24 10774:15	leadership 10775:12,20
10748:15 10749:8,9	10859:18 10863:5	10826:13 10858:25	10782:2 10828:5	10775:23 10857:2
10750:17 10752:22	<b>interrupted</b> 10850:5,12	<b>I'm</b> 10866:21	10835:7 10859:10	learned 10746:1,11
10753:1 10755:16	intersection 10856:9		10865:9	10749:16 10757:5
10756:18 10770:8	<b>intervene</b> 10750:24	J	kindly 10795:19	10758:1,4 10777:25
10842:18 10859:3,6,8	intervention 10751:7	<b>ja</b> 10732:6 10733:23	kinds 10792:3	10795:1,12 10799:21
10861:16,17,22	10805:21,21,22	10736:18 10752:11	10793:23	10800:18 10812:18
10865:24 10866:13	10809:24 10837:4	10760:2 10761:24	knew 10765:17	10813:3 10824:21
10866:20,22 10867:4	10847:24	10763:14 10765:20	10766:4,8 10773:16	10831:19 10844:25
10867:9 10873:17	interventions 10734:12	10767:18,19,22,23,25	10775:4,10,12,23	10845:4 10846:18
informed 10736:2	10846:19,20	10769:14 10788:21	10776:3,9,17	10845.4 10840.18
	interview 10863:14		10770.3,9,17 10781:11 10794:25	leave 10767:18,18,19
10747:24,25 10788:3		10789:8 10799:9		
10788:4,5 10794:14	interviewed 10782:3	10806:15 10807:1	10795:17,24	10767:23,23,23
10810:23 10831:5,8	inter-union 10826:9	10814:20 10816:4	10820:25	10782:20 10789:16
informing 10753:5	intimidation 10800:6	10817:8 10826:22	<b>knob</b> 10767:6	10790:14 10817:6
<b>infractions</b> 10827:16	10834:15 10848:1	10830:20 10841:13	knowing 10799:12	10854:2 10873:25
inherent 10792:14	introduces 10813:22	10841:20 10864:12	10872:4	leaving 10872:3
10842:1,12	invalid 10827:12	<b>Jacob</b> 10863:1,12	knowledge 10730:18	led 10732:5 10850:20
<b>injured</b> 10731:3	investigation 10827:24	<b>Jele</b> 10781:25	10742:1 10750:15	10857:7 10858:24
10753:5 10754:25	investigations	JOC 10789:5 10816:13	10751:23 10752:6	10860:25
10801:4 10871:18	10741:14	10817:17 10819:11	10776:7,8 10777:18	lede 10787:11,14
injuries 10730:16	<b>invitations</b> 10847:1	join 10851:5	10778:6 10780:14	10788:17,18,18,19
10731:4	<b>invite</b> 10831:19		107782:23	10789:16,21 10790:4
		joint 10854:7		
<b>injury</b> 10791:20	10845:2	jong 10767:5	known 10765:12	10790:10
10871:11,25	<b>invited</b> 10833:10	Judge 10740:17,19	10798:20	leeggemaak 10768:16
innocent 10780:1	<b>involved</b> 10740:12	10761:1 10762:23	knows 10749:24	10769:9,20
10800:14	10743:17 10782:4	10763:10 10770:6	10751:7,17 10840:9	left 10799:3,8 10802:9
<b>inquiry</b> 10813:2	10799:11 10806:19	10809:22 10858:17	10867:14	10817:9 10822:23
10843:16 10865:3	10835:8,11 10849:13	10867:11 10873:13	kom 10768:16	10852:4 10872:21
inserted 10759:23	involvement 10796:2,3	Judge's 10741:2	10769:20	leg 10844:6
inside 10754:12,15	10805:23 10851:16	judicial 10865:2	koppie 10804:3	legal 10734:16
<b>insofar</b> 10739:4,6	<b>involves</b> 10792:2	<b>July</b> 10824:16	10806:19 10807:6	10762:10 10770:4
10757:18 10782:21	10798:10	10826:10	10808:2,4,5,9	10813:1,25 10854:20
10797:20 10822:9	irrelevant 10738:8,25	jump 10735:2	10808.2,4,5,9	Lepaaku's 10757:3
10797.20 10822.9	10749:17 10751:19	jumping 10862:2	10817.19 10820.10	lesson 10798:13
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
10851:6,20 10852:25	10751:21 10752:13	<b>JUNE</b> 10730:1	kwalik 10787:13	<b>letters</b> 10837:2
10857:16 10861:20	10764:15 10785:17	justifies 10837:23	Г — т — т	let's 10735:13 10736:5
10866:9	10786:4,6 10812:21	10843:1		10740:5 10747:19
instances 10854:9	10818:13,15	<b>jy</b> 10768:13 10769:3	labelled 10830:8	10754:23 10760:10
<b>instructed</b> 10820:13	irresponsibly 10844:24		labour 10736:3,19	10760:19 10763:6
instructions 10787:22	isiXhosa 10766:17	K	10792:14,23	10765:6,8 10789:15
10820:10 10872:6	isn't 10735:7 10738:12	keep 10755:1 10759:8	10796:10,14,14	10790:1 10809:1
insulting 10768:3	10750:2 10785:24	10785:17 10858:25	10798:14 10836:8,13	10818:19 10821:13
10779:16	10818:10 10838:4	keeps 10764:4,5	10836:19 10845:17	10825:4 10826:1
intended 10845:17,18	10861:9,24	key 10732:5 10749:7	10845:22	10834:25 10837:6
10846:6	isolated 10805:21	10823:6	lack 10775:1 10808:11	10841:11 10849:4
inter 10780:19	issue 10731:21	<b>kill</b> 10776:18 10783:13	10809:17 10810:7	10841:11 10849:4
10870:22	10733:12 10738:24	10783:13 10784:23	ladder 10791:16	10861:11
interacted 10748:16	10741:12 10748:23	10785:9 10788:25	laid 10737:13	let's 10804:8,17
interested 10814:7	10749:18 10756:17	10789:17 10824:3	language 10760:9,11	10809:20
<b>interests</b> 10765:24	10779:20 10787:9	killed 10741:6	10774:15 10775:2	level 10793:3 10825:19
International 10859:21	10794:24 10795:24	10744:20 10747:2	10791:13 10805:4	10838:19 10859:4
internecine 10791:20	10802:5 10812:1	10780:1 10783:15,16	large 10773:6 10792:1	leverage 10805:16
<b>Internet</b> 10863:6	10815:8 10831:11	10790:9,9 10800:13	10805:15	<b>lie</b> 10787:23
interpose 10869:12	10837:2,3 10845:11	10801:2 10835:15	late 10754:21	Lieutenant 10788:23
ARCHIVE FO				

