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 250 26 JUNE 2014 PAGES 31438 TO 31611



© REALTIME TRANSCRIPTIONS

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



	Page 31438		Page 31440
1	[PROCEEDINGS ON 26 JUNE 2014]	1	as well.
2	[09:36] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes.	2	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, but I hope I've
3	It's starting late because some of the counsel were held up	3	answered the question that you put to me. I know what I've
4	in a horrendous traffic jam on the highway. I'm pleased	4	said is slightly imprecise but you understand my problems
5	that they have finally been able to arrive. I see that the	5	in relation to the –
6	case I read on the internet last night has now been	6	MS LE ROUX: Yes.
7	downloaded for me, that's the McCann case and as far as I	7	CHAIRPERSON: - interrelation between the
8	can see there are points in it which have distinct	8	two and particularly what one can describe as world best
9	relevance in this case and thank you very much for making	9	practices, on the assumption that the UK practice is in
10	it available. Mr White, you're still under oath.	10	line with world best practice.
11	GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.)	11	MS LE ROUX: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON: Ms Le Roux?	12	CHAIRPERSON: On handling the kind of
13	EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.):	13	situation that we have here, which is dealt with to some
14	Thank you, Chair. Mr White, if we could start with the	14	extent in those two standing orders.
15	second aspect of our homework which was to consider	15	MS LE ROUX: Yes.
16	standing order 251, exhibit ZZZ8, for the Chair. Chair,	16	CHAIRPERSON: I'm afraid I can't put my
17	we're in your hands as to how you'd like to deal with this.	17	problem –
18	Mr White, we gave him a copy and he has reviewed it. I'm	18	MS LE ROUX: No, no.
19	not sure what specific you'd like him to -	19	CHAIRPERSON: - with greater clarity than
20	CHAIRPERSON: All I was interested to	20	that, but I know what I've said isn't as clear as I would
21	know, whether the Northern Ireland Police Service has got	21	like it to be but I have done my best.
22	standing orders and rules that deal with the situations	22	MS LE ROUX: Yes, and Chair, obviously
23	which are addressed in those two standing orders and what	23	there's a bit more homework in that for us then to see if
24	particularly interested me was the interrelation between	24	we can find other jurisdictions but Mr White, in light of
25	the two because it does look, if one reads 251 there's a	25	what the Chair has indicated he's interested in, if you do
	Dogo 21420		
	Page 31439		Page 31441
1	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing	1	have any response.
2	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't	2	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief
2 3	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in	2 3	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of
2 3 4	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing.	2 3 4	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked
2 3 4 5	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of	2 3 4 5	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under
2 3 4 5 6	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation	2 3 4 5 6	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or
2 3 4 5 6 7	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two	2 3 4 5 6 7	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the other parts of that standing order because we've only got	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the protection of life in relation to the use of lethal force.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the other parts of that standing order because we've only got part 3 and the information we were given is, part 3 is self-standing, that the other parts deal with other topics that are not relevant at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the protection of life in relation to the use of lethal force. In lots of jurisdictions that I've had the privilege to view, some of the legislation might be written in terms of police might use firearms for example to quell a riot or in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the other parts of that standing order because we've only got part 3 and the information we were given is, part 3 is self-standing, that the other parts deal with other topics that are not relevant at all. MS LE ROUX: Yes, Chair, that was as we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the protection of life in relation to the use of lethal force. In lots of jurisdictions that I've had the privilege to view, some of the legislation might be written in terms of police might use firearms for example to quell a riot or in any circumstances I've seen, it'll then go on to say in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the other parts of that standing order because we've only got part 3 and the information we were given is, part 3 is self-standing, that the other parts deal with other topics that are not relevant at all. MS LE ROUX: Yes, Chair, that was as we understand it and we've also been provided with, there was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the protection of life in relation to the use of lethal force. In lots of jurisdictions that I've had the privilege to view, some of the legislation might be written in terms of police might use firearms for example to quell a riot or in any circumstances I've seen, it'll then go on to say in circumstances where life is in danger. So to some extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	procedure for ensuring that innocent people in an advancing group are not injured, as far as possible. There doesn't appear to be a general discretion granted to everybody in the line to fire, which could end up in 60 people firing. Prima facie that doesn't seem to be the idea of 251. Of course 262 then deals with a slightly different situation and I'm not sure that the interrelation between the two doesn't require further exploration and elaboration and I'm simply interested to know whether either - if one confines oneself to Northern Ireland or whether one goes beyond that and looks at the United Kingdom or certainly England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland may or may not be a different question – whether there's some information or inputs which he can provide to help us in that regard, but perhaps you can do it at the end of his evidence, I don't know, end of his evidence in chief. We were told in an e-mail from Mr Pretorius that there's a question as to whether we should look at the other parts of that standing order because we've only got part 3 and the information we were given is, part 3 is self-standing, that the other parts deal with other topics that are not relevant at all. MS LE ROUX: Yes, Chair, that was as we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have any response. MR WHITE: Chair, a couple of very brief points, if it's helpful. Firstly, there are a number of paragraphs, 251.5 which I was surprised to find it talked about police maybe justified in using their firearms under the following circumstances and if their station or barracks is attacked, if an attempt is made to relieve them of prisoners or to deprive them of their arms, but there's a further paragraph which talks about if an attempt is made – sorry, apologies - to defend themselves or other persons from death or serious injury if attacked, it's not clear whether or not those are linked, i.e. if your station is attacked in circumstances where you're defending your life, if they're separate than just the fact that you can use firearms on the basis of the station is being attacked would not be something that in the UK would be recognised. It's very specifically that third point that I talked about. Whatever the circumstances are, it's about the protection of life in relation to the use of lethal force. In lots of jurisdictions that I've had the privilege to view, some of the legislation might be written in terms of police might use firearms for example to quell a riot or in any circumstances I've seen, it'll then go on to say in

Pretoria	1
11010110	

1	Page 31442	1	Page 31444
1	doesn't really matter what you're doing, it's about if life	1	CHAIRPERSON: The problem that I have,
2	is in danger. The other paragraph which I thought was pertinent	2	I'll make another attempt to sort of state it clearly, is I can understand in an ordinary situation where a policeman
3	and I think this might be what you were particularly	3	or woman or a number of them are in a situation where
4 5		4 5	
	directing me towards was paragraph 251.8 which talks about,		they're under attack, they have to defend themselves. I
6	"It is of the utmost importance that the officer or other	6	understand that and you can't expect them to only respond to orders and so on their lives are in danger and they
7	senior member present should give all his attention to the	7	to orders and so on, their lives are in danger and they
8	supervision of the members under his command. He should	8	have to do the necessary but where, as here, you have a
9	not, therefore, except in the case of extreme necessity,	9	group of, a line of people specifically ordered to go to a
10	himself fire but should, by a deliberate word of command,	10	particular place, they are there to deal with the situation
11	order one or more of the members under his command to fire	11	where the first line, the POP people, have been under
12	a specified number of rounds at a particular person or	12	attack and have absented themselves, taken refuse and so
13	persons indicated by him." Now that is a sort of command,	13	on. And they are in line there to deal effectively with
14	I think you used the term yesterday, Chair, which again	14	this group of people who are approaching to attack them and
15	would be something that's not recognised sort of in the UK	15	to say that any, each one of the 60 is entitled to exercise
16	framework insomuch as I think I explained yesterday, the	16	his discretion without any order at all seems to me to be a
17	framework there and the framework applies to the entire UK	17	dangerous doctrine. And 251 says, it appears to deal with
18	including Northern Ireland, are based on authority levels.	18	that kind of situation by saying what we see in 251.8 and
19	So looking at a particular situation, you know, there are	19	you don't have all 60 or possibly all 60 firing. I can
20	levels of authority in relation to deploying firearms	20	understand if there's never going to be an order, you can't
21	officers to different situations. Ultimately at the end it	21	blame all 60 for firing because if I was in the group I
22	comes down to a situation where that individual officer,	22	wouldn't know whether the man next to me is going to fire
23	having been placed in that position on the levels of	23	or not, so I would have to fire myself to protect myself
24	authority, he or she makes that final decision themselves	24	and my colleagues and so on. But if an arrangement such as
25	as to whether or not to pull the trigger on the basis of	25	is set out in 251.8 applies, then of course that isn't a
	Page 31443		Page 31445
1	•		
1	the threat that they perceive at that particular time as	1	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the
2	the threat that they perceive at that particular time as opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read	1 2	•
			problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the
2	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read	2	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole
2 3	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms	2 3	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have
2 3 4	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's	2 3 4	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I
2 3 4 5	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat.	2 3 4 5	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking
2 3 4 5 6	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I	2 3 4 5 6	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me $- I$ haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been
2 3 4 5 6 7	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much	2 3 4 5 6 7	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me -1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, 1'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to this. So 262 is much more what I would be familiar with in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an unreasonable order and there are a whole lot of doctrines,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to this. So 262 is much more what I would be familiar with in relation to, I think, international norms about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an unreasonable order and there are a whole lot of doctrines, legal rules about in what circumstances you can refuse to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to this. So 262 is much more what I would be familiar with in relation to, I think, international norms about proportionality and this paragraph 251.8 of standing order 251 is certainly unusual in terms of any experience that I've had where it's a person who's making a command to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – I haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an unreasonable order and there are a whole lot of doctrines, legal rules about in what circumstances you can refuse to obey an illegal order – it creates scope for considerable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to this. So 262 is much more what I would be familiar with in relation to, I think, international norms about proportionality and this paragraph 251.8 of standing order 251 is certainly unusual in terms of any experience that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an unreasonable order and there are a whole lot of doctrines, legal rules about in what circumstances you can refuse to obey an illegal order – it creates scope for considerable confusion. I don't see how you can say, the police can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	opposed to being commanded to do so. So there's no read across there, there is nothing in the UK use of firearms procedures or doctrine which would map onto this. It's individual perceived threat. The last point that I would make is around, I also read again last night 262 and I think 262 is very much couched in language that I would recognise, which is around – well, first of all there's a very, I would consider, aspirational line in it which says "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." Certainly in the UK we would never see that written in any particular piece of doctrine because it is a very high threshold, "Use of force must be avoided at all costs." The rest of that, I think it's section 11 if memory serves me correct, is much more language that I would recognise which talks about minimum use of force, proportionate use of force in whatever the circumstances are, but I don't see any cross-reference to this. So 262 is much more what I would be familiar with in relation to, I think, international norms about proportionality and this paragraph 251.8 of standing order 251 is certainly unusual in terms of any experience that I've had where it's a person who's making a command to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	problem, then the senior officer then decides which of the 60 will fire and where they will fire and the whole situation will be far more controlled. Now what we have here is a situation which prima facie falls to me – 1 haven't got a clear view on the matter, I'm seeking guidance but what we have is, according to what we've been told by the police, their policy is, every one of the 60 can fire, use his own discretion and so on and take the consequences if he acted inappropriately and he wasn't covered by the relevant doctrines of the criminal law, but nevertheless they do give orders to cease fire, which immediately introduces a contradiction because if number 3 in the line feels that he is in imminent threat and assuming he's got objective grounds for so thinking, he then receives an order by the commander to say cease fire. He doesn't agree that the threat is over, so what must he do? Must he stop firing and if he's correct, be killed? Alternatively, must he disobey the order because it's an unreasonable order and there are a whole lot of doctrines, legal rules about in what circumstances you can refuse to obey an illegal order – it creates scope for considerable confusion. I don't see how you can say, the police can say, yes, the orders – the officers can say you must cease

		1	
1	Page 31446	1	Page 31448
1	it seems to me that 251.8 seems to address the problem I	1	experience, with respect to the number of rounds that they
2	have but then also among the standing orders we've got 262	2	then fire when they perceive the threat?
3	which appears to be a contradiction. I was hoping that	3	MR WHITE: Well, the training would be
4	that contradiction in our standing orders would not be	4	that obviously each individual round has to be justified.
5	repeated in either the Northern Ireland or the UK	5	The training would also include a considerable element of
6	equivalent of the standing orders and you could help us on	6	sort of a revision of, first of all, human rights
7	that but if you can't, well, then so be it but if there is	7	principles and, secondly, an element within the training,
8	something you can tell us, not necessarily now from the top	8	judgmental as we would call it. In other words, officers
9	of your head, as it were, but when you go back to Belfast	9	are placed in the situation where they have to make a
10	you may be able to get some information. Alternatively, as	10	decision whether to fire or not and then to be able to
11	Ms Le Roux says, the legal team instructing you may be able	11	justify the circumstances where they did. Ordinarily
12	to give us some assistance. Anyway that's the problem I	12	police officers would be trained to fire two shots on
13	have. I hope I've made my problem clear.	13	exposure of a target once they have satisfied themselves
14	MR WHITE: Chair, you've it very clear	14	that, you know, the threat is imminent and that tends to be
15	and if I can be of any assistance when, I mean I'll	15	the training in the UK.
16	specifically take with some homework when I go back, to	16	MS LE ROUX: So for a line of 60 that
17	talk to people who would be specialist firearms officers.	17	would be 120 shots if each officer fired. We can do the
18	I'm a trained firearms commander myself but I'll talk to	18	math.
19	some of the people who deal with this type of thing daily	19	MR WHITE: Well, if each individual –
20	and I'll communicate through my legal team if it's of	20	based on the assumption that each individual officer
21	assistance to you.	21	perceives an imminent threat to his life or to someone
22	CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. Ms Le	22	else's life, then having sort of crossed the threshold
23	Roux, thank you for the McCann – I think I've already	23	whereby I required to fire, it could therefore likely lead
24	thanked you for the copy of the McCann case that you gave	24	to two shots being fired, I stress that the training is
25	us. It's a 1995 decision. I would anticipate that there's	25	that when the target is exposed, fire two shots - that's
	D 04447		
	Page 31447		Page 31449
1	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I	1	Page 31449 not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the
1 2		1 2	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and
	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm		not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may
2	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see	2	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and
2 3	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm	2 3	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may
2 3 4	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have	2 3 4	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is
2 3 4 5	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the	2 3 4 5	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots.
2 3 4 5 6	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not	2 3 4 5 6	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then
2 3 4 5 6 7	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds	2 3 4 5 6 7	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority. MS LE ROUX: Mr Chair, we'll certainly do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. MR WHITE: Chair, in relation to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority. MS LE ROUX: Mr Chair, we'll certainly do that, that homework. If L could just ask Mr White one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. MR WHITE: Chair, in relation to the events at scene 2, if I understand the question correctly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority. MS LE ROUX: Mr Chair, we'll certainly do that, that homework. If I could just ask Mr White one question on the 251 issue. Mr White, with respect to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. MR WHITE: Chair, in relation to the events at scene 2, if I understand the question correctly and referring to 2.5 of my supplementary statement, first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority. MS LE ROUX: Mr Chair, we'll certainly do that, that homework. If I could just ask Mr White one question on the 251 issue. Mr White, with respect to the training that your firearms officers receive, so leaving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. MR WHITE: Chair, in relation to the events at scene 2, if I understand the question correctly and referring to 2.5 of my supplementary statement, first of all that I understand that substantial concessions have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been a fair degree of literature on the subject since and I did a short Google search myself last night and I see there's quite a lot of writing on the subject. I'm interested to know whether there are other cases which have come up for courts of higher authority dealing with the situation where the individual shottists are held not liable because they honestly and on objective grounds believed that there was imminent threat and therefore they were entitled to defend themselves, but where the planning that put them in the situation where that happened was held to be defective and there is a finding against the planners or the authorities who, or commanders who allowed that situation to develop. That seems to be the nub of the decision. I'd be interested to see whether the principles set out rather tersely, if I may say so, in this judgment have been elaborated either in academic writing or, if I may be permitted to say so with the prejudices that accompany my background, by courts of higher authority. MS LE ROUX: Mr Chair, we'll certainly do that, that homework. If I could just ask Mr White one question on the 251 issue. Mr White, with respect to the training that your firearms officers receive, so leaving aside for the moment your criticism that you've clearly put	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not to say that if that officer makes the decision at the time, that you know, they fire one shot and stop and there's lots of circumstances in which, you know, that may happen but the way they're trained is when the target is exposed, fire two shots. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we could then move on to the next topic which is your key criticisms and conclusions regarding scene 2. Chair, this is probably most usefully referenced in the supplementary statement of Mr White, page 15 paragraph 2.5. Mr White, could you summarise your conclusions with respect to scene 2 of the operation? MR WHITE: Apologies – MS LE ROUX: And Chair, sorry, I should put the other reference on the record which is in Mr White's final statement, the events of scene 2 are section 7.6 commencing at page 116. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. MR WHITE: Chair, in relation to the events at scene 2, if I understand the question correctly and referring to 2.5 of my supplementary statement, first of all that I understand that substantial concessions have been made in relation to command and control at scene 2 and

1	Page 31450 Secondly, the whole question of proceeding of what's	1	Page 31452 So then the planning would be relevant at that point, but
2	referred to as scene 2 after the events of scene 1, I	2	I'm not sure, with respect, it's fair to say that it was
3	criticise on the basis that certainly within the planning	3	simply the planning that was defective, but how do you
4	it would seem that there should have been a situation where	4	respond to that criticism?
5	basically the operation is paused and stopped as opposed to	5	MR WHITE: Chair, that's very helpful. I
6	moving on to what's referred to as scene 2.	6	think my reference was to the plan. I wasn't suggesting
7	CHAIRPERSON: It's not really a planning	7	that in terms of you know, planning, I don't think, whilst
8	question, though, you talked yesterday about dynamic	8	I did say in my evidence yesterday it could have been
9	situations.	9	anticipated, and in fact I think the evidence is that it
9 10	MR WHITE: Yes, of course.	10	was to some extent anticipated that if the POP came under
11	CHAIRPERSON: I think the evidence is	11	attack and did as the plan suggested, retreat to the Nyalas
12			
	reasonably clear that the police didn't expect scene 1 to	12	or whatever, then the fact that the TRT line would step in,
13	happen. They've used the expression "disruption," the	13	it could have been anticipated. In fact I think it was
14	plans were disrupted. They intended to go to this DDA	14	anticipated that people therefore could be engaged with the
15	plan, disarm – disperse, disarm and arrest plan – I think	15	R5 rifles.
16	about 20 minutes later, the idea was that they were going	16	So do I think that in his planning, that
17	to put the barrier up. They expected the strikers to stay	17	Lieutenant-Colonel Scott addressed is mind to the fact that
18	on the koppie side of the barrier, what amounts to a plain	18	at scene 1 you end up with 17 people dead and then he was
19	really, I think, slightly to the west of the koppie.	19	suggesting that they would move on with the dispersal;
20	Thereafter they were going to give warnings, Calitz was	20	categorically no, I don't for one second suggest that he
21	going to give warnings, two warnings translated into the	21	ever addressed his mind to that.
22	vernacular languages, as to what was going to happen and	22	So the point is, you know what I was referring to
23	then they were going to proceed with the DDA plan and they	23	is that the plan effectively had I suppose at that point a
24 25	didn't expect – some would say they should have expected	24 25	number of stages - to roll out the wire as you describe,
20	but they didn't expect that what would happen would, in	20	Chair, to give the warning and then to move forward. So
	Page 31451		Page 31453
1	Page 31451 fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they	1	Page 31453 when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen.
1 2	5	1 2	0
	fact would happen - what happened would happen - and they		when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen.
2	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was	2	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation
2 3	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of	2 3	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said,
2 3 4	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the	2 3 4	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this
2 3 4 5	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a	2 3 4 5	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan,
2 3 4 5 6	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was	2 3 4 5 6	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm.
2 3 4 5 6 7	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known	2 3 4 5 6 7	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to command and control with what happens next in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to Command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan had been disrupted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that part of the plan it became uncoordinated, I think is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan had been disrupted. A further question that then arises is whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to Command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that part of the plan it became uncoordinated, I think is the word that he used.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan had been disrupted. A further question that then arises is whether what happened at scene 2 involved the, an endeavour to implement the plan. Some witnesses have said – General Mpembe I remember in particular – said the plan was back on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to Command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that part of the plan it became uncoordinated, I think is the word that he used. The second point the, and again you've referred to this Chair, is the role of the JOC insomuch as my understanding of the role of the JOC is that they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan had been disrupted. A further question that then arises is whether what happened at scene 2 involved the, an endeavour to implement the plan. Some witnesses have said – General Mpembe I remember in particular – said the plan was back on track by the time they got to scene 2, and what then was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that part of the plan it became uncoordinated, I think is the word that he used. The second point the, and again you've referred to this Chair, is the role of the JOC insomuch as my understanding of the role of the JOC is that they're supposed to be overseeing this plan and that they should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	fact would happen – what happened would happen – and they dealt with the situation as it happened. So that was something that wasn't part of the plan – it wasn't part of the plan of what would happen and they didn't deal for the contingency of what would happen if it did. That may be a ground for criticism in itself, but once it happened it was really, I would have thought, for Calitz, if he'd known about it – he says he didn't know – or the JOC once the people in the JOC, once they knew about it, to – or I think Mr De Rover takes a similar view, they should then have stopped the operation. [09:56] And proceeded more cautiously and differently. That of course raises factual questions that you don't have to get involved in - we unfortunately do – as to when the JOC first heard about it and first realised it. But it is not fair to say, I would suggest, it was a planning problem, except perhaps the failure to foresee that this might well happen. It was a dynamic situation. The plan had been disrupted. A further question that then arises is whether what happened at scene 2 involved the, an endeavour to implement the plan. Some witnesses have said – General Mpembe I remember in particular – said the plan was back on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when the wire gets rolled out certain events then happen. We have scene 1 and then we sort of have the continuation of the plan. Scott didn't anticipate scene 1, I've said, plus you know as you work through the choreography of this then you have the, sort of the second part of the plan, the disperse and disarm. So my criticism therefore in relation to the issues of command and control I suppose are threefold. Firstly as you say that Officer Calitz who is the operational commander on the ground, I would have thought should have taken the decision to stop it if he knew, and again as you say there are issues of fact which is for yourselves to resolve, not myself. If he didn't know, how could he stop it? Beyond that then there are issues in relation to Command and control with what happens next in relation to Mr Calitz on the basis of the way the units were coordinated, and I think they weren't and I think he gives oral evidence to the effect that, you know, at that part of the plan it became uncoordinated, I think is the word that he used. The second point the, and again you've referred to this Chair, is the role of the JOC insomuch as my understanding of the role of the JOC is that they're

		r	
	Page 31454		Page 31456
1	are issues in relation to facts in question as to whether	1	in relation to scene 2?
2	or not and how much they know, but to me their purpose is	2	MR WHITE: I think, Chair, in relation to
3	that they should have been stopping that plan, taking a	3	the issues I've already highlighted it, I think it's
4	grip and saying things are going badly wrong here, if they	4	specifically with regards to what's referred to as scene 2
5	knew, and the third point is –	5	and approaching koppie 3, and the evidence seems to be that
6	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt you.	6	as police officers approach koppie 3 they come under fire
7	Keep your third point for the moment. I did say yesterday	7	from people within the koppie. That's certainly, there's
8	I didn't want photographs taken – would you listen to me,	8	evidence that that's what they perceived. So my
9	please? I didn't want photographs taken while the evidence	9	fundamental question is why continue into koppie 3 on the
10	is being led. The noise of the camera is distracting,	10	basis that if there is a threat to your life to do that.
11	upsets ones concentration. I did say that yesterday. It	11	The plan is about disperse, disarm and arrest.
12	wasn't an instruction only intended to apply yesterday. It	12	I wondered just simply why police officers would
13	applies until further notice and I'd expect it to be	13	be exposed to the danger of confronting live firearms,
14	complied with. There's a gentleman sitting in the corner	14	especially when the way the resources are configured, at
15	with a camera who's obeying it and which I appreciate, but	15	one stage the koppie is surrounded, so therefore why send
16	it applies to everybody. So please bear that in mind,	16	police officers forward into a situation where they're
17	otherwise I'll have to ask the camera people concerned to	17	facing live fire, as opposed to particularly if you have
18	leave the chamber. I don't want to do that either. Sorry,	18	the koppie surrounded, well then if people are leaving they
19	you were coming to your third point, Mr White.	19	can be stopped, challenged, searched and there are police
20	MR WHITE: And the third point therefore	20	officers who give evidence I think within the TRT line that
21	then in relation to command and control is the fact that	21	that happens out to the west, but basically to pause, to
22	General Mpembe is the overall commander, who's in the	22	reflect, to have police officers in hard cover, as I would
23	helicopter, and I've said from first engaging with this	23	suggest, and then to see whether or not we can negotiate
24	process I don't in any way dispute the decision for General	24	sort of further in relation to the arrest of the people who
25	Mpembe to go in the helicopter to effectively get a bird's-	25	are on the koppie, and I think Lieutenant-Colonel Scott's
	Dama 214EF		Dame 21457
1	Page 31455 eye view in his role as overall commander, therefore he can	1	Page 31457 oral evidence sort of agreed with that proposition on the
2	see more adequately what's happening. But again he is the	2	basis that – again I just question the decision that if
3	overall commander. Things are going badly wrong, again a	3	firearms are being used against police officers, why are we
4	question of fact as to what he knew or what he didn't know,	4	directing them into a position where there's a threat to
5	but one of the points that I was concerned about is General	5	their lives and then therefore placing them in a position
6	Mpembe in his evidence when he said that in his role of	6	where they have to make this individual judgment as to
7	overall commander he couldn't really do anything unless he	7	whether or not they use firearms. I can't understand the
8	was responding to a question from either the JOC or the	, 8	rationale behind that decision.
9	operational commander. You know, if he was aware of this	9	CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]
10	thing going substantially wrong, in any set of	10	point that you don't deal with in the passage to which Ms
11	circumstances I would, I can't find an instruction in the	11	le Roux has directed our attention in your report, the
12	policy framework which say as overall commander he couldn't	12	subject of some evidence before us, and that was the
12	step in at any time because I think by definition he's the	12	apparent failure, I think admitted failure by Brigadier
13	overall commander. If the facts were to show that he was	14	Calitz to give a warning. If the plan was back on track
14 15			
	aware, particularly of something as significant as what	15 16	they were once again busy with the DDA plan, they were busy
16	happened at scene 1 happening – if, I stress – then, you	16 17	effectively with implementing, or complying with the
17	know, all the more in relation to that statement I just	17	provisions of section 9 of the Regulation of Gatherings Act
18	find it absolutely unacceptable.	18	and what is normally required there is a warning, in fact
19	MS LE ROUX: Mr White, returning you to	19	they'd intended to give warnings at – if scene 1 hadn't
20	the events at scene 2, and perhaps the easiest way to do	20	happened, about 20 minutes later they would have given
21	this would be to go in your final statement to page 116,	21	warnings and proceeded with the DDA plan. It was only if
22	there you, and in the pages that follow you set out six of	22	the POP people found they couldn't perform their functions
23	your key criticisms relating to scene 2. Chair, we don't	23	under the DDA plan that the TRT people were supposed to
24	need to recite what those are, but Mr White, if there was	24	take over. But anyway, that's another matter.
	any elaboration you wanted to make about those criticisms	25	When they got to scene 2, according to some of
A	RCHIVE FOR JUSTICE		

		T	
1	Page 31458	1	Page 31460
1	the witnesses the plan was back on track. I know others	1	you have any comment on what Brigadier Calitz's roles and
2	don't agree with that, but some of them do, but in any event there was prima facie an obligation for them to give	2 3	responsibilities in that situation would have been? MR WHITE: As the operational commander,
3	a warning to those on the koppie as to what was going to	4	as the senior officer on the ground I think it's absolutely
4 5	happen, and they didn't do that, and Brigadier Calitz was	4 5	a requirement that Officer Calitz understands who is at
	criticised by a number of counsel, particularly Mr Bizos in	6	that scene, and I think it's incumbent upon him to make
6 7	his cross-examination. You don't deal with that at all.	7	sure that he knows all of the resources and, that are
8	don't know whether you have any comments on it.	8	there, that are present and what they're doing. Having
9	MR WHITE: Chair, I think the reason that	9	said that, there is also a responsibility – I know that
10	I didn't deal with it is because – the only reason I didn't	10	there's evidence that some units moved to scene 2 of their
11	deal with it, I didn't choose to comment simply because I'm	11	own volition. The fact that Brigadier Calitz is the
12	very aware of what the plan was, the rollout of the wire,	12	overall commander and therefore – sorry, apologies, the
13	then a warning, then a period of about 20 minutes to let	13	operational commander, so he's the commander on the ground,
14	people leave, and then to move forward to disperse, disarm	14	the fact that he is that and therefore has overall
15	and arrest. Because of the unforeseen circumstances that	15	responsibility doesn't negate their responsibilities, you
16	we've alluded to in my previous answer at scene 1, I	16	know, for telling him. I mean in some respects he can't be
17	appreciate that Officer Calitz says he didn't know what	17	held accountable for the actions of people when he doesn't
18	happened at scene 1, and again question the fact, but given	18	know, but still my criticism I think in relation to Officer
19	that after scene 1 clearly there is a degree of chaos and	19	Calitz is that given the very serious set of circumstances
20	that, you know, with the gunfire that obviously lots of	20	that we're dealing with, that it is a requirement for him
21	people heard, I think the crowd is gathering, you know,	21	to be in a position where he does know what resources that
22	people are sort of already moving, if you like, and then	22	he has available to him.
23	Officer Calitz basically forms up and starts to move	23	CHAIRPERSON: How can that work? He's on
24	forward with the forces that he was supposed to take,	24	the west side, as far as I remember, of the koppie.
25	albeit that the TRT are not there and I know there's	25	General Naidoo who's supposed to be at forward holding area
	Page 31459		Page 31461
1	Page 31459 evidence that he asks where they are.	1	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he
1 2	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of	1 2	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that
	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled		1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side
2	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I	2	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the
2 3	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework	2 3	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could
2 3 4	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with	2 3 4	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on
2 3 4 5 6 7	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are	2 3 4 5	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, staying with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your people are not where they were supposed to be, they're on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, staying with the roll and responsibilities of Brigadier Calitz on the day,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your people are not where they were supposed to be, they're on the other side of the koppie and you must bear that in mind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, staying with the roll and responsibilities of Brigadier Calitz on the day, and could I ask you to comment on the evidence, assume the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your people are not where they were supposed to be, they're on the other side of the koppie and you must bear that in mind in the orders you issue.' Wouldn't that be fair?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, staying with the roll and responsibilities of Brigadier Calitz on the day, and could I ask you to comment on the evidence, assume the evidence shows that the various units that's around koppie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your people are not where they were supposed to be, they're on the other side of the koppie and you must bear that in mind in the orders you issue.' Wouldn't that be fair? MS LE ROUX: Chair, if I could just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	evidence that he asks where they are. But I think that, you know, for me I was sort of trying to engage with the circumstances now as they rolled out. The original plan was to give a warning. I understand, you know, the statutory and legal framework about giving a warning, but I was sort of engaging with this in terms of a dynamic situation. People are scattering, I'm sure, you know when 328 rounds are fired plus other rounds are being fired potentially at the police, and so there is a lot of gunfire. That's got to create a huge amount of noise. I'm sure lots of people, including probably police officers, are frightened and confused and therefore my understanding of the situation is people are scattering all over the place. To some extent therefore people are already on the move and to be fair, you know, I therefore then didn't criticise this issue of not giving a warning at that stage because to some extent I sort of thought well maybe we've already moved past that, and that's why I didn't particularly make that point. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, staying with the roll and responsibilities of Brigadier Calitz on the day, and could I ask you to comment on the evidence, assume the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1 has come up there actually on his way to scene 1, but he allows himself to be diverted, but we won't go into that for the moment, and he then approaches from the east side where he meets up with the NIU people who've come from the north-east. It's not suggested that Brigadier Calitz could have seen them. It's not suggested there's anything on the, as I understand it, on the radio that would have alerted him to their presence. Wasn't he entitled to assume that they're doing what they have been told to do, that the NIU people are at, I think it was forward holding area 2, in that area, Naidoo is at forward holding area 1, in other words they're at their appointed stations, they haven't come to the area where they are, or they're going to take part in the action at koppie 3? What could he have done? I mean how can you criticise him for not knowing they were there? Truth is they should have reported their position to the JOC and the JOC should have told him 'By the way, you don't know this but you should know that some of your people are not where they were supposed to be, they're on the other side of the koppie and you must bear that in mind in the orders you issue.' Wouldn't that be fair?