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

	1			Tage
Lieutenant-General	10812:12,12 10814:5	10852:10 10859:16	10840:16,23	10745:22 10750:17
10744:10	10814:25 10815:10	maintain 10802:19	10842:22 10844:20	merits 10813:8
life 10730:15 10788:7	10816:13 10817:1,4	maintaining 10850:25	10845:17 10848:4	<b>Merwe</b> 10820:5,19
10796:19,24 10831:2	10820:4,5,25	maintenance 10791:4	10851:24 10854:25	10857:14
10859:13	10821:25 10822:3,12	<b>major</b> 10787:20,22	10859:20 10860:2	message 10731:2
<b>light</b> 10738:10	10822:12 10823:2,5	10836:6	matters 10751:23	10748:18 10873:15
10753:24,25 10754:1	10823:12 10824:18	Major-General	10786:3 10810:20	messages 10824:14
10775:18 10781:17	10824:22 10827:25	10781:24 10789:4,10	10833:20 10836:1	10835:2 <b>met</b> 10787:12 10790:4
10785:11 10842:21 10848:18 10873:24	10828:1,2,5,18 10833:16 10835:15	10849:10,11	10837:13,15 10840:20	
limited 10753:7	10835:15 10835:15	<b>making</b> 10741:21 10752:6 10754:17,25	maximum 10840:3,7	10790:10,10 10808:21,22
10855:6	10833:13 10830:3	10757:10 10785:20	10840:11,18	microphone 10754:1,2
line 10751:2 10758:3	10845:22 10844.1,4	10798:16 10835:4	10846:10	10759:16 10873:8
10765:1 10768:10	10847:13,14	10845:10	<b>Mbombo</b> 10744:2,8,10	mightn't 10779:2
10806:12,22	10848:12 10851:8,15	male 10767:25	10746:8,9 10748:1	mildly 10748:4
10807:24 10812:17	10863:2,12	malice 10774:17	10756:22 10757:13	10835:25
10813:11 10814:4	Lonmin's 10747:5	management 10736:2	10789:22	milieu 10815:13
10829:1 10841:22	10824:13 10826:8	10740:22 10743:9	McIntosh 10803:11,13	mind 10755:1 10771:21
10850:13	10827:23	10748:17,19	10803:20,20 10804:2	10794:10 10829:12
lines 10776:20 10840:5	look 10760:20	10796:11	McIntosh's 10803:24	10829:25 10842:12
linguist 10763:20	10761:13 10773:7,8	MANGWASHI	mean 10747:25	10852:16 10854:24
linguistically 10766:22	10794:12 10808:20	10731:12 10811:6	10755:5 10763:21	minded 10852:11
<b>link</b> 10783:10 10805:16	10808:20 10834:19	manner 10773:10	10786:7 10813:3	mine 10736:1 10743:8
linked 10790:10	10835:12 10863:8	10801:16 10837:24	10815:1 10820:14	10744:2 10800:15
10856:2	looking 10753:24	10857:10	10835:17 10854:22	mines 10851:12
<b>list</b> 10742:17,20	10754:1 10809:15 10843:10	manufactured 10842:8	10856:7 10861:18 10873:14	Mineworkers 10830:13 minimum 10840:4
10743:1 10822:19 <b>listen</b> 10761:21	looks 10863:4,5,6,8	marginal 10850:24 marginally 10765:23	meaningfully 10742:8	Minister 10791:2
10762:1,11 10770:11	10873:6	<b>Marikana</b> 10730:11	meaningtuny 10742.8 means 10767:24	10828:15,20,23,25
10771:5,6 10835:16	lose 10775:6	10777:14,18	10768:25 10792:24	10829:13 10830:24
listened 10761:6	loss 10831:1	10802:17 10805:12	10816:22 10820:2	10831:2,17,17,24
10762:2,25 10771:22	lost 10730:14 10741:11	10830:24 10831:1,4	meant 10772:12	10832:10,16 10833:6
listening 10756:16	10741:14 10780:22	10831:10 10832:6	10774:14 10804:23	10833:19 10835:2,6,7
10770:23 10864:10	10825:1	10864:8,18,20	10804:24 10865:11	10835:12,21,21
little 10793:10	lot 10770:10 10773:4	10866:2 10871:21	meet 10871:24	10836:7,11 10837:9
10807:15 10852:15	10773:25 10805:14	Marikanas 10864:21	meeting 10730:13	10837:18,21,24,25
10852:18 10867:12	10805:18 10807:14	mark 10789:11	10736:13,14,15,16	10838:11,19 10840:1
live 10746:11 10761:15	10853:24 10858:21	marked 10758:24	10803:4 10819:9	10840:10 10841:17
10761:16 10763:11	loved 10730:25	massacre 10748:16	10835:1 10847:13	10841:24 10842:2,5
10763:11	<b>lunch</b> 10810:5,11,16	10750:24 10751:19	meetings 10816:24 meets 10836:11	10842:10 10843:21
<b>lives</b> 10740:23,25 10741:10,14 10743:7	<b>lying</b> 10790:5 <b>lê</b> 10790:4	10751:24 10823:5 10863:2,12	members 10836:11 members 10736:3,19	10844:11,18 10845:19 10846:2,24
local 10730:14	le 10790.4	material 10773:14	10740:8,11 10743:16	10845:19 10840.2,24 10847:21 10851:2
locking 10798:18	M	10774:8 10785:23	10745:3 10747:24	10853:3,7 10856:4,21
log 10820:13	maag 10769:13	10786:21 10837:20	10755:1 10761:5	10857:12,22,23
logical 10847:13	maar 10768:16	10842:25 10843:1,3	10775:14 10776:8	10858:7,9,9 10859:13
long 10732:22	10769:20	materials 10822:12	10777:11,17	10859:20,22 10865:5
10734:11 10754:22	madam 10856:17	Mathunjwa 10735:15	10778:20 10779:24	10865:7,18
10820:25 10821:1,3	mag 10768:15,15,15,16	10737:24 10739:13	10781:7,11 10787:18	ministerial 10856:14
10821:14 10829:2	10768:16,17,20	10743:3	10787:21,24 10788:7	10865:1 10870:23
10845:1 10852:3	10769:9,13,14,18,19	matter 10747:15	10788:20 10789:17	Ministers 10835:1
10861:6 10862:4	magazine 10768:17,21	10751:23,24 10752:6	10790:6,8,8 10805:16	Minister's 10829:18
10865:9 10869:2	10769:12,14,17,20	10753:16 10756:18	10831:1 10837:12	10830:1,2 10844:16
10870:9,15,25	<b>magazines</b> 10764:5 <b>Magidiwana</b> 10798:13	10756:23 10763:25	memory 10733:17	10850:15 <b>minor</b> 10851:18,19
longer 10775:7 10871:20	10798:16	10770:15 10774:6 10776:22 10782:13	<b>men</b> 10745:5 10847:11 <b>mention</b> 10796:17	<b>minute</b> 10734:10
Lonmin 10736:10,15	Mahlangu 10766:18,24	10776.22 10782.13	10828:24 10829:21	10748:2,13,15,20
10736:16 10737:3	10767:1,3,16,21	10796:12,13 10800:8	10828:24 10829:21	10748.2,13,13,20
10740:7 10743:15	10768:22 10769:13	10802:22 10803:8	mentioned 10732:14	10755:16 10756:18
10747:7 10793:4,8	10769:18 10770:2	10813:1 10820:23	10787:20 10800:23	minutes 10871:9
10795:2 10797:8	10791:14,23	10824:1 10825:11	10802:12 10854:8	10873:15,16,17,21
10799:20 10802:18	10820:12 10843:9	10831:8,9,13	Merafi 10783:12,22	misinformation
10802:25 10803:5	10868:23 10873:4	10832:12,14 10834:4	10784:22 10785:3,4,9	10743:12,13
10804:4 10808:22	<b>mail</b> 10844:16	10836:3,9,18,19	10788:15,25	misprint 10763:16
10809:8,12 10810:8	10862:25	10838:8,18,20	Merafi's 10784:12	misquoting 10785:13
10810:15 10811:19	main 10814:2 10852:7	10839:16 10840:15	merely 10744:15	missed 10756:12

ARCHIVE FOR JUSTICE

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

# Marikana Commission of Inquiry

Page	1	0
гаус		L

		-	-	Page II
missing 10779:8	10869:18	10801:11 10821:5	10749:15 10793:14	10780:2 10790:16
mission 10848:13	<b>Mpofu's</b> 10802:21	negotiated 10824:15	10749:15 10795:14	10798:8 10802:8
		8		
<b>mistake</b> 10862:9	10804:22 10808:16	10826:10	10831:18 10869:9,9	10806:1 10842:13
10865:17,18 10866:1	Mpumalanga 10840:1	negotiation 10794:22	objected 10829:6	10853:5 10864:23
10866:11 10867:2,13	<b>Mthethwa</b> 10846:3	10795:4 10798:11	objecting 10814:3	10872:2,21
10867:14,15,16,17,18	10865:5	neutral 10844:16,17	objection 10738:17	ones 10730:25
10868:2,4,9	murder 10775:24	10854:6	10749:23 10764:12	10752:16 10800:22
mistaken 10744:23	10800:6 10834:16	never 10750:3	10813:11,17,19,21	10852:11 10871:23
mistakes 10862:9	10840:17 10845:24	10810:13 10854:23	10814:2 10817:21	ongoing 10736:3,19
mistaking 10784:20	10848:13	new 10730:3,5,9	10818:8,15 10821:15	10738:1 10740:8
misunderstanding	murdered 10801:2	10760:22 10812:2	10821:20 10826:18	10743:4 10751:5
10784:8	murders 10835:14	10700.22 10812.2	10828:2 10829:6	ons 10768:13,14
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
mitigated 10826:8	<b>muti</b> 10767:17,18,20,22	news 10866:19	objectionable 10833:11	10769:3,4,5
mixed 10824:14	10767:22,24	newspaper 10751:9	objections 10786:5	ontsteld 10787:12
<b>Mm</b> 10860:20		10863:8	10827:25 10845:1	<b>op</b> 10790:4,10
<b>moment</b> 10734:15	<u> </u>	newspapers 10866:19	objectively 10771:19	opdragte 10787:14
10737:11 10746:3	named 10776:3	nexus 10778:16	<b>oblige</b> 10870:2	open 10787:1 10825:15
10747:15,16	nameless 10789:17,21	10779:8	observation 10836:21	10842:7
10752:17 10766:4	10789:22,24	night 10809:8 10810:8	observed 10798:8	opening 10745:1
10777:9,10,20	names 10819:11	10810:9	10850:21	10772:9 10777:3,22
10778:24 10837:23	10828:24 10829:21	nine 10740:23,25	obvious 10735:7	10778:17 10786:23
10778.24 10857.25	10828.24 10829.21	10741:6,10,14	10850:19	107791:19 10811:17
10852:5 10865:17				10791:19 10811:17 10824:13 10827:22
	<b>narrow</b> 10795:13,15	10743:7 10800:12,13	<b>obviously</b> 10744:17	
Monday 10736:7	Nathi 10846:2 10865:5	10801:12	10751:16 10759:21	10842:7 10843:25
10776:18 10777:13	National 10731:7	NIU 10832:4	10762:15 10780:16	operate 10805:15
10809:6,8 10810:8	10736:9 10740:6	<b>nobody's</b> 10747:1	10786:7 10817:12	operation 10732:2
monologue 10843:17	10748:5 10749:3,10	<b>nog</b> 10768:16	10825:14 10838:14	10734:24 10735:4,9
months 10770:22	10750:12 10756:13	non 10742:15 10835:11	10841:21,25 10846:5	10773:5,6,9 10776:9
morning 10731:14,16	10760:9,11 10771:17	nonsense 10844:23	10850:9 10852:23	10781:22 10782:7
10817:17 10820:25	10772:5 10791:1,3	non-Lonmin 10795:10	10867:25 10871:20	10805:15 10815:14
10832:2 10846:8	10802:17 10809:21	non-unionised	10872:22	10862:10
10847:10 10868:14	10810:19 10812:6,11	10835:10	occasions 10786:5	operational 10734:6,14
10868:15,15	10816:21 10830:12	normal 10763:4	10817:5,13	10734:16,18 10836:1
10871:22 10872:17	10831:7,11,18	10796:24 10872:6	occurred 10842:11	10838:19 10853:4
10874:8	10832:10,16 10833:5	normally 10776:11	offensive 10823:13,16	10856:7,22 10857:3
mother 10760:11	10837:14,18 10838:1	10869:12	office 10730:12	10859:4,9 10861:21
motherfucker 10764:4	10842:23 10849:10	northern 10760:14,15	10847:18 10873:11	operationalise 10853:6
motivated 10774:17	10849:11,19	North-West 10744:11	10873:16	opinion 10854:16
10780:19 10853:7	10856:13,23,24	<b>note</b> 10753:4	officers 10736:14	10866:21
MOTLOENYA	10857:3,23 10860:16	noted 10732:16	10743:15 10777:7	opinions 10770:14
10754:24 10755:5,9	10874:3,6	NUM 10730:12	<b>oh</b> 10733:1 10758:21	opportunistic 10844:24
10755:12	<b>nature</b> 10793:11	10736:4,20,24	10758:23 10759:7	opportunity 10747:8
move 10751:19	10868:4	10738:1 10739:11	10836:23 10842:8	10786:21 10813:6
10752:15 10763:7	near 10745:24 10825:3	10730:110739:11	10850.25 10842.8	ops 10788:8
				-
10772:7 10774:11	<b>nearly</b> 10843:14	10741:19 10743:5	10872:9 10873:3	order 10734:7,21
10783:4,5,7,8	necessarily 10756:4	10746:6 10747:3	okay 10737:12,19,19	10777:9,10,20
10819:24 10821:4,13	10773:16 10779:22	10794:17 10830:21	10738:23 10740:18	10796:17,18,23
10825:4 10849:1	10819:4 10830:8	10835:14 10844:18	10746:14 10747:9	10797:3 10800:6,23
10855:24 10858:4	10858:13 10859:19	10851:5,9,12,15	10748:11 10750:19	10801:1 10803:24
10860:12,17	10866:22	number 10735:2	10752:14,18 10758:4	10818:12 10826:13
10861:11 10862:1,3	necessary 10807:22	10744:20 10753:7	10762:5 10763:8	10829:5 10834:14
10865:16	10872:15	10754:14 10779:21	10775:11 10777:1,25	10835:9,13 10837:15
moved 10774:23	need 10732:1 10748:13	10779:21 10781:25	10780:24 10781:5,5	10847:2,25 10848:7
10862:1	10755:11 10764:1	10786:4 10795:17	10785:8,15 10786:15	ordinarily 10773:9
moving 10756:9	10750:15 10792:9	10780.4 10793.17	10788:14 10790:14	10859:11 10861:19
10765:24	10770.15 10792.9	10813.24 10810.23	10783.14 10790.14	10859:11 10801:19
		10823:1,22 10827:7		
<b>Mpembe</b> 10746:5	10841:18 10846:15		10795:14,14 10797:6	ordinated 10734:24
10756:22 10783:11	10848:10 10865:19	numbering 10863:18	10798:4 10804:8	ought 10802:18
10783:13 10784:25	needed 10820:10	numbers 10781:8	10805:1 10810:4	outside 10754:11
10785:9 10787:13,21	needn't 10821:14	Nyala 10788:7	10814:11 10816:19	10795:4,20 10874:1
10787:23 10788:25	<b>needs</b> 10734:19		10816:22 10822:22	overall 10792:10
10789:17 10790:3,5	10837:4 10847:15	0	10825:19 10827:6	overheard 10817:18
10806:14,21 10807:4	10848:14	oath 10731:8 10772:5	10829:16 10850:4	10819:18
10868:21 10869:10	neem 10787:13	10811:2 10842:10	10858:8 10860:12	overlapping 10812:2
<b>Mpofu's</b> 10755:14	negotiate 10794:23	10849:12	10861:12	overpowered 10799:5
10765:16 10801:7	10795:3,4,20	object 10738:3	once 10772:8 10777:1	overtures 10858:21
10/05.10 10001.7	10795.5,4,20	<b>0.ject</b> 10750.5		57010010510050.21

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Page	1	1
rayc		

10820:25 10821:3 10778:16 10787:17 plane 10873:25 position 10735:18 108	ident 10830:12,21
	uciii 10050.12,21
	835:2 10846:2
	847:3 10859:6,21
i g i	863:14 10864:19
	866:3,7,10,14,18
pased 10055.2 10017.7 10010.25 positions 10021.9 100	867:2,9 10868:5
	ident's 10870:22
	s 10757:12 10823:3 sure 10828:25
	829:1,3 10831:16
	833:5,8,15 10834:3
	834:12 10843:20
	844:12 10852:9
10777:6 10781:13 <b>perfectly</b> 10834:20 10825:15 10843:15 <b>postponement</b> 10874:7 108	853:13,16 10854:4
	869:16
	umably 10739:24
	760:14 10800:4
	850:3
	ent 10750:24
	ented 10751:18,24 ious 10773:24
	863:25 10864:4
	iously 10733:2
	847:17
	empt 10741:4
	planning 10735:1
	a 10832:25
	arily 10858:8
	ary 10871:23
	cipally 10795:3,23
	<b>cipals</b> 10859:10 <b>ciple</b> 10798:1,7
	812:17
	ciples 10790:16,19
	802:24
	ate 10744:21
	745:6 10768:2,4
	778:21 10816:25
	820:3
	y 10821:7
	832:25 10852:23 ctively 10735:4
	ably 10735:24
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	743:24 10763:24
	768:20 10864:12
	lem 10746:1
10752:7 10774:25 <b>picture</b> 10778:18 10837:13 10856:22 10802:19 107	770:8 10814:10
	831:22 10835:5
	836:5 10849:1
	870:12,13 10871:2
	lems 10832:19
	edure 10735:2 eed 10738:22
	746:21 10754:3
	810:10 10817:19
	eedings 10730:1
	747:1 10754:20
partly 10852:23 10771:10 10773:5 10850:19 10847:1 10851:1 proce	ess 10798:10,20
	805:13
	essed 10823:2
	esses 10771:8
	<b>ured</b> 10822:14
	uce 10845:5
	luced 10775:1 843:22,23,23
	uction 10792:24

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

### Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				1 490 1
productive 10846:17	protestors 10807:6	quickly 10765:9	10830:6 10850:14	referred 10732:24
-				
professional 10765:3	provided 10785:22	10811:24	reads 10761:14	10791:2 10798:11
10777:9,11,21	10821:25	quiet 10843:11	10762:14 10769:2	10799:22 10812:6
10778:6 10780:20	<b>Provincial</b> 10744:10	quietly 10754:23	10866:18	10818:5 10832:1
10781:14	10745:23 10749:2	quit 10865:5	ready 10768:12	10837:19 10856:20
professionalism	10776:21,22	quite 10749:16	10769:1 10868:21,22	10863:24
-	·			
10764:18 10765:5,22	10782:13,16 10784:3	10763:19 10810:21	real 10740:20 10800:24	referring 10764:7
10775:6 10778:12	10788:3 10819:11	10810:24 10818:7	10801:4 10808:9,10	10768:4 10775:10
10779:19	10847:18 10857:15	10824:25 10831:15	10859:13 10862:3	10817:12 10866:3
profit 10798:15	10857:24 10858:7	10863:25 10868:22	realised 10778:2	refers 10768:2
profound 10730:11	provisions 10734:16	quote 10746:12	10788:1	reflect 10764:22
-		-		
programmes 10866:19	10813:23,25	10851:9 10864:17	reality 10748:20	reflected 10739:8
progress 10730:13	<b>public</b> 10734:7	quote/unquote 10821:2	really 10737:6 10739:3	reformulate 10738:21
10795:15	10791:12 10796:17	10828:19 10866:12	10764:13 10769:7	10802:11 10808:16
prolonging 10846:16	10796:18,23 10797:3		10770:14 10776:7	10814:12 10818:14
promise 10735:15	punch 10765:1	R	10797:1 10801:25	10827:20 10833:11
10743:3 10852:13	punctuate 10816:16	rabbit 10845:5	10807:13,15	10848:19 10849:6
10864:13	<b>punish</b> 10823:15	radio 10820:12	10809:22,24 10812:4	10852:11
promises 10870:9	purely 10836:9,19	radios 10820:2,8	10814:3 10815:8	reformulated 10801:16
prompted 10764:14	purpose 10738:18	10854:7	10826:23 10851:25	refuse 10839:11
proper 10834:21	10774:14	railway 10806:12,21	10860:13 10868:17	refusing 10824:16
		-		refute 10775:22
10835:3 10847:1,14	purposes 10735:1	10807:24	reason 10732:18	
10858:16 10866:7	<b>pursue</b> 10782:23	raise 10813:10	10744:21 10752:25	10855:21
properly 10779:9	purview 10856:21	raised 10794:25	10762:20 10771:1	refutes 10855:20
10793:11 10834:18	pushing 10802:1	10811:17 10840:19	10784:4 10805:24	regard 10802:23
property 10796:20	puts 10746:2 10796:7	10845:11	10811:23 10852:24	10809:9
	10814:22		10811.23 10832.24	
10800:7 10801:2		raising 10850:16		regarding 10831:3
10834:16 10835:15	putting 10737:2	Ramaphosa 10831:3,6	reasonable 10823:8	10837:13
proposing 10762:6	10738:2 10740:11	10831:23 10841:24	reasons 10782:7	regret 10750:12
10869:25	10741:1 10742:13	10842:4,15 10843:24	10786:25 10811:15	10756:10
proposition 10776:6	10770:14 10772:8,16	10845:21 10846:21	10850:19 10854:17	regularly 10837:12
10778:1,8,9 10780:3	10772:22 10774:21	10846:22 10848:12	<b>rebut</b> 10823:25	rejected 10865:4
10780:7,7,8,23	10776:7 10778:1	10850:13	recall 10733:3	relate 10750:13
10781:6 10786:9	10779:11,13 10780:3	rationally 10771:18	10842:13 10850:1	10858:20
10787:2,7 10789:3,12	10780:7,8,8,11,23	<b>RDOs</b> 10824:16	recalled 10843:2	related 10830:10
10790:2,6 10798:5	10786:9 10787:3,7	reached 10809:25	recapitulate 10847:5	10833:7
10802:16 10807:16	10790:2,7 10800:16	10841:4	receivable 10854:16	relates 10736:15
10813:23 10815:17	10806:4 10807:16	react 10779:2	receive 10835:8	10757:18 10812:4,7,8
10817:10 10820:1,4	10808:25 10815:24	reaction 10736:23	10867:9	10848:21
10820:21 10821:11	10824:22 10829:17	10864:24	received 10740:15	relating 10841:23
10823:19 10824:9,10	10829:22 10834:5	read 10732:20	10745:17 10753:4	relation 10811:25
10825:12 10826:2	10835:20,24 10852:8	10733:18,22 10734:2	10814:13 10831:12	10832:17 10854:3,4
10835:18 10841:2,10	10852:21,24	10734:11,25 10735:7	10835:7 10844:10	relations 10820:24
10852:16,18	10856:17 10870:24	10751:9 10752:25	10850:8 10866:22	10837:2 10859:21
10853:16 10856:17	<b>pyp</b> 10761:15 10763:10	10760:23,25 10761:2	10867:4	relationship 10811:19
		· ·	receives 10837:12	
propositions 10785:19	10763:12,16	10761:14 10763:8,10		10812:19,21
10813:13,25		10764:3 10767:16	recipient 10835:25	10814:10 10818:12
10815:21,25	Q	10768:11 10770:16	recollection 10783:21	10824:22 10844:1,3
10816:15 10818:17	qualified 10800:4	10770:18 10778:16	10784:13	10844:14,22,23
10819:23 10822:18	qualify 10773:20	10787:17,17 10789:2	record 10732:25	10856:18
10825:3 10827:8	quarter 10849:6	10789:19 10791:11	10733:15 10757:19	relative 10799:3
10828:10 10833:23	10871:10 10872:9,10	10811:17 10812:5	10782:20 10814:7	relay 10748:18
	-			
10841:2,6 10847:8	questioning 10802:10	10817:16,24 10818:6	10826:5 10828:23	relayed 10744:2,18
10852:4,13 10855:7	10812:17 10813:11	10818:8,9 10820:5	recorded 10820:8,12	relevance 10738:19,24
10870:25	10841:22 10850:13	10827:22 10829:17	10862:5	10751:10 10752:16
protagonists 10797:12	questions 10731:11	10829:24 10830:3,10	recording 10757:3,8,11	relevant 10735:5
10799:19	10742:11 10771:15	10830:11 10844:2,3	10757:13,19	10741:23 10765:23
<b>Protea</b> 10822:1,1,2,3		, ,	recourse 10847:14	10864:15
	10782:1,15 10785:17	10863:23 10864:12		
protect 10834:22	10802:2 10813:13	10865:14 10866:5	recovery 10731:3	relied 10735:13
10845:3	10841:1 10842:24	10871:6 10872:20	reduce 10825:17	10844:6 10853:15
protesters 10743:9	10861:14 10864:1,14	reader 10829:13	refer 10732:18 10736:1	religious 10797:5
10744:20 10747:24	10864:14,16	readily 10859:12	10759:19 10817:14	rely 10733:17 10816:15
10748:1 10793:5,9	10869:22,24	reading 10738:24	reference 10736:1	10816:20,23 10820:4
10797:9 10821:5,9	10809.22,24	10764:20,21	10743:15 10748:8	10844:13,15
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
10823:7 10824:14	quick 10754:18	10766:11 10819:17	10767:25 10795:12	relying 10841:16
10854:6	quicker 10732:24	10829:25 10830:4,5,6	10813:23 10824:15	remain 10771:14
ARCHIVE EO	R LUSTICE			