		1	
1	Page 31462 17, 2.5.7 is where he deals with Brigadier Calitz. This	1	Page 31464 not have anticipated that that would be happening at all,
2	particular point is 2.5.11(d), which is page 20, because I	2	but of Officer Kidd, and I can fully understand as a
3	see Mr White is flipping through the file. That reference	3	professional police officer he hears this gunfire and he
4	may assist.	4	feels that he needs to respond to that. His task is to
5	MR WHITE: Apologies, Chair. Again if I	5	protect the informal settlement. You know, that's not
6	could ask Ms le Roux, because I was slightly distracted in	6	under threat, so he then goes to assist, and I would
7	looking at this, could you please repeat again just what	7	applaud and congratulate him for doing that. I think it's
8	you said?	8	a very professional attitude to take.
9	MS LE ROUX: In your, the reference is	9	The criticism is he didn't tell anyone else and
10	that in your supplementary statement commencing at page 17	10	therefore we're back to this issue, you know, my, you know,
11	is where you deal with Brigadier Calitz. 2.5.11(d), which	11	key criticisms are in relation to things like intelligence,
12	is on page 20, is the specific point the Chair is	12	briefing, planning and command and control. So the fact
13	referencing.	13	that Captain Kidd then takes his unit to do something which
14	MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, and I'm grateful	14	is out of sync with the plan and therefore can't be
15	to Ms le Roux. I was actually just, the reason I was	15	anticipated by other people, there is a requirement on him
16	distracted, I was starting to read 2.5.11 and looking for	16	to make sure that certainly Officer Calitz, the JOC and
17	the particular point, so as she says specifically in	17	other units are aware of the activity that he's going to
18	relation to (d), "Irrespective the purpose of the	18	take.
19	organisation, reorganisation line and the plan, Brigadier	19	MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we can then
20	Calitz can also be criticised for his failure to remain in	20	round out your command and control point, because we've
21	contact with those units that were intended to be part of	21	covered a lot of them already. In your supplementary
22	the follow-up to the dispersal action, particularly the TRT	22	statement, page 16, paragraph 2.5.6, you deal with this
23	and the NIU.	23	question of command and control from the JOC. If you could
24	Whilst it might be understandable that Brigadier	24	summarise that criticism and your conclusions for the
25	Calitz did not actively contact Captain Kidd's TRT unit at	25	Chair?
1	Page 31463	1	Page 31465
1	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed	1	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's
2	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and	2	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC
2 3	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not	2 3	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that
2 3 4	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I	2 3 4	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that
2 3 4 5	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any
2 3 4 5 6	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were	2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation
2 3 4 5 6 7	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my comment was in relation to the TRT under the command of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information they were receiving. Or indeed anyone else."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my comment was in relation to the TRT under the command of Captain Kidd and his instructions basically were around the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information they were receiving. Or indeed anyone else."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my comment was in relation to the TRT under the command of Captain Kidd and his instructions basically were around the protection of the informal settlement, and Captain Kidd	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information they were receiving. Or indeed anyone else." MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we then move onto the one explanation that the SAPS have provided for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my comment was in relation to the TRT under the command of Captain Kidd and his instructions basically were around the protection of the informal settlement, and Captain Kidd then, if my memory serves me correct, in oral evidence talks about hearing the gunfire and whatever over the radio and responding of his own volition, and so the criticism	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information they were receiving. Or indeed anyone else." MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we then move onto the one explanation that the SAPS have provided for what went wrong at Marikana with respect to radio
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	forward holding area 2, given that that unit was supposed to be stationary in front of the informal settlement, and did not actively contact the K9 unit, which was not supposed to take part in the final dispersal at all, I would have expected that the operational commander to remain in contact with the TRT and the NIU units that were supposed to follow up the POP members as part of the plan. Accordingly Brigadier Calitz must be held responsible at least in part for his lack of awareness that the NIU had arrived at koppie 3." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, with regard to your saying that certain of the units went to the koppie on their own, it was part of the original plan that some of the units were tasked with sweeping koppies 2 and 3 following upon the dispersal and that's perhaps in the execution of that that some of the units that were so tasked did that. MR WHITE: Well, I think in particular my comment was in relation to the TRT under the command of Captain Kidd and his instructions basically were around the protection of the informal settlement, and Captain Kidd then, if my memory serves me correct, in oral evidence talks about hearing the gunfire and whatever over the radio	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: Thank you. Again I think it's best if I just simply read this. "In relation to the JOC it now seems clear that members of the JOC were aware that the operation had gone badly wrong by the time that Brigadier Pretorius sent a text to IPID at 16:03. Any lingering doubts as to the seriousness of the situation could have been resolved by the time that Brigadier Pretorius had spoken to Captain Loest by telephone at 16:06. [10:16] I cannot understand why in those circumstances members of the JOC did not do more to contact the operational commander or the overall commander or to act themselves to slow down or halt the operation and to regroup. Although Brigadier Pretorius gives evidence of attempting to contact Brigadier Calitz and Major-General Naidoo by telephone no one else in the JOC has given any evidence of making any attempt to make contact with the operational overall commanders in light of the information they were receiving. Or indeed anyone else." MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if we then move onto the one explanation that the SAPS have provided for what went wrong at Marikana with respect to radio communications. In your final statement, page 106, section

	D 04444		D 01//0
1	Page 31466	1	Page 31468
1	call signs and the like on the radio. But focusing on the		used to get angry with people at work, you know we have an
2	actual radio capacity of the SAPS on the day, could you set	2	expression in Ireland I recall about "Fit to kill dead
3	out your key criticisms and comments?	3	things." You know it's basically an expression to show how
4	MR WHITE: Chair, just briefly, I think	4	frustrated and how angry you are. But it's almost beyond
5	that in operations, in large complex operations it is not	5	comprehension for me that an event of this nature, if I was
6	unusual for it to have problems with the radios	6	the senior officer on the ground and not even around the
7	particularly around volume of traffic. And therefore	7	end of the operation when 34 people have died. But the
8	because it's not unusual, it's predictable and I think in	8	fact that 17 people have died or potentially are dying,
9	terms of planning that sort of issue should have been	9	many more are injured in the middle of an operation and ${\rm I},$
10	discussed and consideration been given to having perhaps a	10	as the senior officer on the ground, don't become aware of
11	separate command channel. I understand from, I think TTT4	11	that, not made aware of it and again question of fact, you
12	which is the minutes of one of the JOC meetings it	12	know but assuming the facts that I'm not made aware of that
13	specifically states that the radio department, for want of	13	until, you know, a considerable period of time later. I
14	a better term, in SAPS had highlighted the fact that	14	suppose even expressing that sort of frustration around
15	there's a back-up radio channel, I think it was channel 38	15	that, it's expressing a disbelief around it. I simply
16	or something. So you know, given that large operation's	16	cannot comprehend a set of circumstances where that would
17	involving a number of units quite often result in radio	17	be the case that information of such magnitude is not
18	traffic chaos a bit like a traffic chaos perhaps on the way	18	brought to my attention somehow.
19	here this morning. Therefore problems with radios are not	19	MS LE ROUX: And picking up on the
20	something which I think would ordinarily come as a surprise	20	somehow, Mr White, assume that there were radio problems
21	and again it's part of the planning that should have been	21	how would you expect to have come to know that the
22	worked through. And then also as Ms Le Roux then says,	22	operation had resulted in 17 people being fatally wounded
23	also beyond that in terms of the use of the radio, you know	23	and others injured, alternatively later on 34?
23	the confusion in relation to instructions that were being	23	MR WHITE: Chair, it just comes back to
25	given with a lack of call signs. And I've listened to some	25	the point that I made earlier on in relation to principally
25	given with a lack of call signs. And i ve listened to some	25	
	Page 31467		Page 31469
1	Page 31467 of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts	1	Page 31469 that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to
1 2	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts	1 2	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to
	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions	_	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did
2 3	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given.	2	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius
2	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I	2 3	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I
2 3 4 5	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but	2 3 4 5	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure
2 3 4 5 6	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a	2 3 4 5 6	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we	2 3 4 5 6 7	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz? Use the must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz? Un we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had taken place until a fairly lengthy period of time after it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior POPs commander –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had taken place until a fairly lengthy period of time after it had happened and you were told that the reason you didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior POPs commander – <u>CHAIRPERSON:</u> Colonel Mere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had taken place until a fairly lengthy period of time after it had happened and you were told that the reason you didn't know is because there were radio problems, what would your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior POPs commander – CHAIRPERSON: Colonel Mere. MR WHITE: Oh it is, thank you, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had taken place until a fairly lengthy period of time after it had happened and you were told that the reason you didn't know is because there were radio problems, what would your response be?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior POPs commander – CHAIRPERSON: Colonel Mere. MR WHITE: Oh it is, thank you, Chair. Colonel Mere, did anyone try and contact him because he is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	of the audio of the radio and read some of the transcripts and I mean it is very confusing with regards to directions that had been given. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry to interrupt, can I just raise a point not directly relevant at the moment but that is, is it a practise in Northern Ireland to keep a recording of all the radio traffic? One of the problems we have here is that apparently it wasn't done, well it's said it wasn't done, I assume the purposes of the question that that's correct. We haven't got a complete recording of all the radio traffic, there are gaps and quite important things happened or should have happened during the gaps. Our task would be made much easier if there was a complete recording. Do you do that in Northern Ireland or – MR WHITE: The simple answer is yes, Chair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, one final question on radios, if you were the overall commander or the operational commander of an operation in which 34 people were killed and the reason you didn't know that that had taken place until a fairly lengthy period of time after it had happened and you were told that the reason you didn't know is because there were radio problems, what would your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that the JOC, you know what did they do first of all to stop or slow the operation, you kind of thing? What did they do, I talked about evidence that Brigadier Pretorius had given around trying to phone Officer Calitz and I appreciate that the phone didn't pick up, because I'm sure he's busy. Similarly with Officer Naidoo but, you know, what else was done, who else was phoned that given the magnitude of the situation, can we phone someone else who is close to Calitz? Can we phone someone who's not that close to Calitz but has access to a vehicle that can go and tell Calitz? You know there must be ways and again I suppose it's not for me to say exactly how, I'm asking the question, you know, well what did you do? You know it's got to be a situation whereby, given the events that are unfolding, I just simply say well did you do? I understand Brigadier Pretorius's evidence around trying to make two phone calls, is that sufficient, so I understand a senior officer who's at scene 1 because there's evidence of some of the police officers handing over firearms to him, I forget the rank, Mr Mere or Murray, I think he's a senior POPs commander – CHAIRPERSON: Colonel Mere. MR WHITE: Oh it is, thank you, Chair.

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

1	Page 31470 saying that I'm absolutely surprised that, you know, every	1	Page 31472 MR WHITE: Yes absolutely. For some
2	effort wasn't made in order to bring this information to	2	reason and maybe it's about background noise, on numerous
3	the attention of Officer Calitz and would sort of ask the	3	occasions someone will come forward from another point.
4	question then because I haven't seen it in written evidence	4	did some work with the Metropolitan Police and they
5	I haven't necessarily seen anything further in oral	5	actually operate on a system of runners. One of the things
6	evidence, so am I missing something around actually what	6	that surprised me about the Metropolitan Police, an
7	people in the JOC did to bring this information to the	7	organisation I have respect for, is that you'll see them,
8	attention of principally Officer Calitz?	8	perhaps if you view television footage, they have all these
9	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You're no doubt	9	hand-held radios. They're not connected to an earpiece and
10	familiar with Brigadier Calitz's evidence about when he was	10	the amount of communication they must miss you know just
11	at the scene and him shouting out orders that the noise of	11	with these – as opposed to having it connected to an
12	the Nyalas and if someone was trying to contact him on the	12	earpiece but I actually did the senior public order
13	cell phone he might not have heard it. Is that your	13	commander's course with the Met in 2004 I think it was.
14	experience on the field as well?	14	And I was surprised they have actually have a system of
15	MR WHITE: Of course. You know the way	15	runners as they call it where they have a number of people
16	our radio communications work is that we actually have an	16	allocated to the commander who will run and transmit
17	earpiece connected to the radio. So to some degree it sort	17	messages to other people and bring –
18	of disturbs your peripheral hearing if you like of other	18	CHAIRPERSON: I remember the origin of
19	things and many times I have been in a situation where I'd	19	the Metropolitan Police with the Bow Street runners, so
20	have an earpiece here with the radio, I have my mobile	20	that goes back many centuries.
21	phone perhaps shoved up the inside of my riot helmet. So	21	MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair.
22	I'm trying to make a phone call or listen to some	22	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Can I just
23	instructions that have been given by phone, I might miss	23	understand why with a hand-held radio you would miss
24	something in this ear on the radio. Obviously at that	24	communication as opposed to having an earpiece?
25	point I certainly am not aware of what's going on in the	25	MR WHITE: Just simply because – well if
	Page 31471		Page 31473
1	background alternatively I take the mobile phone out, I put	1	you think about this, imagine your mobile phone and on an
2	it in my pocket, hear it when it rings again. So you know		
		2	iPhone Apple very kindly provides you with those nice wide
3	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be	2 3	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your
3 4	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if		earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation.
	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have	3	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece
4	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a	3 4	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it
4 5 6 7	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two	3 4 5	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation
4 5 6 7 8	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a	3 4 5 6	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going
4 5 6 7 8 9	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and
4 5 7 8 9 10	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that –	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience in an operational commander role have you ever had someone	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the other hand you had an earpiece in it's much more likely
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience in an operational commander role have you ever had someone – Mr White, just following up on your answer, when you've	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the other hand you had an earpiece in it's much more likely that you're going to. So it's not to say, you know, that
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience in an operational commander role have you ever had someone – Mr White, just following up on your answer, when you've been in an operational commander role, I understand you may	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the other hand you had an earpiece in it's much more likely that you're going to. So it's not to say, you know, that they will definitely miss but certainly the potential is
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience in an operational commander role have you ever had someone – Mr White, just following up on your answer, when you've been in an operational commander role, I understand you may have the two people on your shoulder as you describe them,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the other hand you had an earpiece in it's much more likely that you're going to. So it's not to say, you know, that they will definitely miss but certainly the potential is that you're much more likely to miss communications. Just
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	suffice if I say individual bits of communication can be missed. It happens all the time, quite often, you know, if I'm the senior officer on the ground I would normally have someone on my shoulder, quite often two people. One a tactical advisor, I explained their role yesterday. Two effectively a logist, someone when he hears me making a direction on the radio, when he hears me saying something to the tactical advisor, when he hears me saying something to the unit commanders he'll be writing that down. One of the other functions that he would have is basically to monitor the radio and tap me on the shoulder, Sir, did you hear that communication from – you know to make sure that – you know would it be reasonable to say an officer in the position of Mr Calitz wouldn't necessarily hear every piece of communication that's been relayed, yes I think that's entirely fair. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your experience in an operational commander role have you ever had someone – Mr White, just following up on your answer, when you've been in an operational commander role, I understand you may	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	earphones. So if you have a mobile phone and you have your earphones in you pretty much hear the whole conversation. If you imagine having a mobile phone without the earpiece and say for example it's on speaker and you're holding it in your hand while you're making a telephone conversation to the Chair and at the same time lots of things are going on and other people are distracting your attention and talking to you. So it's not even that you're having a specific conversation with the Chair. Actually maybe the Chair has phoned you to have a bit of a chat around how yesterday went and you're thinking to yourself I don't really need to hear this but, you know, he's the Chair and obviously I'll be polite. Yes, Mr Chair, every so often because you're monitoring the conversation but you're not specifically engaged with it because you actually need to have a conversation with other people. Will you absolutely hear every word the Chair says? No you won't. If on the other hand you had an earpiece in it's much more likely that you're going to. So it's not to say, you know, that they will definitely miss but certainly the potential is

	Page 31474		Page 31476
1	there's sort of ambient background noise, you know, those	1	MR WHITE: Chair, very briefly in this, I
2	or whatever is coming out of the radio actually reach your	2	mean if you're planning an operation which anticipates, you
3	ear or some other noises sort of override that whereas if	3	know, high levels of force then you need to make provision,
4	you have an earpiece in then at least you hear.	4	there's a requirement to make provision in relation to
5	MS LE ROUX: Mr White, does that	5	first aid. I understand that part of the plan Lieutenant-
6	explanation of a hand-held radio versus an earpiece excuse	6	Colonel Scott did make provision for first aid responders.
7	other officers from ensuring they communicate with the	7	So that's one point. Was that sufficient, again it's a
8	commander and ensure confirmation that their communications	8	question for yourselves perhaps. But then it sort of goes
9	reached the overall commander, or the operational	9	beyond that, so we have scene 1 and some of the evidence
10	commander?	10	that has been shown to me is that at scene 1 there are
11	MR WHITE: Categorically no, what I'm	11	police officers who can be seen on videos who engage in
12	referring to here is that in my experience in these large	12	conversation, whatever they're talking about I don't know.
13	public disorder situations where there's a lot of different	13	But it's obvious – sorry, apologies, Chair. Sorry I was
14	things going on it is predictable that there will be heavy	14	just letting you finish your conversation.
15	traffic on the radio. It is predictable that people will	15	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Tokota raised a point
16	have difficulties getting through on the radio. It is	16	with me which we'll raise with you when you get there in
17	predictable that individual people will miss certain	17	your evidence.
18	things. You know all of that is, I think, as I've said.	18	MR WHITE: Thank you. So the brief
19	My criticisms are in relation to Officer Calitz, at least	19	point, this appears that there is video evidence which
20	of the resources that he knows should be with him, his part	20	shows police officers who were standing in proximity, close
21	of the plan, maintaining contact with them. My criticisms	21	proximity to some of the people who were lying down at
22	are in relation to the JOC, the overall commander making	22	scene 1. Some of those people were clearly at that stage
23	sure that given that the situation is clearly unfolding in	23	not dead but obviously injured and I'm just asking the
24	a way that it wasn't intended to unfold and they're hearing	24	question why those officers are not giving first aid. I
25	instructions from Officer Calitz being given over the radio	25	appreciate there's a first aid provision within the
	Dago 21475		Daga 21477
1	Page 31475 which actually clearly suggests that the operation is	1	Page 31477 operation and there may good reasons. I again guestion the
1	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is	1 2	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the
			operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating
2	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen.	2	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the
2 3	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz	2 3	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is
2 3 4	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a	2 3 4	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any
2 3 4 5	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of	2 3 4 5	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did
2 3 4 5 6	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else	2 3 4 5 6	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about
2 3 4 5 6 7	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a	2 3 4 5 6 7	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of your final statement. Chair, this is where Mr White sets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph 4, page 6. Mr White, perhaps if you could summarise your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of your final statement. Chair, this is where Mr White sets out his conclusions relating to first aid attention for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph 4, page 6. Mr White, perhaps if you could summarise your response to the SAPS here and then' I'll ask you some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of your final statement. Chair, this is where Mr White sets out his conclusions relating to first aid attention for the wounded. Mr White, if you could briefly summarise your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph 4, page 6. Mr White, perhaps if you could summarise your response to the SAPS here and then' I'll ask you some follow up questions with respect to the Mr X evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of your final statement. Chair, this is where Mr White sets out his conclusions relating to first aid attention for the wounded. Mr White, if you could briefly summarise your concerns and criticisms with respect to first aid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph 4, page 6. Mr White, perhaps if you could summarise your response to the SAPS here and then' I'll ask you some follow up questions with respect to the Mr X evidence. MR WHITE: Chair, on memory I think was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	which actually clearly suggests that the operation is continuing to happen. Even if they're assuming well Officer Calitz knows about what happened at scene 1 and he isn't making a judgment to say well we need to move on with the second of the operation and move into koppie 3. Surely someone else must making a decision to say hold on we need to take a grip of this. You know we need to stop this now and to override his instruction. Or alternatively maybe they're saying clearly Officer Calitz doesn't know therefore we need to get this information to him. And I'm making the point that the JOC, I would wonder where the evidence is, particularly the JOC or other senior people, they all have a responsibility in this. What did they do to get that information to him? Or alternatively it's the JOC, the joint operational command, you know, that they didn't of themselves do something to stop this, to slow it down, to pause and to reconsider. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, moving on then to my next topic which is covered at page 122, section 8 of your final statement. Chair, this is where Mr White sets out his conclusions relating to first aid attention for the wounded. Mr White, if you could briefly summarise your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	operation and there may good reasons. I again question the fact as to why those first aiders are not actually treating these people, but they're not is a fact. So my question is why are police officers not even attempting to give any cursory first aid. It's a long, long time since I did first aid training but one of the things I know about bleeding and quite often gunshot wounds obviously is around direct pressure. So at the very least, you know, why is some help not being given. Again question of fact as to whether or not if earlier even cursory first aid had have been given might some of the people, who subsequently died, actually survived, I don't know. MS LE ROUX: Mr White, then finally, you're aware of course, of the evidence of Mr X and of course, it's not complete, you've interrupted him, but with respect to Mr X's testimony as we understand it and of course, this is something that you deal with in your response to the SAPS in GW10. CHAIRPERSON: What page of GW10? MS LE ROUX: In particular it's paragraph 4, page 6. Mr White, perhaps if you could summarise your response to the SAPS here and then' I'll ask you some follow up questions with respect to the Mr X evidence.

	Dama 21/70		Dec. 21400
1	Page 31478 to Mr X. One, the first one I think is in relation to from	1	Page 31480 The second statement of 2014 as you, it basically
2	February 13 and the second one from February 14. I think	2	adds additional facts in which I think in summary basically
3	in summary in relation to all of that you know Mr X -	3	represent a heightened level of threat from this group, and
4		4	again I respond to that. But perhaps in the interest of
5	you – Chair, just for the record the SAPS interrogatories	5	brevity if I go directly to 4.7 of this particular
6	to Mr White was they request Mr White to express an opinion	6	statement and I basically just say, "Accordingly the
7	or advise his stated opinion or to revise his stated	7	contents of both Mr X's statements, if true, do not change
8	opinion where were he to assume that the evidence of Mr X	8	the opinions expressed in my final statement in any
9	is truthful. Sorry, Mr White, I interrupted you.	9	significant way. Although the February 2014 statement
10	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, let me read that	10	suggests that the threat from the militant group may have
11	again because I interrupted you and there's a typing error	11	been even greater than believed by SAPS, this simply
12	which I'll correct when I read it. "SAPS request Mr White	12	reinforces my view that substantially greater consideration
13	to express an opinion or to advise his stated opinion were	13	should be given to the alternative to a tactical option to
14	he to assume that the evidence of Mr $\rm X$ – were he to assume	14	disarm the strikers and there should have been a
15	that the evidence of Mr X to be truthful." And his answer,	15	substantially greater focus on intelligence gathering,
16	this comes from the SAPS points of disagreement between	16	planning, briefing and communication."
17	SAPS and Mr White and he then in his reply deals with the	17	MS LE ROUX: Mr White, in your
18	two statements effectively. There are a number of others,	18	supplementary statement, if we go to page 24 –
19	but for our purposes there are two main statements of Mr X.	19	CHAIRPERSON: I was proposing to take the
20	The one dated February 13 which he deals with paragraph 4.2	20	short first break round about now. When you said "finally"
21	or 4.3 I think and 4.4.	21	a few minutes ago I thought I'd wait, but if it was
22	[10:35] And then there is a subsequent statement a year	22	finally –
23	later, February 2014, where a number of facts are stated,	23	MS LE ROUX: It's the final topic, Chair.
24	or allegations are made which didn't appear in the earlier	24	I have a –
25	statement and he then deals with them in 4.5 and 4.6 and	25	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I understand.
25		25	
	Page 31479		Page 31481
1	then summarise in 4.7. That's correct, that's the	1	MS LE ROUX: - few questions.
2	position –	2	CHAIRPERSON: I'm not being critical. I
3	MS LE ROUX: Yes.	3	understand how these things happen, but will it be
4	CHAIRPERSON: - as far as the statement	4	convenient for you if we take the adjournment now? It will
5	is concerned.	5	
6		~	give you chance to go through your notes and proceed with
	MS LE ROUX: So Mr White, taking it in	6	give you chance to go through your notes and proceed with due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final
7	C C		due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final
	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is	6	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order?
8	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have?	6 7	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final
8 9	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed	6 7 8	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short
8 9 10	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which	6 7 8 9 10	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes.
8 9 10 11	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13	6 7 8 9 10 11	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
8 9 10 11 12	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes.
8 9 10 11 12 13	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.]
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	due preparation and concentration to your final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	due preparation and concentration to your final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	due preparation and concentration to your final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	due preparation and concentration to your final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted. So ultimately I make the point that in relation	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the Mr X case, if I can shorthand it like that, and you've
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted. So ultimately I make the point that in relation to my key criticisms around the issues that I covered	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the Mr X case, if I can shorthand it like that, and you've dealt with it with respect to his two statements. I would
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted. So ultimately I make the point that in relation to my key criticisms around the issues that I covered yesterday on a number of occasions, intelligence, the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the Mr X case, if I can shorthand it like that, and you've dealt with it with respect to his two statements. I would just like to ask you the following, whether you accept the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted. So ultimately I make the point that in relation to my key criticisms around the issues that I covered yesterday on a number of occasions, intelligence, the planning, briefing, command and control, accountability, I	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should 1? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the Mr X case, if I can shorthand it like that, and you've dealt with it with respect to his two statements. I would just like to ask you the following, whether you accept the evidence that there is at least a group of the strikers who
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	turn, if you assume that Mr X's February 2013 statement is true, what response do you have? MR WHITE: Chair, as you rightly pointed out my response is at 4.5 and 4.6 of my statement, which basically says that Mr X's evidence in February '13 statement is in many ways consistent with the intelligence that the police actually engage with, i.e. things that they knew that, you know, amongst this larger crowd there was a smaller group who because of the events on the 13th could provably be sort of recognised as potentially violent group, and then also the intelligence that they were operating on with regards to what was presented in the JOC, that if police tried to remove weapons then that would be resisted. So ultimately I make the point that in relation to my key criticisms around the issues that I covered yesterday on a number of occasions, intelligence, the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	due preparation and concentration to your final-final-final point. Will that be in order? MS LE ROUX: That's fine, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: We'll take the short adjournment now, 15 minutes. [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES] [11:02] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. You're still under oath, Mr White. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.] CHAIRPERSON: Ms le Roux. MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: Final canter. I shouldn't use that word in this context, should I? Final lap. EXAMINATION BY MS LE ROUX (CONTD.): Mr White, just before the adjournment we were dealing with the Mr X case, if I can shorthand it like that, and you've dealt with it with respect to his two statements. I would just like to ask you the following, whether you accept the

1	Page 31482	-	Page 31484
1	MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I accept that.	1	lot of heavily armed people with traditional weapons.
2	MS LE ROUX: And you accept that the	2	I've made reference to the fact that I don't
3	group on the koppie in the whole had traditional weapons	3	think there's any dispute that some of the threat that the
4	and that there was, there's conceivably a smaller, what's	4	police officers were facing in relation to particularly the
5	been referred to as the warrior group that were also armed	5	events on the 16th included a firearms threat, and there's
6	with traditional weapons?	6	evidence of course that say that firearms were actually
7	MR WHITE: Again Chair, yes, I accept	7	used against them.
8	that.	8	So at no point did I sort of try and deny the
9	MS LE ROUX: And Mr White, do you accept	9	fact that this is a very, very difficult, complex, and as I
10	that there may be evidence that there was this smaller	10	say, dangerous operation for the SAPS, and I think I've
11	militant group that were aggressive towards the police and	11	said a number of times in my statements, you know, I've got
12	made threats?	12	sympathy in terms of, you know, an organisation having to
13	MR WHITE: Again Chair, yes, I confirm	13	deal with this.
14	that.	14	However, and I think I alluded to this yesterday,
15	MS LE ROUX: Mr White, if I could then	15	you know these threats take place within the context of a
16	ask you the final-final question of your evidence-in-chief;	16	large crowd. I don't know if the SAPS would suggest that
17	page 127, paragraph 10.1.3 of your final statement, it's	17	everybody within that large crowd has a particularly
18	the last paragraph of your statement – Chair, I'm afraid	18	violent intent in relation to the police. So this is a
19	I've done this wrong. There's a preceding point which I	19	crowd management situation with additional complexities and
20	must go to first before I get there –	20	additional sort of threats, if you like, added in within
21	CHAIRPERSON: That was your final-final	21	that, and I think that, you know, in summing up I could go
22	point. We're going to get your final-final-final point in	22	to 3.2.3 of my supplementary statement where I say,
23	due course.	23	"Consequently I do not consider that there's a sharp
24	MS LE ROUX: Indeed. Apologies, Chair.	24	dispute between SAPS and me in relation to the nature of
25	Mr White, in your supplementary statement – apologies to	25	the threat faced. The sharp dispute is in relation to the
	Page 31483		Page 31485
1	you as well. In your supplementary statement, page 24,	1	response to that threat. Many of my criticisms are based
2	section 3.2, this is where you respond to the dispute	2	on the fact that SAPS operational plan does not appear to
3	between yourself and the SAPS with respect to, if I can	3	have taken the potential threat properly into account.
4	call it the nature of the threat, or the nature of the	4	Notwithstanding the fact that the threat to the police was
5	response. Chair, perhaps it's easiest to read it into the	5	significant and specialist units were brought in to assist
6		5	significant and specialist units were brought in to assist
6	record. "The SAPS state broadly as follows. In broad	6	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a
о 7	record. "The SAPS state broadly as follows. In broad terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public		
_	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements,	6	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a
7	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the	6 7	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting
7 8	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements,	6 7 8	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide
7 8 9	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the	6 7 8 9	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd
7 8 9 10	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White	6 7 8 9 10	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My
7 8 9 10 11	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the	6 7 8 9 10 11	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be
7 8 9 10 11 12	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana."
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage."	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that. Could you place that before the Commission, please?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been appraised of those threats?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that. Could you place that before the Commission, please? MR WHITE: Chair, I think that throughout	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been appraised of those threats? MR WHITE: Yes, and I've seen the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that. Could you place that before the Commission, please? MR WHITE: Chair, I think that throughout all three of my statements I've engaged with the fact and	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been appraised of those threats? MR WHITE: Yes, and I've seen the evidence of both Mr Calitz and Mr McIntosh that refer to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that. Could you place that before the Commission, please? MR WHITE: Chair, I think that throughout all three of my statements I've engaged with the fact and said frequently this is a difficult, complex and most	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been appraised of those threats? MR WHITE: Yes, and I've seen the evidence of both Mr Calitz and Mr McIntosh that refer to those threats and I think they're made repeatedly, yes.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	terms the SAPS accepts the general principles of Public Order Policing referred to by Mr White in his statements, but wish to test the relevance or practicability of the principles of the events as they occurred at Marikana. Further, there is a sharp dispute in the description in the nature of the threat where Mr White appears to move from a premise that the threat that the armed and militant group of 400 strikers presented a public order management problem, whereas SAPS contends that the threat the group presented with armaments and behaviour well exceeded the boundaries of what a Public Order Policing could manage." Mr White, you then set out your response to that. Could you place that before the Commission, please? MR WHITE: Chair, I think that throughout all three of my statements I've engaged with the fact and	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the POP members, I consider the situation at Marikana was a crowd management situation to be managed according to established crowd management principles. In a wide spectrum of public order events the situation presenting itself at Marikana was extremely challenging, but that does not mean that the application of public order crowd management principles was no longer appropriate. My understanding is that Standing Order 262 continued to be applicable to the SAPS operation at Marikana." COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: You have no doubt been appraised of the evidence as regards certain threats that were made to the police. One was the burning of the Hippos, as they were called. Another was "We're all going to die today," or words to that effect. You have been appraised of those threats? MR WHITE: Yes, and I've seen the evidence of both Mr Calitz and Mr McIntosh that refer to

	Page 31486		Page 31488
1	your final statement, paragraph 10.1.3, and that	1	assigns this type of responsibility to Public Order
2	essentially summarises your attitude to the operation at	2	Policing. Am I right?
3	Marikana. Perhaps we can just end by you reading that into	3	MR WHITE: I think that's correct, yes.
4	the record.	4	MR SEMENYA SC: But one distinct thing
5	MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, at 10.1.3 I say,	5	about that right, it seems to me that it is a right which
6	"It is a matter for the Commission to judge the validity of	6	has its own internal constitutional limitations, i.e. you
7	the actions of the individual officers who used lethal	7	
			can do it peacefully, correct? MR WHITE: Of course.
8	force on the 16th of August 2012. However, even if there	8	
9	was conclusive evidence that every shot fired was	9	MR SEMENYA SC: And you're also to do it
10	justifiable self or private defence, my opinion is that	10	without arms.
11	this operation represents a serious failure of Public Order	11	MR WHITE: Yes, I don't disagree.
12	Policing. With better preparation, planning, leadership	12	MR SEMENYA SC: Now so that you then have
13	and execution a situation in which more than a hundred SAPS	13	a specialist unit in a democratic order that is responsible
14	police officers felt compelled to fire live ammunition is	14	for crowd management operations. Am I right?
15	likely to have been avoided."	15	MR WHITE: As I understand the position
16	The only one sort of amendment I might make to	16	here in South Africa, yes, correct.
17	that, Chair, is basically when I say "serious failure in	17	MR SEMENYA SC: And I will try and go
18	Public Order Policing." I think it's a serious failure in	18	through some of these instruments with you just to have an
19	policing, full stop.	19	appreciation of what it is that in some way balances all of
20	MS LE ROUX: Thank you, Chair, we have no	20	these things out, if you follow my logic. Because our
21	further questions.	21	anticipation in the exercise of this right is that it is
22	CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms le Roux. Mr	22	going to be largely, it's going to largely involve an
23	Semenya, are you in a position to commence your cross-	23	exercise of a valid right, the constraints on the police to
24	examination?	24	use force are therefore higher. Am I right?
25	MR SEMENYA SC: I am, Chair.	25	MR WHITE: Apologies, Sir, I didn't quite
		_	
	Page 31487		Page 31489
1	Page 31487 CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you	1	Page 31489 follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't
1	5	1 2	
	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you		follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't
2	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it	2	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please?
2 3	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a	2 3	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression
2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity	2 3 4	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to
2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or	2 3 4 5	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter?	2 3 4 5 6	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on	2 3 4 5 6 7	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON:Before you start would youlike to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: MR WHITE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: I think amongst other things,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: L think amongst other things, I mean certainly Public Order Policing also extends to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're referring to. I can say that having read the Standing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: L think amongst other things, I mean certainly Public Order Policing also extends to things like football and wherever you have crowds, not just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're referring to. I can say that having read the Standing Order 262 I understand I think the definition of both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: L think amongst other things, I mean certainly Public Order Policing also extends to things like football and wherever you have crowds, not just specifically related to protest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're referring to. I can say that having read the Standing Order 262 I understand I think the definition of both gatherings and demonstrations, but you know, I certainly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHAIRPERSON: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: I think amongst other things, I mean certainly Public Order Policing also extends to things like football and wherever you have crowds, not just specifically related to protest. MR SEMENYA SC: Right, but because people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're referring to. I can say that having read the Standing Order 262 I understand I think the definition of both
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: Before you start would you like to do some housekeeping first or do you want to do it as you go along? You've given us a file containing a number of statements of which you gave notice to those calling Mr White, which he's presumably had an opportunity to read. Do you want me to mark them as exhibits now, or how do you want to handle the matter? MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, can we do it on the beat as and when I – CHAIRPERSON: Yes, if that's what you want to do, let's do it that way. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Mr White. MR WHITE: Good morning. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I ask that we paint the context within which Public Order Policing obtains? In democratic countries it is a measure intended to give meaning to the right of assembly. Am I right? And protest. MR WHITE: L think amongst other things, I mean certainly Public Order Policing also extends to things like football and wherever you have crowds, not just specifically related to protest.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	follow. I think I might have missed a word. I didn't quite hear. Could you repeat, please? MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. In the expression of that constitutional right of assembly and protest, you then have at least in this country statutes that begin to flesh out how that right is to be exercised, and in our case we have the Regulation of Gatherings Act, correct? MR WHITE: Indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And when you, at least when I read it closely it seems to define for me even things of what the gatherings are contemplated in terms of that legislation. Have you paid it close attention you will realise if you do that for instance it does not necessarily conceive gatherings of a nature that is about industrial dispute. I can take you to the definition of gatherings if you want me to. Should I? MR WHITE: I don't know that it, if that's necessary. If I could say for the record, Chair, I mean I'm not in any way an expert or very overly familiar with the particular piece of legislation that you're referring to. I can say that having read the Standing Order 262 I understand I think the definition of both gatherings and demonstrations, but you know, I certainly

	Page 31490		Page 31492
1	a later stage.	1	are to produce outcomes that are desirable that all the
2	MR SEMENYA SC: No, there is nothing very	2	role-players in a particular event cooperate with each
3	troubling about this. I'm merely saying that in a	3	other.
4	democratic order such as we have here you would expect to	4	MR WHITE: Well, I think if all of the
5	have a very complex set of legal rules and system	5	role-players in a particular event cooperate with each
6	regulation labour relations for instance, where industrial	6	other, that's likely to contribute to the best possible
7	disputes would be taken to resolve and addressed.	7	outcome. Basically what "Keeping the peace" talks about is
8	MR WHITE: I'd be guided by you, but I'm	8	how you engage with stakeholders to try and encourage that
		9	situation to prevail. Of course the reason that we have a
9	sure that's the case.		
10	MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Now, and on top of	10	document like "Keeping the peace" is the fact that in
11	that I can take you to Standing Order 262 if you like, but	11	difficult situations not all of the actors, stakeholders or
12	it also is really a Standing Order fleshing out what is in	12	participants do necessarily act in the way that we would
13	the statute, the Regulation of Gatherings Act, right? You	13	want them to do, so therefore you don't necessarily always
14	can accept that.	14	get the absolute desired outcome that you're looking for.
15	MR WHITE: Yes.	15	MR SEMENYA SC: No, I know I'll get there
16	MR SEMENYA SC: Now even when we look at	16	in a little while, but the proposition I'm putting to you
17	instruments which I think is the plinth on which your	17	that you get the desirable outcome where there is every
18	opinions are based, for instance "Keeping the peace," the	18	party comes to the party and do what they must do, that is
19	one distinct thing about those type of instruments is they	19	the way that assures a successful outcome to a public order
20	make the fulcrum of public policing really policing by	20	operation. Am I right?
21	consent as the document speaks, right?	21	MR WHITE: Like I say the hope would be,
22	MR WHITE: I think that the, where it's	22	in fact if every single stakeholder, every single
23	talking about is the ultimate objective of the police is to	23	participant or actor in any particular policing situation
24	try and ensure that that situation maintains. We police	24	was operating in a way that was contributing to this
25	communities and societies with their consent and the whole	25	desired outcome, then I don't think actually there will be
	Page 31491		Page 31493
1	Page 31491 purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to	1	Page 31493 a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as
1 2		1 2	9
	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to		a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as
2	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult	2	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody
2	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring	2 3	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a
2 3 4	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent.	2 3 4	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well
2 3 4 5	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya	2 3 4 5	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of
2 3 4 5 6	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity	2 3 4 5 6	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would
2 3 4 5 6 7	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act?	2 3 4 5 6 7	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order management entails a confluence of cooperation by various	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also conversely when the wheels get off the wagon you would want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order management entails a confluence of cooperation by various stakeholders involved in any operation of this kind. Am I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also conversely when the wheels get off the wagon you would want to see in what respect the one or other of the role-players
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order management entails a confluence of cooperation by various stakeholders involved in any operation of this kind. Am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also conversely when the wheels get off the wagon you would want to see in what respect the one or other of the role-players did not bring their weight to the wheel, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order management entails a confluence of cooperation by various stakeholders involved in any operation of this kind. Am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also conversely when the wheels get off the wagon you would want to see in what respect the one or other of the role-players did not bring their weight to the wheel, correct? MR WHITE: I have no dispute with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	purpose around a document like "Keeping the peace" is to ensure that when we deal with complex and difficult situations, that actually we're very conscious of ensuring that we do so in a way that maintains that public consent. CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, before Mr Semenya continues, may I ask you this. Have you had an opportunity to study the Regulation of Gatherings Act? MR WHITE: No, Chair, I haven't and I think that's why I made the comment earlier on in my evidence. I'm not a lawyer, I'm certainly not a lawyer in South Africa, so no, I haven't. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I just said central to maintenance of public order there is a great dependence on the cooperation of the society where the maintenance of public order must obtain. Am I right? MR WHITE: As I said, I think that's the objective that the police should bear in mind when you're engaging with these difficult situations. MR SEMENYA SC: And if I understand those instruments, as I say, "Keeping the peace," public order management entails a confluence of cooperation by various stakeholders involved in any operation of this kind. Am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a need for the police in the UK to have a doctrine such as "Keeping the peace" because I mean ultimately if everybody was playing the role to see if we can resolve disputes in a way that doesn't create any difficulties or problems, well then why would you need guidance to help you sort of achieve that? So I mean clearly this is what we would want, but we know the reality of life is it doesn't always work like that, so that's why there is a document such as "Keeping the peace" which helps to sort of guide police commanders in preparing for these things. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, Mr White, the Chair in the past would say to witnesses don't try and answer a question you anticipate will follow. The proposition I'm putting with you is plainly correct. Am I right? That everybody playing their part, the outcomes are almost always a happy one. MR WHITE: If everyone plays their part then the outcomes are almost always a happy one, yes. Apologies, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And also conversely when the wheels get off the wagon you would want to see in what respect the one or other of the role-players did not bring their weight to the wheel, correct?

	Page 31494		Page 31496
1	MR WHITE: I don't dispute that.	1	centre the emphasis on making sure that these operations
2	MR SEMENYA SC: Right, and when I look at	2	have the confidence and the support of all the role players
3	the Regulation of Gatherings Act which the Chair referred	3	when they are staged, public order operations.
4	to, in fact the whole structure is to obtain what is called	4	MR WHITE: In its general intent, yes, I
5	a section 4 meeting where you know who is going to be in	5	think that's reasonably accurate, yes.
6	the march, what resources are necessary, what medical is	6	MR SEMENYA SC: That, too, transported
7	necessary, who is going to do the marshalling, etcetera,	7	into the APP as well.
8	etcetera. Am I right?	8	MR WHITE: Absolutely.
9	MR WHITE: I have seen that in –	9	MR SEMENYA SC: Right. Now a proper
10	CHAIRPERSON: He says he hasn't read the	10	investigation, I gather, of what would have happened in
11	act. He must just accept what you say, but of course	11	Marikana would entail probing, as I put the expression,
12	you'll also appreciate that section 9 of the act does deal	12	where the wheels got off. You look at the role of the
13	with the situation where the police have to take action,	13	police, you look at the role of Lonmin, you look at the
14	like disarming, dispersing, even arresting in certain	14	role of the unions, et cetera. Am I right?
15	circumstances, because there are dangers, threats to public	15	MR WHITE: I think that would be fair and
16	peace. So the act isn't entirely directed at specific	16	reasonable, yes.
17	peaceful irenic gatherings. But the witness doesn't know	17	MR SEMENYA SC: And I was quite surprised
18	anything about that, so you can't ask him about it, except	18	that your brief seemed to be saying, just look at the
19	putting propositions to him, I mean.	19	conduct of the police. That was your brief, right?
20	MR SEMENYA SC: Well, even if it is	20	MR WHITE: That's absolutely correct.
21	without reference to the act, Mr White, that is your	21	MR SEMENYA SC: And I want to suggest to
22	understanding about how planning of public operations	22	you, Mr White, that as an independent expert commenting on
23	happen. You involve all the role-players, you define their	23	a public order operation that went awry, you would have
24	roles and you draw an agreement and you have a written	24	said to, as you call them, your legal team, but this will
25	plan. Am I right?	25	give a very skew report because I must be able to comment
	Page 31495		Page 31497
1	Page 31495 MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes.	1	Page 31497 on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or
1 2		1 2	
	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes.		on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or
2	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one	2	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to
2 3	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are	2 3	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say?
2 3 4	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and	2 3 4	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to
2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which	2 3 4 5	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried
2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that	2 3 4 5 6	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case. MR SEMENYA SC: Just for completeness,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know, it's fair to say that there was no intent, no attempt from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case. MR SEMENYA SC: Just for completeness, even the other instrument relative to public order policing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know, it's fair to say that there was no intent, no attempt from my legal team to try and shield from the fact that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case. MR SEMENYA SC: Just for completeness, even the other instrument relative to public order policing that comes to mind would be the HMIC document, the rules of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know, it's fair to say that there was no intent, no attempt from my legal team to try and shield from the fact that obviously there are other role players within this and some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case. MR SEMENYA SC: Just for completeness, even the other instrument relative to public order policing that comes to mind would be the HMIC document, the rules of engagement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know, it's fair to say that there was no intent, no attempt from my legal team to try and shield from the fact that obviously there are other role players within this and some of the things that they did or did not do, but my brief was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: As far as possible, yes. [11:22] MR SEMENYA SC: The trickier one obviously would relate to instances where they are spontaneous and therefore there are no plannings and therefore there may be unforeseen circumstances for which some measure of planning must happen, but we'll get to that later, am I right? MR WHITE: Correct. MR SEMENYA SC: Now, you were aware that this Commission was established to investigate a number of things, am I right? MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And the Marikana incident with which you are now familiar is intended to probe, or the Commission is intended to probe around that event, the role played by the various stakeholders, if I were to call it that. Correct? MR WHITE: Yes, Chair, I understand that to be the case. MR SEMENYA SC: Just for completeness, even the other instrument relative to public order policing that comes to mind would be the HMIC document, the rules of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on the roles of others to see whether or not they did or did not have an impact on the resultant outcome – fair to say? MR WHITE: I don't know if that's fair to say in that I don't think my legal team at any stage tried to hide any evidence from me in terms of the role of others. I mean I've been provided with transcripts of meetings between the police and Lonmin, for example, and you know certainly I've been provided with a lot of evidence which shows, as Ms Le Roux was referring to in her sort of closing remarks there about the sort of potential violent intent of at least some of the people within the group, but my experience is, as I referred to yesterday, is on the basis of, you know, 30 years policing. My understanding was I was being asked to provide expert opinion in relation to, based on my experience and therefore I don't think it was actually unusual that I was being asked to look at the role of the police in this because that's what I know best. But I do think, you know, it's fair to say that there was no intent, no attempt from my legal team to try and shield from the fact that obviously there are other role players within this and some

		1	
1	Page 31498	1	Page 31500
1	MR SEMENYA SC: No, I'm not blaming	1	would have acted appropriately or what could they have
2	anybody. I'm merely saying that you hold expertise in	2	brought to bear in producing an outcome that is desirable.
3	relation to the role, for instance, of the community in	3	You have that type of expertise. I'm just exploring that
4	public order operations, correct?	4	your expertise is not limited to the conduct of the police.
5	MR WHITE: I have lengthy experience in	5	MR WHITE: Well, I'm more than happy to
6	dealing with the situations where engagement with the	6	discuss my experience in relation to dealing with
7	community is a requirement.	7	stakeholders involved in these types of situations beyond
8	MR SEMENYA SC: And you have expertise	8	the police. Do I have any particular experience or
9	and understanding in relation to the role of the public in	9	expertise in relation to the conduct of unions? No, I
10	public order management operations, am I right?	10	don't but again in order to be helpful in – for example I
11	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed.	11	explained yesterday that a lot of the difficulties that we
12	MR SEMENYA SC: So you could competently	12	have in Northern Ireland relate to the parading situation,
13	have given us your expert opinions about the	13	so there are a number of actors there like the parading
14	appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers	14	institutions, the bands, residents' associations, the
15	in the Marikana tragedy, am I right?	15	Parades Commission themselves, all actors, stakeholders who
16	MR WHITE: I'm not sure what you would	16	can contribute to this and I've lots of experience in
17	have anticipated or wanted me to say. I mean I've said	17	dealing with those.
18	throughout this, is there a real threat in this operation	18	MR SEMENYA SC: You see, I'm trying to
19	to the police, frequently I've said that. So therefore	19	get us at a point where we don't leave this Commission with
20	logically that potentially comes from at least a section of	20	the conclusion that the South African Police Service must
21	the crowd who therefore, I think logic would show, are	21	be, must be put at a level where a resolution of public
22	clearly not going to be overly co-operative with the	22	disorder must accept on the one equation that people will
23	police. So I'm not sure ultimately what the point of the	23	come with spears, they will come with pangas, they'll come
24	question is and I'm not being obtuse –	24	with murderous intent, they will come and attack the police
25	MR SEMENYA SC: I'll repeat it, I'll	25	and we must get our police at a level equivalent to contain
20			
	Page 31499		Page 31501
1	Page 31499 repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order	1	Page 31501 that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr
1 2	5	1 2	0
	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order		that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr
2	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the	2	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right?
2 3 4	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right?	2 3	 that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question
2 3 4 5	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes	2 3 4	 that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly –
2 3 4 5 6	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes.	2 3 4 5 6	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it.
2 3 4 5 6 7	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also	2 3 4 5	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert	2 3 4 5 6 7	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm not trying to be awkward but – so I'll say yes and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission. MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and therefore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm not trying to be awkward but – so I'll say yes and then perhaps I can help you further at a later stage.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission. MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and therefore with the benefit of your expertise it would have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm not trying to be awkward but – so I'll say yes and then perhaps I can help you further at a later stage. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. And so you could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission. MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and therefore with the benefit of your expertise it would have been possible to say, to have you tell the Commission that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm not trying to be awkward but – so I'll say yes and then perhaps I can help you further at a later stage. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. And so you could bring your critical scrutiny into looking as to whether for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission. MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and therefore with the benefit of your expertise it would have been possible to say, to have you tell the Commission that the proper play by Lonmin in this public order would have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	repeat it. You hold expertise in relation to public order management operations, to give expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of the strikers, for instance, in this case. Am I right? MR WHITE: That's – okay, I'll say yes and then let's see where it goes. MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. And you also hold expertise and you could have given us your expert opinion in relation to the appropriateness or otherwise of the conduct of Lonmin in the resultant tragedy that resulted, am I right? You hold that expertise. MR WHITE: Well, as I said yesterday, I have limited expertise in relation to dealing with industrial disputes but if your point is about having experience with regard to dealing with different stakeholders – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct. MR WHITE: - community, then yes, I do, but again I caveat my answer by saying I don't really understand the implication of the question and again I'm not trying to be awkward but – so I'll say yes and then perhaps I can help you further at a later stage. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. And so you could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that. That would be the wrong approach completely, Mr White, am I right? MR WHITE: I'm not, I'm genuinely not following you. I understand, if I understand the question properly – MR SEMENYA SC: Which I can explain it. MR WHITE: Please do. MR SEMENYA SC: If we are to avoid another Marikana, we cannot leave this Commission with a recommendation that says the police must be upped to the level where they always are to deal with people who are armed, they are in formations, with murderous intent and intent on killing the police, the message must come out of this Commission that says in a democratic order you need to have law abiding tolerance so that the police can also discharge the maintenance of public order and peace. Isn't that where we should be going? MR WHITE: I don't think that's an unreasonable proposition and I hope that's what comes out of the Marikana Commission. MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and therefore with the benefit of your expertise it would have been possible to say, to have you tell the Commission that the

Droto	dia
Pretor	la

1	Page 31502 stakeholder could see where it erred, with the benefit of	1	Page 31504 appropriate part to be played by this group, that group,
2	your expertise. Correct?	2	that group, for a desirable outcome. That expertise you
3	MR WHITE: Well, I think that there may	3	have, am I right?
4	well be things that Lonmin could have done differently,	4	MR WHITE: I'm not sure ultimately
5	there may well have been things that the unions could have	5	therefore what my conclusions would have been and how
6	done differently, there may well have been things that the	6	helpful they would be if I was to say that I think Lonmin
7	strikers themselves could have done differently, all of	7	should have perhaps at an earlier stage agreed to give the
8	that. And as I say, I understand that that's what the	8	miners more money, then maybe all of these events could
0 9	Commission will address themselves to. However, my brief	8 9	have been avoided. I think the unions should have been
9 10	-	9 10	
10	was to look at this from the point of view of the police, that's where I have expertise and beyond that, if all of	11	more conciliatory in relation to the amount of money they
	· · ·	12	were asking for. I think you know the strikers shouldn't
12	those people have contributed in a different way then it		have been as violent, they should have – you know, would
13	still requires the police to have an operation or approach to the situation and that's what I commented on. If all of	13	that have been of value to you, Chair?
14		14 15	MR SEMENYA SC: I would suggest it would
15 16	those actors had have acted differently, well, then maybe	15 16	be of value to the Commission, Mr White, because the
16	the outcome would have been different but I would still say that, you know, my assistance to the Commission is best in	16 17	finding of the Commission would also be having the benefit
17 18		17	of an expert opinion of the kind you hold and I would have been able to argue on the basis of your expert opinion that
10	relation to operational policing because that's where my experience is. But going back to the earlier part of your	18	I'm able to drive a submission of where Lonmin could have
20	question when you were talking about, you know, the rights	20	gone right or wrong on the strength of the expert opinion
20	and responsibilities, I mean one of the things that we talk	20	of Mr White with such a wealth of experience –
22	about all the time around the European Convention on Human	22	CHAIRPERSON: Of course the difficulty
22	Rights in my own country and the fact that it's my primary	22	with that is, one doesn't want him to express expert
23	legislation, is with rights come responsibilities. I do	23	opinions on matters on which, on which he has no expertise.
25	not for one second try and suggest that Lonmin, the	25	If you think of the Marikana situation as being like a sick
20		20	
	Page 31503		Page 31505
1	Page 31503 strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have	1	Page 31505 patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and
1 2		1 2	0
	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have		patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and
2	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to	2	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have
2 3	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the	2 3	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient,
2 3 4	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I	2 3 4	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist –
2 3 4 5	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no,	2 3 4 5	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the
2 3 4 5 6	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving	2 3 4 5 6	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I	2 3 4 5 6 7	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we? MR WHITE: I absolutely agree with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things about the fact that they shouldn't have possessed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we? MR WHITE: I absolutely agree with that polnt, that's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things about the fact that they shouldn't have possessed the weapons, they shouldn't go around murdering people,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we? MR WHITE: I absolutely agree with that point, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: So you would be able to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things about the fact that they shouldn't have possessed the weapons, they shouldn't go around murdering people, injuring people and making threats. Those are his areas of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we? MR WHITE: I absolutely agree with that point, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: So you would be able to bring your informed experience and opinion and expertise in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things about the fact that they shouldn't have possessed the weapons, they shouldn't go around murdering people, injuring people and making threats. Those are his areas of expertise, those are linked to the sort of cardiac problems
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	strikers themselves, et cetera, et cetera, have responsibilities in relation to this. My brief was to engage with the police, on the issues in relation to the police. If your question is that you feel that perhaps I should have pushed back on my legal team and said, no – no, I feel I should be contributing more and I should be giving expert opinion in relation to the rules of the others, then to be honest with you I think there's a point of disagreement, whether it's from the point of view that I say my expertise is in relation to operational policing that happens within that wider context, I'm sure other people are far more able than me to be able to talk about the intricacies of the activities of unions or the mine company or whatever. MR SEMENYA SC: No, I thought, Mr White, we had agreed that your expertise is public order policing and we have agreed that that field is a field which operates with multiple parties who sit together and who bring their weight to the equation. That, we have gone past it now, I think, haven't we? MR WHITE: I absolutely agree with that point, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: So you would be able to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	patient who's got lung cancer, who's got a broken femur and a few other diseases as well or maladies as well, you have a number of doctors come and give opinions on the patient, what can be done to heal the patient, the cardiologist – and also heart trouble – the cardiologist talks about the heart, the oncologist talks about the cancer, the orthopaedic surgeon talks about the fractured femur. You don't expect the cardiologist then to say, well, by the way, while I'm here I'll tell you what I think about the fractured femur and I'll tell you what I think about the lung cancer. He is called as an expert to deal with one part of the problem, namely the police, their operations. He has expertise, of course, in something else and that's dealing with disorderly people who cause this public disorder and require policing operations and by implication, he wasn't asked directly but by implication he has expressed criticisms of the strikers because he talked about the magnitude of the threat, he talked about the problem the police had. Clearly, had he been asked to elaborate on that he presumably would say, talk to things about the fact that they shouldn't have possessed the weapons, they shouldn't go around murdering people, injuring people and making threats. Those are his areas of

1	Page 31506	1	Page 31508
1	along and tries to give us, gives evidence to us about how	1	witnesses, some of them were extensively cross-examined but
2	he thinks trade unions should behave, dealing with matters	2	there were a number of witnesses you led and you obviously
3	of industrial relations and so forth or he tells us how he	3	have to because there are a lot of police actors involved
4	thinks employers should behave, how they shouldn't be	4	in this. There were certain reasons which I don't want to
5	obstinate and difficult and possibly cynical in the way	5	go into as to why some of the cross-examination, some of
6	they approach the matter - these are all criticisms that we	6	the police people took far longer than we thought.
7	will hear in due course I'm sure – then, frankly, I would	7	Documents that had previously been asked for and were said
8	tell him, is that, do you know anything about that, have	8	to be non-existent finally appeared on Colonel Scott's
9	you got experience of that, we're not interested	9	computer and that led to lengthy cross-examination. And
10	particularly in your views on that. So I'm not sure that	10	other documents came forward as well. Certainly a lot of
11	the proposition you're putting to him is entirely accurate.	11	time has been spent on the police case for various reasons
12	MR WHITE: Thank you, Chair, I'm very	12	but the point that I'm making to you is that AMCU has under
13	grateful.	13	the microscope, NUM has been under the microscope, a number
14	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, perhaps two things	14	of witnesses have come from the striker's side. We're now
15	immediately. You would be aware, Chair, that one of the	15	busy with the police, we're near the end of the police
16	concerns my client has is that we are 18 months into this	16	evidence, this witness, of course, has been interposed for
17	Commission hearing, 90% of what we do has been probing the	17	logistic reasons. We're then going to turn to Lonmin and I
18	police conduct and where the terms of reference clearly	18	know the police take the view and this has been stated in
19	point to a probing of multiple areas that may have	19	their opening statement, that Lonmin behaved badly. That
20	contributed to the result, on the time frame now given the	20	if Lonmin had been co-operative and had done things that
21	rest of the matters have to be done in a month.	21	they were urged to do by the police then you will contend
22	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, can I respond to that?	22	in due course I take it that either - that what happened on
23	You talk about the present time frame. As you know, an	23	the 16th of August wouldn't have happened and you may well
24	application has been made for an extension and we will get	24	have submissions to make in regard to the 13th as well. And
25	the result of that I believe quite soon and if the	25	the point I'm making to you is I'm not sure that this
	Page 31507		Page 31509
1	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a	1	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to
2	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully –	1 2	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be
	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also –		witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to
2	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll	2	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that
2 3	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence	2 3	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already
2 3 4	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the	2 3 4	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the
2 3 4 5	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence	2 3 4 5	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already
2 3 4 5 6	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the	2 3 4 5 6	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the
2 3 4 5 6 7	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to	2 3 4 5 6 7	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you produced the statement of Mr X and Mr Mpofu took the view	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you ask him more about it he will say more, he can criticise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you produced the statement of Mr X and Mr Mpofu took the view that he would like to call evidence later to deal with what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you ask him more about it he will say more, he can criticise the behaviour of the strikers. And he's already conceded
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you produced the statement of Mr X and Mr Mpofu took the view that he would like to call evidence later to deal with what Mr X was going to say. And he gave statements, we've got	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you ask him more about it he will say more, he can criticise the behaviour of the strikers. And he's already conceded that there was a very serious problem that the police had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you produced the statement of Mr X and Mr Mpofu took the view that he would like to call evidence later to deal with what Mr X was going to say. And he gave statements, we've got statements of two witnesses whom he proposes to call as I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you ask him more about it he will say more, he can criticise the behaviour of the strikers. And he's already conceded that there was a very serious problem that the police had to deal with. As I understand it he has a great 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	extension is granted then of course we won't just have a month but to deal with the point you made more fully – MR SEMENYA SC: And also – CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, can I finish? I'll give you an opportunity. We started off with evidence which took much longer than we thought it would, but of the objective facts on the ground, what the people who went to the scene found and so forth. We then moved on to the evidence, I think it was of AMCU, they led their evidence and their conduct came under scrutiny and Mr Mathunjwa was extensively cross-examined, and other AMCU officials I think. Then we had evidence from NUM. [11:41] The NUM people gave evidence, they were extensively cross-examined and from the president of NUM down to the shop stewards and people on the ground at Marikana. That evidence was also examined fully. Then we had people like Mr Magidiwana and Mr Phatsha, among the strikers, they gave evidence, they were cross-examined extensively. At that point, as far as I remember, you produced the statement of Mr X and Mr Mpofu took the view that he would like to call evidence later to deal with what Mr X was going to say. And he gave statements, we've got statements of two witnesses whom he proposes to call as I understand fairly soon after Mr X's evidence. We then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	witness can help us much in relation to the criticisms to be directed against Lonmin. Those criticisms will not be ignored, they will be fully investigated. We've already had cross-examination of Mr De Costa on issues of that kind, so there is already, some of that material is already before us. So I can understand the police saying that the impression is created we are the sole people who are being criticised. And that's not fair you would say. Now, of course, if that correct you would be entitled to say it's not fair but certainly the other persons who are listed or other parties listed in the terms of reference whose behaviour has to be examined, some of it has been examined, some still will be examined. This witness though I would have thought in the position of a cardiologist in the metaphorical example I put to you, who can help us to deal with the cardiological problems, he can't help us very much anyway in relation to the behaviour of the unions or the employer. That's to say by implication, I presume if you ask him more about it he will say more, he can criticise the behaviour of the strikers. And he's already conceded that there was a very serious problem that the police had to deal with. As I understand it he has a great with the police, the problem, of course, was armed strikers who were

	Page 31510		Page 31512
1	gatherings or assembly in the Constitution, who were in	1	what the request was for the increase and you compare the
2	possession of weapons who refused to hand them over and	2	two figures, that might seem to be significant.
3	some of whom appear to have used them to murder or injure	3	MR SEMENYA SC: But I take it you did not
4	people or certainly certain people at various times. That	4	know the numbers.
5	is very serious misbehaviour which I take it he can	5	MR WHITE: I think, could you point me to
6	elaborate on if you want him to. But I don't think the	6	the particular part of my statement where I say that and
7	main thrust of what you said with respect is correct and I	7	maybe I might try and help you?
8	thought it appropriate for me to say so.	8	MR SEMENYA SC: Certainly. If you go to
9	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, as you would say	9	your provisional statement WW2.
10	one day we'll want to look at this transcript and see what	10	MR WHITE: Yes.
11	it is that we did and one of those things that I would like	11	MR SEMENYA SC: And if you go to page 14
12	to say is to read that as SAPS we took all the points we	12	you will find on that page paragraph 3.1.2 you're dealing
13	deemed relevant in relation to the evidence of the witness	13	with the event of Marikana in a summary. Are you there?
14	and I acknowledge the hypothetical example that, Chair,	14	MR WHITE: Yes.
15	you're making. But this witness, that's where I started, I	15	MR SEMENYA SC: There it reads, "on 9 and
16	said you are an expert in a field where confluence of	16	10 August 2012 about 3000 employees commenced the strike at
17	various players are intended to operate in a particular way	17	Lonmin's Marikana mine in the North West Province of South
18	to produce the desired outcome. Now I think it is fair,	18	Africa. They were demanding a significant increase in
19	Chair, with respect that I should –	19	their salaries to twelve and a half thousand per month."
20	CHAIRPERSON: I'm not stopping you, I'm	20	MR WHITE: I see that that's correct,
21	just saying to you as a matter of emphasis, you can	21	yes.
22	obviously ask him about the employer, you can ask him about	22	MR SEMENYA SC: Well to that I ask you
23	the trade unions, you can ask him about the strikers. I'm	23	did you know what the numbers are. What were they earning,
24	not stopping any of that cross-examination but what I was	24	what were they not earning and why twelve and a half
25	resisting was the suggestion that he can testify with equal	25	thousand is such a significant increase?
1	Page 31511 authority and expertise and experience in relation to the	1	Page 31513 MR WHITE: First of all L wrote the
1	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the	1	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the
2	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the	2	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was
	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives		MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they
2 3	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is	2 3	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment
2 3 4 5	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You	2 3 4	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand.
2 3 4	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you
2 3 4 5 6	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion	2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand.
2 3 4 5 6 7	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary. MR WHITE: I've said that specifically	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no? MR WHITE: In my experience, you know if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary. MR WHITE: I've said that specifically and I accept that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And I was quite intrigued by the adjective you used, that is was significant, what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no? MR WHITE: In my experience, you know if there's anything that can be done in order to try and avoid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary. MR WHITE: I've said that specifically and I accept that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And I was quite intrigued by the adjective you used, that is was significant, what informed that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no? MR WHITE: In my experience, you know if there's anything that can be done in order to try and avoid disorder that's what you should do and I note that Mr De Rover I think said something very similar where he talks about your mouth is your best weapon. In other words if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary. MR WHITE: I've said that specifically and I accept that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And I was quite intrigued by the adjective you used, that is was significant, what informed that? MR WHITE: On reflection I assume that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no? MR WHITE: In my experience, you know if there's anything that can be done in order to try and avoid disorder that's what you should do and I note that Mr De Rover I think said something very similar where he talks about your mouth is your best weapon. In other words if we can talk these situations down, of course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	authority and expertise and experience in relation to the behaviour of Lonmin which has already come under the microscope to some extent and the Lonmin representatives here will I'm sure be pleased to hear that that scrutiny is going to continue when the Lonmin witnesses come. You can't deal with him with Lonmin's behaviour with the same depth that you can deal with the evidence of – his opinion in evidence in relation to the police and as I've said by implication the strikers as well. And the same applies to the trade unions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr White, examining the evidence you did realise very early did you not that the tragedy in Marikana had as its origin an industrial dispute. MR WHITE: Yes indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: About which, as I will show you later, you say the employees were demanding significant increase in their salary. MR WHITE: I've said that specifically and I accept that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And I was quite intrigued by the adjective you used, that is was significant, what informed that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: First of all I wrote the statement a long time ago, I'm assuming that there was obviously information in front of me which said what they were earning and allowed me to sort of make the assessment that from whatever X was to twelve and a half thousand. I'm foggy with regards to what it was. Perhaps if you could just help me with regards to what that figure was. MR SEMENYA SC: Let's move on a little, Mr White. You were also aware, having read the evidence, that what the strikers really demanded on the koppie was merely that the employer must come speak to them. Right? MR WHITE: I've seen a lot of evidence where strikers have made that request, I think actually often through the police. MR SEMENYA SC: And in your experience a demand of that nature is capable of resolving a public disorder. It's one that attempts must be made at meeting it, no? MR WHITE: In my experience, you know if there's anything that can be done in order to try and avoid disorder that's what you should do and I note that Mr De Rover I think said something very similar where he talks about your mouth is your best weapon. In other words if we