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

**RealTime Transcriptions** 

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

Page	13

				Page 1
remainder 10808:8	10785:25 10791:12	re-examination	10817:17,18 10820:7	<b>se</b> 10739:14
remained 10763:1	10705.25 10791.12	10850:4,8 10855:18	10817.17,18 10820.7	seated 10768:4
		-		
remaining 10869:18	10861:3	rhetorical 10821:6,12	10830:25 10831:8,9	seating 10756:11
remarks 10731:6	requisite 10779:18	<b>ride</b> 10844:25	10831:12 10832:12	seats 10753:8
remember 10731:24	10809:17 10810:7	rifles 10827:17,19	10832:13 10849:24	Sebatchane 10768:14
10732:3,8 10733:13	10854:9	right 10737:16	10853:14 10867:10	10769:7,8,8
10733:13,15 10734:9	reserve 10819:21	10743:21 10747:13	satisfied 10762:14	second 10730:3,15
10760:8,10 10761:10	10850:9	10759:18 10763:8	10847:16,19	10737:24 10743:4
10774:22,23	reserved 10819:22	10764:20 10765:6	satisfy 10757:20	10763:13,17 10764:6
10776:19 10779:25	residing 10827:14	10766:1,1 10767:12	10762:12	10814:4,4 10823:25
	-	-		
10781:24,25	resolved 10837:4	10799:1 10804:5,6	Saturday 10873:12	10824:10 10833:17
10782:12,14 10785:9	resolving 10752:8	10805:7 10815:23	save 10733:6 10767:9	10834:9 10839:21
10790:17 10811:16	resonate 10805:25	10822:14 10839:18	10769:23 10791:17	10840:8 10845:10
10811:19 10815:6	respect 10738:16	10843:23 10857:18	saw 10778:18 10823:13	10851:13 10854:19
10822:10 10830:5	10741:4 10749:6	10861:13 10862:21	10864:23	10863:19
10831:24 10833:14	10750:14 10764:3	10864:5,6	saying 10737:24	Secondly 10819:9
10834:1 10835:21	10784:9 10786:4	rightful 10833:21	10739:3,6 10744:21	10829:18
10836:2,11 10842:6	10807:15 10812:20	rights 10797:3	10748:9,14 10753:14	second-hand 10739:5
10843:21	10820:18 10829:5,13	10834:22 10850:9	10757:11 10762:3	secretary 10851:13
remind 10767:9	10820.18 10829.3,13	right-hand 10863:9	10763:6 10768:5	section 10790:24
		8		
10811:1	10840:23 10846:4	ring 10857:13	10771:16,19	10791:1,10,15
reminded 10784:12	10866:2	<b>rise</b> 10785:23	10779:15 10780:4,4	10798:25 10812:4,5,7
10871:17	respects 10814:19	risk 10762:16	10780:11,13	10868:17
reminding 10862:11	respond 10770:9,17	rivalry 10826:9	10783:12 10787:10	sections 10791:6
<b>remove</b> 10780:17	10786:17 10850:10	role 10739:14 10741:2	10789:21 10794:6,21	secure 10847:1
10788:4,6	responded 10778:22	10741:7,25 10743:13	10801:20,23 10802:6	10848:13
removed 10751:6	response 10777:8,10,20	10843:15 10857:9	10804:11,12	security 10847:10,14
10777:14,17 10778:5	10794:2 10831:6	10859:10 10860:16	10805:10 10815:24	10847:16 10848:9
10778:12 10780:16	10847:20 10851:6	roles 10837:17,25	10805.10 10815.24	10865:11,11
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
10781:9,12,12,20	10863:2,12	10857:8 10858:19,22	10827:12,21	see 10731:1,5 10741:14
10782:7,9,11	responsibilities	10860:9	10833:14 10834:19	10745:17 10754:3,17
removing 10860:17	10790:25 10856:14	room 10751:6	10837:20 10848:11	10758:7 10761:18,19
render 10777:9,11,21	10858:20 10860:9,11	10753:11	10853:5 10855:8,9	10767:5 10769:4
10778:5 10780:20	responsibility 10734:17	rooms 10779:4	10859:12 10865:5	10770:20 10776:23
10781:14	10858:23	round 10731:22	10868:20	10778:15,17 10782:4
repeat 10756:14	responsible 10734:23	10769:23	says 10734:5,12,21,22	10787:11 10804:11
10786:24 10796:3	10765:7 10772:15	rounded 10769:24	10735:2 10742:4	10804:24 10806:1
10700.24 10790.5	10773:1,17 10791:4	row 10754:7,16	10733.2 10742.4	10808:18,24
	-			
repeated 10739:24	10844:19 10845:7,8	rubber 10820:16	10747:8 10749:12	10809:23 10817:4
repeatedly 10803:21	10865:7	rudimentary 10798:13	10762:14 10763:12	10818:19 10838:5
10860:19	rest 10786:14 10795:16	rule 10751:15 10752:13	10765:19 10768:1,2	10839:4 10843:10
		<b>multing</b> $10740.1621$		
repeating 10847:17	10850:21 10853:20	ruling 10749:16,21	10769:2 10772:10	10851:23 10853:25
<b>repeating</b> 10847:17 <b>rephrase</b> 10856:16	10850:21 10853:20 10857:17	10750:20 10786:1	10769:2 10772:10 10777:7 10778:4	
				10851:23 10853:25
rephrase 10856:16	10857:17	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11
<b>rephrase</b> 10856:16 <b>report</b> 10820:12 10863:13	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 <b>seek</b> 10749:21 10873:18
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 <b>run</b> 10811:23 <b>running</b> 10770:5 <b>rushed</b> 10736:10 <b>Rustenburg</b> 10851:11 <b>Ryland</b> 10761:14 10764:9 <b>Rylands</b> 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>Saam 10787:12 10790:4</u>	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 say-so 10829:22 scanned 10849:22 scarcely 10838:22	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 say-so 10829:22 scanned 10849:22 scarcely 10838:22 scene 10744:24	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10755:19,23
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12 require 10735:8	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10755:19,23 10757:18 10763:3
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10755:19,23
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12 require 10735:8 10776:15 10791:25	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3 revenge 10774:17 reverse 10752:24	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>Saam 10787:12 10790:4</u> 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14 SANDF 10851:10	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18 <b>sciences</b> 10792:20	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10755:19,23 10757:18 10763:3
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12 require 10735:8 10776:15 10791:25 required 10808:11	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3 revenge 10774:17 reverse 10752:24 revisited 10733:12	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14 SANDF 10851:10 10870:21 SAPS 10736:2	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18 <b>sciences</b> 10792:20 <b>scientist</b> 10792:13 <b>screen</b> 10753:15	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10757:18 10763:3 10764:8,11 10765:10 10765:15 10770:25
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12 require 10735:8 10776:15 10791:25 required 10808:11 10859:2	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3 revenge 10774:17 reverse 10752:24 revisited 10733:12 re-characterise	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14 SANDF 10851:10 10870:21 SAPS 10736:2 10747:24 10757:4,13	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 say-so 10829:22 scanned 10849:22 scarcely 10838:22 scene 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18 sciences 10792:20 scientist 10792:13 screen 10753:15	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10757:18 10763:3 10764:8,11 10765:10 10765:15 10770:25 10773:12 10775:17
rephrase 10856:16 report 10820:12 10863:13 reported 10820:7,8 10832:11 reports 10789:19 10847:9 represent 10772:24 representation 10835:7 representatives 10812:13 10815:10 represented 10753:6 request 10749:16 10844:18 requested 10820:14 10830:25 10850:1 10869:2 requests 10831:6 10837:12 require 10735:8 10776:15 10791:25 required 10808:11	10857:17 restarted 10862:6 restoration 10847:2 restore 10797:2 restored 10796:24 rests 10848:22 result 10746:6,10 10747:2 10845:17,18 10846:6 10853:14 results 10791:20 resume 10810:19,22 10849:6 resumed 10772:19 resumes 10730:2 10772:3,4 10810:17 10849:8,9 10873:22 10873:23 retained 10790:24 reticence 10828:3 revenge 10774:17 reverse 10752:24 revisited 10733:12	10750:20 10786:1 10826:13 run 10811:23 running 10770:5 rushed 10736:10 Rustenburg 10851:11 Ryland 10761:14 10764:9 Rylands 10758:14,18 10758:20 10761:4,22 10766:4 10769:15 Ryland's 10759:3 <u>S</u> saam 10787:12 10790:4 10790:10 sacrosanct 10798:7 sake 10770:22 10795:14 SANDF 10851:10 10870:21 SAPS 10736:2	10777:7 10778:4 10785:2,6,8 10787:11 10791:19 10797:21 10805:24 10815:19 10817:15 10818:13 10819:14 10820:6,7 10827:24 10837:9,14 10837:16 10838:10 10839:8,9 10845:20 10851:9,12,17 10854:20 10857:13 10863:1,1,12,19 <b>say-so</b> 10829:22 <b>scanned</b> 10849:22 <b>scarcely</b> 10838:22 <b>scene</b> 10744:24 10761:6 10778:23 10779:7 10788:5,6 10796:7 10832:18 <b>sciences</b> 10792:20 <b>scientist</b> 10792:13 <b>screen</b> 10753:15	10851:23 10853:25 10863:18 10867:21 10872:3 10873:11 seek 10749:21 10873:18 seeking 10755:13 10848:9 seeks 10847:24 seen 10761:6 10803:21 segregation 10837:17 10837:25 self-defence 10744:24 10778:21 10779:14 semantics 10794:13 10840:15 Semenya 10736:25 10737:17 10738:9,11 10745:2,10,11 10745:2,10,11 10748:6,7 10755:13 10757:18 10763:3 10764:8,11 10765:10 10765:15 10770:25