		I	
1	Page 31514	1	Page 31516
	evidence what I invite your comment on, of the police, even at the highest level trying to persuade Lonmin into talking	1 2	the other as a kind of intermediary or messenger taking messages from the strikers to the employers and from the
	to the strikers on the koppie –	2	employers to the strikers. So the point you make is
3 4	MR CHASKALSON SC: Sorry, Chairperson,	4	correct. So I've allowed you to proceed.
	5 1		
	the evidence is actually to the contrary. I mean the	5	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. Given
	evidence is that the police at the highest level,	6	your expertise you would have found the conduct of the
	Lieutenant-General Mbombo were essentially telling Lonmin	7	police to have been appropriate in those circumstances, Mr
	to take a hard line against the strikers.	8	White, am I right?
9	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Chaskalson, there was	9	MR WHITE: Just to clarify where the
	also evidence I think from General Mpembe –	10	police passed on messages from the strikers to the
11	MR CHASKALSON SC: The highest level is	11	management or to the hierarchy of the unions that they
	Lieutenant-General Mbombo, Chairperson.	12	wanted to negotiate?
13	CHAIRPERSON: The highest level is	13	MR SEMENYA SC: Well let's start at this
	actually General Phiyega, National Commissioner Phiyega	14	level, of encouraging dialogue around the impasse.
	but let's take the highest level out of it in this case and	15	MR WHITE: Yes, I'm entirely supportive
	say at a high level.	16	of the police in encouraging dialogue, yes.
17	MR CHASKALSON SC: The highest level that	17	MR SEMENYA SC: And you have seen,
	engaged with Lonmin was Lieutenant-General Mbombo on	18	looking at the evidence, the extent at which that effort
	record.	19	was done by the police in trying to dissolve the dispute,
20	CHAIRPERSON: That's correct. But let's	20	that you'd find to appropriate behaviour wouldn't you or
-	just limit it to a high level. At the high level the	21	not?
	evidence is General Mpembe did ask the police, sorry ask	22	MR WHITE: I agree and I endorse the
	Lonmin to deal with the strikers and Lonmin took up an	23	comments of the Commissioner when she talked about Mr
	attitude they had a two year contract and a two year wage	24	McIntosh and in particular doing this, yes and I think I've
25	agreement, it wasn't necessary for them to engage and there	25	potentially commented on it.
_			
	Page 31515	1	Page 31517 CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further
1 \	were various other reasons they gave. So there is	1	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further
1 v 2 s	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the	2	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that
1 v 2 s 3 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based	2 3	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come
1 v 2 s 3 l 4 c	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and	2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed
1 v 2 s 3 l 4 d 5 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when	2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in
1 v 2 s 3 l 4 d 5 l 6 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried
1 v 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l 9	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their
1 v 2 s 3 l 4 d 5 l 6 l 7 d 8 l 9 10 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l 9 10 l 11 c	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l 9 10 l 11 c 12 l	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l 9 10 l 11 c 12 l 13 c	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful
1 x 2 s 3 l 4 c 5 l 6 l 7 c 8 l 9 10 l 11 c 12 l 13 c 14	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would
1 1 2 5 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on
1 1 2 3 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15 16	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that?
1 1 2 2 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15 15 16 17 1	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort
1 1 2 3 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15 15 16 17 1 18 1	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single
1 1 2 3 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 1 15 0 16 1 17 1 18 1 19 0	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their
1 1 2 2 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 1 15 0 16 1 17 1 18 1 19 0 20 1	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed back through to Lonmin. That is the evidence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their responsibilities would that ultimately lead to the best
1 1 2 3 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15 15 0 16 1 17 1 18 1 19 0 20 1 21 21	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed back through to Lonmin. That is the evidence. CHAIRPERSON: When Lieutenant-Colonel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their responsibilities would that ultimately lead to the best possible outcome. And I said yes if Lonmin, you know, had
1 1 2 2 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 15 15 0 16 17 18 1 19 0 20 1 21 2 22 1	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed back through to Lonmin. That is the evidence. CHAIRPERSON: When Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh was being cross-examined by Mr Mpofu he made it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their responsibilities would that ultimately lead to the best possible outcome. And I said yes if Lonmin, you know, had to be much more compliant perhaps it would have led to a
1 1 2 2 3 1 4 0 5 1 6 1 7 0 8 1 9 10 11 0 12 1 13 0 14 1 15 0 16 1 17 1 18 1 19 0 20 1 21 2 22 1 23 0	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed back through to Lonmin. That is the evidence. CHAIRPERSON: When Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh was being cross-examined by Mr Mpofu he made it clear he was operating in two capacities. One capacity as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their responsibilities would that ultimately lead to the best possible outcome. And I said yes if Lonmin, you know, had to be much more compliant perhaps it would have led to a different outcome. Mr Semenya asked about do I have
1 2 3 2 3 1 4 0 5 5 1 6 7 0 8 9 10 1 11 0 1 12 1 1 13 0 1 14 1 5 0 15 0 1 1 16 1 7 1 18 1 19 0 20 1 2 1 23 0 2 1 23 0 2 2	were various other reasons they gave. So there is substance in the point being put by – he isn't quite the highest level, I understand the point you're making based on the transcript of discussion between General Mbombo and Mr Mokwena which presumably will be dealt with later when Mr Mokwena comes to give evidence. But subject to the deletion of the word highest I'll allow Mr Semenya to ask his questions. MR SEMENYA SC: Mr Chair, isn't the palliative degree in my judgement correct? The National Commissioner came the Monday and even asked who are these faceless people. Let's try and examine these things but an objection of what degree of – CHAIRPERSON: I've disallowed the objection, I said you can carry on. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: But it goes further because when the negotiations were taking place and the request was made of the negotiators that message for the employer to come to the scene to talk to them was passed back through to Lonmin. That is the evidence. CHAIRPERSON: When Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh was being cross-examined by Mr Mpofu he made it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: One could go a bit further couldn't one? One could say that this is a matter that obviously will be dealt with more fully when witness come back from Lonmin. But the view I think has been expressed but I'm interested to get your views on it, not quite in terms that I'm going to put it to you but the view has being expressed that the police were given a rather poor hand to play if you use card playing analogy. They tried to get the strikers to leave the koppie, lay down their arms and so forth. Because of the attitude adopted by the employer that the police were doing their best to solve the problem by negotiation but it will be said and has already been said that the attitude adopted by Lonmin was unhelpful and made the police task more difficult than it would otherwise have been. Are you in a position to comment on that? MR WHITE: I think that the opening sort of questions that I answered were around if every single actor lived up to what we would see as their responsibilities would that ultimately lead to the best possible outcome. And I said yes if Lonmin, you know, had to be much more compliant perhaps it would have led to a

		1	
1	Page 31518	1	Page 31520
1	yesterday in relation to my experience and just briefly	1	I don't know that my criticisms are suggesting that in any
2	reflect back and things like parade disputes. We have a	2	way that the police always need to be – I don't know if
3	number of actors there and it is incredibly frustrating	3	this in unison with the question and if it's not I
4	around the [indistinct] of some of those groups in relation	4	apologise but I don't know if you're suggesting that my
5	to their firmly held views as to what should happen. Again	5	recommendations or my criticisms will ultimately lead to
6	if only they would give this a little bit of ground and	6	the South African police being armed at the teeth to be
7	they would give this little bit of ground it would make the	7	able to deal with a very violent group with spears and I
8	situation a lot easier. But they don't. I can have a view	8	don't know.
9	on them, I can be sort of critical and whatever but the	9	[12:01] I apologise if I have misconstrued.
10	bottom line is whatever the position is I then have to deal	10	MR SEMENYA SC: Shall it be a convenient
11	with that. And I can go home at night and be really,	11 12	stage for the tea?
12	really frustrated and I can have a particular view on		CHAIRPERSON: If it is convenient for
13	particular stakeholders but it doesn't actually change the	13 14	you. [COMMSSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
14	fact that here is this really difficult position as the		
15	police commander I need to deal with it. I wish it was	15	[12:22] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Mr
16 17	different but it's not so how do I deal with it. MR SEMENYA SC: Well you see we're going	16 17	White, you're still under oath. GARY WHITE: [s.u.o.]
17	MR SEMENYA SC: Well you see we're going to be ultimately asking the Commission to tell the rest of	17	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya.
19	South Africa and the rest of the world that it is	19	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair.
20	inappropriate to come with murderous intent and attacking	20	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Before you start,
20	the police in any democratic order. But I want to rest all	20	Mr Semenya, can I just ask Mr White, have you been
22	of those opinions at the back of your expertise, Mr White.	22	furnished, Mr White, with the statements from the other
23	You see where I'm going.	23	parties, Lonmin, NUM, AMCU, injured and arrested, to –
24	MR WHITE: Well I will just simply	24	MR WHITE: Sorry, Commissioner, I've seen
25	respond and say I absolutely agree with exactly what you've	25	a number of statements from parties other than the police.
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 31519		Page 31521
1	said. I hope you do tell the world and the rest of South	1	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not
2	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like	1 2	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than
	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know,		You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look
2 3 4	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and	2 3 4	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but
2 3 4 5	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of.	2 3	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than
2 3 4 5 6	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police	2 3 4 5 6	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using	2 3 4 5 6 7	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence, raised my concerns and criticisms on the basis of my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] tell us what you've seen, I get the impression – I just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence, raised my concerns and criticisms on the basis of my experience and I hope that's helpful to you Chair and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] tell us what you've seen, I get the impression – I just want to know whether my impression is correct – that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence, raised my concerns and criticisms on the basis of my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] tell us what you've seen, I get the impression – I just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence, raised my concerns and criticisms on the basis of my experience and I hope that's helpful to you Chair and to the rest of the Commission in deciding how you might want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] tell us what you've seen, I get the impression – I just want to know whether my impression is correct – that there was a difficulty in regard to your getting transcripts of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Africa that it is absolutely wrong to come to an event like this with murderous intent and the fact that, you know, amongst all of that two police officers were killed and this is something I'm extremely cognisant of. MR SEMENYA SC: And to expect the police in this country to raise their level of skill in using rubber bullets to contain this type of violence. That is the wrong direction for this Commission to send us a message. Am I right? MR WHITE: I think that the key criticisms that I've made in relation to the police as you say, my criticisms are only at the police because of my grief are hopefully intended to be helpful to the Commission in relation to – I think if these things had have been done better then potentially even with all of the difficult circumstances of this then potentially maybe the tragic outcome may not have happened. It may still have happened, we just simply don't know but I do look at the events across those number of days, observed the evidence, raised my concerns and criticisms on the basis of my experience and I hope that's helpful to you Chair and to the rest of the Commission in deciding how you might want to make recommendations going forward that perhaps a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	You know, have I seen every single statement? I'm not sure. I've certain seen statements from parties other than the police. I'm pretty sure Lonmin's – I need to just look at my legal team just around helping with my memory, but certainly categorically I've seen statements other than from the police, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And have you had an opportunity to be appraised of their evidence as well as it appears on the transcript? MR WHITE: Yes, I mean and I've seen things like transcripts between, meetings between for example the Lonmin management and the police and have read those, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: And the evidence in court insofar as they – MR WHITE: No, I haven't been directed towards the oral evidence of those – COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Thank you, Mr White. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] tell us what you've seen, I get the impression – I just want to know whether my impression is correct – that there was a difficulty in regard to your getting transcripts of the evidence of witnesses who testified in Afrikaans and

		1	
1	Page 31522	1	Page 31524 as best translation as we could, or you know, sort of
1	being prepared. I don't know what's happened. I don't need those, so I haven't seen them, but I don't know how	1	summarise and translate into English and provide those to
3	far they've gone with that, but there was at one stage	2	Mr White, with non-English witnesses.
4	certainly I was told a problem in relation to showing	4	CHAIRPERSON: I see, thank you. Yes, Mr
5	people like you transcripts of evidence of people who	5	Semenya.
6	testified in Afrikaans. Is that still the case, or –	6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):
7	MR WHITE: I would be confident, Chair,	7	Thank you, Chair. At the back of your expertise, I take it
8	that I think that certainly any evidence that you know my	8	the Commission can say at the end of the day that to avoid
9	legal team felt, and obviously I'll be very open, clearly	9	another Marikana a party similarly situated like Lonmin is
10	I, to some degree was obviously in their hands. I'm	10	better to be more facilitative and not obdurate if that
11	confident that they have tried to show me, you know,	11	position would avoid the tragedy, correct?
12	evidence basically of this entire picture. I haven't seen	12	MR WHITE: You know, I think that's the
13	any oral transcripts in relation to people, I'm pretty	13	ideal that we would all want to work to, as I said in a
14	confident other than the police having engaged with that.	14	previous answer, and in addition to that perhaps if I could
15	If I help, if it's helpful of course, you know, I	15	refer to 2.3 of my supplementary statement when I
16	haven't been engaged in this process constantly. You know	16	ultimately say any – this is in relation to questions that
17	I was engaged initially when I received the evidence from	17	have been asked of me that I think have been referred to
18	the SAPS hard drive and that's largely from what I, from	17	earlier on – any criticisms that I may direct towards the
19	there that I prepared my provisional statement. Then there	19	police in regard to their actions at Marikana is in no way
20	was perhaps a bit of a hiatus and then around the	20	intended to absolve any other party of their responsibility
21	completion of my final statement, which obviously was a	21	or obligations under the law of civic duty.
22	fairly lengthy process given that it was almost 130 pages,	22	MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, it is more a quest
23	and I engaged with further evidence, you know, Lieutenant-	23	on my part to see how with the expertise you have a party
24	Colonel Scott's hard drive, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera,	24	similarly placed like Lonmin should in other circumstances
25	and also some of the oral evidence and there was, that you,	25	behave to avoid these outcomes. That's where I'm trying to
	Page 31523		Page 31525
1	the Commission has heard.	1	go with you.
2	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably	2	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be
2 3	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from	2 3	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are
2 3 4	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know,	2 3 4	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of
2 3 4 5	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my	2 3 4 5	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome
2 3 4 5 6	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African	2 3 4 5 6	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use
2 3 4 5 6 7	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the	2 3 4 5 6 7	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you know, absolutely I've engaged with every single page.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that it is important that we all operate within the parameters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you know, absolutely I've engaged with every single page. MS LE ROUX: And Chair, if I could just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that it is important that we all operate within the parameters of permissible behaviour, if you are police, if you are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you know, absolutely I've engaged with every single page. MS LE ROUX: And Chair, if I could just clarify, with respect to evidence that wasn't given in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that it is important that we all operate within the parameters of permissible behaviour, if you are police, if you are employers, if you are strikers, etcetera, and that's why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you know, absolutely I've engaged with every single page. MS LE ROUX: And Chair, if I could just clarify, with respect to evidence that wasn't given in English, the Brigadier Calitz English translations of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that it is important that we all operate within the parameters of permissible behaviour, if you are police, if you are employers, if you are strikers, etcetera, and that's why this conversation I'm having with you. It's important that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Commission has heard. Another hiatus and then it literally was probably around three weeks ago I then received a further brief from the South African Human Rights Commission around, you know, here's the new evidence and as I've said openly in my supplementary statement, neither I or the South African Human Rights Commission would be trying to say to the Commission that this is now the entirety of all the evidence that your good selves have heard since my final statement in October 2013, because I just think that will be impossible. I mean in my own office at home we started to print out the key transcripts from the National Commissioner, General Mbombo, General Mpembe, I think General Mpembe's oral evidence ran to something like four lever ach files. You know it's literally thousands, a couple of thousand pages or something. I have done my best to try and engage with as much of that as I possibly can, but you know, I will be lying to you if I say that you know, absolutely I've engaged with every single page. MS LE ROUX: And Chair, if I could just clarify, with respect to evidence that wasn't given in English, the Brigadier Calitz English translations of the transcripts are available on the Commission's website and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	go with you. MR WHITE: Well, again hopefully to be clear, my experience with these types of situations are that if everyone is prepared to enter into the spirit of compromise, it is much more likely to lead to an outcome which lessens the likelihood of the police having to use any type of force at all, and because you raised this in the context of my experience just before we broke for the short moment, I had been making the point that in my experience unfortunately a lot of actors don't necessarily play the part that we would want them to. It would be great if in my country there was a commission which would somehow be able to force those other actors and stakeholders to live up to what I consider to be their civic duty and responsibilities, but I don't know that they're in a position to do that. MR SEMENYA SC: But the ringing message must always come even from a commission such as this that it is important that we all operate within the parameters of permissible behaviour, if you are police, if you are employers, if you are strikers, etcetera, and that's why this conversation I'm having with you. It's important that ringing message must come out, no?

		1	
	Page 31526		Page 31528
1	you place that, of course you would want all stakeholders	1	certainly in Northern Ireland extends beyond that, as I
2	to live up to what are considered to be their	2	gave a lot of evidence yesterday. So therefore sometimes
3	responsibility. Of course you would.	3	actually the threat level is such that the tactical,
4	MR SEMENYA SC: And even in relation to	4	tactics employed by the police actually go beyond AEPs to
5	the unions, I don't know if you're familiar with the	5	sometimes live rounds.
6	evidence that this complaint of the RDOs is one that is as	6	MR SEMENYA SC: Well, that's in
7	old as 2009, complaining about the same thing until it	7	exceptional circumstances. The rule really is non-lethal
8	manifested in the manner it did in 2012. On the basis of	8	force must be used to contain public disorder. Isn't that
9	your expertise would you say that there could have been	9	right?
10	something done differently by the unions?	10	MR WHITE: Yes, as far as possible,
11	MR WHITE: Chair, referring to the	11	that's correct.
12	interjection that you made earlier on, I mean I'm not	12	MR SEMENYA SC: And it is principally
13	familiar with all that the unions have done in this ongoing	13	because unlike in robberies and other violent criminal
14	dispute, certainly not stretching back to 2009. I would	14	behaviour, there is no such constraint on the response
15	say for the record again as a professional police officer	15	appropriate by police in those circumstances, is there?
16	who has lots of experience in dealing with these particular	16	MR WHITE: As in to say that when you're
17	types of situations, perhaps if everyone comes to them with	17	dealing with a robbery –
18	a, in the spirit of compromise and prepared to negotiate,	18	MR SEMENYA SC: No, as in saying police
19	well then ultimately we can avoid the police ever having to	19	have a duty in swotting a robbery to use less-than-lethal
20	use any force at all, a lot less higher levels of force,	20	weapons, there's nothing like that.
21	but I don't genuinely understand what the relevance is of	21	CHAIRPERSON: Robberies are robberies. I
22	the question in relation to could the unions have done	22	think you mean serious robberies like cash heists and that
23	more. I haven't engaged specifically with that, but you	23	sort of situation, don't you? You don't mean just an
24 25	know I admit if Mr Semenya says that he thinks that perhaps		ordinary robbery. You mean very serious robberies where
20	they could have, then I'm not going to disagree with that,	25	firearms are used and that kind of thing.
	Page 31527		Page 31529
1	Page 31527 but I don't really think that's an area within my	1	Page 31529 MR WHITE: The general concept that we
1 2	but I don't really think that's an area within my	1 2	
			MR WHITE: The general concept that we
2	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise.	2	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use
2 3	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I	2 3	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances.
2 3 4	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even	2 3 4	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take
2 3 4 5	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if
2 3 4 5 6	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you	2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or
2 3 4 5 6 7	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition, is it not? There you are dealing even with the fact that the use of force, if it should be there at all, at its very highest it's a rubber bullet, or what you call the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they require AEPs. That's part of the tactical plan which the assistant chief constable, the gold commander has to approve.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition, is it not? There you are dealing even with the fact that the use of force, if it should be there at all, at its very highest it's a rubber bullet, or what you call the attenuated energy projectile in the UK. That's the level	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they require AEPs. That's part of the tactical plan which the assistant chief constable, the gold commander has to approve.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition, is it not? There you are dealing even with the fact that the use of force, if it should be there at all, at its very highest it's a rubber bullet, or what you call the attenuated energy projectile in the UK. That's the level at – that's the highest level of containing public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they require AEPs. That's part of the tactical plan which the assistant chief constable, the gold commander has to approve. Specifically on AEPs there are various levels of authority. The authority to issue AEPs is at the level of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition, is it not? There you are dealing even with the fact that the use of force, if it should be there at all, at its very highest it's a rubber bullet, or what you call the attenuated energy projectile in the UK. That's the level at – that's the highest level of containing public disorder. Am I right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they require AEPs. That's part of the tactical plan which the assistant chief constable, the gold commander has to approve.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	but I don't really think that's an area within my expertise. I think I've been very clear in relation to how I think it's the responsibility of all people. I mean even if you take it right back to there should be responsibility in all citizens to act properly and within the law, but you know what; sometimes people break the speed limit, sometimes people steal things out of shops, sometimes people assault each other in the street. If they didn't do any of those things would that likely to be a better outcome in relation to, you know, policing? Of course it would. Unfortunately life's not like that. But just to come back to your particular question; I don't know the intricacies of this particular dispute and what the unions did or didn't do, so I don't really feel I can comment much more than that. MR SEMENYA SC: No, Mr White, you see Public Order Policing is a slightly different proposition, is it not? There you are dealing even with the fact that the use of force, if it should be there at all, at its very highest it's a rubber bullet, or what you call the attenuated energy projectile in the UK. That's the level at – that's the highest level of containing public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: The general concept that we adhere to in the UK in relation to policing around the use of force is minimal use of force in any circumstances. When police officers deploy to any situation, so let's take it a non-public order situation, a robbery as you say, if police officers are attending a robbery with firearms, or they may be even attending a robbery where somebody is, carried out with baseball bats and, you know, threatening people with weapons like that and not firearms, then the police approach to dealing with that will be again to use the minimum level of force. We don't routinely carry AEPs in all police vehicles. Even the public order police don't carry routinely AEPs. That tactical option is reserved for when planning an operation, in the way I explained yesterday, when the silver commander is required to give consideration to how he or she is going to plan this out, they might think based on the threat and risk assessment that they require AEPs. That's part of the tactical plan which the assistant chief constable, the gold commander has to approve. Specifically on AEPs there are various levels of authority. The authority to issue AEPs is at the level of

	Dago 21520		Dogo 21522
1	Page 31530 to issue it out of a station armoury to be carried in a	1	Page 31532 live round.
2	vehicle, and in our context we actually then lock them in a	2	MR SEMENYA SC: No, I accept that
3	lock box in the vehicle.	3	lawfully police of whatever rank and level, even civilians
4	As the situation develops and we see how this	4	for that matter, are only justifiable justified to use
5	plan is unfolding, if the threat level is such that these	5	force proportionate to the threat. That's not my enquiry
6	things might need to be used then the silver commander	6	with you, but I'm saying in police training there are
7	makes the judgment as to whether or not he/she gives	7	various levels of training and at one end of it is training
8	authority to deploy, take them out of the vehicle and make	8	that is intended to adequately contain violent serious
9	them ready, and then there's a further level of authority	9	robberies, as the Chair is describing, for which POP
10	which is authority to use, again by the silver commander.	10	members are not necessarily so trained. Is that a fair
11	After that it becomes the individual choice of the police	11	statement to make?
12	officer based on the circumstances now that he has	12	MR WHITE: Would we send POP members as
13	authority to use, whether or not he's going to fire given	13	you talk about to, you know, an armed robbery? If it as
14	the circumstances he sees in front of him. Now that's in a	14	absolutely necessary because there was no one else to send,
15	public order situation.	15	well of course we're going to, but as a choice of first
16	As I say the tactical support groups who deal	16	preference, no, we would send the armed response units and
17	with public order don't just deal with that. The majority	17	I explained their function.
18	of their time is spent engaged in searching and other types	18	MR SEMENYA SC: And by converse of logic
19	of activities. So they don't routinely carry them.	19	if it's a public order thing you don't send the armed
20	It may be that because of an increased threat	20	response team either, you send an appropriate level of
21	situation that they may get authority to carry them over a	21	force to contain it as best as they're trained.
22	period of two weeks when the assistant chief constable has	22	MR WHITE: That's correct, and I've
23	been convinced that there is a need for them to have	23	covered this in my final statement. I'm not sure which
24	immediate access, so he gives the authority to deploy in a	24	particular paragraph, but where I talk about if in a public
25	particular geographic area over a defined period of time.	25	order situation the level of threat is such that it's
	Page 31531		Page 31533
1	Page 31531 So park that.	1	Page 31533 requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy
1 2		1 2	•
	So park that.		requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy
2	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we	2	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I
2 3	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies	2 3	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also
2 3 4	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be	2 3 4	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels
2 3 4 5	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed	2 3 4 5	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to
2 3 4 5 6	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and	2 3 4 5 6	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason,
2 3 4 5 6 7	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in	2 3 4 5 6 7	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical options are appropriate. So therefore AEP may well be used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his supplementary statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical options are appropriate. So therefore AEP may well be used in that type of a situation, which is categorically and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his supplementary statement. MR SEMENYA SC: No, it's not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical options are appropriate. So therefore AEP may well be used in that type of a situation, which is categorically and definitely not public order, but it's being used because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his supplementary statement. MR SEMENYA SC: No, it's not the supplementary statement, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical options are appropriate. So therefore AEP may well be used in that type of a situation, which is categorically and definitely not public order, but it's being used because it's far more preferable in those circumstances to see if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his supplementary statement. MR SEMENYA SC: No, it's not the supplementary statement, Chair. CHAIRPERSON: This is the statement that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So park that. In relation to the types of officers that we would send to more serious day-by-day incidents - robberies as I was asked for in the question – we would likely to be sending our armed response vehicles to those. The armed response vehicles are officers specially trained - I explained this yesterday - who have lots of tactical options ranging from the traditional police truncheon and handcuffs, individual CS spray that you can spray in someone's face. They're not generally used, but those officers would be armed with Taser. They would also be armed with AEPs. They would carry AEPs all the time, and they're also armed, as their name suggests, with lethal rounds. When they go to engage for example a robbery then they have to make the assessment as to what they think they may need to do, and again this will be guided by a level of authority because this is a firearms incident and there will be some senior officer who's been engaged at this time to basically guide in relation to what types of tactical options are appropriate. So therefore AEP may well be used in that type of a situation, which is categorically and definitely not public order, but it's being used because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	requiring also a firearms response, then we would deploy the armed response officers into that situation. I explained in my statement how that would be done and I also then alluded to the fact that even at the higher levels again our most specially trained people in relation to firearms would be the SSU, the special support unit, which I'm assuming is perhaps a bit of a read-across to the STF as it's being described here, and part of the reason, Chair, that I say that potentially a read-across is that when I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Scott talk about snipers, if we were deploying snipers it would be the SSU, the special support unit that will be doing that, and because he said it's the STF I'm assuming there's perhaps a read-across there. I might be wrong in that. MR SEMENYA SC: Can we deal with an appreciation of the nature of threat Marikana was emanating from the strikers. I invite us, Chair, to exhibit AAAA8, which is the supplementary statement of Mr X. CHAIRPERSON: This is not his supplementary statement. MR SEMENYA SC: No, it's not the supplementary statement, Chair.

		1	
1	Page 31534 want us to deal with various paragraphs from there and	1	Page 31536 MR SEMENYA SC: No, I'm just alerting you
2	solicit your reaction, Mr White. If we start with	2	where I'm going. I'm just trying to take the excerpts of
3	paragraph 4 it says, "On Thursday 2012-08" – the screen has	3	the statement and ultimately I'll say that it shows a
4	a different one. It must be AAAA8.	4	particular level of organisation. I'm just trying to have
5	CHAIRPERSON: According to the heading on	5	you walk with me.
	the screen we are being shown exhibit AAAA8 which is from	6	MR WHITE: Sorry, my apology. I think
6 7	docket CAS205, I take it it's 205/8/2012. You've got a	7	you criticised me earlier on for trying to get ahead. I
	list in your bundle of documents to which the witness is	8	thought that you'd asked me a specific question and I was
8		9	responding to that, so I apologise.
9	referred, of item 8 which has a number of statements, nine		
10	of them in fact. The last one listed is AAAA8, the one –	10	MR SEMENYA SC: That's perfectly okay.
11	now we've got AAAA1.2, that's the typed version of one of	11	And if you go to 6 you will see that he discusses the
12	the statements he made. That is, according to my notes	12	Saturday and says, "On Saturday 2012-08-11 at about 08:00
13	AAAA1.2 is the typed version of the statement he made on	13	we met again at Wonderkop stadium, we were still many. We
14	the 7th of February 2013. What we've dealt with so far have	14	agreed to go to NUM offices, to the closed NUM offices. We
15	been – we, I mean the Commissioners and the witness – were	15	went to NUM offices singing slogans, songs. We passed the
16	the two main statements which Mr X made, the first one	16	first gate to the hostel, passed the bus stop, passed the
17	being the 7th of February 2013 which was discussed by the	17	taxi rank and near the toilets of NUM we were stopped by
18	witness in his supplementary statement and then there was a	18	mine security and the security started firing upwards with
19	second statement made in February this year, but what we've	19	rubber bullets and we started running away to different
20	now got on the screen is the typed version of the first	20	directions until we all met at the mountain koppie near
21	main statement, as it were, the one of February 2013, 7th of	21	Nkaneng informal settlement." And there they were
22	February. We've got on the screen now paragraph 4 of that	22	addressed by various individuals "who told us that we will
23	statement, is that the paragraph to which you wish to refer	23	not meet at the stadium again, that's the mine property,
24	the witness?	24	we'll hold our meetings at the mountain henceforth." You
25	MR SEMENYA SC: I'm indebted to you,	25	have noted that, haven't you?
	D		D
1	Page 31535 Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr	1	Page 31537 MR WHITE: Yes, indeed.
1	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr	1	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed.
2	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike	2	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then
2 3	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report	2 3	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further
2 3 4	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on	2 3 4	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the
2 3 4 5	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our
2 3 4 5 6	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop	2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that directly links them to the warrior group that you describe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And the level of fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that directly links them to the warrior group that you describe at this stage but, you know, the fact that people come	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And the level of fact about which you base your opinions, you would accept that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that directly links them to the warrior group that you describe at this stage but, you know, the fact that people come together, many, many people and they have nominated five	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And the level of fact about which you base your opinions, you would accept that the evidence is that they thought this muti would render
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that directly links them to the warrior group that you describe at this stage but, you know, the fact that people come together, many, many people and they have nominated five members to represent them talking to the employer, does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And the level of fact about which you base your opinions, you would accept that the evidence is that they thought this muti would render them invincible.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Chair. For the record, it is AAAA8.2 – 1.2. Then, Mr White, it reads, "On Thursday 2012-08-09 when the strike started it was agreed that all of the RDOs must not report for work and that we must meet again at 8 o'clock AM on Friday 2012-08-10 at Wonderkop stadium. On Friday 2012-08-10 at about 08:00AM we met again at Wonderkop outside the gate of the stadium. There were a lot of people, about 5 to 8 000 people and we were now joined by people of other sections or departments, but all mineworkers. There were five of us who were nominated to represent us when talking to the employer about our demands." If I stop there, I'm going to be seeking to convey to you that you see a certain level of organisation in what ultimately proves to be the warrior group, the militant group or the armed group or the tight group. Are you with me? MR WHITE: Ja, I'm happy to accept that clearly this is an ongoing process, as you say, people meet and leaders are identified and nominated. I don't know that there's evidence in that particular paragraph that directly links them to the warrior group that you describe at this stage but, you know, the fact that people come together, many, many people and they have nominated five	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: Yes, indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. Paragraph 7 then says, mentions some names there and says, "They further addressed us that we must unite and seeing that the security are shooting at us, we are not going to get our demands. They told us that we must organise an inyanga to protect us from being shot and make us strong." Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: If I may just interrupt myself, you're not familiar with things like the use of muti, are you? MR WHITE: Before engaging with this process, I'd never even heard the word. I'm slightly more familiar with it now because of the evidence obviously that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And you don't know what influence, if any, it has on people who apply it. MR WHITE: I don't know. I can only form a judgment based on the information that I've read. MR SEMENYA SC: And the level of fact about which you base your opinions, you would accept that the evidence is that they thought this muti would render

1	Page 31538	1	Page 31540
1	of circumstances I come across where people believe things	1	MR SEMENYA SC: "High" is a better word
2	and I can't understand why they believe them, but I	2	to use, you say.
3	wouldn't question their strength of belief in them and I	3 4	MR WHITE: There do seem to be a lot of
4	don't think in engaging with this evidence it's either my	4 5	incidents, absolutely, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: On which the police have
5	place to question the level of belief in it and I don't		
6	think in informing my judgments I have questioned that	6	built a particular reliance, given the success rates that
7	belief. I think I've tried to enter into the process on	7	they have achieved over the years.
8	the basis of, if that's what people believe, well, then	8	MR WHITE: Again I'm very conscious that
9	look at the evidence with regard to how these circumstances	9	Mr De Rover comments on this in his statements. I'm
10	unfolded, accepting that that is the position, that –	10	genuinely not in a position to judge from the point of view
11	MR SEMENYA SC: And neither are you	11	that I've engaged with the evidence in relation to the 9th
12	exposed to many incidents of public disorder in this	12	to the 16th of August. I don't know the circumstances in
13	country where muti is alleged to have been used and where	13	relation to any of the other incidents so I can't draw
14	no such allegation exists into those containment of public	14	conclusions as to whether or not they were dealt with very
15	disorder situations, am I right?	15	well. I mean at this moment in time I'm more than happy to
16	MR WHITE: The only incidents of public	16	accept your suggestion or the evidence of Mr De rover that
17	disorder that I've engaged with in terms of this process,	17	perhaps they have, but I genuinely cannot comment on that
18	as I think I was clear about yesterday, is the	18	and I think I've actually commented to that effect in
19	circumstances relating to the 9th to the 16th of August.	19	relation to some of the questions I've already answered to
20	MR SEMENYA SC: And whilst we're still	20	the SAPS legal team.
21	there, I mean as an expert you would agree with me, won't	21	MR SEMENYA SC: Well, where I'm going
22	you, that police operations rely in building their doctrine	22	with this is that where you talk about police planning, you
23	on past experiences that build up, am I right?	23	must be placing some measure of value in what the past
24	MR WHITE: Of course, I think experience	24 25	experience in relation to an event is for the purposes of
25	is always going to inform, you know, an ongoing process,	25	that planning about which you make, you express opinions.
	Page 31539		Page 31541
1	Page 31539 yes.	1	Page 31541 MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question
1 2		1 2	5
	yes.		MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question
2	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings	2	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me.
2 3	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would	2 3	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that
2 3 4	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of	2 3 4	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons
2 3 4 5	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police	2 3 4 5	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is
2 3 4 5 6	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works.	2 3 4 5 6	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type situations. I wouldn't be qualified to say whether it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no expectation that in the events of the 16th that would happen. However, I would say to you in order to engage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type situations. I wouldn't be qualified to say whether it's huge or not and I say that genuinely because you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no expectation that in the events of the 16th that would happen. However, I would say to you in order to engage with that premise, are you saying to me that that is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type situations. I wouldn't be qualified to say whether it's huge or not and I say that genuinely because you've challenged me earlier on around my use of the word	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no expectation that in the events of the 16th that would happen. However, I would say to you in order to engage with that premise, are you saying to me that that is the case, that in every situation in relation to public order
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type situations. I wouldn't be qualified to say whether it's huge or not and I say that genuinely because you've challenged me earlier on around my use of the word "significant" so I don't think I'm qualified to say that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no expectation that in the events of the 16th that would happen. However, I would say to you in order to engage with that premise, are you saying to me that that is the case, that in every situation in relation to public order policing in South Africa that in the rolling 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 24	yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And in their debriefings and forming their, informing their operations, they would learn from previous lessons of successes and correction of previous lessons of failures. That's how a police organisation works. MR WHITE: I think that's how any professional learning organisation should work, yes, I agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Including the police. MR WHITE: Absolutely including the police. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes, and you do accept that South Africa experiences a high degree, I mean a huge number of public disorders in a particular year, at least in our recent past? You are familiar with that history – with that fact, not history. MR WHITE: I have certainly been given some information which suggests that, you know, there are a large number of public order, public disorder type situations. I wouldn't be qualified to say whether it's huge or not and I say that genuinely because you've challenged me earlier on around my use of the word	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR WHITE: Sorry, maybe your question slightly deviated from what I thought you were asking me. I thought that you were asking me the sort of position that police operational planning should adhere to lessons learned from previous experiences and if that, if that is the question that you asked me, then yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Of course. Now where, as the evidence stands, that given the history and successes of previous operations, the police have never ever confronted a situation where an unfurling of a barbed wire would trigger an attack on the police. If you accept that as the premise, you cannot falter their planning on the basis that that should have been foreseeable, am I right? MR WHITE: Firstly, to be absolutely crystal clear, if you accept as a premise that in the history of public order policing for the South African Police that the rolling out of barbed wire has not resulted in people charging towards that wire, then I think it would be fair to say then there would be absolutely no expectation that in the events of the 16th that would happen. However, I would say to you in order to engage with that premise, are you saying to me that that is the case, that in every situation in relation to public order

	Page 31542		Page 31544
1	MR SEMENYA SC: I don't know whether you	1	the record to be clear that we're asking Mr White to assume
2	asked me a question. I'm –	2	it was not anticipated, where we have evidence from
3	MR WHITE: I did, Chair. I said Mr	3	Lieutenant-Colonel Scott that it was.
4	Semenya said to me if I accept the premise that this has	4	MR SEMENYA SC: Chair –
5	never happened before when wire is rolled out that people	5	CHAIRPERSON: What page is that again?
6	charge forward, would it be fair to base expectations that	6	MS LE ROUX: Page 10 of Mr White's
7	when the wire was rolled out on this occasion that people	7	supplementary statement.
8	wouldn't charge forward and I said based on that premise,	8	CHAIRPERSON: Paragraph? Paragraph?
9	very clearly, yes, I think that would be a reasonable	9	MS LE ROUX: It's the paragraph at the
10	expectation, of course. But I then said to him, you know,	10	top of the page, little Roman (ii). This is recapping –
11	in engaging with that premise is he then able to say to me	11	CHAIRPERSON: No, no –
12	that actually that is the case, that in the history of	12	MS LE ROUX: - and then there's a
13	public order policing in South Africa in relation to the	13	transcript reference footnote 36.
14	high number of incidents I think, as he described it, that	14	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I understand but what
15	when wire has been rolled out that there has never ever	15	he was talking about was the commencement of the dispersion
16	been a case that people have charged before the wire, and I	16	action and what we are dealing with now is something which
17	think that's a fair question to ask back.	17	I think precedes the commencement of the dispersion action,
18	MR SEMENYA SC: I put it –	18	namely the putting up of the protective barrier. There was
19	CHAIRPERSON: But it's not normally the	19	of course the suggestion in one of the plans that it
20	function of witnesses to ask questions of those who are	20	wouldn't be a good idea to have the wire trailers there on
21	cross-examining them and it's not a good precedent to	21	the Wednesday because that might provoke the strikers but I
22	establish. He put the premise to you, got an answer. If	22	think the proposition put by Mr Semenya is an accurate one
23	he wants your answer to have value he may have to lead the	23	and not contradicted by the passage on page 10 of the
24	evidence to support the premise but, with respect, it's not	24	supplementary statement to which you refer. So think Mr
25	for you to ask him a question.	25	Semenya can continue.
20		20	
	D		
	Page 31543		Page 31545
1	Page 31543 MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we	1	Page 31545 MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm
1 2	9	1 2	5
	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we		MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm
2	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that –	2	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police
2 3	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other	2 3	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the
2 3 4	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that	2 3 4	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques
2 3 4 5	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the	2 3 4 5	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one
2 3 4 5 6	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given.	2 3 4 5 6	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's supplementary statement, page 10, little (ii) at the top of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You measure their conduct based on information that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's supplementary statement, page 10, little (ii) at the top of the page, there's a reference to the transcript. It's day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You measure their conduct based on information that was available to them at the time they acted in the matter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's supplementary statement, page 10, little (ii) at the top of the page, there's a reference to the transcript. It's day 137 page 14579 where the evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You measure their conduct based on information that was available to them at the time they acted in the matter under scrutiny. Am I right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's supplementary statement, page 10, little (ii) at the top of the page, there's a reference to the transcript. It's day 137 page 14579 where the evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel Scott is recorded that he anticipated the risk that upon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You measure their conduct based on information that was available to them at the time they acted in the matter under scrutiny. Am I right? MR WHITE: That would only be fair too,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR CHASKALSON SC: But Chairperson, we do, with respect, have a practice in this Commission that – a practice that we were trying to enforce only the other day, that where a proposition is put, if it's not contained in the evidence in the transcript, a statement to that effect has to be given and if it is contained in the evidence in the transcript, a reference must be given. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, no – no, but that's a different situation. There where evidence is put then one expects, and we've said it must be a statement setting out the evidence unless opposition for it involves a conclusion from circumstantial evidence and the circumstances are already before us, but here a proposition was put, he was asked to accept whether it's correct as an assumption, he did and I am saying if the assumption isn't established to be correct then the answer he obtained won't have any value. I don't think we can take it any further than that. MS LE ROUX: Chair, while we're dealing with potential objections to this premise, in Mr White's supplementary statement, page 10, little (ii) at the top of the page, there's a reference to the transcript. It's day 137 page 14579 where the evidence of Lieutenant-Colonel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I'm just saying from experience when one critiques a police operation, it is a critique that is often not done with the benefit of hindsight, am I right? MR WHITE: Well, I think all critiques are ultimately done with the benefit of hindsight, that one – I would hope that I have tried to engage with this process and tried to understand in offering up some concerns and criticisms, I've tried to engage with the evidence and tried to understand what the circumstances that the police officers were engaging with at the time, and based my judgment on the decisions that they were making at the time – MR SEMENYA SC: Correct – MR WHITE: - with the benefit of the information that they had, as opposed to having the luxury, I would say, of the 20/20 hindsight aspect, so ja. MR SEMENYA SC: That's where I'm going, typically known as the reasonable officer test. You measure their conduct based on information that was available to them at the time they acted in the matter under scrutiny. Am I right?

		I	
1	Page 31546 take the lunch adjournment now, Chair?	1	Page 31548
1	CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Mr Semenya. We must	1	attack on the police. With that given, would you criticise the planning not to have factored that as a possibility?
3	try to be back at quarter to two.	2	MR WHITE: Could I understand your
			-
4		4	question? You're saying to me that in all of the
5	[13:52] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Mr	5	experience of the South African Police that this has never
6	White, you're still under oath.	6	ever happened, then I wouldn't question an assumption in
7	GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.)	7	relation to the planning for this particular event. It
8	CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya?	8	would be unlikely to happen in this particular event if
9	MS LE ROUX: Chair, if I could, before my	9	that is the case, and I stress, that the rolling out of the
10	learned friend commences, just give you a correct page	10	wire would encourage an attack on the police.
11	transcript for this point. Earlier I directed you to an	11	MR SEMENYA SC: Sorry, maybe I did not
12	aspect of Mr White's statement with a footnote to	12	follow the answer. Are you saying you would criticise an
13	Lieutenant-Colonel Scott's evidence around the anticipation	13	unknown not being factored as a possible risk?
14	of the attack on the barbed wire. If I could give you two	14	MR WHITE: Hopefully, Chair, again I'll
15	references because the issue was canvassed with Mr Scott,	15	repeat. If the experience of the South African Police, I
16	firstly in response to a question from yourself, Chair, and	16	think is implied in the question, has been that this has
17	then secondly, the second reference relates to a question	17	never ever happened before that the rolling of the wire
18	from Commissioner Hemraj. It was day 137 on the 15th of	18	resulted in an attack on the police, then I think that
19	October commencing at page 14564, line 25. Page 14564 line	19	based on that experience it would be reasonable as a
20	25, this is the Chair asking, then he goes, "What I did	20	planning assumption to expect that the rolling out of the
21	anticipate, though, was that once the wire was rolled out	21	wire on this occasion wouldn't result in an attack on the
22	that if there would be weak points between the actual	22	police. However, I'd say I'm basing that answer on the
23	trailer and the Nyala, that those would need to be defended	23	premise that it's provably true, therefore that this has
24 25	because I foresaw that there's a possibility that if they did approach at that stage or during the actual dispersion	24 25	never happened before and, secondly, I'm assuming that the
25	and approach at that stage of during the actual dispersion	25	suggestion is provably true that there is an attack on the
	Page 31547		Page 31549
1	Page 31547 action to try to come through to the police's side that	1	Page 31549 police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of
1 2		1 2	5
	action to try to come through to the police's side that		police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of
2	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or	2	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I
2 3	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you	2 3	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so.
2 3 4	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view –	2 3 4	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you
2 3 4 5	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the	2 3 4 5	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the
2 3 4 5 6	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I	2 3 4 5 6	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262.
2 3 4 5 6 7	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was there something you wished to say?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could include something like barbed wire, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was there something you wished to say? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could include something like barbed wire, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you look at clause
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was there something you wished to say? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): No, no, thank you, Chair. Mr White, I want to deal with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could include something like barbed wire, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you look at clause or section 11 of that standing order, it has under 11.2 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was there something you wished to say? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): No, no, thank you, Chair. Mr White, I want to deal with the fact that on this history, until the Marikana event,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could include something like barbed wire, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you look at clause or section 11 of that standing order, it has under 11.2 and says to us, "If negotiations fail and life or property is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	action to try to come through to the police's side that there would be weak points. Either through those gaps or possibly even underneath." And he continues – Chair, you then put your prima facie view – CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, for the reference and may I say that, you know, you're doing what I spoke to someone else about the other day, that it's not appropriate normally while a witness is being cross- examined for the counsel who leads the witness to sort of interpose little extra bits of evidence to support what he says or not. I understand you're not doing it for the purpose – MS LE ROUX: Chair, I'm just correcting the reference. CHAIRPERSON: You're giving us a reference, it's useful to have that on the record so when we read the record we'll have the reference and I'm grateful to you for that but I think you can perhaps give us the reference in re-examination. We'll let Mr Semenya continue in the meantime. You've turned your light on, was there something you wished to say? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): No, no, thank you, Chair. Mr White, I want to deal with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	police on this occasion as a result of the rolling out of the wire and I don't give a specific judgment on that. I don't think it's my place to do so. MR SEMENYA SC: And I did understand you correctly that you did familiarise yourself with the provisions of the standing order 262. MR WHITE: That's correct, I have read 262. MR SEMENYA SC: Can I invite you that we look at clause or section 2 which is dealing with definitions? If you go to 2, at F there is a definition for defensive measure, do you see that? MR WHITE: I do indeed. MR SEMENYA SC: And it says, "Defensive measures refer to proactive tactical measures such as a static barrier which are used to protect and safeguard people or property by cordoning off or blocking, isolating, patrolling, escorting and channelling people." That would include something like barbed wire, am I right? MR WHITE: I think absolutely, it could include something like barbed wire, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you look at clause or section 11 of that standing order, it has under 11.2 and

Marikana Commission of Inquiry

	Page 31550		Page 31552
1	step 1 it says, "Put defensive measure in place as a	1	experience, says Mr Semenya, is that that's never happened
2	priority." Okay? It is only two where the warning starts	2	before and that was why they didn't foresee it on that
3	to happen, do you agree with you?	3	occasion and I think you've conceded again that if that's
4	MR WHITE: I agree with you on the force	4	so, if that assumption is correct then obviously the point
5	order, yes.	5	made by Mr Semenya is correct, that they can't be
6	MR SEMENYA SC: So when, in Marikana, the	6	criticised for not foreseeing something would happen which
7	police put up a defensive measure like a barbed wire, they	7	had never happened before in similar circumstances. That
8	weren't expected to announce in terms of the standing order	8	must also be right.
9	that you are now going to be putting a defence wire and	9	MR WHITE: Chair, again you're absolutely
10	this is its purpose, et cetera, am I right?	10	correct but if I could remind you of a caveat in my
11	MR WHITE: Against that specific point in	11	response which basically said this premise is based on this
12	the force order, I can agree with that.	12	is provably true.
13	MR SEMENYA SC: That would contradict	13	CHAIRPERSON: Yes.
14	your opinion on this point, would it not? I thought your	14	MR WHITE: And that's why, and again I
15	evidence was that they should have announced and removed	15	apologise for asking the question, it's the first time I've
16	the element of surprise in relation to this matter.	16	appeared as an expert witness in front of a Commission like
17	MR WHITE: Yes, absolutely and I'm very	17	this so I'm learning as I go along in relation to the rules
18	clear on that. You know when the police – my evidence was	18	and any further questions I'll address through you, Chair,
19	given, Chair, on the basis of my experience and my	19	so I apologise for –
20	experience is that when the police carry out a measure it	20	CHAIRPERSON: You did make it clear that
21	is often likely that, you know, one of the predeterminants	21	that, your answer was based upon the acceptance of the
22	of crowd behaviour will be the activities of the police.	22	premise, not because you accept the premise as correct from
23	If the police were going to actually carry out an action,	23	your own knowledge but you accept that if that is the
24	then therefore the police could anticipate that there will	24	premise then your answer is given on the basis, on the
25	be a response to that action and therefore should warn the	25	assumption shall we say that the premise is correct. You
1	Page 31551	1	Page 31553
1	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very	1	did make that clear -
2	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience	2	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm
2 3	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd	2 3	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before
2 3 4	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred	2 3 4	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may
2 3 4 5	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk	2 3 4 5	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement
2 3 4 5 6	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much	2 3 4 5 6	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember
2 3 4 5 6 7	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do	2 3 4 5 6 7	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly – CHAIRPERSON: Is that basically what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be afforded the same courtesy in relation to actually being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly – CHAIRPERSON: Is that basically what you're saying?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly – CHAIRPERSON: Is that basically what you're saying? MR WHITE: That is exactly correct,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be afforded the same courtesy in relation to actually being asked questions which are based on things that are provably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly – CHAIRPERSON: Is that basically what you're saying? MR WHITE: That is exactly correct, Chair.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be afforded the same courtesy in relation to actually being asked questions which are based on things that are provably true.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	crowd. Now my evidence I think, I hope, yesterday was very clear with regards to, I was basing that on my experience on what I think to be relatively well recognised crowd management principles. I think I may have referred specifically even to within "Keeping the Peace" we talk about no surprises. So my evidence yesterday was very much on the general premise that if the police are going to do something they should give a warning in advance. CHAIRPERSON: What Mr Semenya's point is, is that what they did was in accordance with the procedure enjoined upon them by standing order 262 and that you concede to be correct. So you can't criticise them therefore for not complying with their own standing order. Your point, as I understand it, is that your experience is, never mind what the standing order says, it's sensible to apply the no surprises principle because if you don't you may get a reaction from the crowd which you don't want. MR WHITE: That is exactly – CHAIRPERSON: Is that basically what you're saying? MR WHITE: That is exactly correct, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	did make that clear – MR WHITE: That's absolutely true but I'm conscious of the fact that in some of the evidence before the Commission, including perhaps – and I think this may have been what Mr Semenya was referring to – the statement of Mr De Rover where he talks about, and I can't remember off the top of my head, I'm more than happy to check it out, the huge number – and I use that word advisedly – of public order incidents that the South African Police have dealt with. I have given evidence to say I have no knowledge of those and I'm just saying for my own protection in terms of the evidence that I give you, Chair, is that if it can be proven, if it's provably true that this has never happened before, well, then I'm absolutely more than happy to say as a planning assumption why would Lieutenant-Colonel Scott think that it might happen then, if it is provably true. I'm sure that I will be asked to show evidence of statements that I make to this Commission and I think it's only then fair for my protection that I be afforded the same courtesy in relation to actually being asked questions which are based on things that are provably true. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, well, of course that

		1	
1	Page 31554	1	Page 31556
1	it's a point that they can make, but it's not normally wise	1	point on, go to step 2 as contemplated in section or clause
2	for witnesses to start asking questions of the cross-	2	11 of the standing order 262.
3	examiner, even in the circumstances such as we find here	3	MR WHITE: If, again in order to be
4	because it creates a precedent. It's a genie that, once	4	helpful, with all of the things that we previously
5	you've let it out of the bottle, you can't put back in	5	suggested, if this then, I think that you used the word
6	again so I think we must avoid that if we – carry on, Mr	6	"attack," happened as a result of the wire being deployed,
7	Semenya.	7	I think your question is would that have taken the police
8	MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you, Chair. I	8	by surprise, given the previous experience and with all of
9	think, Mr White, the point is even more than that. The	9	those things which you said, yes, I'm sure it would have
10	evidence is that before the unfurling of the barbed wire,	10	taken them by surprise if that had happened in that way,
11	Mr Noki came and asked what was the purpose of this barbed	11	yes.
12	wire there. Was that information, are you aware of that	12	MR SEMENYA SC: And the opportunity to
13	information?	13	follow 262 sequentially, as it is numbered here, would then
14	MR WHITE: I'm aware that Mr Noki	14	have been disrupted.
15	approached the police on a number of occasions in relation	15	MR WHITE: Under those circumstances the
16	to the purpose of the barbed wire and if you direct me to a	16	opportunity to follow that as you say, would have been
17	particular incident when he did that, if you want to show	17	disrupted.
18	me the reference or alternatively if we're talking	18	MR SEMENYA SC: Okay. And were you
19	generally at this point I'm more than happy to accept the	19	exposed to the evidence that according to the Sangoma's
20	point that he certainly approached the police to ask about	20	instruction to the group of people who were taking these
21	the purpose of the wire.	21	rituals, undergoing these rituals, was that what they
22	MR SEMENYA SC: And as a matter of	22	needed to do is to provoke some action on the part of the
23	evidence, it is that that communication was, the answer to	23	police and the muti will work. Are you familiar with the
24	that enquiry was communicated by the police through a	24	evidence?
25	loudhailer audible to the majority of the people who were	25	MR WHITE: I'm aware of that specific
	Page 31555		Page 31557
1	Page 31555 on the hill. Was that information made available to you?	1	Page 31557 point, as recently as last night it was brought to my
1 2		1 2	5
	on the hill. Was that information made available to you?	2	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my
2	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that	2	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair.
2 3	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through	2 3	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed
2 3 4	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once.	2 3 4	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available
2 3 4 5	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you	2 3 4 5	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012?
2 3 4 5 6	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point	2 3 4 5 6	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority	2 3 4 5 6 7	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the defensive measure interrupted the entire plan as it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're asking me the question that when the stun grenade gets
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the defensive measure interrupted the entire plan as it was conceived because it was a happening of the first time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're asking me the question that when the stun grenade gets fired it should be a surprise, you're saying to me it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the defensive measure interrupted the entire plan as it was conceived because it was a happening of the first time. Would you find that understandable from your point as an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're asking me the question that when the stun grenade gets fired it should be a surprise, you're saying to me it should be a surprise that that creates a reaction by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the defensive measure interrupted the entire plan as it was conceived because it was a happening of the first time. Would you find that understandable from your point as an expert, that they were all caught by surprise, this is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're asking me the question that when the stun grenade gets fired it should be a surprise, you're saying to me it should be a surprise that that creates a reaction by the crowd, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	on the hill. Was that information made available to you? MR WHITE: Yes, I've read evidence that suggests that a response to that question was made through loudhailer. I think the question was posed more than once. I don't know if the loudhailer was used every time but, you know, again I don't know for certain. And the other point that I don't know is whether or not, you know, the majority of the people on the hill heard that warning certainly but I know that there was evidence given that the warning or the explanation rather was given by loudhailer, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: And the execution contemplated by clause or section 11 of the standing order is that after the defensive measure has been taken – the second step – you warn participants according to the Act of the action that will be taken against them should the defensive measure fail. Do you see that? MR WHITE: I can see that, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: Now the evidence, I don't know if this has been brought to your attention but I want to solicit your opinion, is that the attack on the defensive measure interrupted the entire plan as it was conceived because it was a happening of the first time. Would you find that understandable from your point as an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	point, as recently as last night it was brought to my attention, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: And have you been exposed to the fact that that as an intelligence was not available to the police, let me talk about the 13th of August 2012? MR WHITE: I will assume that it wasn't available to the police because TT5 exhibit doesn't make any specific reference to it. MR SEMENYA SC: And given the fact that there was no history of incidents where use of a stun grenade triggered a direct attack on the police, there couldn't be expected, on the principle we discussed of a reasonable officer test to have anticipated it in advance that such a stun grenade would trigger an assault on the police. MR WHITE: I think the evidence that I have given is that, as a general premise, we can say that the behaviour of crowds can be influenced by the behaviour, actions of the police. Therefore if we're dealing specifically with the 13th, if I follow you correctly you're asking me the question that when the stun grenade gets fired it should be a surprise, you're saying to me it should be a surprise that that creates a reaction by the

		1	
1	Page 31558	1	Page 31560
1	question. Past police experience has never produced an	1	AEPs, and you're using those with the intention to try and
2	outcome where use of a stun grenade triggers an attack on	2	get the crowd to move back to maintain a distance. The
3	the police. I'm putting that to be the fact. Now I'm	3	reason that we would want to maintain a distance, I gave
4	inviting your opinion on this. If that is factually	4	evidence yesterday, Chair, with regards to the types of
5	correct, the police could not have reasonable have foreseen	5	threat we would be under – Molotov cocktails, blast bombs –
6	such action such as a stun grenade or teargas to be a	6	the vast majority of those types of weaponry are thrown.
7	trigger for an attack on them. Is that reasonable to draw	7	Therefore if the intelligence is, or you're seeing that
8	that conclusion, given your expert experience?	8	situation live in front of you, obviously what you want to
9	[14:12] MR WHITE: You see my evidence has always		do is try and push the crowd back far enough so that if any
10	been that in my experience actions by the police will	10	of those types of instruments are thrown then they won't
11	create a reaction by the crowd, so therefore that reaction	11	reach behind the police lines, therefore causing injury to
12	to a stun grenade, which with respect we don't use in the	12	the police. So the intention in firing both water cannon
13	UK, the reaction to a stun grenade might be, and I'm sure	13	and also AEPs would be to push the crowd back, and our
14	this is what the police probably intended, is that people	14	expectation would be that that is exactly what would
15	would run away. That's the reaction, to move back from	15	happen.
16	that.	16	Does that happen in every set of circumstances?
17	Maybe in other circumstances when the police do	17	No, it doesn't. Take for example specifically AEP. AEP is
18	something it raises the level of emotion within the crowd.	18	directed at a particular individual, the individual that
19	Again I have seen this where the police have used force, in	19	the person who's responsible for firing it has identified
20	my context whether that be AEPs or water cannon, the	20	as posing the biggest threat at that particular time.
21	purpose of those tactical options is to try and get the	21	That's why the round is fired at them. Now how the rest of
22	crowd to move back and create some distance, but of course	22	the crowd will perceive that is they'll be aware that an
23	that it's going to inflame them, this is something you take	23	AEP round has been fired and they'll hear the bang,
24	into consideration, you know, the attitudes within the	24	potentially they'll hear, you know, see the puff of smoke
25	crowd which actually might result then in a reaction from	25	and whatever, and that one person may well be hit and maybe
	B 04550		
1	Page 31559	1	Page 31561 fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will.
1	them.	1	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will,
2	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if	2	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage
2 3	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has	2 3	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward.
2 3 4	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a	2 3 4	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any
2 3 4 5	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that	2 3 4 5	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back,
2 3 4 5 6	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with	2 3 4 5 6	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other
2 3 4 5 6 7	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but	2 3 4 5 6 7	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you use things like pyrotechnics, you use – well, you don't use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than actually be engaged by it maybe they might just start to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you use things like pyrotechnics, you use – well, you don't use teargas there, but the reaction is to move away from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than actually be engaged by it maybe they might just start to withdraw. So you know, you're actually bringing it, as Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you use things like pyrotechnics, you use – well, you don't use teargas there, but the reaction is to move away from the police and not to attack. Isn't that your experience?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than actually be engaged by it maybe they might just start to withdraw. So you know, you're actually bringing it, as Mr Scott might have suggested in stage 2 of the plan, as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you use things like pyrotechnics, you use – well, you don't use teargas there, but the reaction is to move away from the police and not to attack. Isn't that your experience? MR WHITE: The intention in using, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than actually be engaged by it maybe they might just start to withdraw. So you know, you're actually bringing it, as Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	them. Specifically in relation to your question, if this situation where a stun grenade has been fired has never before resulted in an attack on the police, then as a planning assumption I think it would be fair to say that when you're working out what might happen, consistent with the remarks that I've made about general principles but that would it be a reasonable planning assumption that it would not happen; on this occasion I think that would be a reasonable planning assumption. But I am relying on the fact that, you know, the person making that assumption would be aware that this had never happened before, in order to try and answer your question, because it would be my experience in a more general sense that, as I've explained to the Commission, when action is taken by the police it creates a reaction and that reaction can be very varied. MR SEMENYA SC: And the reaction standard, I'm sure even in your country, Mr White, if you use things like pyrotechnics, you use – well, you don't use teargas there, but the reaction is to move away from the police and not to attack. Isn't that your experience?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fall, whilst you know, other people within the crowd will, because they're not being affected by it might, their rage is inflamed, if you like, and they might come forward. That has happened. Other people will, 'I don't want any part of this' now the police have stepped up and move back, which is exactly what we want, and then of course other people within the crowd might not be aware of that happening at all. So the reaction of the crowd will often be varied. The intention in firing it is we get the crowd to move back, but one of the things that we take into consideration even in bringing water cannon to a scene, and I think I made reference to this yesterday, is that the appearance of the water cannon – because unlike an AEP launcher you can't hide them, they're huge – that as itself can sometimes inflame a situation in the crowd. Sometimes we'll bring it forward in terms of dynamic planning because you're actually thinking this might achieve a purpose insomuch as the crowd see the water cannon and rather than actually be engaged by it maybe they might just start to withdraw. So you know, you're actually bringing it, as Mr Scott might have suggested in stage 2 of the plan, as a show of force, but you're also weary of the contrary effect

		I	
1	Page 31562 So the issue is that actually you know, there's	1	Page 31564 fired and nothing has happened. I don't know how you
2	no absolute predeterminant of this, how this is going to work out, and in many respects that's the skill of a public	2	respond to that. It's just a prima facie view of mine and
3		3	may be entirely erroneous. MR WHITE: Chair, I think number 1, we
4	order commander trying to use his experience on the ground		
5	in terms of some dynamic planning. I would love to be able	5	don't use stun grenades; number 2, muti is obviously a
6	to sit here and say to you, you know, actually if A	6	concept that I was unfamiliar with, as I'd given evidence
7	happens, then B will happen, then C will happen, then D	7	earlier on. So I don't know, but I can follow your logic
8	will happen.	8	absolutely and certainly as I say in response to your
9	Unfortunately in my experience it's not like	9	question it was brought to my attention last night, I've
10	that. As a general premise when police take action the	10	seen published statements which have suggested the impact
11	circumstances is if something happens, it's like physics,	11	of muti. I've seen statements which have suggested things
12	reaction creates a reaction and certainly in relation to	12	that, actions that the strikers who have subjected
13	the situation that we're talking about it seems activities	13	themselves to muti if they do, that might negate the muti.
14	of the police then create a reaction.	14	I've been aware of statements to that effect before. The
15	In relation to the question I'm being	15	specific issue of the muti is not effect, will not take
16	specifically asked therefore, would stun grenades force the	16	effect until such times as there's an attack by the police
17	crowd to go back? I think the general premises is that	17	and therefore it needs to be provoked. That's if I follow
18	yes, you would expect them to do that. Does that happen in	18	you correctly, and you're nodding, so I think I do. That
19	every single occasion? I genuinely don't know because I	19	specific piece of information was, the first I heard of
20	don't use stun grenades. Does it happen every single	20	this was last night, so with that in mind in relation to
21	occasion here in South Africa? Well, of course I don't	21	what you're saying then I think that's a logical
22	know, but if the circumstances that are being put to me are	22	conclusion, Chair, yes.
23	every single time this has been used in South Africa,	23	MR SEMENYA SC: And also allied to that,
24	here's what the response was, that the crowd moved back,	24	these people are having blankets around them which would
25	the crowd didn't as a result of that attack, then I would	25	make the rubber bullets not penetrate, almost fortifying
	Page 31563		Page 31565
1	say as a general planning assumption in terms of	1	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do
1 2	6	1 2	5
	say as a general planning assumption in terms of		the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do
2	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I	2	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to
2 3	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is	2 3	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with
2 3 4	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would	2 3 4	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal
2 3 4 5	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that	2 3 4 5	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves?
2 3 4 5 6	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South	2 3 4 5 6	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different
2 3 4 5 6 7	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that?	2 3 4 5 6 7	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe this is a firework that's been let off. A stun grenade	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever come across a crowd who obviously have undergone the types of rituals and the belief construct that is associated with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe this is a firework that's been let off. A stun grenade goes off, you think a bullet is being fired at you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever come across a crowd who obviously have undergone the types of rituals and the belief construct that is associated with muti in terms of – invincible, invisible and invulnerable I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe this is a firework that's been let off. A stun grenade goes off, you think a bullet is being fired at you. Nothing happens, because it's a stun grenade. That might	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever come across a crowd who obviously have undergone the types of rituals and the belief construct that is associated with muti in terms of – invincible, invisible and invulnerable I think are three words that I've seen in the evidence,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe this is a firework that's been let off. A stun grenade goes off, you think a bullet is being fired at you. Nothing happens, because it's a stun grenade. That might in fact encourage people to believe that the muti is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever come across a crowd who obviously have undergone the types of rituals and the belief construct that is associated with muti in terms of – invincible, invisible and invulnerable I think are three words that I've seen in the evidence, absolutely no, I haven't, and I think I've previously given
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	say as a general planning assumption in terms of anticipating what the implication is when I fire this, I think that would be reasonable to assume. My question is does the person who's firing it realise that and how would he be informed by all of this evidence which suggests that it has never ever, ever, ever happened before in South Africa? How would they know that? CHAIRPERSON: It depends upon when the planning that we talked about took place. If the planning took place after the 13th then there was knowledge that stun grenades do not have the effect of making the people run away because they didn't run away on the 13th, and the further problem that I have and I'd like you to comment on, is – and I don't know about these cases where stun grenades made people run away, but accept for the moment that that's correct, the people who ran away, were they people who'd taken muti? Because it seems to me that – and this is a prima facie view, I just want comments on it – a stun grenade I take it is designed to make a person think they're being shot at and they're not being made to believe this is a firework that's been let off. A stun grenade goes off, you think a bullet is being fired at you. Nothing happens, because it's a stun grenade. That might	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the belief the sangoma tells them that bullets will do nothing to you. I'm painting this picture, Mr White, to say am I conveying to you the fact that we are dealing with a group of people quite different from how your normal public disorder crowd behaves? MR WHITE: Crowds behave in different ways and people within crowds have different intentions and suffice to say that there are a lot of people in Belfast who engage with this activity that it will be very difficult, you know, to try and work out specifically what they might try and do because they put themselves in positions of considerable danger, which I would say is just not logical. You know, why would people do this when they're likely to get hurt in terms of use of force by police or someone else? So I just make that point that we're not always dealing with very rational people that make logical assumptions in relation to dealing with crowds, full stop. In relation to the point around do I, have I ever come across a crowd who obviously have undergone the types of rituals and the belief construct that is associated with muti in terms of – invincible, invisible and invulnerable I think are three words that I've seen in the evidence,