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Page	1	4
rayc		т

				Faye I
10776:14,15	10854:4	10848:12 10851:8	10871:17 10873:3	10857:1,5 10859:16
10777:16,22	seventh 10822:18	similarly 10740:19	sort 10737:6 10763:4	spiel 10844:20
10781:15,16,18,23	severe 10823:12	simple 10735:6	10775:1 10782:3	spirit 10798:24
10783:17,18,23	Shabangu 10845:21	10781:6 10790:6	107792:2	10799:1 10812:24
	0			
10785:13,16	shaded 10793:7	10792:23,25 10836:3	sorts 10762:21	split 10822:20
10786:11,16	shaft 10823:1	10849:16 10856:17	Sotho 10760:14,15,16	<b>spoke</b> 10809:7 10813:1
10791:11 10802:15	shapes 10797:4	10860:13 10861:3	10760:20	10814:5 10815:1,9
10803:10,15	<b>share</b> 10867:14	simplistically 10845:13	sought 10835:25	10820:19 10828:23
10807:13,19	<b>shared</b> 10820:2	simply 10752:19	10852:1	<b>spoken</b> 10743:25
10818:21,22,24	sheet 10820:13	10770:24 10780:4	sound 10825:7	10768:23 10802:18
10819:3,13,15,21	she'll 10733:24,25	10826:14 10835:20	sounds 10768:23	10809:12 10817:2
10829:8,10,12,18	<b>she's</b> 10805:10	10845:13 10851:4,14	10770:12	<b>spot</b> 10862:2
10849:25 10856:11	10810:21 10814:6	10861:2	soundtrack 10761:4,7	springboard 10858:4
10857:7,21 10859:12	10815:18,20,22	sir 10821:15 10826:14	10761:8	spur 10865:17 10866:2
10861:8 10869:8,17	10813.10,20,22	sit 10321.15 10320.14 sit 10753:6,11 10768:25	sources 10866:20	10867:2
10869:23 10870:2,13	10844:10 10855:11	10771:2 10869:19	South 10772:10	<b>spurn</b> 10814:17
10870:14 10871:4,7	10860:19 10861:8	site 10799:13	10823:8 10863:15	<b>SS2</b> 10734:21
10873:24 10874:2,3	10870:7	sitting 10755:4 10769:1	Southern 10760:15	stabilised 10837:5
Semenya's 10739:9	<b>shift</b> 10873:11	10773:18 10869:11	so-and-so 10815:1	<b>stability</b> 10797:3
10741:4	<b>shit</b> 10767:20,24	situation 10734:7,12,14	10859:14	stage 10730:21
semi-automatic	<b>shoot</b> 10787:24	10734:20 10735:12	so-called 10735:14	10735:13 10745:24
10827:17,19	10820:11	10753:2 10778:19	10830:9 10853:2	10747:11 10783:2
send 10835:17	shooting 10730:12	10788:2 10792:22	10857:1 10860:5	10800:13 10806:17
senior 10736:14	10865:10	10793:3 10831:10	10867:18 10868:1	10809:17 10841:5
10743:14	shootings 10744:12	10837:5 10840:11	space 10753:7	10845:24
sense 10739:9,10	<b>shore</b> 10841:17	situational 10734:5,17	speak 10779:3	stages 10827:23
10774:17 10778:12	short 10733:10 10775:2	situations 10792:8,21	10792:15 10795:9	stakeholders 10805:23
10862:3	10870:24	10812:18 10837:14	10799:5 10802:25	10809:25 10810:2
		six 10802:17 10854:4		
sent 10748:17 10784:4	shorten 10811:14		10803:1 10804:4	10815:15
10824:14 10859:20	10812:9	sixth 10822:17 10864:1	10805:11 10807:23	stand 10823:19
sentence 10766:19	<b>shot</b> 10744:20,23,24	skirmish 10799:23	10810:9 10815:9	10856:9
10767:7	10745:3,4 10764:4	slaat 10768:15 10769:7	10857:15,22,23	standards 10764:17
Senzeni 10830:12,21	<b>shouldn't</b> 10742:10	10769:8	10858:7,9 10859:14	10765:2,22
Seoka 10747:23	10759:6 10765:10	small 10870:21	10861:23	standing 10734:21
10750:23	10856:24 10861:25	Smith 10863:14	speakers 10805:8,11	standpoint 10756:19
Seoka's 10751:7	10869:14 10870:12	social 10792:13,20	speaking 10767:20	10756:20 10867:16
separate 10856:2	10870:13,25	10796:19 10797:4	10768:1,3,5,11	stands 10860:25
Sepedi 10760:10,12,13	<b>show</b> 10766:7,7,8	society 10772:13,25	10810:8 10856:25	standstill 10800:15
10760:13 10805:7,11	10777:2 10779:5,22	10792:13 10837:13	10859:11,15	Star 10844:2,4,5
Sergeant 10857:13	10792:11 10840:10	soldiers 10866:16	10861:17 10871:24	start 10730:5 10760:19
series 10815:21	showed 10772:17	sole 10780:4,12	<b>speaks</b> 10760:14	10770:14 10804:10
10841:2,6 10852:3	10810:7	somebody 10762:3	10764:6 10771:1	10864:8 10865:8
10870:24	showing 10749:8	10873:11	10857:15	10870:7
serious 10771:14,17	10772:21	somebody's 10772:17	special 10750:15	started 10732:10
10820:21	shown 10773:14	someone's 10751:2	10851:10,17	10733:11 10754:19
served 10827:14			specially 10872:16	
	10778:14 10779:17 10782:20 10872:15	somewhat 10856:2 sommer 10768:14		10756:21 10773:12 10774:24 10787:7
10869:19			<b>specific</b> 10733:21	
service 10745:4	shows 10863:2,12	10769:4,5	10734:15,15 10823:9	10805:14 10832:6
10761:5 10770:3	side 10754:8 10798:17	soon 10868:22	specifically 10737:9	10850:15 10869:2
10772:10 10777:8,9	10801:10 10802:25	10872:16	10783:10 10803:12	10870:6
10777:11,21 10778:6	10803:1,5,6,12	sorry 10735:21	10804:6 10812:6	starting 10773:14
10780:20 10781:14	10804:4 10808:19	10736:17 10741:3	10817:14	state 10868:24 10870:3
10791:5,12,21	10812:13 10827:13	10747:25 10754:24	specificity 10776:16	stated 10740:22
10857:17 10866:23	10827:14,16	10757:4 10758:11	speech 10779:6	10743:9 10826:21
Sesotho 10759:12,22	10833:16,16,23	10759:16,19	10813:4,5,7,7	statement 10735:21,22
10760:1,1 10761:12	10834:14,14,25	10760:21 10775:25	speeches 10845:1	10736:23 10738:25
10766:11,14	10835:8,8,16 10836:1	10787:16 10791:18	speedy 10731:3	10739:1,2,4,8,24
10767:20 10768:1,3,6	10856:22	10806:4 10809:3	spelt 10772:12	10740:2,19,21
10768:11 10770:2	sides 10797:19 10823:9	10829:9,9 10830:2,17	spend 10731:22	10744:1 10745:1
session 10873:12	10854:11	10829.9,910830.2,17	spending 10807:14	10744.1 10745.1
set 10782:8 10816:13	sidetracked 10796:10	10835:5,19 10841:7	sphere 10856:7,7,8,19	10757.4 10765.12
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			-	
10845:24 10847:8	signed 10849:20,22	10842:17,17	10856:22 10857:3	10772:9,20 10773:16
10859:15	significantly 10828:14	10849:10 10850:5	10859:5,9 10860:5	10777:3,6,15,15,23
Setati 10753:9,14,22	10842:22	10852:20 10853:12	10861:18,21	10778:7,17 10782:22
10754:4,13,25	Silence 10816:22	10853:13 10859:18	10865:25	10783:1,24 10784:12
seven 10802:18	similar 10844:18	10863:1,5 10868:25	spheres 10856:10	10784:13,23 10785:5
ARCHIVE FO	R JUSTICE	1	<u> </u>	I

RealTime Transcriptions

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

Pa	age	1	5

-				Page 15
10785:14 10786:23	studied 10792:20	10772:12 10782:11	tape 10762:15	10873:2 10874:5
10789:20 10791:19	subcontracted	10772:12 10782:11	targeted 10777:7	thanked 10749:13
10794:14 10811:17	10822:14	10798:24 10804:14	task 10851:10,17	10772:13
10811:20 10816:11	subject 10791:1	10806:16 10811:9	tea 10754:6 10772:1	<b>theme</b> 10844:7
10817:15 10818:4,24	10811:23 10814:1	10814:18,20	10827:14 10848:16	<b>theory</b> 10742:15
10819:3 10820:4	10818:20 10822:2	10821:22 10823:23	10849:4	<b>therapy</b> 10782:6
10821:23 10824:13	10836:5,6 10871:14	10832:3,7 10854:18	team 10762:10 10770:4	thereof 10734:22
10827:22 10828:22	subjected 10834:15	10855:21 10856:15	10805:16	10775:16 10796:5,6
10829:4,18,25	submission 10844:14	10861:10 10866:17	telephone 10810:20	there'll 10753:12
10830:3,16 10831:20	10844:15,24 10845:7	10866:21 10869:25	10832:15	10755:23 10756:19
10837:9 10838:10,13	10845:8	10871:8 10873:19	telephoned 10788:2	there's 10738:17
10837.9 10838.10,13	submissions 10846:21		telephones 10847:20	
		surely 10741:23		10739:23 10751:1
10846:24 10849:19	10848:18	10742:7 10827:2	telephonic 10830:23	10757:11 10758:21
10849:21,22 10850:1	submit 10764:22	10835:17 10836:12	10831:2	10758:21 10767:17
10850:15 10851:9	submitted 10820:5	surprised 10843:11	television 10753:12	10767:17,22,22
10856:10 10857:7	subsequent 10742:6	surrounding 10851:12	10866:19	10770:12 10784:11
10862:18 10863:23	substance 10844:9,11	Susan 10845:20	tell 10733:25 10762:2	10785:23 10786:8
10866:5	substantiate 10818:12	suspect 10768:19	10763:21 10765:11	10793:15 10794:17
statements 10739:24	10845:6	10769:11,16	10769:16 10799:22	10794:19 10796:18
10745:16 10769:24	succeed 10834:4	suspicion 10795:10	10803:8 10807:9	10800:5,6 10811:9
10745.1010709.24	10843:4	sustained 10731:4	10803.8 10807.9	10806.5,010811.9
10773:21 10786:22	successful 10845:15	system 10735:3	10827.10 10839.10	10810.1 10821.20
		e e		
10787:8 10794:15	successfully 10743:11	systems 10795:21	10874:1	10831:21 10832:3,7
10812:23 10817:4	succinctly 10848:23	<b>s.u.o</b> 10731:12 10811:6	telling 10806:3	10832:14,15 10834:1
static 10751:1	sudden 10846:8		tension 10798:11	10834:13 10835:13
stating 10785:18	sufficient 10847:16,19	T	terms 10734:15	10836:3 10839:19
station 10823:3	sufficiently 10816:21	table 10810:24	10769:19 10773:5	10840:7 10841:4
10857:14	10851:19	10849:19	10778:9 10792:16	10844:11 10868:18
statutory 10812:25	suggest 10730:19	take 10734:13,17	10856:18 10857:2	10870:20,21
10813:23,24	10738:20 10752:15	10750:4 10755:15	10860:10 10870:19	10871:11,20
stay 10753:20	10753:18 10765:17	10756:2 10761:14	terrain 10842:10	<b>thesis</b> 10847:6
steeds 10768:17	10766:3 10774:11	10766:11 10771:4,25	teruggeloop 10787:12	<b>They'd</b> 10832:6,8
10769:21			test 10760:7	
	10798:5 10862:2	10788:8 10789:10		<b>they'll</b> 10762:16
step 10750:23 10868:1	10872:24	10790:17 10793:10	testified 10777:3	they're 10754:12
stepping 10860:14	suggested 10740:9	10796:19 10799:9	10819:8 10830:13,22	10760:19 10765:21
steps 10777:8 10784:15	10742:24 10750:3	10806:7 10810:5	10841:24 10842:16	10779:20 10815:22
10791:21	10754:5 10770:2	10825:6 10837:14	10856:21	10846:22
<b>STF</b> 10832:5	10833:4 10837:20	10840:23 10841:4	testimony 10853:24	they've 10761:9
stick 10767:6 10814:21	10853:10	10848:16 10849:4	thank 10730:7,22	10872:3,14
stomach 10769:10	suggesting 10776:2	10856:3 10857:16	10731:4,7,14,20	<b>they'd</b> 10808:4
stone 10860:14	10779:21 10795:16	10858:14 10861:8	10734:2,20 10736:12	10809:12
stood 10805:4	10801:6 10803:3,5	10862:17 10863:15	10736:17 10742:25	thicket 10849:13
stop 10754:20 10836:7	10828:3 10837:23	10863:17 10868:13	10747:20 10750:22	thing 10730:8 10752:19
strength 10843:3	10828:5 10837:25	10869:8 10870:8,16	10747.20 10750.22	10754:5 10767:16
		10809:8 10870:8,10		
strictly 10845:16	suggestion 10808:11		10758:25 10760:6	10769:4,5,6 10770:16
strike 10793:16,21	10828:24,25 10829:2	taken 10744:13	10761:25 10762:22	10796:5,6 10825:16
10794:4,11 10796:4,8	10852:8	10761:4 10774:3	10766:24 10767:8	10829:22,23
10796:12 10800:1,3	suggests 10739:4	10784:15 10795:7,24	10769:22 10770:19	10833:17,17
10800:14,18	10775:24 10834:12	10796:20 10823:1,2	10772:2,6,6 10773:21	10838:15 10847:12
strikers 10748:17	10857:12	10838:11 10854:11	10774:1 10780:21	10853:7 10865:8
10793:16 10795:3,8	suitable 10872:7	10863:6 10865:12	10781:5 10782:19	10866:10 10870:22
10795:20 10796:15	summing 10858:3	takes 10799:24	10783:7 10788:10,13	10871:11 10873:13
10801:12 10805:18	<b>Sun</b> 10846:12	10802:12 10825:5	10790:14 10799:12	things 10733:10
10805:21 10806:6	superadded 10800:22	10842:22	10799:17 10802:10	10739:21 10749:7
10807:10 10808:6	support 10829:15	talk 10789:24 10793:16	10802:14 10804:20	10755:21 10749:7
10809:13 10810:9	supports 10786:9	10801:13 10803:12	10802.14 10804.20	10753.21 10762.21
10809.15 10810.9			10807.1 10810.25	10766:8,9 10770:20
	suppose 10772:11	10810:1 10811:10		
strikes 10793:24	10858:8 10864:9	10815:14	10816:8,19 10819:25	10771:11,18
10824:19	supposed 10796:21	talking 10756:21	10825:21,24,24	10772:10,18
striking 10808:6	10797:5	10760:19 10784:1,9	10826:3,6 10832:23	10773:14,15,19
10848:3 10865:8	supposing 10744:15	10784:10 10801:10	10832:24 10838:21	10777:16 10779:15
strive 10810:1	suppress 10777:20	10802:7 10807:10	10843:5 10849:23	10779:17,18
strong 10775:2	suppressing 10777:8	10810:2,14 10859:14	10850:3,5,6 10854:1	10781:12 10782:23
structured 10856:18	10777:10	10867:16	10855:23 10856:1	10786:2 10794:16
structures 10730:14	sure 10754:13,14,19	talks 10790:25	10858:5 10860:4	10795:22 10799:11
10793:17 10795:5,6	10763:15,19 10771:1	tame 10824:19	10864:17 10868:16	10802:5 10812:9
A R C H I V F F O			1000.117 10000.10	10002.0 10012.9