Marikana Commission of Inquiry

		1	
1	Page 31566 MR SEMENYA SC: But this also points to	1	Page 31568 move? Is it before of the police then starting to take
2	doctrine because the police can understand that there is	2	action, i.e. they can see the Nyalas with the wire
3	de-individuation in crowd unrest situation, that that	3	starting to roll out? Is it a combination of those things?
4	builds into the doctrine. What is not doctrine, and I'm	4	I genuinely don't know, but I'm absolutely saying to you
5	suggesting to you, is how this particular group was	5	yes, you know, from the evidence I've seen that at a point
6	behaving. Did that come out from reading the evidence to	6	when the wire is rolling out and therefore the point after
7	you?	7	the gentleman from the AMCU has spoken and has left, then
8	MR WHITE: There is a lot of evidence	8	you know, other than the particular group that you're
0 9	that talks about the fact that this particular group, or at	9	focussing on, other people are leaving the koppie, yes.
9 10	least people within it have undergone muti rituals and what	9 10	MR SEMENYA SC: And you're familiar with
11	that means to them in terms of what they believe that it	11	the fact that the AMCU president, as you refer to, was
12	would do. I'm absolutely crystal clear on that. Does that	12	pleading with this group of muti band to say please go
13	answer your question, or is there a supplementary part to	13	away? You –
14	it?	14	MR WHITE: I think he actually said "on
14	MR SEMENYA SC: Let me try and explicate	15	my bended knees" or something. There was a reference to
16	it. The group of 3 000-odd people that were in the koppie,	16	that –
17	once the barbed wire was unfurled they disappeared. They	17	MR SEMENYA SC: Correct.
18	walked into various different directions. That would be	18	MR WHITE: - and pleading with them, yes.
19	predictable behaviour that the majority of people would	19	CHAIRPERSON: I think further he pleaded
20	move if they see a police action starting, right? At least	20	with them to go away, he went on his bended knees, told
21	- well, let me solicit your opinion.	21	them that if they didn't go away they'd be killed and the
22	MR WHITE: I think that it's entirely	22	evidence is they didn't take what he said seriously and
23	predictable that people would, you know, if the police are	23	they said they're ready to be killed and the group – this
24	now starting to roll out barbed wire and the situation	24	is the evidence, there may be other evidence later which
25	therefore seems to be now starting to escalate, that you	25	will be different, but the evidence is that there was a
	Page 31567		Page 31569
1	know, people would, generally people would move away and I	1	bunched group at the front, who according to the evidence
2		2	
	think yes, there is absolutely a lot of evidence that a lot	2	of Mr X are the makarapas, they were the ones who
3	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they	3	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa
3 4	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly	3 4	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told
3 4 5	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the	3 4 5	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended
3 4 5 6	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct.	3 4 5 6	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed,
3 4 5 6 7	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be	3 4 5 6 7	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously.
3 4 5 6 7 8	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most	3 4 5 6 7 8	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really.	3 4 5 7 8 9 10	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later,
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case,	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes.	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail,
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests that, you know at, in and around the particular time that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming out of the Eastern Cape and coming to work in a different
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests that, you know at, in and around the particular time that we're talking about a number of people started to leave the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming out of the Eastern Cape and coming to work in a different North West province up in the country. Has this been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests that, you know at, in and around the particular time that we're talking about a number of people started to leave the koppie. I'm aware, you know, because of evidence that I've	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming out of the Eastern Cape and coming to work in a different North West province up in the country. Has this been brought to your attention?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests that, you know at, in and around the particular time that we're talking about a number of people started to leave the koppie. I'm aware, you know, because of evidence that I've seen that the AMCU leader or president – excuse me, or	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming out of the Eastern Cape and coming to work in a different North West province up in the country. Has this been brought to your attention? MR WHITE: I haven't in all honesty seen
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of people did. I think other people didn't; maybe they were just above to move, I don't know, but certainly there's evidence to suggest that other people amongst the 3 000 that you refer to moved away yes, that's correct. MR SEMENYA SC: And that would be consistent with past police experience and that's how most of these public disorder situations are resolved, by minimum use of force really. MR WHITE: Hopefully that is the case, that's the intention, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: But it was in fact the case. That's what I'm inviting your opinion on. It was in fact the case that in Marikana those who were not in the muti band moved away. MR WHITE: And again I think I've seen video evidence and photographic evidence which suggests that, you know at, in and around the particular time that we're talking about a number of people started to leave the koppie. I'm aware, you know, because of evidence that I've seen that the AMCU leader or president – excuse me, or whatever the particular title is – I think has addressed	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	apparently didn't pay any attention to what Mr Mathunjwa had said. Mr Mathunjwa spelt it out quite clearly, told them to go, pleading with them to do so, went on his bended knees and told them if they didn't do it they'd be killed, and they don't appear to have taken that very seriously. There is an argument of course that there was a bit of delayed reaction and they then eventually did decide to leave and that's one of the issues we have to decide later, but on the evidence that we have, as I've summarised it to you, the facts are as I've given them to you. MR WHITE: Yes, Chair. MR SEMENYA SC: To add to the cocktail, to add to that cocktail, I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention or you have read the evidence that this involved also an employment environment involving migrant labour where you find people in the majority coming out of the Eastern Cape and coming to work in a different North West province up in the country. Has this been brought to your attention? MR WHITE: I haven't in all honesty seen evidence to that effect, Chair, but having had the

		I	
	Page 31570		Page 31572
1	result of just conversations that I've had with my legal	1	some of that happens but not very much. Generally speaking
2	team as they've tried to, you know, explain sort of some of	2	our gastarbeiters come, work in the mines and other
3	the context. So the issue of migrant labour I know very	3	industries and so on and then go back to the places from
4	little about, but I'm familiar that there is an added	4	which they come, taking the money they've earned. They
5	complication around that. But as I say, that has been on	5	remit money, of course, to their families while they're
6	the basis of conversations with my, the legal team who I've	6	working but they also try to save money and go back. In
7	spent obviously a lot of time with, as opposed to I don't	7	many cases buy smallholdings and lead a traditional kind of
8	know that I could point to specific evidence that I've seen	8	life raising cattle and that sort of thing. That's the
9	to that effect.	9	background, the migrant labour system has operative in this
10	MR SEMENYA SC: And they come and work	10	country for well over a century if not a century and a
11	using a language quite different and distinct from the	11	half. And there's all sorts of problems it brings in its
12	language of the people who live in those neighbourhoods.	12	wake which are matters that this country will have to deal
13	MR WHITE: I'm not aware of that, but I	13	with in the years to come. But its very central to what
14	know that from the 13th I think there was evidence around a	14	goes on not only in the Lonmin mine but mines generally. I
15	particular language and –	15	think that's the – I'm sorry I had to give you a little
16	CHAIRPERSON: No, no, there are two	16	lecture but that's really the background you need to know
17	points. There are two points. The first point is most of	17	to understand the point that Mr Semenya is putting to you.
18	the rock drill operators were people – most, if not all of	18	Did I put it correctly, Mr Semenya?
19	the rock drill operators, were people who didn't come from	19	MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair, and just
20	the Rustenburg area. They came from what is known as the	20	around that point of – I don't know if it's been brought to
21	labour-sending areas. Most of them came from Eastern Cape,	21	your attention that the permanents in Rustenburg it's also
22	Pondoland, others came from Lesotho and Swaziland and so	22	undermined because the people there would consider them
23	on, Mozambique I think too. Most of them were Pondos	23	alien. In fact, Chair, you'd recall Advocate Dira acting
24	though, from Pondoland, and the language they speak is	24	for Bapo ba Mogale saying they came and infested our land
25	Xhosa. The people in the Rustenburg Marikana area, they	25	here. So I'm trying to –
1	Page 31571 speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were	1	Page 31573 CHAIRPERSON: Sorry Bapo ba Mogale the
1	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were	1	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the
2	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's	2	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's
2 3	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point.	2 3	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana.
2 3 4	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a	2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who
2 3 4 5	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually	2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago,
2 3 4 5 6	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to
2 3 4 5 6 7	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters,"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters actually permanently stay in Germany, many of them work for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair. Yes, Mr White, so I've tried to paint a profile of the 300,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters actually permanently stay in Germany, many of them work for BMW and they live in Bavaria making BMW motor cars. They	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair. Yes, Mr White, so I've tried to paint a profile of the 300, 400 people. Now I want to try and deal with the statements
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters actually permanently stay in Germany, many of them work for BMW and they live in Bavaria making BMW motor cars. They come from Turkey and various other places but the position	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair. Yes, Mr White, so I've tried to paint a profile of the 300, 400 people. Now I want to try and deal with the statements that at least point us to the lengths with which the manner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters actually permanently stay in Germany, many of them work for BMW and they live in Bavaria making BMW motor cars. They come from Turkey and various other places but the position appears to be in Europe that many of them then put roots	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair. Yes, Mr White, so I've tried to paint a profile of the 300, 400 people. Now I want to try and deal with the statements that at least point us to the lengths with which the manner the perpetrator would review how grisly they were – shall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	speak Setswana, which is a Tswana language. So they were different ethnic group, spoke a different language. That's the first point. The second point is that on the mines they have a lingua franca which is known as Fanagalo, which is actually an artificial language composed of bits of various of the vernacular languages, some of them so-called Nguni languages like Zulu and Xhosa, and some of them bits of Sotho and Tswana and so on. The evidence in relation to what happened on the 13th, the Monday, and thereafter when Lieutenant-Colonel McIntosh came and negotiated, the language used was Fanagalo, this artificial language which is used on – this lingua franca used on the mines. That's the point. But the further point is that – I try to use a term you may understand – these people come from, most of the workers are migrant labourers, they are what would be known in German as "gastarbeiters," [14:32] Except I think a lot of the gastarbeiters actually permanently stay in Germany, many of them work for BMW and they live in Bavaria making BMW motor cars. They come from Turkey and various other places but the position	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, Bapo ba Mogale the witness, the Bapo ba Mogale is the tribal authority, it's the tribe of people who are Setswana, they speak Tswana. The evidence or the assertion made to us by the counsel who appeared for them in an application we had some time ago, there was a great deal of resentment by these people to this influx of migrant labourers who came and took the jobs away and the money they would have otherwise earned and so on. So there is a – of course then it's correct to use the expression xenophobia because they're not really foreigners in the South African sense but they're almost treated as if they are foreigners if the are from different ethnic group within South Africa. According to what was put to us there were quite strong feelings of hostility towards them on the part of the local people. How true that is I don't know but that certainly was an allegation of a witness very strongly made before us. I think that's a correct summary of the position is it, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: It is indeed, Chair. Yes, Mr White, so I've tried to paint a profile of the 300, 400 people. Now I want to try and deal with the statements that at least point us to the lengths with which the manner

1	Page 31574 to refer us to?	1	Page 31576 of control. The security ran away as well while we were
2	MR SEMENYA SC: If we can start at	2	attacking them in large number." I emphasise the point in
3	paragraph 12, Chair.	3	that the attack is in large number. "I saw the two
4	CHAIRPERSON: This is an account of what	4	security officials try to get into their vehicle and we
5	happened on the 13th isn't it?	5	blocked them and assaulted with our weapons. I personally
6	MR SEMENYA SC: On the 12th.	6	stabbed one of the security somewhere on the mouth or face.
7	CHAIRPERSON: Oh yes, quite right. This is	7	I stabbed him with a butcher knife I had with me. I saw
8	what happened on the 12th the Sunday morning.	8	Baai shooting at a security and took his firearm and saw
9	MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, Chair.	9	Anele shooting at other security official. Anele took his
10	CHAIRPERSON: In the vicinity of the	10	firearm and a cell phone. After Baai taking security's
11	hostel and the taxi rank, yes.	11	cell phone he gave it to one Tjevi. I also saw Mambush
12	MR WHITE: Chair, apologies for the	12	taking a two way radio and a cell phone from security
13	interruption, where you want to take me -	13	official's lying outside a vehicle. I saw one Bhele had a
14	CHAIRPERSON: AAAA1.2.	14	two litre container with petrol and pour it on a security
15	MR WHITE: Yes indeed and I have it in	15	vehicle and it caught fire. Anele took blood from a
16	front of me and –	16	security using his panga and put blood into a plastic.
17	CHAIRPERSON: Page 7 going onto page 8.	17	Bhele then cut off the chin and tongue of a security who
18	MR WHITE: Just for clarification, Sir, I	18	was lying outside the vehicle and put them into the plastic
19	apologise and this is a statement from Mr X.	19	that Anele had already put the blood in. One of the guy
20	CHAIRPERSON: This is Mr X's statement,	20	whom I saw also stabbing a security was Rasta, I also saw
21	the first statement, the statement he made in February 2013	21	Baai pulling a security official out of a vehicle." What
22	and he's describing what happened on the Sunday morning	22	I'm saying it's a very grisly description of a brutality on
23	when the two security guards, employed by Lonmin, were	23	another human being, would you agree?
24	killed in the vicinity of NUM office and the taxi rank and	24	MR WHITE: It's shocking.
25	the hostel and so on.	25	MR SEMENYA SC: And not typical of that
	Page 31575		Page 31577
1	Page 31575 MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 –	1	Page 31577 which you would find in public disorder environment
1 2		1 2	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing
	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he		which you would find in public disorder environment
2	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened.	2	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across
2 3	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you.	2 3	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come
2 3 4 5 6	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page,	2 3 4 5 6	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph.	2 3 4 5 6 7	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR SEMENYA SC:You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON:I should say when I sayhe's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened.I should say when I sayMR WHITE:Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC:If you go to that page,just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph.It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts"On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE:I see that point, yes. It describes in ratherbroad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stards or block us on our way."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR SEMENYA SC:You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON:I should say when I sayhe's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened.I should say when I sayMR WHITE:Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC:If you go to that page,just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph.It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE:I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC:MR WHITE:I see that point, yes. It describes in ratherbroad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who starts or block us on our way."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR SEMENYA SC:You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON:I should say when I sayhe's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened.I should say when I sayMR WHITE:Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC:If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph.It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE:I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC:MR WHITE:I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC:It describes in ratherbroad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their possession. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and action in concert. Did your reading of the evidence reveal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their possession. Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and action in concert. Did your reading of the evidence reveal that picture?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their possession. Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you go to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and action in concert. Did your reading of the evidence reveal that picture? MR WHITE: I think that it's fair to say that the evidence revealed a degree of organisation and to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their possession. Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you go to paragraph 12 which is where I'm trying to point our –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and action in concert. Did your reading of the evidence reveal that picture? MR WHITE: I think that it's fair to say that the evidence revealed a degree of organisation and to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR SEMENYA SC: You would see on page 7 – CHAIRPERSON: I should say when I say he's describing what happened he's describing what he alleges happened. MR WHITE: Of course, Chair, thank you. MR SEMENYA SC: If you go to that page, just before paragraph 12, that is an unnumbered paragraph. It just gives us context, we're on page 7 where it starts "On Sunday" do you see that? MR WHITE: I see that point, yes. MR SEMENYA SC: It describes in rather broad terms that they take a decision to go to the offices of NUM and they say took – "The decision was that we are going to fight anyone who stands or block us on our way." That's the background then the security guards come there, if I just rush it through and they were going to fight with their weapons, the knobkerries, the pangas, the spears, the bush knives and they also even had a firearm in their possession. Do you see that? MR WHITE: Yes, I do. MR SEMENYA SC: And if you go to paragraph 12 which is where I'm trying to point our – direct our attention. Then say "The security officials	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which you would find in public disorder environment necessarily. If there'd been a killing it's been a killing but this is something else. MR WHITE: Again I haven't come across this type of thing in my experience, no. I have come across situations obviously where people have been killed but in terms of the sort of ritual aspect of the follow ups or post mortem it would seem, that no, Chair, I haven't. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: There's a further, when he gave evidence Mr X said that they took a decision that they would kill anyone that came in their way. The statement just says that they would fight with anyone. He specifically said they would kill anyone that came in their way. MR WHITE: Thank you, Commissioner. MR SEMENYA SC: There are other statements of various witnesses. If I have to go there I will, also demonstrating the action of the group being and action in concert. Did your reading of the evidence reveal that picture? MR WHITE: I think that it's fair to say that the evidence revealed a degree of organisation and to some degree a mutual intent, how far that spread across the

	D 04530		
1	Page 31578 point that you're trying to make that you know this is not	1	Page 31580 members or a number of the members of the group act in a
2	one or simply two individuals who were sort of acting of	2	way totally out of character because of this de-
3	their own initiative as such. I'm more than happy to	3	individuation effect of operating in a mob situation. I
4	accept that point, absolutely.	4	take it you must have encountered periods, evidence of that
5	MR SEMENYA SC: And the evidence we are	5	kind in your experience.
6	told when the 300, 400 of them, the evidence is also that	6	MR WHITE: If it's helpful, I actually
7	when the group of 300 or 400 of them were to go around the	7	make specific reference to some academic learning within my
8	kraal, this is now on the 16th, now Mr Noki then says to all	8	final statement. I make particular reference to work by
8 9	of them, no you don't have to run away, we have done	0 9	
	5		Professor Stott. I think at the time he was connected with
10	nothing wrong. We are all going home and the surprise	10	Liverpool University but I'm not sure if he still is and
11	element and this is where I'm inviting your opinion, is	11	Professor Stott does a lot of work with the UK police
12	they all agree to go in a direction that he's leading them.	12	generally. He is involved in training, he is involved in
13	So I'm suggesting that the argument on our part will be	13	helping to develop doctrine. But I think that one of his
14	that they were acting as a single concerted group under	14	central themes is that when he first started engaging with
15	command and instruction with a bend on a murderous route.	15	the police a number of years ago he felt that perhaps the
16	MR WHITE: I think ultimately that's a	16	doctrine and the thinking that informed that that his
17	question of fact is to whether they were or not and that's	17	concern was out of date because it largely engaged with
18	obviously for yourself, Chair as the Commission. If it's	18	what are traditional crowd management theories informed as
19	helpful to the Commission, as I've said, I do see, you	19	far back by Gustave Le Bon from the sort of late 1900s.
20	know, evidence of a number of people at least acting in	20	Sorry 1800s which talked about mob mentality and a crowd
21	concert as opposed to these people all acting as	21	acting as one. Stott's work along with others looks at it
22	individuals. Could I again offer to the Commission if it's	22	very differently hence his work would be referred to as the
23	helpful, you know, again I have plenty of experience of	23	elaborated social identity model. And within that what he
24	this. I've seen crowds of 200 or 300 who will open up	24	would talk about is that people actually still act as
25	despite the fact that they're throwing stones or whatever,	25	individuals to some extent. And this is part of the thing
	Page 31579		Page 31581
1	-		
	a large section of them bernaps to the side of the middle		that I was referring to earlier on, it's almost in the
1	a large section of them perhaps to the side of the middle of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a	1	that I was referring to earlier on, it's almost in the actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps
2	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a	2	actions of the police that might have - forgive my perhaps
2 3	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots	2 3	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on
2 3 4	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then	2 3 4	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps
2 3 4 5	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the	2 3 4 5	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some
2 3 4 5 6	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've	2 3 4 5 6	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as
2 3 4 5 6 7	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert.	2 3 4 5 6 7	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also used the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can only offer you my experience and expertise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also used the word de-individuated and we've had a number of cases in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can only offer you my experience and expertise. CHAIRPERSON: I'm just trying to explain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also used the word de-individuated and we've had a number of cases in South Africa where expert evidence has been given of mob	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can only offer you my experience and expertise. CHAIRPERSON: I'm just trying to explain to you the word Mr Semenya used, de-individuated was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also used the word de-individuated and we've had a number of cases in South Africa where expert evidence has been given of mob violence. Experts evidence has been given that there's an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can only offer you my experience and expertise. CHAIRPERSON: I'm just trying to explain to you the word Mr Semenya used, de-individuated was a reference to theories based on the work of Le Bon which was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	of the crowd will open up revealing someone standing with a gun behind them. The gunman will fire a number of shots towards the police and the crowd will immediately then obviously move back across shielding our sight of the gunman while he gets away. You know again – so I've experience of people that act in concert. CHAIRPERSON: So that then is an illustration of all or most of the members of the group acting almost as one. MR WHITE: Hopefully it's an example of experience of organisation, a lot of people certainly acting, understanding a plan and operating in concert with it. I absolutely accept that there was no element of this concept of protection by muti or whatever in the context that I'm familiar with. But just out of that and hopefully for assistance in relation to my assistance to you, Chair as someone who has a degree of experience in this type of thing, so that was specifically around organisation in crowds. CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya also used the word de-individuated and we've had a number of cases in South Africa where expert evidence has been given of mob	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actions of the police that might have – forgive my perhaps pre-use of language, almost a radicalisation of fact on some parts of the crowd. And it may well be that perhaps an over reaction by the police might draw together some people who previously were within a crowd almost as individuals and now all of a sudden they have a sort of a common identity because they're experiencing the same thing at the same time by the police. So he refers to it as an elaborated social identity model. But I mean all of this is to say that to a large extent the doctrine in the UK and I think sort of further afield, certainly within Europe would be that Le Bon's sort of theory on this crowd. You know people sort of acting as a single entity because they sort of if you like, get the protection and the anonymity of the crowd. And take on this sort of single mindset, it's the law of thinking. And I say that just in a European context, it may well be and I'm not clearly an expert on this but maybe the introduction of the added ingredient of the muti type issue might change that. I can only offer you my experience and expertise. CHAIRPERSON: I'm just trying to explain to you the word Mr Semenya used, de-individuated was a

1	Page 31582	1	Page 31584 MR WHITE: And apologies, Chair, to you
1	before the courts in the 80s and early 90s when there was	1	
2	mob violence and necklacing and that kind of thing. And a	2	and to Mr Semenya.
3	lot of evidence was led by experts, psychologists mainly of	3	[14:52] In that I misinterpreted when he said one single
4	the Le Bon theory and I was involved in a matter in	4	cell phone on the koppie. I was imagining this was an
5	Upington. This was quite a notorious case at the time,	5	agreement amongst the three and a half, you know the 3 300,
6	there was a lot of evidence of that kind and what seemed	6	as opposed to just a particular group. Perhaps that's what
7	clear was that a number of people were acting out of	7	you're talking about and I'm saying I would have remembered
8	character. You had a wide range of people, all sorts of	8	
9	occupations and types of personalities and so on and when	9	CHAIRPERSON: The evidence of X, Mr X is
10	they were together in this – the action which led to the	10	that I think there were various discussions on the koppie
11	case in which I appeared they acted out of character you	11	and it was agreed – whether, you know there was, certainly
12	see. And we had evidence which was accepted by the court.	12	whether it was agreed by everybody is something he can't
13	And there were a number of other cases where	13	talk about, but it appears to have been accepted without
14	similar evidence was accepted and that's the basis I think	14	dissent as it were, you know, vocalised express dissent,
15	of Mr Semenya's question. In fact we've even got training	15	that that would be what would happen, that there'd be only
16	manuals that were put before the Commission, police	16	one cell phone. That's Mr Semenya's question.
17	training manuals where the Le Bon theory is expounded as	17	MR SEMENYA SC: Correct, and - Chair,
18	sort of doctrine accepted by the police. So I put that to	18	yes, thank you – and also that seems to be an explanation
19	you for what it's worth. Of course it also has a bearing I	19	for the death of Mr Twala on the 14th, who it was found
20	take it on the question you've been debating and that is	20	after interrogation he had a cell phone and that had
21	whether one can criticise the police for making certain	21	airtime on it. That information has, are you aware of it?
22	assumptions. If the Le Bon theory is accepted as doctrine	22	MR WHITE: I'm familiar with evidence
23	in police training, whether it's right or wrong is a	23	concerning the death of the gentleman that you talk about.
24	different question. In judging the conduct of the police	24	I'm familiar that there was evidence in relation to
25	and whether they can be criticised for planning on the	25	discussions specifically about the fact that he had to
1	Page 31583 hasis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are	1	Page 31585
1	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are	1	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the
2	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are	2	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to
2 3	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts	2 3	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had
2 3 4	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise	2 3 4	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on
2 3 4 5	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your	2 3 4 5	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate.
2 3 4 5 6	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically	2 3 4 5 6	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to
2 3 4 5 6 7	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it.	2 3 4 5 6 7	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question. CHAIRPERSON: I think you can accept that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do, when are they planning to do it, how they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise the police capability of finding reliable intelligence to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question. CHAIRPERSON: I think you can accept that that is the evidence. Again it's evidence from Mr X,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise the police capability of finding reliable intelligence to inform their planning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question. CHAIRPERSON: I think you can accept that that is the evidence. Again it's evidence from Mr X, whether Mr X's evidence is going to be believed at the end	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the set things that you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise the police capability of finding reliable intelligence to inform their planning. It may well have an impact on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question. CHAIRPERSON: I think you can accept that that is the evidence. Again it's evidence from Mr X, whether Mr X's evidence is going to be believed at the end of the day is a matter none of us knows the answer to at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the things that you said, what you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise the police capability of finding reliable intelligence to inform their planning. MR WHITE: It may well have an impact on it, I mean if this, yes, if this group is acting, and 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 25	basis of certain assumptions. If those assumptions are what they have been taught, if those assumptions are doctrine accepted by the police and accepted by the courts over the last decades then it's difficult to criticise them. I think that's all – I'm sorry if I took your question away from you, Mr Semenya, but that's basically the point you were building up go I take it. MR SEMENYA SC: Indeed, Chair. Now, Mr White, I don't know if this information has your attention but there was even a decision at the koppie that only one cell phone be allowed there. Has that information been brought to you? MR WHITE: I don't think I'm aware of that particular piece of information. I'm not sure if I've seen that and I've forgotten it, I think it's quite a significant point, the fact that it is only once I'm sure I would remember it. And I'm more than happy to engage with that piece of evidence if you want to direct me to it or alternatively it's a more general point that you're making, I'm happy to hear your question. CHAIRPERSON: I think you can accept that that is the evidence. Again it's evidence from Mr X, whether Mr X's evidence is going to be believed at the end	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	mobile phone. I'm not familiar with the, I suppose the causal connection necessarily that I think you refer to that perhaps because he had a mobile phone and there had previously been agreement that there would only be one on the koppie, then in some respects that marked his fate. I'm not aware of that particular aspect, I would have to say. MR SEMENYA SC: Now I'm painting that picture to drive the point that collating ongoing intelligence about the thinking of this group, what they are planning to do it, is seriously compromised in the light of the set of facts I'm painting. Would you accept? MR WHITE: Sorry, when you say is seriously compromised, I thought that all of the set things that you were suggesting is all of these things tend to suggest that, you know, this is a group acting in concert as opposed to it compromises that fact, as opposed – MR SEMENYA SC: No, it would compromise the police capability of finding reliable intelligence to inform their planning. It may well have an impact on

1	Page 31586 tight-knit group and it's very hard to penetrate and of	1	Page 31588 that even where there was actionable intelligence there are
2			C C
2	course therefore that, yeah, I'm absolutely happy to accept that that is going to have an impact on the police's	2 3	questions with regards to how properly that was acted upon. CHAIRPERSON: That related to what
4	ability to be able to actually get intelligence from within	4	happened on the Sunday, Sunday the 12th. What the police
5	the group. Whether it makes it impossible, I don't know,	5	were supposed to do was to beef up – if that's the right
6	but I'm more than happy to accept the premise that of	6	word – the visible policing activity in the light of the
7	course it's likely to make it more difficult, yes.	7	information received, and that they didn't seem to have
8	MR SEMENYA SC: Now when I tried to	8	done properly, hence these incidents that took place that
9	follow your evidence about inadequate intelligence in	9	we've been talking about, the security guards and so on,
10	relation to the Marikana operation, did I understand you to	10	and according to Brigadier Engelbrecht General Mpembe was
11	say the intelligence was inadequate as a function of one or	11	dissatisfied that there hadn't been appropriate response to
12	other negligence on the part of the police in not picking	12	the intelligence.
13	it up when it was there?	13	Of course what we know is thereafter there's a
14	MR WHITE: I made the point that when I	14	massive increase in the forces available – forces is a word
15	was engaging with the evidence and I saw the exhibit TT5,	15	I don't like - the members of the service who were there
16	which was labelled as a composite of all of the	16	who were responding to the threat, as it were. It was a
17	intelligence that was available to the police throughout	17	relatively low-key operation, as far as one can tell from
18	this operation, and on that piece of paper there were 10	18	the evidence, on the Sunday but certainly as the time went
19	entries. I think if memory serves me correct, and if	19	on the degree of intensity of police operation increased
20	you're prepared to indulge me from memory as opposed to me	20	dramatically. So it doesn't follow that intelligence
21	looking at it, but I think the first three, possibly four,	21	information would have been responded to perhaps as
22	maybe three entries relate to incidents that happened in	22	inadequately as was the case on the Sunday, but I think to
23	February. I think then the fourth one –	23	put the whole thing in context.
24	CHAIRPERSON: The point was there were	24	I'm told I may be wrong when I said that the
25	basically only three –	25	security officers killing took place because of the lack of
	Page 31587		Page 31589
			Tuge 51567
1	MR WHITE: Two, possibly three, yes –	1	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right,
1 2	MR WHITE: Two, possibly three, yes – CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three	1 2	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe
			visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment
2	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable –	2	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe
2 3	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items –	2 3	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment
2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable –	2 3 4	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is
2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call	2 3 4 5	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya?
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard	2 3 4 5 6	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two	2 3 4 5 6 7	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been auctioned in the way that he would have expected it. So my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the sparsity of the intelligence and the fact that Brigadier
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been auctioned in the way that he would have expected it. So my comment was in relation to intelligence I was surprised at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the sparsity of the intelligence and the fact that Brigadier Engelbrecht contacts General Mpembe in relation to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been auctioned in the way that he would have expected it. So my comment was in relation to intelligence I was surprised at how little there was and I was therefore making an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the sparsity of the intelligence and the fact that Brigadier Engelbrecht contacts General Mpembe in relation to this particular piece of evidence, and I absolutely understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHAIRPERSON: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been auctioned in the way that he would have expected it. So my comment was in relation to intelligence I was surprised at how little there was and I was therefore making an assumption – and I stand by it – that therefore, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the sparsity of the intelligence and the fact that Brigadier Engelbrecht contacts General Mpembe in relation to this particular piece of evidence, and I absolutely understand your point, Chair, that the resources for this operation
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: - items, two or three items – MR WHITE: Actionable – CHAIRPERSON: - of what you would call intelligence in the document. You were surprised, regard being had to the period it covered, that they only had two or three bits of information and that you suggested indicated inadequate intelligence gathering, as I understood your evidence. MR WHITE: That's correct, Chair, and then I went on to say that even engaging with one of the pieces of evidence which I would consider to be actionable intelligence, and I referred to the statement of Brigadier Engelbrecht and the conversation then that he had with General Mpembe when it was obvious that it seems to me that Brigadier Engelbrecht didn't feel that the intelligence that he had actually taken the trouble to send a text on to Mr Mpembe and subsequently speak to him about it, had been auctioned in the way that he would have expected it. So my comment was in relation to intelligence I was surprised at how little there was and I was therefore making an assumption – and I stand by it – that therefore, you know, the operation must be compromised up to a point in relation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	visible policing, but anyway, the rest of it was right, that there was a message sent, information sent to Mpembe which he passed on and he later expressed disappointment that it hadn't been adequately responded to. That part is correct, is it not, Mr Semenya? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Yes, Chair, that part is correct – CHAIRPERSON: But the point I was making was that thereafter there was a dramatic build-up of resources, police resources and so that fact didn't necessarily operate either at all or as strongly thereafter. MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Mr White, I wanted us to – MR WHITE: Perhaps – MR SEMENYA SC: - to tidy – sorry? MR WHITE: Perhaps just for a point of clarification therefore in relation to my evidence is that - I think I commented on this yesterday – given the sparsity of the intelligence and the fact that Brigadier Engelbrecht contacts General Mpembe in relation to this particular piece of evidence, and I absolutely understand your point, Chair, that the resources for this operation were gradually building up, but you know, for me it's, I