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Faye I
10814:23 10819:7	10787:23 10844:13	travel 10871:20	unclear 10748:8	unqualified 10817:11
10820:18 10833:21	10844:20 10848:14	treatment 10846:18	10770:11	unrealistic 10835:18
10845:18 10846:9	10860:9 10871:19	<b>tribunal</b> 10767:9	underlying 10796:5	<b>unrest</b> 10837:3 10865:6
10847:17 10850:21	<b>TOKOTA</b> 10870:15	tried 10750:23	understand 10730:6,13	10871:21
10852:21 10854:7	told 10736:18 10737:3	10751:12 10809:11	10731:10 10737:1	upheld 10786:5
10856:8,23 10859:15	10741:18 10744:10	trigger 10735:13	10745:1,7,17	uphold 10752:1
10868:19 10871:6	10745:22 10750:7	trivialise 10837:6	10746:18,19	upset 10787:19
thinking 10758:11	10751:9 10754:10	trivialised 10837:8	10748:21 10751:10	10810:24
10805:25	10785:21 10795:19	trouble 10824:8	10759:22 10760:15	upstairs 10762:11
thinks 10833:20	10795:25 10816:10	<b>TRT</b> 10779:24 10832:5	10762:3 10764:14	<b>upwards</b> 10861:22
third 10743:5 10834:1	10835:22 10836:7	true 10737:22,23	10765:16 10774:4	up-to-date 10732:1
thirdly 10789:22	10853:6 10869:7	10791:14 10801:11	10777:23 10780:23	up-to-the-minute
thought 10730:16	10872:2,14 10873:24	10806:10 10836:13	10780:25 10781:2,2	10735:4,8
10737:13 10739:16	10874:1	truth 10791:23		
			10790:11 10792:18	urgent 10810:20
10766:8 10799:23	tomorrow 10755:2,4	try 10754:15 10769:23	10793:1 10801:9	use 10763:5 10792:16
10800:9 10803:3	10868:14,15	10804:4 10827:20	10802:3 10803:17,19	10818:11 10820:16
10809:18 10824:24	tongue 10760:11	10845:12 10856:16	10803:25 10805:9	10823:10 10840:3
10862:1	top 10753:25 10820:9	10873:1	10807:14 10808:23	10842:1 10854:7,7
<b>threat</b> 10788:3,6	10863:9,19	trying 10733:10	10810:19,21,24	<b>useful</b> 10814:18
,	topic 10828:13	10807:21 10840:10	10810:19,21,24	
threatened 10783:13			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>uses</b> 10755:14
10783:13 10784:23	10833:14 10847:23	<b>Tshwane</b> 10857:14	10815:25 10824:25	usually 10768:25
10788:24 10824:4	totally 10745:19	Tuesday 10731:19,20	10827:20 10833:7	utterances 10765:12
threateners 10788:15	10764:15 10835:17	10809:9	10841:18 10842:18	uttered 10801:3
threats 10783:11	<b>Town</b> 10835:1	turf 10746:6,10	10856:11 10857:9	
10784:13,14,15	10845:21	turn 10734:3 10751:3	10860:6 10868:12	V
10790:3,7,10 10801:3	toxic 10811:18,18	10873:7	10871:11,12	vague 10738:14
three 10734:9 10820:20	10824:22 10825:7	turned 10738:9	understandable	valid 10760:6 10827:12
throw 10865:18	10827:19 10841:4	10744:20 10781:16	10770:20	10844:13 10874:7
thrust 10852:9	10844:1,14	10782:1 10823:12,23	understanding 10779:8	validly 10845:11
Thursday 10755:5	to-the-minute	10827:15,17	10790:13 10860:11	<b>van</b> 10787:11 10820:5
10868:15 10869:10	10747:22	turning 10827:18	10867:4	10820:19 10857:14
10872:17 10873:12	<b>trade</b> 10795:9	<b>TV</b> 10763:4	understands 10856:16	vang 10768:14 10769:3
10874:4,8	tradition 10867:20	<b>two</b> 10736:3,19	understood 10746:17	10769:5
tien 10768:15 10769:7	traditional 10864:25	10740:8 10741:8	10769:16 10820:14	variety 10866:20
10769:8	tragedy 10824:20	10746:10 10770:22	10852:10	various 10739:13
<b>till</b> 10818:14	10859:4 10866:2	10773:7 10779:21	<b>undue</b> 10841:15	10793:23 10797:4
time 10731:23	trans 10768:12	10782:2 10788:7	10848:8,21 10852:8	10809:25,25
10732:20 10733:7	transcribed 10761:9	10789:19 10793:13	10848.8,21 10852.8	10809.23,23
10734:8 10738:1	transcript 10758:13,18	10794:16 10797:12	undueness 10848:22	vehicle 10788:7
10740:4 10749:20	10758:20 10759:2,9	10797:19,22 10802:1	unduly 10869:15	<b>venue</b> 10730:3,9
10754:19 10756:14	10759:20 10761:3	10802:2,23 10803:4	<b>unfair</b> 10814:23	verbal 10772:21
10757:10 10761:13	10762:10,19	10811:15 10819:7	10826:15 10852:23	<b>verbose</b> 10794:6
10763:8,16,17	10872:17	10820:18,24 10821:2	10871:22	verkeerde 10787:14
10769:23 10770:17	transcription 10759:21	10823:6 10825:6	unfairness 10801:9	Vermaak 10784:20,20
10770:22 10778:8	transcripts 10803:21	10826:8 10828:6	unfortunate 10730:8	10785:2,6,8,14
10789:5,6,10	10872:15	10831:4 10832:7,19	unfortunately	10787:10 10788:24
10789.3,0,10	transform 10853:3	10831:4 10832.7,19	10752:19 10846:14	10789:20,24,25
		/		
10814:8 10815:23	translate 10768:8,18	10836:25 10838:8,8	10850:11	vernacular 10760:3
10819:19 10825:6	translated 10759:12	10841:22 10845:8,18	<b>union</b> 10795:9,21	10761:8,10,11,12
10828:1 10832:4	10760:4 10761:9,11	10847:10 10850:23	10799:4 10830:12	version 10735:22
10839:16 10842:24	10766:13 10788:11	10854:12 10856:9	unionised 10835:12	10738:8 10744:22,25
10844:7,7 10849:7	10872:18	10857:1,5 10859:16	<b>unions</b> 10736:3,20	10746:3,12,25
10858:15,16	translating 10766:17	10865:10,11,11	10739:13 10740:9	10747:1,5,18
10865:21 10869:2,13	10766:23	10867:23 10868:18	10746:10 10826:8	10749:17 10770:12
10870:19 10871:12	translation 10761:20	<b>two-year</b> 10795:22	<b>Unknown</b> 10767:19	10771:19
10871:25	10767:9,21 10770:9	type 10770:16	unlawful 10775:3	versions 10770:8
times 10734:20	10707.5,21 10770.5	10771:21 10845:3	unnecessary 10814:8	10771:23
10764:4 10769:9	translations 10770:24	<b>types</b> 10782:2	unpacking 10868:1	victims 10792:2
10786:1	10771:9	typical 10792:8	unprofessionally	<b>VICTORIA</b> 10731:12
<b>Tip</b> 10730:5,7,22	transmit 10859:3,6		10780:13	10811:6
10731:1,5 10846:14	transmitted 10833:6,24	U	unprotected 10793:16	<b>video</b> 10758:14,18,20
10850:10,12,16	10859:9 10861:22	<b>UK</b> 10863:1,7	10794:4,7,11 10795:3	10759:3 10761:4,6
10851:20,23,24	10868:5	ultimately 10847:7	10796:4,8,15 10800:1	10766:4 10778:18
10871:21	transparent 10791:5	<b>um-mm</b> 10733:25	10800:2,14 10801:12	videographers
<b>Tip's</b> 10851:4	transposed 10856:8	<b>unaware</b> 10769:6	unprotectedness	10821:22
today 10770:12	traumatised 10782:5	unchallenged 10847:24	10796:12	videos 10761:23
today 10770.12	traumatised 10762.5	anchunchgen 100+7.24	10720.12	,14005 10701.23

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

**RealTime Transcriptions** 

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

## Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page 1
10773:15	10731:21 10732:18	we'd 10869:19	witness's 10809:20	10787:2 10811:2,4
view 10745:18 10781:8	10748:1,18 10785:9	we'll 10732:21	wondering 10759:6	10816:5 10826:24
10785:25 10801:12	10789:17 10794:22	10749:20 10752:4	won't 10730:4	10849:11 10855:8,12
10802:4 10805:24	10795:4 10808:22	10753:17 10754:7	10733:15,22 10741:6	10855:15,21
10812:20 10824:12	10839:23 10852:14	10762:18 10764:11	10755:3 10782:23	10860:13 10868:20
10824:17,17,20	10852:15 10858:22	10766:11 10771:3,3	word 10755:15	you've 10738:14
10826:7,20 10832:25	wants 10761:13	10771:25 10786:12	10763:13 10768:21	10749:15 10766:20
10846:15 10847:7	10783:18 10812:18	10790:14 10813:8	10768:24 10771:2,7	10780:22 10781:16
10854:6 10867:1	10818:22 10829:10	10833:21 10849:6	10775:20 10791:7	10783:1,3 10785:11
viewed 10732:8	10855:17 10868:24	10854:2 10869:11	10822:8 10823:10	10786:19 10819:22
10823:9 10854:5,10	war 10746:6,10	10872:8,17 10873:20	words 10734:9	10824:8 10825:11
10854:11	warra-warra 10795:22	we're 10749:1	10740:24 10743:7	10827:7 10834:11
views 10750:12	10846:8	10763:23 10764:16	10763:21 10783:12	10839:19 10840:19
10786:2,3,25	wasn't 10741:24	10803:22 10814:7	10783:15 10790:23	10841:4,6 10852:3
10806:22	10745:15 10749:18	10821:16 10825:2	10799:3 10800:16	10853:9,22 10861:25
violence 10800:6,15 10801:3 10834:15	10750:3,4,7,8,14	10843:22 10869:15	10851:20 work 10730:20 10751:5	10862:1,7,15 10867:24 10874:6
10801:5 10854:15	10751:11 10759:15 10782:10 10789:4,5,6	10871:19 10872:4 we've 10739:12	10767:20,24	<b>yô</b> 10767:4,4
violent 10824:19	10789:9,10 10818:5	10748:25 10759:12	10770:20 10772:15	<b>yu</b> 10/07.4,4
10840:3	10789.9,10 10818.5	10748.23 10759.12	10770.2010772.13	Z
vir 10787:13	waste 10869:13	10785:9 10787:9	worked 10805:23	<b>Zokwana</b> 10739:12
visited 10799:14,18	wasting 10749:20	10788:8 10794:18	10816:25	10830:12,21 10831:5
vis-à-vis 10797:11	10814:8	10799:23 10828:11	workers 10792:15	10847:2,9,22
<b>voice</b> 10761:15	wat 10787:14	10844:10 10845:24	10793:17 10826:11	10848:12,13,15
vulgar 10768:1	watch 10753:15	10856:4	10865:8	10850:18
10779:6 10780:18	watches 10866:19	we'll 10802:13 10810:5	working 10792:23	<b>Zuma</b> 10863:1,12,14
<b>vulgarities</b> 10770:2	water 10748:9	10810:15	10820:3 10863:2,13	10863:19 10865:4
10771:10 10778:13	10820:16	<b>we're</b> 10802:4	world 10795:16	
	way 10730:19 10732:22	10803:23,23	worried 10816:9	0
W	10733:10 10738:14	10807:14	worry 10741:18	<b>00:42</b> 10760:21,24
wage 10793:13,15	10738:21 10739:17	we've 10803:21	worst 10796:14	<b>00:46</b> 10760:21,24
10794:25 10795:4	10745:14 10746:22	10805:23	worthwhile 10868:14	000 10820:9
10797:20,20	10752:5 10770:7	whatsoever 10739:15	worthy 10750:2	<b>02:15</b> 10764:2
10801:22,25	10772:16 10779:2	10828:22 10844:12	wouldn't 10732:23	<b>02:30</b> 10764:3
10826:10 10848:6 wages 10794:19	10797:5 10803:17 10808:2,5,12	10846:7 what's 10741:15	10766:9 10771:21 10793:16 10795:8	1
10795:18,23 10865:6	10808.2,5,12 10814:25 10816:3	10745:21 10751:2	10795.10 10795.8	<b>1</b> 10735:2 10823:1
wait 10754:6 10797:14	10817:1 10823:25	10743.21 10731.2	would've 10739:16	10735.2 10825.1
10813:6 10873:14	10828:1 10834:25	10735:15 10054:12	wrong 10748:10	<b>10</b> 10731:24 10732:4,5
walked 10787:18	10840:10 10846:3,10	what-do-you 10820:22	10752:4 10762:19	10732:6,8,12,19
want 10730:21	10848:25 10849:12	what-do-you-call	10771:6 10776:25	10733:12,16
10731:22 10733:21	10851:3 10858:16,18	10819:1	10787:22 10803:18	10744:23 10764:4
10736:1 10739:11	10858:21	whilst 10730:13	10840:9,12	10769:9 10790:16
10740:20 10741:16	ways 10789:19	whiteboard 10819:10	wrote 10842:4	10865:10
10747:21 10748:9	weak 10799:4,6	<b>who's</b> 10763:20		<b>10th</b> 10741:11
10753:6,18,19,19	weapon 10865:9	wide 10795:15	X	10805:14
10754:22 10756:12	weapons 10803:23	10866:20	<b>X</b> 10830:9	<b>10:06</b> 10730:2
10761:16,20	website 10862:25	Wie 10768:14 10769:7	<b>Xhosa</b> 10766:14	<b>10:26</b> 10740:18
10762:23 10768:8	10863:1,7	10769:8	10767:1 10768:8,9,19	<b>10:46</b> 10753:4
10769:23 10770:21	Wednesday 10731:17	wish 10731:2 10774:4	10805:8,11	<b>100%</b> 10741:18
10772:7 10775:3,21	week 10733:12 10743:2 10757:18 10761:23	10782:15 10848:19 10873:9	<u> </u>	<b>1000%</b> 10771:1
10782:9 10785:12 10786:18 10787:5	10757:18 10761:23	wishes 10748:6	<b>Y</b> 10830:9	<b>11:05</b> 10765:10 <b>11:48</b> 10772:4
10789:15 10782:16	weighed 10865:20	10813:4	yesterday 10730:10	<b>11:48</b> 10772:4 <b>12</b> 10791:6 10830:14,22
10796:9 10798:8	well-known 10823:3	withdraw 10773:20	you'd 10731:1 10841:8	12 10791:0 10850:14,22 10871:9
10805:17 10811:8	well-planned 10734:23	10798:14 10824:9	10848:19 10849:25	<b>12th</b> 10847:4,8,10,21
10812:10 10820:20	went 10733:2,14	10831:19 10833:10	you'll 10735:19	<b>12:08</b> 10780:22
10830:4 10843:19	10788:5 10789:13	witnesses 10739:25	10768:21 10781:23	<b>12:28</b> 10792:19
10844:9 10848:20	10823:24 10828:1	10740:1 10775:22	10791:24 10830:5	<b>12:47</b> 10801:8
10849:1 10850:7	10870:6	10786:23 10794:15	10863:17	<b>120</b> 10807:3
10853:19,21	weren't 10740:11	10817:4 10852:22	you're 10737:2,5,10	<b>13</b> 10791:6 10811:25
10862:15 10865:20	10761:12 10784:16	10869:12	10740:1 10752:10,16	13th 10736:7,8
10865:22 10868:17	10839:9 10869:7	witness's 10738:25	10757:24 10761:1	10740:16 10741:7,11
10869:16 10872:9,23	weren't 10778:23	10749:17 10751:22	10763:6 10764:20,21	10747:2 10774:24
10873:7,8,13	Western 10730:12	10812:20 10830:7	10764:22,25	10777:13,13
wanted 10730:6	10768:24	10854:16	10780:23 10784:20	10778:10,23 10779:7
ARCHIVE FO	RJUSTICE	1	1	1

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Email: realtime@mweb.co.za

			Page 18
10770 22 25	25 10759 21 22		
10779:22,25	<b>25</b> 10758:21,22		
10781:21 10789:7	10791:15		
10799:17 10803:19	<b>26</b> 10758:20,22		
10803:19 10804:1	<b>262</b> 10734:21		
10805:13,17 10806:4	<b>270</b> 10822:25		
10806:21 10807:2,8	<b>289E</b> 10845:20		
10809:15,19			
	3		
10810:14 10812:11			
10814:5 10815:11	<b>3</b> 10735:2,13 10816:23		
10863:8	10821:4 10843:14		
<b>13:45</b> 10748:2	10846:6 10849:21		
<b>14th</b> 10809:15,19	<b>3-0</b> 10862:22		
10820:6 10821:1	<b>3.1</b> 10734:5		
<b>14:02</b> 10810:18	<b>3.3.1</b> 10734:5		
<b>14:22</b> 10820:7,18	<b>3.3.2</b> 10734:11		
<b>14:41</b> 10831:14	<b>3:00</b> 10767:15		
<b>15</b> 10830:11	<b>30-minuter</b> 10869:19		
15th 10831:24 10832:1	<b>31</b> 10753:7,7 10754:10		
10832:2 10846:6			
	10754:11,18		
10847:4	<b>34</b> 10744:21 10745:3		
<b>15.1</b> 10850:15	<b>34.4</b> 10791:19		
<b>15.2</b> 10830:24	<b>35</b> 10777:7 10781:13		
<b>15:01</b> 10845:9	10782:8		
<b>15:32</b> 10849:9 10860:7	<b>39</b> 10772:9		
<b>16</b> 10766:7 10817:16			
10831:2	4		
<b>16th</b> 10741:12	<b>4</b> 10730:1 10735:2		
10744:12,13 10745:3	10871:10		
10750:9 10778:2,23	<b>49</b> 10817:15		
10781:22 10783:22	10 1001/110		
	5		
10784:10,10			
10800:13 10821:3	<b>5</b> 10787:11 10869:20		
10832:2 10846:8	10870:1 10871:10		
10859:17	10872:9,10		
	10872.9,10		
<b>16:11</b> 10869:21			
<b>16:27</b> 10873:23	6		
<b>17</b> 10735:21,23 10764:5	<b>6</b> 10819:9 10820:25		
<b>17th</b> 10757:12 10823:4			
	10821:3		
10859:2,17	<b>6th</b> 10843:16 10869:3,5		
<b>18</b> 10829:24 10830:1			
10831:10 10832:1	7		
<b>19th</b> 10843:16	<b>7</b> 10929-15		
	7 10838:15		
<b>195(1)(d)</b> 10791:10	<b>7th</b> 10869:3,5		
<b>199</b> 10730:4			
1	8		
2			
	<b>80%</b> 10760:18		
<b>2</b> 10734:25 10744:24	<b>800</b> 10851:1		
10761:6 10778:10,23			
10820:9 10846:1	9		
10863:17,25	<b>9</b> 10845:23 10868:22		
<b>2.2.5</b> 10791:18	<b>9th</b> 10741:11		
<b>2:00</b> 10767:15	<b>9.3</b> 10811:20,21,22		
<b>20</b> 10759:4 10832:11	<b>9.4</b> 10734:21		
<b>2012</b> 10777:13	<b>9:30</b> 10868:15 10874:8		
10817:16 10820:6	<b>95%</b> 10760:15		
10830:23 10863:8			
<b>2013</b> 10730:1			
<b>21</b> 10837:9			
<b>214</b> 10791:1			
<b>216</b> 10791:2	54		
218 10790:24 10812:5,5	1 0 A 20.12		
<b>23</b> 10826:10 10838:10	and I man		
	7 × 10 11-21 1		
10838:13	and the last		
<b>23(5)</b> 10798:25	or to have		
24 10744:1,4,5	10 11		
10849:21	1 your other		
10849:21 A R C H I V F F O	0 1007100		
ARCHIVE FO	K . U S I C L		