Page 1380 Page 1380 1 this one of low or three specific pieces of intilligence: 1 reason why there was such a lock of intelligence. I have 2 the fact that Brajatier Englithrecht, who is 1 think a very seen exidence, including the statement for example of 3 work present in the Intelligence across the statement for example of Sinderstate 4 so significant and so important that the contacts the 5 5 work presents in the Intelligence across care difficult + seemed to me that the very 5 6 work so could visible policing in order to try and policie 7 6 work so could have informers placed with particular 1 1 data was work able of the activities it is asso. 6 1 data was way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way way spacefils, committies it is asso. 1 1 data way state all data way				
2 senior person in the Indilgence Engebrach, holds it black avory 2 senior person in the Indilgence Engebrach, the it black avory 3 senior person in the Indilgence Engebrach, the it black avory 3 Officer Victor, which Indicates some of the activities that 4 brack avort avoid avoid another to be personal during in the individual to this - 1 appreciate, you 5 Intelligence. I am not, I havent been provided I don't 7 had was around visible policing in order to try and police 6 intelligence. I am not, I havent been provided I don't 8 out this threat. 6 intelligence. I am not, I havent been provided I don't 10 a staution in wy country where given the longstanding 10 and I don't deny. I'm sure that there were namy, many 11 a found have informed splaced within particular 10 and I don't deny. I'm sure that there were namy, many 12 from thit's very specific, somethers its issos NV 14 inform into I stay and bilain (Linke avere 13 from thit's wery specific, somethers its insol 16 in stay insol in the Indilgence' engelificati 14 wold have the coperison whereby say for example wereby 14 informing this senior. 15 het polentificat are				-
3 3				5
4 so significant and so important that he contacts the 4 he had undertaken in order to try and obtain further 5 overall commander in relation to this - 1 appreciate, you http://encours.are.utificat.it is seemed to me that they 6 function concers are difficat.it is seemed to me that they http://encours.are.utificat.it is seemed to me that they 7 had was around visible policing in order to try and police 7 9 Chair, you referred yesterday quite correctly to 1 10 a stauration in my country where given the longstanding 1 11 nature would have informers placed within policitat in 1 12 organisations. Sometimes the longstanding to have the experience whereby say for example we know 13 from that is very specific, sometimes the loss to New 14 befast city certer in a particular area, were no sure 15 befast city certer in a particular area, were no sure 16 befast city certer in a particular area, were no sure 17 thatis were, doen of the response. In thit would be to have a 18 befast city certer in a particular area, were no sure 19 thatis there sere no were histont this there are 19 thatis there sere no were histonthis the sure and there an				
5 scal commander in relation to this - Lappreciate, you 5 intelligence. I am not, I haven't been provided I don't 6 how, resources are difficul - it seemed to me that they 6 think with, you know, the full explanation with regards to why there was not you or there precess of actionable 8 out this threat. 7 The saying to you in response I fully understand 10 a situation in wy country where given the longstanding 11 and I don't deny. I'm sure that there were many, many 11 nature we would have informes placed within particular 11 difficulties in trying to datain intelligence that were 12 organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 13 the 13th and the 16th, the level of Intelligence that were 13 from that is very specific, sometimes it's less so. We 14 MM there were many, many 14 would have the experime whereby so for example we know 14 Intelligence. Tany song in tass as uncertain some specifically and some some some some some some some some				
6 kow, resources are difficult - it secred to me that they 6 thick with, you know, the full explanation with regards to 7 had was around visible policing in order to try and police 0 with themail. 9 Chair, you referred yesterday quite correcity to 9 I'm saying to you in response 1 duity understand 11 a situation in my contry where given the inografiang 11 and 1 dort dery, I'm sure that there were many, many 12 organisations. Sometimes its its is so. We 11 difficulties in trying to obtain intelligence, but I still 13 from that is very specific. sometimes its is so. We 14 informing those operations was very, very sparse. 14 belats it you carls in a particular area, were not sure 15 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 12 watever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 16 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 12 sometime in there is the applicing presence. Firstly if that 17 Thats what I'm asking you. 13 think to themselve was applicing or sence. 18 MR WHTE: Woll, where was applicing and it as a function of police remissness. 14 thorest the poscient was avaing withe				-
7 had was around visible policing in order to try and police 7 why there was only two or three places of actionable 8 out this threat. 8 intelligence across the course of a week 10 a stuation in my country where given the longstanding 10 and 1 dont dony. I'm sure that three were many, many 11 arganisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 11 difficulties in rying to out in response 1 fully understand 12 organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 11 difficulties in rying to out in segonse 1 fully understand 13 from that is very specific, sometimes its less so. We 13 the T3th and the 16th, the level of intelligence that were 14 would have the experience were stray out that were were many, many 14 Informing those operations was very, very sparse. 15 that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the 16 Im saying 1 is it as a function of police remismess. 16 intelligence is abould accurate and therefore then a bomb 16 Tm saying 1 is it as a function of police remismess. 17 think to themesoles. On, the police know something, and the 10 very wishbe policing presence and they start to 18 theres we hold he that the conversatin that the conversation that the set wery o			-	-
8 out his threat. 8 intelligence across the course of a week. 9 Chair, you referred yesterday quite correctly to a siluation in you county where given the longstanding and and more down, the super that there were many, many and and down, this were were many, many and and the fath, the level of intelligence, but I still organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back is from this is very specific, sometimes it's less so. We is altal thy control in a particular acra, were not sure is based thy there was going to be a bomb within the is fast ity control in a particular acra, were not sure is whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a were visible policing presence. Firstly if that intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb is moving in, there's the possibility of interruping that. is moving in, there's the possibility of interruping that. is moving in there's the posibility of interruping that. is nowing in the indiverse are miss. is nowing in the indiverse are were are and therefore the a bomb the response to that would term an intelligence and then I'm know, they careful and consolus tow. all of a sudden therewere are individuel. there are the individuel. intendee, 's of don't know, they allow and the fast meany and then I'm there are the individuel. there areal might deer the movement of the		-	6	
9 Chair, you referred yesterday quite correctly to 10 9 The saying to you in response I fully understand 10 10 10 a stuation in my country where given the longstanding 11 10 and I don't demy. I'm sure that there were many, many 11 11 arganisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back. 13 from that is very specific, sometimes it's less so. We 14 11			-	
10 a situation in my country where given the longstanding 10 and I don't damy, I'm sure that there were many, many 11 nature we would have informers placed within particular 11 difficulties in trying to obtain intelligence, but I still 12 organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 11 difficulties in trying to obtain intelligence, but I still 13 from that is very specific, sometimes it's less so. We 11 informing those operations was very, very, very sparse. 14 would have the experience whereby say for example we know 15 IN SEMENVA 3C: Now I know it is sparse. 16 Befast city center in a particular area, were not sure 16 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 17 that potentially there was possibility of interrupting that, 18 MR WHITE: Well, I think that there are 18 whatever, where possibility of interrupting that, 10 saudence yesterday 12 20 thuy sets he possibility of interrupting that, 22 second that he page care levidence that he never ever got 21 thorefore that might doter the movement of the borobi hit 16 saudence yesterday 21 theracter that might doter the movement of the borobi 3 meet the individuat			_	-
11 nature we would have informers placed within particular 11 difficulties in trying to obtain intelligence, but 1 still 12 organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 11 come back to the point that the operations specifically on 13 from that is very specific. sometimes it is tess so. We 14 informing those operations was very, very sparse. 15 that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the 16 If sing that and that 16th, the level of intelligence that were 14 word visible policing resonce. Firstly if that 16 If sing that as that the that there are 16 intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore than a bomb 16 If sing that. 17 15 intelligence. Firstly if that 16 inserve what if would be to have a 17 16 inserve with we was policing constance. Firstly if that 16 maximum and therefore that would be to have a 16 inserve the possibility of interrupting that. 12 iscuents and intelligence requirement. He 16 think to theresprese. Firstly if that 18 specifically asks for some intelligence requirement. He 16 think to theresprese. Firstly if that 18 specifically asks for some intelligence t			9	
12 organisations. Sometimes the intelligence that comes back 12 come back to the point that the operations specifically on 13 from that is very specific, sometimes its less so. We 13 the 13th and the 16th, the level of intelligence that twere 14 would have the experience whereby say for example we know 15 the 13th and the 16th, the level of intelligence that twere 15 that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the 16 Im saying is it as a function of police remissress. 16 effect up centre in a particular area, were not sure 16 Im saying is it as a function of police remissress. 17 that's work is as duracturate and therefore then a bomb intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb 16 insolving in, theres the possibility of interrupting that, 17 that's to what'y ou could point to with 17 that's to theres board accurate and therefore then a bomb 20 regards to what'y ou call police remissness. For example 18 invite out the policy how are behind this threat, you 21 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 23 therefore that might dater the movement of the bomb in the 1 1 1 would have a samiles 24 thorefore lipadice fingolitecth' was having with	10		10	
13 from that is very specific, sometimes its less so. We 13 the 13th and the 16th, the level of Intelligence that were 14 would have the experience whereby say for example we know 14 informing those operations was very, very sparse. 15 thet potentially there was oging to be a bomb within the 15 MR SEMEWAY SC: Now it its sparse. 16 Belfast city centre in a particular area, were not sure 16 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 17 exactly the lime, exactly where its coming from or 17 That's what I'm asking you. 18 whatever, one of the responses to that would be to have a 18 MR WHITE: Will With that there are 19 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 18 MR WHITE: Wall and intelligence, and therefore than a bomb 21 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 issues what I would term an intelligence, and then rever ever got 23 presence out the peopic whare behind this threat, you 23 such and terefore that an policing out the 24 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 2 MR SEMENA SC: On whose par? 2 therefore that might deter the moverestation that 5 <	11		11	
14 would have the experience whereby say for example we know 14 Informing those operations was very, very sparse. 15 that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the MR SEMENYA SC: Now I know it is sparse. 16 wardy the time, exactly where it's coming from or 14 MR SEMENYA SC: Now I know it is sparse. 17 reactly the time, exactly where it's coming from or 17 That's what I'm asking you. 18 18 wary visible policing presence. Firstly if that 20 cartain pieces of evidence that you caul polic remissness. For example 19 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 20 regards to what you cail policine remissness. For example 21 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 issue what I would term an intelligence, and then I'm 23 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 25 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm 24 threat. 14 met endividual. 14 MR SEMENYA SC: No whose part? Just give 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 MR SEMENYA SC: No whose part? Just give 4 thereat. 14 seemed to me that the conversation	12			
15 that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the 15 MR SEMENYA SC: Now I know it is sparse. 16 Belfast city centre in a particular area, were not sure 16 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 17 exactly the time, exactly where it's coming from or 17 That's what I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. For example 18 whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 18 MR WHITE: Well, I think that there are 17 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 19 certain picces of evidence that you could point to with 20 bit number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 22 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 21 they careful and conscious too; all of a sudden 24 specifically asks for some intelligence requirement. He 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 24 specifically asks for some intelligence requirement. 21 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 37 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 therefore that might deter than apolicing out the 4 MR SEMENYA SC: No whose part? Just give 3 therefore that might deter them overeation that	13		13	the 13th and the 16th, the level of intelligence that were
16 Belfast city centre in a particular area, we're not sure 16 I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness. 17 exactly the time, exactly where it's coming from or 18 Mratever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 18 whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 18 MR WHITE: Well, I think that there are 19 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 18 MR WHITE: Well (I think that there are 11 intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb 18 method (I think that there are 12 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 20 respanse to that. So I think that the are erequirement. He 12 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 22 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 23 respense to that. So I think that, you know, that 1 would term an intelligence requirement. He 24 thore she policing presence and they start to 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 25 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 4 threat. 3 36 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 threat. 5 <td>14</td> <td></td> <th></th> <td></td>	14			
17 exactly the time, exactly where it's coming from or 17 That's what I'm asking you. 18 whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 18 MR WHITE: Well, I think that there are 19 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 10 regards to what you call police remissness. For example 21 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 20 regards to what you call police remissness. For example 22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 24 know, they're careful and conscious too; all of a sudden 22 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 25 therefore that might deter the movement of the bobm in the 3 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then 'T 4 threat. 4 threat. 4 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 6 Briggadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation 7 intelligence is and you you part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he waninted to 6 MR SEMENYA S	15	that potentially there was going to be a bomb within the	15	MR SEMENYA SC: Now I know it is sparse.
18 whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a 18 MR WHITE: Well, 1 think that there are 19 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 10 certain pieces of evidence that you could polite remissness. For example 21 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 21 certain pieces of evidence that you call police remissness. For example 22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 23 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 23 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm 24 know, they're careful and conscious too: all of a sudden 24 confident that he gave cral evidence that he never ever got 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 2 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 3 me the individual. 1 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 4 thare. It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that 1 would be an example whereNY	16	Belfast city centre in a particular area, we're not sure	16	I'm saying is it as a function of police remissness.
19 very visible policing presence. Firstly if that 19 certain pieces of evidence that you could point to with 20 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 19 certain pieces of evidence that you could point to with 21 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 10 regards to what you call police remissness. For example 21 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 Lieutenant-Colonel Scott I said in my evidence yesterday 22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 Lieutenant-Colonel Scott I said in my evidence yesterday 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 21 Lieutenant-Colonel Scott I said in my evidence yesterday 24 know, theyre careful and consclous too; all of a sudden 21 Specifically asks for some intelligence; and then I'm 25 therefore that might deter the movement of the both the 31 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 3 It streat. 11 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 11 4 thread. 4 MR WHITE: 01 MR SEMENVA SC: 01 More was that 4 thered. thered. MR SEMENVA SC:	17	exactly the time, exactly where it's coming from or	17	That's what I'm asking you.
20 intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb 20 regards to what you call police remissness. For example 21 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 20 regards to what you call police remissness. For example 22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 21 Lisutenant-Colonel Scott 1 said in my evidence yesterday 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 23 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then lever ever got 23 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 2 MR SEMENVA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 4 threat. 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation 6 MR SEMENVA SC: Where was that 1 intended, 's ol don't know, I'm blind to what particular 1 whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be 1 intended, 's ol don't know, I'm blind to what particular 1 would be an example where it might be 1 interd	18	whatever. One of the responses to that would be to have a	18	MR WHITE: Well, I think that there are
21 is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that, 21 Lieutenant-Colonel Scott I said in my evidence yesterday 22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 22 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 4 confident that he gave oral evidence that he never ever got 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 26 confident that he gave oral evidence that he never ever got 26 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 3 me the individual. 3 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 3 me the individual. 4 threat. 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 6 harpen. I think in fairness to M Mpembe when they had the 3 3. 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I 1 intelligence and ny our part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 12 instructions Mr Mpembe and how let dwn he may have 1 1 whether we have	19	very visible policing presence. Firstly if that	19	certain pieces of evidence that you could point to with
22 but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing 22 issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He 23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 22 issues what I would term an intelligence, and then I'm 24 know, theyre careful and conscious too; all of a sudden 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 26 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 26 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the movement of the bomb in the 26 37 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 4 threat. 4 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 6 MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that 7 6 bappen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the 3 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 subsequent conversation his reply is "It didn't happen as I 10 something, but I think - I was going to raise with you 11 intended, "so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular 14 MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair. <td>20</td> <td>intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb</td> <th>20</th> <td>regards to what you call police remissness. For example</td>	20	intelligence is absolute accurate and therefore then a bomb	20	regards to what you call police remissness. For example
23 presence out the people who are behind this threat, you 23 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm 24 know, they're careful and conscious too; all of a sudden 23 specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 24 confident that he gave oral evidence that he never ever got 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 26 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the threat. 4 threat. 4 MR SEMENVA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 me the individual. 4 MR WHTE: On the part of the South 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 6 MR SEMENVA SC: Where was that 6 happen. I think in fairness to M Mpembe when they had the 8 3. 10 somesthing, but I think - I was going to raise with you 1 11 intelligence that they might have been able to do something 16 3. 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 15 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well let's act on 15 intelligence that they might have be	21	is moving in, there's the possibility of interrupting that,	21	Lieutenant-Colonel Scott I said in my evidence yesterday
24 know, theyre careful and conscious too: all of a sudden 24 confident that he gave oral evidence that he never ever got 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 26 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 4 thereat. 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 6 MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that 7 to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that 3 . 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 something, but I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 11 intended,* so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular 11 whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 12 appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say 13 <	22	but number 2, because if you put that very visible policing	22	issues what I would term an intelligence requirement. He
25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 25 they see heightened policing presence and they start to 25 any response to that. So I think that, you know, that 7 think to themselves, 'Oh, the police know something,' and 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 therefore that might deter the movement of the bornb in the 3 me the individual. 4 threat. 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe In relation 7 Intelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 soubsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I 11 whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 15 CHAIRPERSON: Air is appropriate? 14 here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or 15 CHAIRPERSON: Air is appropriate? 14 <td< td=""><td>23</td><td>presence out the people who are behind this threat, you</td><th>23</th><td>specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm</td></td<>	23	presence out the people who are behind this threat, you	23	specifically asks for some intelligence, and then I'm
Page 31591 Page 31591 1 think to themselves, 'Oh, the police know something, 'and' therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the miss in place. We would refer to that as policing out the miss in place. We would refer to that as policing out the 4 threat. It seemed to me that the conversation that Miss SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that African Police department. Miss WHITE: On the part of the South 6 Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with M Mpembe in relation Miss SEMENYA SC: Where was that mitelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to mitelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 9 chaire Miss Sement So Mr Mpembe when they had the something, but I think - I was going to raise with you 11 intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular mite appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let dow ne may have mite appropriate? 14 Miss SEMENYA SC: Thank you. Mite and take the tea adjournment. 17 certatinly Mr Engelbrecht	24	know, they're careful and conscious too; all of a sudden	24	confident that he gave oral evidence that he never ever got
1 think to themselves, 'Oh, the police know something,' and 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 2 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 3 me the individual. 4 threat. 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation 6 MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that 7 to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that 7 intelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to 8 3. 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 10 subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I 11 whether we havent reached the stage where it might be 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 12 appropriate? 14 14 here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or 14 MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair. 15 15 intelligence that th	25	they see heightened policing presence and they start to	25	any response to that. So I think that, you know, that
1 think to themselves, 'Oh, the police know something,' and 1 would be an example whereby there's a remiss. 2 therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the 2 MR SEMENYA SC: On whose part? Just give 3 first place. We would refer to that as policing out the 3 me the individual. 4 threat. 4 MR WHITE: On the part of the South 5 It seemed to me that the conversation that 5 African Police department. 6 Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation 6 MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that 7 to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that 7 intelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past 8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to 8 3. 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 10 subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I 11 whether we havent reached the stage where it might be 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 12 appropriate? 14 14 here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or 14 MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair. 15 intelligence that they might have been				
2therefore that might deter the movement of the bomb in the first place. We would refer to that as policing out the first place. We would refer to that as policing out the threat.2MR SEMENYA SC: MR WHITE:On whose part? Just give me the individual.4threat.4MR WHITE: MR WHITE:On the part of the South5It seemed to me that the conversation that to here's this particular plece of intelligence is that5African Police department.6Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation to here's this particular plece of intelligence is that6MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that77to here's this particular plece of intelligence is that83.9CHAIRPERSON: Ves, I was looking for10subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have been by other people, but the fact remains that actually10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or a about and it certainly wasnt done to the satisfaction of thougs, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's there was intelligence on to properly acted upon, and that's there was intelligence on the pooler's acted upon, and that's 				-
3first place. We would refer to that as policing out the threat.3me the individual.4threat.4MR WHITE: On the part of the South5It seemed to me that the conversation that5African Police department.6Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation6MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that7to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that7intelligence and on your part - Chair, I see it is 5 past8seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have to ber by other people, but the fact remains that actually10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?It is, Chair.14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair.It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you, and that's not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were second part. Is it your evidence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence I don't know the25<				
4threat.4MR WHITE:On the part of the South5It seemed to me that the conversation that5African Police department.6Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation6MR SEMENYA SC:Where was that7to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that7intelligence and on your part – Chair, I see it is 5 past8seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to83.9happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the9CHAIRPERSON:Yes, I was looking for10subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is		-		
5It seemed to me that the conversation that5African Police department.6Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation6MR SEMENYA SC: Where was that7to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that7intelligence and on your part - Chair, I see it is 5 past8seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to83.9happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the9CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for10subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC: Thare are two distinct18MR SEMENYA SC: There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON: ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19 <td>3</td> <td></td> <th>3</th> <td></td>	3		3	
6Brigadier Engelbrecht was having with Mr Mpembe in relation 76MR SEMENYA SC: Intelligence and on your part - Chair, I see it is 5 past7to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the subsequent conversation his reply is "It didn't happen as I intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 13 been by other people, but the fact remains that actually 14 here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or intelligence that they might have been able to do something about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of that it si appropriate?14 MR SEMENYA SC: C HAIRPERSON: A R SEMENYA SC: A lift, well let's act on that and take the tea adjournment.18MR SEMENYA SC: There are two distinct18 C CMAIRPERSON: C MAIRPERSON: A SEMENYA SC: Thank you.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is to was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's second part. Is it your evidence that the police were second part. Is it your evidence that the police were second part. Is it your evidence that the police were second part. Is it your evidence that was there?23 C GARY WHITE: C MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): C MAIRPERSON:24MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very24 C ROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): C Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to				·
7to here's this particular piece of intelligence is that7intelligence and on your part - Chair, I see it is 5 past8seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to83.9happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the9CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for10subsequent conversation his reply is "It didn't happen as I10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC: There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON: 15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25] CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss	5		_	
8 seems to be what he had anticipated or what he wanted to 9 3. 9 happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the 9 CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I was looking for 10 subsequent conversation his reply is 'It didn't happen as I 10 something, but I think - I was going to raise with you 11 intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular 11 whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be 12 instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have 12 appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say 13 been by other people, but the fact remains that actually 13 that it is appropriate? 14 here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or 14 MR SEMENYA SC: It is, Chair. 15 CHAIRPERSON: Alright, well let's act on 16 about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of 16 that and take the tea adjournment. 17 Certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well. 17 MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you. 18 MR SEMENYA SC: There are two distinct 18 CHAIRPERSON: 15 minutes. 19 things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is 19 [COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMIS	6		6	
9happen. I think in fairness to Mr Mpembe when they had the subsequent conversation his reply is "It didn't happen as I intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular9CHAIRPERSON: something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police wree22GARY WHITE:(s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.)	7		7	
10subsequent conversation his reply is "It didn't happen as I10something, but I think - I was going to raise with you11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.2223CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wan	8			
11intended," so I don't know, I'm blind to what particular11whether we haven't reached the stage where it might be12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22gARY WHITE:I'm saying I was very23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	9		9	Ũ
12instructions Mr Mpembe gave and how let down he may have been by other people, but the fact remains that actually12appropriate to take tea, but do I understand you to say13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were exercise in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):2525surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to				
13been by other people, but the fact remains that actually13that it is appropriate?14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were22GARY WHITE:(s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to				
14here was this identifiable piece of evidence, or14MR SEMENYA SC:It is, Chair.15intelligence that they might have been able to do something15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were22GARY WHITE:(s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to				
15intelligence that they might have been able to do something about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.15CHAIRPERSON:Alright, well let's act on17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.16that and take the tea adjournment.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were aremiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	13			
16about and it certainly wasn't done to the satisfaction of certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.16that and take the tea adjournment.17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC: Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC: There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON: 15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON: The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were22GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to		•		
17certainly Mr Engelbrecht and potentially Mr Mpembe as well.17MR SEMENYA SC:Thank you.18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were22GARY WHITE:(s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	15		15	-
18MR SEMENYA SC:There are two distinct18CHAIRPERSON:15 minutes.19things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is19[COMMISSION ADJOURNSCOMMISSION RESUMES]20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were22GARY WHITE:(s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	16	-		-
 things, Mr White, I'm trying to tidy with you. The one is there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were remiss in collecting intelligence that was there? CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya? MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the 				5
20there was intelligence not properly acted upon, and that's not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr21what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?20[15:25]CHAIRPERSON:The Commission resumes. Mr23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there? VMR WHITE:23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to				
21not what I'm discussing with you. I want to discuss the second part. Is it your evidence that the police were21White, you're still under oath.22second part. Is it your evidence that the police were remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?22GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.)23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	19		19	[COMMISSION ADJOURNS COMMISSION RESUMES]
22 second part. Is it your evidence that the police were 22 GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.) 23 remiss in collecting intelligence that was there? 23 CHAIRPERSON: Mr Semenya? 24 MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.): 25 surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the 25 Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	20	/ 3 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	20	
23remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?23CHAIRPERSON:Mr Semenya?24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	21		21	White, you're still under oath.
24MR WHITE:I'm saying I was very24CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):25surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the25Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to		A DATE OF THE DESIGN AND A DATE OF THE	22	GARY WHITE: (s.u.o.)
25 surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the 25 Thank you, Chair. Mr White, just before break I wanted to	22	h II Print L. Links		
		remiss in collecting intelligence that was there?	23	5
ARCHIVE FOR LUSTICE	23 24	remiss in collecting intelligence that was there? MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very		CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):
	23 24 25	remiss in collecting intelligence that was there? MR WHITE: I'm saying I was very surprised at the lack of intelligence. I don't know the	24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR SEMENYA SC (CONTD.):

1	Page 31594	1	Page 31596
1	understand what you called police remissness in relation to	1	intelligence and I'm prepared to accept that. I fully
2	intelligence gathering. Are you saying they were remiss	2	understand that, so I'm now pointing to particular pieces
3	because despite the request by Colonel Scott, no feedback	3	of evidence where I'm saying, well, Lieutenant-Colonel
4	was given?	4	Scott issued an intelligence requirement which would have
5	MR WHITE: Overall I make the assessment	5	helped him. He wouldn't have issued it if he didn't think
6	on the basis of the sparsity of intelligence and you, I	6	it would have helped him and yet he got no response back in
7	think before tea you'd said there is a sparsity of	7	relation to that. So I think, you know, that's evidence of
8	intelligence. Dealing with – I'm saying that I understand,	8	a contributory factor. Had Lieutenant-Colonel Scott got
9	I'm sure there were huge difficulties in relation to trying	9	information back and specifically in relation to what he
10	to gather intelligence but nonetheless I still think the	10	was asking for, would that have had a significant impact on
11	outcome therefore raises questions. So I then looked to	11	the ultimate outcome of this operation? I don't know and
12	specific issues and I deal specifically, Chair, with this	12	to be absolutely fair, I don't think the specific types of
13	at page 60 of my final statement in paragraph 6.2.2. If	13	intelligence that he was asking for would have made this
14	it's helpful to paraphrase, I make reference to the fact	14	big dramatic effect, but I'm using that basically to say,
15	that Lieutenant-Colonel Scott suggests that he had sought	15	look, I think there are intelligence failures here overall.
16	intelligence, sought intelligence on the area's roads and	16	Again I come back to my main criticism, an operation this
17	the attitudes of the area's population. Community	17	scale of magnitude running over this period of time with
18	intelligence and tension indicators are the sort of things	18	such a dearth of intelligence and now here is an example,
19	that I, is the language that I would use in relation to	19	Chair, to you to show you that how clearly the processes
20	what he seems to be seeking. Bearing in mind that he's the	20	were not properly working, which basically helps to
21	chief planner, he puts out what I've previously described	21	reinforce my overall points. So I'm not saying that the
22	as what I would consider to be an intelligence requirement.	22	specific piece of intelligence would have had, you know,
23	He says this is what I need in order to help me build this	23	the impact of changing the outcome of the tragedy of
24	plan. Lieutenant-Colonel Scott then gives oral evidence.	24	Marikana.
25	He talks, he gives evidence potentially – ja, oral evidence	25	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: The question is
	5 01505		D 01503
1	Page 31595	1	Page 31597 whether the particular intelligence that be requested and
1	to the fact that no information came back, with the	1	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and
2	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to	2	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning
2 3	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to	2 3	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to
2 3 4	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if	2 3 4	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question?
2 3 4 5	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral	2 3 4 5	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected
2 3 4 5 6	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again	2 3 4 5 6	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around	2 3 4 5 6 7	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or otherwise of the operation. That's one of my key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in fact we would like the police to deal with them really,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or otherwise of the operation. That's one of my key criticisms. So engaging with the evidence, in order to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in fact we would like the police to deal with them really, really harshly because we're frightened of them, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or otherwise of the operation. That's one of my key criticisms. So engaging with the evidence, in order to be fair, I have been alerted to the fact that the South	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in fact we would like the police to deal with them really, really harshly because we're frightened of them, we're concerned about them. Maybe people in the community would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or otherwise of the operation. That's one of my key criticisms. So engaging with the evidence, in order to be fair, I have been alerted to the fact that the South African Police have said that there are specific issues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in fact we would like the police to deal with them really, really harshly because we're frightened of them, we're concerned about them. Maybe people in the community would have actually said, look, to be honest with you, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	to the fact that no information came back, with the exception of some small piece of information in relation to something to do with the roads itself. I can point you to the transcript where, the specific transcripts, Chair, if it's helpful. Transcript 13418 to 9 is where, in oral evidence, Mr Scott under questioning by Ms Le Roux again talks about this requirement that he issues around intelligence. And it's in transcript 15125 is where he then responds in relation to a question from Ms Le Roux and indicates that he doesn't actually receive any intelligence back with regards to that matter. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I have – sorry. [Microphone off, inaudible] - the lack of that specific intelligence that he requested impacted adversely on the planning. MR WHITE: What I'm attempting to do is basically say that I struggled to understand how this operation, over a period of a week, only had 2/3 pieces of actionable intelligence. I think that the lack of intelligence significantly impacted on the success or otherwise of the operation. That's one of my key criticisms. So engaging with the evidence, in order to be fair, I have been alerted to the fact that the South	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	whether the particular intelligence that he requested and the lack of any response adversely affected the planning because he was the chief planner? What is the answer to that question? MR WHITE: I think it adversely affected the planning because he is the chief planner, yes. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: How so? MR WHITE: Well, ultimately Lieutenant- Colonel Scott was trying to establish, you know, what the view in the local community was and what basically, to try and find information around the attitudes of people generally. So when we're talking about this crowd on the koppie, whilst we've been focusing very much on the warrior group that's just been described – it's not my description but that's how it has been described – but the information that he was seeking was then perhaps going to be informative in relation to how other people might respond to police interaction, because potentially if the police had have moved forward, maybe people – maybe people in the community said, we want nothing to do with these people, in fact we would like the police to deal with them really, really harshly because we're frightened of them, we're concerned about them. Maybe people in the community would

		1	
1	Page 31598 whatever but actually you know what, we know a number of	1	Page 31600 aspect of intelligence. On page 60 to which you've
2	them and I don't think there's anything in that. Maybe	2	referred us, from the third line downwards you talk about
3	they would have been basically saying, look, at the end of	3	the kind of information which you would have expected to
4	the day these are the people who are actually standing,	4	see. "This might have included information in relation to
5	fundamentally standing up for our rights so we have a	5	the intentions of the protesters, i.e. how long they
6	degree of sympathy with them. Those sorts of things then	6	intended to maintain their protest, details on individual
7	would have potentially factored into this – say for example	7	key members of the groups, where the majority of the people
8	you take the last premise, then you've got to take into	8	who left the koppie each evening went, how many remained on
	consideration, well, if we take any action in relation to	0 9	the koppie overnight and who they were, the likely number
9	-		
10	this warrior group, actually the intelligence is telling us	10	of firearms, et cetera." You say, "I would have expected
11	that the other 3 000 people are potentially going to be	11	to see this information being updated and fed into the JOC
12	very supportive of them. So instead of dealing with the	12	on an ongoing regular basis." Now some of that information
13	group that's potentially going to be resistant to the	13	might have been difficult to get, the intention of the
14	police, which is 300, maybe then the activities that the	14	protesters, how long they intended to remain and so on. So
15	police take, because of the community intelligence that's	15	the indications, I think, are that they intended to remain
16	coming back, suggests that we're going to engage with a	16	there until they got their R12 500, but what we do know,
17	group who are going to be resisting us, which is 3 000. I	17	because Brigadier Engelbrecht tells us this, is a process
18	think that is particularly significant information.	18	was on the go to get certain information. He talks about,
19	COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: The basis of that	19	I mentioned it to your yesterday, in his statement, they
20	is that the community that you talk – you equate the	20	got a whole lot of detectives from Gauteng, they spent
21	community to the 3 000 people?	21	their time analysing the still photographs and I think the
22	MR WHITE: I simply say that the	22	videos together with Lonmin human relations people to try
23	community in Marikana are a source of information and	23	to identify particular people. Presumably they would have
24	intelligence. I think, in my experience, it's up to the	24	concentrated, I would think, on those who were visibly
25	police to explore every avenue and I think to a large	25	bearing not just sticks and so on but pangas and assegais
	Page 31599		Page 31601
1	Page 31599 extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong –	1	Page 31601 and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would
1 2		1 2	•
	extent Colonel Scott - I'm assuming, I might be wrong -		and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would
2	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence	2	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill
2 3	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back.	2 3	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or
2 3 4	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he	2 3 4	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on.
2 3 4 5	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he	2 3 4 5	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can
2 3 4 5 6	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the	2 3 4 5 6	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only
2 3 4 5 6 7	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information.	2 3 4 5 6 7	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned accordingly, mustn't he?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was given for this operation but there appears to be no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned accordingly, mustn't he? MR WHITE: Well, obviously he is taking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was given for this operation but there appears to be no intelligence gathered to support that operation. Well, my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned accordingly, mustn't he? MR WHITE: Well, obviously he is taking decisions in the absence of that information but I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was given for this operation but there appears to be no intelligence gathered to support that operation. Well, my understanding of that is this, if they arrested people as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned accordingly, mustn't he? MR WHITE: Well, obviously he is taking decisions in the absence of that information but I think that he does give further oral evidence that obviously, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was given for this operation but there appears to be no intelligence gathered to support that operation. Well, my understanding of that is this, if they arrested people as they were proposing to arrest people, I think they hoped to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	extent Colonel Scott – I'm assuming, I might be wrong – agrees with me. That's why he issued that intelligence requirement and yet he got nothing back. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: I'm not sure he agrees that it had an adverse effect on his planning but he agrees that he asked for it and didn't receive the information. MR WHITE: Apologies, Commissioner, just to be clear. When I said that I think he agrees with me, in that I'm saying that if he – the fact that he issued that intelligence requirement, I think that logic would suggest that Colonel Scott feels that the information that would come back is going to be of value to him, otherwise why would he issue it? Whether or not, with no information coming back, he feels that that had a significantly detrimental effect on his planning, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Equally, if he didn't get the information, he must have planned accordingly, mustn't he? MR WHITE: Well, obviously he is taking decisions in the absence of that information but I think that he does give further oral evidence that obviously, you know, the planning is to some extent undermined by the lack	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and possibly even firearms. Then presumably they would have expected the Lonmin people to say, yes, that is Bill Jones and this is his address, he lives in this hostel or he lives in a shack in the informal settlement and so on. That appears to have been an ongoing process which I can only assume, we may have more evidence later but I can only assume that it hadn't yet reached finality. I understand your point is they should really have given the results as and when they came in but it does look as if they were still busy with it and they weren't yet ready to do anything specific with it. You also refer to the proposal to have a cordon and search based on – I think Mpembe had talked about, yes, it's paragraph 6.2.3 on page 61 - you say, "I note that stage 5 of the operational plan involved 'intelligence led follow-up operations to arrest at places of residence' and stage 6 of the plan involved a cordon and search operation which necessarily would have required intelligence to be effective." You say authorisation was given for this operation but there appears to be no intelligence gathered to support that operation. Well, my understanding of that is this, if they arrested people as they were proposing to arrest people, I think they hoped to get information from them which would have assisted them

		1	
1	Page 31602 mentioned to you yesterday, one is the results of this	1	Page 31604 12 o'clock. I thought at one stage, in fact I'm still not
2	analysis of the still photographs read with the information	2	sure that I was wrong, that in fact there was a mistake
3	they hoped to get from Lonmin and the other was a response	3	when those – I told you those minutes were heavily edited –
4	from NUM in consequence of the request that General Mpembe	4	that when the minutes were finally produced at Roots some
5	made to Mr Zokwana that the NUM people must tell the police	5	considerable time down the track, the intelligence given at
6	which of their colleagues and miners have got dangerous	6	12 o'clock was reported as having been given at 6:30, but
7	weapons and where they keep them and so on. And that	7	in any event that appears to be the point at which the
8	request was only made on the Wednesday night and that was	8	curtain went down on such evidence as had been gathered
9	of course the night the decision was taken that, come what	9	which was reported. It doesn't mean they weren't going on
10	may, if the weapons weren't handed down, Thursday was D-	10	with the intelligence gathering and who knows what evidence
11	day. So there wasn't much, there wasn't any time to react	11	would not have been available at say 6 o'clock on Thursday
12	to that. That, I would think, appears to be the answer to	12	evening if they'd then gone over to the cordon and search
13	the point you make. It's not necessarily correct to say no	13	operation which had already been authorised.
14	intelligence had been gathered but certainly not enough	14	MR WHITE: I agree with everything you
15	time had elapsed for such intelligence as had been gathered	15	say, Chair, I think you're absolutely right. And to add to
	to be processed and put in a reportable form, but if they		that, the conversation that I was having with the
16	had not decided to go ahead on the Thursday and they	16	Ũ
17 18	decided to wait until the Friday when they had more	17 18	Commissioner earlier on with regards to an intelligence requirement that Lieutenant-Colonel Scott said, it may well
	information of the kind I've discussed, it might have been		have been that if the police officers were out within the
19	C C	19	•
20	different but that's one of those what-if questions, isn't it?	20	community and asking for community intelligence, one of the
21		21	issues that may have come back might have been some information which might have been of assistance in relation
22 23	MR WHITE: Indeed, Chair, but perhaps if it's helpful I could deal with those because I don't want	22	-
23 24	in any way that, you know, my information or evidence, say,	23 24	to this cordoning application as well. The point that I'm
24 25	is in any way misleading. Let me look at 6.2.3. In the	24 25	making here, the very last few words in relation to 6.2.3, "No intelligence gathered" – "There appeared to be no
25	is in any way misleading. Let me look at 0.2.3. In the	25	No intelligence gathered – There appeared to be no
	Page 31603		Page 31605
1	Page 31603 first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon	1	Page 31605 intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I
1 2		1 2	0
	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon		intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I
2	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach	2	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite
2 3	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat,	2 3	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first
2 3 4	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the	2 3 4	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been
2 3 4 5	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base	2 3 4 5	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there
2 3 4 5 6	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information	2 3 4 5 6	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an
2 3 4 5 6 7	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the	2 3 4 5 6 7	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However –	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said –
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been some evidence of it. But of course what we're also told	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence that actually is available. So I make that judgment on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been some evidence of it. But of course what we're also told is, I think the curtain goes down essentially on Thursday morning because the last bit of information which is mentioned is the information that was given, albeit subject	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence that actually is available. So I make that judgment on the basis of that particular piece of evidence that I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been some evidence of it. But of course what we're also told is, I think the curtain goes down essentially on Thursday morning because the last bit of information which is mentioned is the information that was given, albeit subject to a typographical mistake possibly, at 6:30 I think it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence that actually is available. So I make that judgment on the basis of that particular piece of evidence that I've engaged with in relation to the Commission and perhaps, perhaps, we don't know, had Lieutenant-Colonel Scott's activities been carried out as he requested, maybe there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been some evidence of it. But of course what we're also told is, I think the curtain goes down essentially on Thursday morning because the last bit of information which is mentioned is the information that was given, albeit subject to a typographical mistake possibly, at 6:30 I think it was on Thursday morning, although there's some suggestion that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence that actually is available. So I make that judgment on the basis of that particular piece of evidence that I've engaged with in relation to the Commission and perhaps, perhaps, we don't know, had Lieutenant-Colonel Scott's activities been carried out as he requested, maybe there might have been more information to assist with that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	first instance what I'm saying is, I talk about the cordon operation and I think that's a very good tactical approach to take to this. It's again trying to police our threat, you know, let's go and find these guns. Right. If the only information/intelligence that they were going to base that cordon application on was basically on the information that they got on the arrests at stage 4 or 5 of the operation, well, then of course there will be no intelligence prior to the operation. However – CHAIRPERSON: But there were the other two things. There was the response they were hoping to get from Mpembe's request to Zokwana and there was the material they were hoping to get from the analysis of the still photographs from Lonmin which would have provided information as to who the people who had weapons and where they lived. And that apparently was an ongoing process which I take it we must assume hadn't reached finality because otherwise if it had been, there would have been some evidence of it. But of course what we're also told is, I think the curtain goes down essentially on Thursday morning because the last bit of information which is mentioned is the information that was given, albeit subject to a typographical mistake possibly, at 6:30 I think it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	intelligence gathered to support that operation." Why do I say that? I say that because TT5 says this is a composite of all of the intelligence. Now I said that in my first provisional statement, I've said it in my – so I've been engaged in this process over a period of time. If there was ongoing intelligence and perhaps actually it's been an oversight and it hadn't made it, for the purposes of this Commission, into TTT – TT5 then, apologies – then I'm sure, you know, it was within the remit of the SAPS legal team to actually say, actually TT5, you know, was a moment in time and here is all of this other intelligence. But you know here I am sitting in front of you, sir, at the end of June in 2014, having engaged with this process over a period of time and one of my key criticisms carried over from my very first statement is saying about lack of intelligence and I point to TT5. No-one has ever come back to me and said – no-one has ever come back to you, more importantly, sir, and said well, actually TT5 is not all of the intelligence that actually is available. So I make that judgment on the basis of that particular piece of evidence that I've engaged with in relation to the Commission and perhaps, perhaps, we don't know, had Lieutenant-Colonel Scott's activities been carried out as he requested, maybe there

		l I	
1	Page 31606 The second point is that I'm aware of some	1	Page 31608 would point as a single example to that particular issue
2	evidence that I've engaged in, engaged with around the	2	that I've talked about with Mr Scott, he asked, and I don't
3	investigative arm of the operation and also perhaps the	3	think he, nothing came back to him. We would have been
4	intelligence arm and I would also then point to the	4	having a different conversation if it had been that there
5	statement of Mr Victor, if perhaps reference, is this – I	5	was a report-back to say that no intelligence is available
6	think it's unexhibited but it's Mr Johannes Jacobus	6	within the community, but that's not the case.
7	Hermanus Victor. He's from the intelligence branch and I	7	MR SEMENYA SC: You see, Mr White, I have
8	engaged with that particular piece of evidence and he talks	8	two aspects to take up with you on that answer. One, you
9	about the different things that he was attempting to do in	9	are now throwing conjecture on a question of fact, which
10	relation to, you know, gathering intelligence and I support	10	shouldn't be your province. What you are saying is there
11	and congratulate him for that. He talks at 4.9 of that	11	was intelligence obtainable but not obtained, or obtained
12	statement about "interviewing possible witnesses, security	12	but not conveyed to Mr Scott. It's a province where you
13	officers and members of the public to obtain intelligence	13	cannot be as an expert.
14	and to ID suspects. Some witnesses asked me not to divulge	14	MR WHITE: Then I apologise to the
15	their IDs for fear in relation to their safety," which is	15	Commission if I've overstepped my boundaries, and I mean
16	entirely something you can anticipate and of course he's	16	that sincerely. I genuinely do apologise, but you're
17	not going to divulge those but you know I would question	17	asking me a question in relation to intelligence. As I
17	then, well, what happened as a result of those interviews?	17	said on numerous occasions yesterday, I point to the
19	If those did in fact take place, what valuable information	19	exhibit TT5 as the key document that I was relying on in
20	did you actually get that you were then able to put into	20	relation to my criticism around intelligence. Then you
20	the system which would then have informed TT5 but, more	20	asked me a question, was it about, you know, there was a
22	importantly, informed the operation? So I mean all of this	22	remiss, in other words people hadn't $-$ I'm assuming, my
23	is in relation to your question, sir, with regards to, you	23	assumption was that your question you asked me was that
24	know, do I see any particular remiss or failings.	24	perhaps people hadn't done what they were supposed to do,
25	[15:45] Those are two examples as I've engaged with the	25	and in my answer to you I was saying well here's some
20		20	
	Page 31607		Page 31609
1	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some	1	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark
2	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that	2	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise.
	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process	2 3	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you
2 3 4	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of	2 3 4	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature
2 3 4 5	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the	2 3 4 5	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned
2 3 4 5 6	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it	2 3 4 5 6	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear
2 3 4 5 6 7	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching	2 3 4 5 6 7	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to the criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, given the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to the criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have exhausted that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, given the difficulties that you admit there were and the climate,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have exhausted that. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, given the difficulties that you admit there were and the climate, it's possible they tried very hard and didn't succeed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have exhausted that. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] fair to use the word "criticism" in this context. What you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, given the difficulties that you admit there were and the climate, it's possible they tried very hard and didn't succeed to get intelligence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have exhausted that. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] fair to use the word "criticism" in this context. What you say is at the top of page 60, "I would have expected to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	evidence. I'm saying I do think that there are some feelings. I, for the record I have stated frequently that I absolutely understand that this is not an easy process because of all of the things that you say, Sir, and all of the things that have already been put before the Commission. Was it hard to get intelligence? I'm sure it was, but I still come back to the point my overarching criticism is this operation I think was handicapped on the basis of poor intelligence. The intelligence composite TT5 has 10 entries, of which two/three are what I would consider to be actionable intelligence. It would seem to me that there does seem to be some degree of breakdown in the processes which actually feed the intelligence into the people that need that information in order to make informed decisions. Whether or not if they had much more intelligence it would have ultimately led to a different outcome, I genuinely don't know. That's an assessment that you'll have to make, Sir, but I'm here to help to provide evidence on the basis of my experience and that's it. COMMISSIONER HEMRAJ: Mr White, given the difficulties that you admit there were and the climate, it's possible they tried very hard and didn't succeed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	examples, and genuinely Chair, if I've overstepped my mark there I absolutely apologise. MR SEMENYA SC: Because we agree with you entirely; there wasn't adequate intelligence of the nature we now know. We now know a lot more and would have planned this operation a lot, lot better, having a clear understanding what threat was there, etcetera, etcetera. But you and I agreed earlier that's not the probe now. The probe now is to look at what on the ground was the intelligence available and whether or not they acted properly based on it. Am I correct? MR WHITE: Well, of course an operation can only be based on the intelligence that's available and then taken appropriate actions and steps in relation to that intelligence. However, my evidence to the Commission, you know I was asked, I give evidence in relation to criticisms and concerns in relation to the operation and the criticisms, you know one of the chief criticisms was in relation to the absence of intelligence. MR SEMENYA SC: Alright, I think we have exhausted that. CHAIRPERSON: [Microphone off, inaudible] fair to use the word "criticism" in this context. What you

1	Page 31610
	line 2 on page 60. "I would have expected it." Then you
2	say the kind of thing you would have expected, and you then
3	deal with Scott's request and there appears to be no
4	response, and you deal with TT5 and TT4, and so on. But
5	what it amounts to is you expected a lot of information
6	which, or intelligence, which wasn't available. Whether it
7	wasn't available because they tried hard and couldn't get
8	it is something we don't know. We have to speculate about
9	that. There's in fact a question mark on that.
10	If they got information of the kind you
11	mentioned, you know the people went home every night and
12	how many remained on the koppie and the likely number of
13	firearms, if they got that information, which they may have
14	got, which we don't know, then of course it wasn't
15	conveyed. So there are two questions. One thing seems to
16	be clear; whatever information, if – did they – there are
17	two points. Did they get information? It may be they
18	didn't get information despite vigorous efforts to do so.
19	If they did get information then the criticism would be
20	they should have communicated that and they didn't.
21	think we can accept that they didn't communicate any
22	information other than what they say they communicated. So
23	the real question is did they get – should they have got
24	more information than they communicated? Did they do their
25	best, or were they slack and lazy and inefficient, and so
	Page 31611
1	on? In other words were they to blame for the fact that
2	they didn't get information? And without knowing what
2	
3	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they
4	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was,
4 5	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we
4 5 6	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was
4 5 6 7	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that
4 5 6 7 8	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's
4 5 7 8 9	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a
4 5 7 8 9 10	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I intend to put.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I intend to put. CHAIRPERSON: That sounds like a point
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I intend to put. CHAIRPERSON: That sounds like a point that I can't resist, despite my wish to be able to do so.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I intend to put. CHAIRPERSON: That sounds like a point that I can't resist, despite my wish to be able to do so. So we'll adjourn now until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	efforts they made, without knowing what obstacles they encountered, without knowing how much resistance there was, we can't really make a judgment on that, can we? So we can't criticise them. We can say the intelligence was "poor" but whether it was culpably poor in the sense that they should have got more than they did, I'm afraid that's something on the material before us we can't make a judgment on. That must be right, surely? MR WHITE: Well then I thank you for the clarification, Chair, and I'm happy to agree with you. MR SEMENYA SC: Chair, I intend to deal with video footage to deal with a particular aspect. CHAIRPERSON: Will the video footage take more than seven minutes? MR SEMENYA SC: Yes. Well, not seven minutes, but what it would do, it would entail us replaying it in the morning to make a connection with the questions I intend to put. CHAIRPERSON: That sounds like a point that I can't resist, despite my wish to be able to do so.

				Page
A	account 31485:3	31604:15	31593:5 31595:24	amounts 31450:18
AAAA1.2 31534:11,13	31574:4	added 31484:20	Afrikaans 31521:24	31610:5
31573:24 31574:14	accountability	31570:4 31581:19	31522:6	analogy 31517:8
AAAA8 31533:17	31479:24	addition 31524:14	aggressive 31482:11	analysing 31600:21
31534:4,6,10	accountable 31460:17	additional 31480:2	ago 31480:21 31513:2	analysis 31602:2
AAAA8.2 31535:1	accurate 31496:5	31484:19,20	31523:3 31573:5	31603:13
abiding 31501:15	31506:11 31544:22	address 31446:1	31580:15	Anele 31576:9,9,15,19
ability 31586:4	31590:20	31502:9 31552:18	agree 31445:16	angry 31468:1,4
able 31438:5 31446:10	ach 31523:15	31601:3	31458:2 31503:21	announce 31550:8
31446:11 31448:10	achieve 31493:6	addressed 31438:23	31516:22 31518:25	announced 31550:15
31496:25 31503:12	31561:18	31452:17,21 31490:7	31538:21 31539:9	anonymity 31581:15
31503:12,23	achieved 31540:7	31536:22 31537:4	31550:3,4,12	answer 31458:16
31504:18,19 31520:7	acknowledge 31510:14	31567:23	31576:23 31578:12	31467:15 31471:21
31525:13 31542:11	acknowledged	adds 31480:2	31604:14 31609:3	31478:15 31493:12
31562:5 31586:4	31483:24	adequate 31609:4	31611:12	31499:19 31524:14
31591:15 31606:20	act 31457:17 31465:12	adequately 31455:2	agreed 31457:1	31542:22,23
	31489:7 31490:13	31532:8 31589:4	31503:16,17 31504:7	31543:16 31548:12
31611:22 absence 31599:21	31491:7 31492:12	adhere 31529:2	31535:3 31536:14	31548:22 31551:24
	31494:3,11,12,16,21	31541:4	31584:11,12 31609:8	31552:21,24
31609:19	31527:6 31555:14	adjective 31511:22	agreement 31494:24	31554:23 31559:13
absented 31444:12	31579:7 31580:1,24	adjourn 31611:23	31514:25 31584:5	31566:13 31583:24
absolute 31492:14	31593:15	ADJOURNED	31585:4	31597:3 31602:12
31562:2 31590:20	acted 31445:9 31500:1	31611:25	agrees 31599:2,5,6,9	31608:8,25
absolutely 31455:18	31502:15 31545:21	adjournment 31481:4	ahead 31536:7	answered 31440:3
31460:4 31470:1	31582:11 31588:2	31481:10,20 31546:1	31602:17	31517:18 31540:19
31472:1 31473:18	31591:20 31609:10	31593:16	aid 31475:22,24	anticipate 31446:25
31496:8,20 31503:21	acting 31572:23	ADJOURNS 31481:11	-	31453:3 31493:13
31518:25 31519:2	31578:2,14,20,21	31520:14 31546:4	31476:5,6,24,25 31477:5,6,10	31546:21 31550:24
31523:19 31532:14				
31539:11 31540:4	31579:10,13	31593:19	aiders 31477:2	31606:16
31541:14,19	31580:21 31581:14	admit 31526:24	airtime 31584:21	anticipated 31452:9,10
31549:20 31550:17	31582:7 31585:18,24	31607:22	albeit 31458:25	31452:13,14 31464:1
31552:9 31553:2,14	action 31461:14	admitted 31457:13	31603:22	31464:15 31498:17
31564:8 31565:24	31462:22 31494:13	adopted 31517:10,13	alerted 31461:8	31543:23 31544:2
31566:12 31567:2	31543:24 31544:16	advance 31551:8	31595:23	31557:13 31591:8
31568:4 31578:4	31544:17 31547:1	31557:13	alerting 31536:1	anticipates 31476:2
31579:14 31586:2	31550:23,25	advancing 31439:1	alien 31572:23	anticipating 31563:2
31589:22 31596:12	31555:15 31556:22	adverse 31599:5	allegation 31538:14	anticipation 31488:21
31604:15 31607:3	31558:6 31559:15	adversely 31595:14	31573:16	31546:13
31609:2	31562:10 31566:20	31597:2,5	allegations 31478:24	anybody 31498:2
absolve 31524:20	31568:2 31577:18,19	advise 31478:7,13	alleged 31538:13	anyway 31446:12
academic 31447:16	31582:10 31598:9	advisedly 31553:8	alleges 31575:4	31457:24 31509:17
31580:7	actionable 31587:4,13	advising 31503:25	allied 31564:23	31589:1
accept 31481:23	31588:1 31592:7	advisor 31471:7,10	allocated 31472:16	apologies 31441:10
31482:1,2,7,9	31595:19 31607:11	Advocate 31572:23	allow 31515:7	31449:13 31460:12
31490:14 31494:11	actions 31460:17	AEP 31531:20,25	allowed 31447:12	31462:5 31476:13
31500:22 31511:20	31486:7 31524:19	31560:17,17,23	31513:4 31516:4	31482:24,25
31532:2 31535:17	31557:19 31558:10	31561:14	31583:11	31488:25 31493:19
31537:22,25	31564:12 31581:2	AEPs 31528:4	allows 31461:2	31574:12 31584:1
31539:13 31540:16	31609:14	31529:12,14,19,22,23	alluded 31458:16	31599:8 31605:8
31541:11,15 31542:4	actively 31462:25	31531:12,12	31484:14 31533:4	apologise 31520:4,9
31543:14 31552:22	31463:3	31558:20 31560:1,13	Alright 31551:23	31536:9 31552:15,19
31552:23 31554:19	activities 31503:13	afforded 31553:20	31593:15 31609:20	31574:19 31608:14
31563:15 31578:4	31530:19 31550:22	afield 31581:12	alternative 31480:13	31608:16 31609:2
31579:14 31583:21	31562:13 31592:3	afraid 31440:16	alternatively 31445:18	apology 31536:6
31585:13 31586:2,6	31598:14 31605:23	31482:18 31611:8	31446:10 31468:23	APP 31496:7
31596:1 31610:21	activity 31464:17	Africa 31488:16	31471:1 31475:9,15	apparent 31457:13
acceptance 31552:21	31565:9 31588:6	31491:11 31512:18	31554:18 31583:19	apparently 31467:8
accepted 31497:25	actor 31492:23	31518:19 31519:2	ambient 31474:1	31569:3 31603:16
31582:12,14,18,22	31517:19	31539:14 31541:24	AMCU 31507:9,11	appear 31439:3
31583:3,3 31584:13	actors 31492:11	31542:13 31562:21	31508:12 31520:23	31478:24 31485:2
accepting 31538:10	31500:13,15	31562:23 31563:7	31567:22 31568:7,11	31510:3 31569:7
accepts 31483:7	31502:15 31508:3	31573:13 31579:23	amendment 31439:25	31597:25
access 31469:10	31518:3 31525:10,13	African 31500:20	31486:16	appearance 31561:14
31530:24	actual 31466:2	31520:6 31523:4,6	ammunition 31486:14	appeared 31508:8
accompany 31447:18	31546:22,25	31541:16 31548:5,15	amount 31459:11	31552:16 31573:5
	add 31569:14,15	31553:9 31573:11	31472:10 31504:10	31582:11 31604:25
ARCHIVE FO	R LUSTICE		1	1

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page
appears 31444:17	31531:12,13	assistant 31529:20,24	31508:23 31512:16	31596:6,9,16
31446:3 31476:19	31532:13,16,19	31530:22	31538:19 31540:12	31598:16 31599:3,13
31483:13 31521:9	31533:2 31535:15	assisted 31601:23	31557:5	31599:15 31604:21
31571:23 31584:13	armoury 31530:1	associated 31565:21	authorisation 31601:18	31605:16,17 31607:7
31601:5,19,25	arms 31441:8 31488:10	associations 31500:14	authorised 31604:13	31608:3
31602:12 31604:7	31515:24 31517:10	assume 31459:22	authorities 31447:12	background 31447:18
31610:3	arrangement 31444:24	31461:9 31467:9	authority 31442:18,20	31471:1 31472:2
applaud 31464:7	arrest 31450:15	31468:20 31478:8,14	31442:24 31447:5,18	31474:1 31572:9,16
Apple 31473:2	31456:11,24	31478:14 31479:7	31511:1 31529:23,23	31575:15
applicable 31485:14	31458:15 31601:15	31511:24 31544:1	31529:25 31530:8,9	back-up 31466:15
application 31485:11	31601:22	31557:6 31563:3	31530:10,13,21,24	badly 31454:4 31455:3
31506:24 31573:5	arrested 31520:23	31601:6,7 31603:17	31531:17 31573:2	31465:4 31508:19
31603:6 31604:23	31601:21	assuming 31445:14	available 31438:10	balances 31488:19
applies 31442:17	arresting 31494:14	31468:12 31475:3	31460:22 31523:23	band 31567:16
31444:25 31454:13	arrests 31603:7	31513:2 31533:7,13	31545:21 31555:1	31568:12
31454:16 31511:9	arrive 31438:5	31548:24 31599:1	31557:4,7 31586:17	bands 31500:14
apply 31454:12	arrived 31463:10	31608:22	31588:14 31604:11	bang 31560:23
31537:18 31551:16	artificial 31571:6,13	assumption 31440:9	31605:19 31608:5	Bapo 31572:24 31573:1
appointed 31461:12	aside 31447:23	31448:20 31543:14	31609:10,13 31610:6	31573:2
appraised 31485:16,20	asked 31477:25	31543:15 31548:6,20	31610:7	barbed 31541:10,17
31521:8	31497:15,18	31552:4,25 31553:15	avenue 31598:25	31546:14 31547:25
appreciate 31454:15	31505:16,19 31508:7	31559:5,8,10,11	avoid 31501:8	31549:19,21 31550:7
31458:17 31469:5	31515:11 31517:23	31563:1 31587:23	31513:20 31524:8,11	31554:10,11,16
31476:25 31494:12	31524:17 31531:4	31608:23	31524:25 31526:19	31566:17,24
31590:5	31536:8 31541:6	assumptions 31565:17	31554:6	barracks 31441:7
appreciation 31488:19	31542:2 31543:14	31582:22 31583:1,1,2	avoided 31443:11,14	barrier 31450:17,18
31533:16	31553:17,21	assures 31492:19	31486:15 31504:9	31544:18 31549:16
approach 31456:6	31554:11 31562:16	attack 31444:5,12,14	31519:25	base 31537:22 31542:6
31501:1 31502:13	31599:6 31606:14	31452:11 31500:24	aware 31455:9,15	31603:5
31506:6 31529:10	31608:2,21,23	31541:11 31543:25	31458:12 31464:17	baseball 31529:8
31546:25 31603:2	31609:16	31546:14 31548:1,10	31465:3 31468:10,11	based 31442:18
approached 31554:15	asking 31469:12	31548:18,21,25	31468:12 31470:25	31448:20 31485:1
31554:20	31476:23 31504:11	31555:20 31556:6	31477:14 31495:9	31490:18 31497:16
approaches 31461:3	31518:18 31541:2,3	31557:11 31558:2,7	31506:15 31513:9	31515:3 31529:18
approaching 31444:14	31544:1 31546:20	31559:4,22 31562:25	31554:12,14	31530:12 31537:20
31456:5	31552:15 31554:2	31564:16 31576:3	31556:25 31559:12	31542:8 31545:12,20
appropriate 31485:12	31557:21 31592:17	attacked 31441:7,11,13	31560:22 31561:7	31548:19 31552:11
31504:1 31510:8	31596:10,13	31441:15	31564:14 31567:21	31552:21 31553:21
31516:7,20 31528:15	31604:20 31608:17	attacking 31518:20	31569:25 31570:13	31581:24 31601:12
31531:20 31532:20	asks 31459:1 31592:23	31576:2	31583:13 31584:21	31609:11,13
31547:8 31588:11	aspect 31438:15	attempt 31441:7,9	31585:6,25 31606:1	basically 31450:5
31593:12,13	31545:17 31546:12	31444:2 31465:17	awareness 31463:9	31456:21 31458:23
31609:14	31577:7 31585:6	31497:20	awkward 31499:21	31463:20 31468:3
appropriately 31500:1	31600:1 31611:14	attempting 31465:15	awry 31496:23	31471:12 31477:25
appropriateness	aspects 31515:25	31477:4 31595:16		31479:11 31480:1,2,6
31498:14 31499:3,9	31608:8	31606:9	<u> </u>	31486:17 31492:7
approve 31529:21	aspirational 31443:10	attempts 31513:17	B 31501:25 31562:7	31522:12 31531:19
area 31460:25	assault 31527:9	attending 31529:6,7	ba 31572:24 31573:1,2	31551:19 31552:11
31461:11,11,11,13	31557:14	attention 31442:7	Baai 31575:24 31576:8	31583:6 31585:25
31463:1 31527:1	assaulted 31576:5	31457:11 31468:18	31576:10,21	31586:25 31595:17
31530:25 31570:20	assegais 31600:25	31470:3,8 31473:9	back 31446:9,16	31596:14,20
31570:25 31590:16	assemble 31487:25	31475:22 31489:12	31451:23 31457:14	31597:10 31598:3
areas 31505:23	assembly 31487:18	31555:19 31557:2	31458:1 31464:10	31603:6
31506:19 31570:21	31489:4 31510:1	31564:9 31569:3,16	31468:24 31472:20	basing 31548:22
area's 31594:16,17	assertion 31573:4	31569:21 31572:21	31502:19 31503:5	31551:2
argue 31504:18	assessment 31513:4	31575:23 31583:9	31515:20 31517:4	basis 31441:15
31553:24	31529:18 31531:15	attenuated 31527:22	31518:2,22 31524:7	31442:25 31450:3
argument 31569:8	31594:5 31607:18	attitude 31464:8	31526:14 31527:5,13	31453:16 31456:10
31578:13	assigns 31488:1	31486:2 31514:24	31542:17 31546:3	31457:2 31497:14
arises 31451:20	assist 31461:24	31517:10,13	31554:5 31558:15,22	31504:18 31519:21
arm 31606:3,4	31462:4 31464:6	attitudes 31558:24	31560:2,9,13 31561:5	31526:8 31538:8
armaments 31483:16	31485:5 31605:24	31594:17 31597:11	31561:11 31562:17	31541:13 31550:19
armed 31482:5	assistance 31446:12,15	auctioned 31587:20	31562:24 31572:3,6	31552:24 31570:6
	31446:21 31502:17	audible 31554:25	31575:25 31579:5	31582:14 31583:1
31483:14 31484:1	51770.21 51502.17			
31483:14 31484:1 31501:12 31509:24	31579:17,17	audio 31467:1	31580:19 31590:12	31594:6 31598:19

RealTime Transcriptions

Pretoria

				Page
31607:9,19	31611:1	build 31538:23	capable 31513:16	31485:16 31494:14
bats 31529:8	blaming 31498:1	31594:23	capacities 31515:23	31508:4 31510:4
Bavaria 31571:21	blankets 31564:24	building 31538:22	capacity 31466:2	31521:2 31535:13
bear 31454:16	blast 31560:5	31583:7 31589:24	31515:23	31555:6 31582:21
31461:21 31491:17	bleeding 31477:7	builds 31566:4	Cape 31569:19	31583:1 31592:19
31500:2	blind 31591:11	build-up 31589:9	31570:21	31600:18
bearing 31582:19	block 31575:14	built 31540:6	Captain 31462:25	certainly 31439:11
31594:20 31600:25	blocked 31576:5	bullet 31527:21	31463:20,21	31443:11,22
beat 31487:9	blocking 31549:17	31563:22	31464:13 31465:8	31447:19 31450:3
	blood 31576:15,16,19			
beef 31588:5		bullets 31519:8	card 31517:8	31456:7 31464:16
behave 31506:2,4	BMW 31571:21,21	31536:19 31564:25	cardiac 31505:24	31470:25 31473:22
31524:25 31565:6	bomb 31590:15,20	31565:1	cardiological 31509:16	31487:21 31489:23
behaved 31508:19	31591:2	bunched 31569:1	cardiologist 31505:4,5	31491:10 31497:9
behaves 31565:5	bombs 31560:5	bundle 31534:8	31505:8,25 31509:15	31508:10 31509:10
behaving 31566:6	Bon 31580:19 31581:24	burning 31485:17	careful 31590:24	31510:4 31512:8
behaviour 31483:16	31582:4,17,22	bus 31536:16	carried 31529:8	31521:5 31522:4,8
31509:12,17,21	Bon's 31581:13	bush 31575:18	31530:1 31605:14,23	31526:14 31528:1
31511:2,6 31516:20	bottle 31554:5	busy 31457:15,15	carry 31515:15	31539:18 31554:20
31525:20 31528:14	bottom 31518:10	31469:6 31508:15	31529:12,13	31555:8 31562:12
31550:22 31557:18	boundaries 31483:17	31601:10	31530:19,21	31564:8 31567:4
31557:18 31566:19	31608:15	butcher 31576:7	31531:12 31550:20	31569:24 31573:16
Belfast 31446:9	Bow 31472:19	buy 31572:7	31550:23 31554:6	31579:12 31581:12
31565:8 31590:16	box 31530:3	way 51512.1	cars 31571:21	31583:25 31584:11
belief 31538:3,5,7	box 31330.3 branch 31590:3	С	cars 31371.21 case 31438:6,7,9	31588:18 31591:16
31565:1,21	31606:7	C 31501:25 31562:7	31442:9 31446:24	31591:17 31602:14
believe 31506:25	break 31480:20	Calitz 31450:20	31468:17 31481:21	cetera 31496:14
31538:1,2,8 31563:20	31527:7 31593:25	31451:7 31453:9,16	31489:7 31490:9	31503:1,1 31550:10
31563:24 31566:11	breakdown 31607:13	31457:14 31458:5,17	31495:19 31499:4	31600:10
believed 31447:8	brevity 31480:5	31458:23 31459:21	31507:25 31508:11	challenged 31456:19
31480:11 31583:23	brief 31441:2 31476:18	31459:25 31460:5,11	31514:15 31522:6	31539:23
bend 31578:15	31496:18,19	31460:19 31461:5	31533:24 31541:23	challenging 31485:10
bended 31568:15,20	31497:23 31502:9	31462:1,11,20,25	31542:12,16 31548:9	chamber 31454:18
31569:5	31503:2 31523:3	31463:8,25 31464:16	31567:11,14,15	chance 31481:5
benefit 31501:22	briefing 31464:12	31465:15 31469:4,9	31582:5,11 31588:22	change 31480:7
31502:1 31504:16	31479:24 31480:16	31469:10,11 31470:3	31608:6	31518:13 31581:20
31545:4,6,15	briefly 31466:4	31470:8 31471:16	cases 31447:4 31563:14	changes 31479:25
best 31440:8,10,21	31475:23 31476:1	31474:19,25 31475:3	31572:7 31579:22	changing 31596:23
31465:2 31492:6	31518:1	31475:10 31485:22	31582:13	channel 31466:11,15
31405.2 31492.0	Brigadier 31457:13		cash 31528:22	31466:15
		31523:22	CAS205 31534:7	
31513:23 31517:11	31458:5 31459:21,24	Calitz's 31460:1		channelling 31549:18
31517:20 31523:16	31460:1,11 31461:5	31470:10	categorically 31452:20	chaos 31458:19
31524:1 31532:21	31462:1,11,19,24	call 31448:8 31466:1,25	31474:11 31521:5	31466:18,18
31610:25	31463:8 31465:5,7,14	31470:22 31472:15	31531:21	character 31580:2
better 31466:14	31465:15 31469:3,16	31483:4 31495:16	cattle 31572:8	31582:8,11
31486:12 31519:16	31470:10 31523:22	31496:24 31507:21	caught 31555:24	charge 31542:6,8
31524:10 31527:10	31587:14,17	31507:23 31527:21	31576:15	charged 31542:16
31540:1 31609:6	31588:10 31589:20	31587:5 31592:20	causal 31585:2	charging 31541:18
beyond 31439:10	31590:2 31591:6	called 31485:18	cause 31505:14	Chaskalson 31514:4,9
31453:14 31466:23	31600:17	31494:4 31505:11	causing 31560:11	31514:11,17 31543:1
31468:4 31476:9	bring 31470:2,7	31579:25 31594:1	31595:25	chat 31473:12
31500:7 31502:11	31472:17 31493:23	calling 31487:5	cautiously 31451:12	check 31553:7
31528:1,4	31499:24 31503:19	calls 31469:17	caveat 31499:19	chief 31439:16
Bhele 31576:13,17	31503:24 31561:17	camera 31454:10,15,17	31552:10	31529:20,24
big 31596:14		cancer 31505:1,6,11	cease 31445:11,15,23	31530:22 31594:21
	bringing 31561:12,21			
biggest 31560:20	brings 31572:11	cannon 31558:20	cell 31470:13 31576:10	31597:3,6 31609:18
Bill 31601:2	broad 31483:6	31559:25 31560:12	31576:11,12	chin 31576:17
bird's 31454:25	31575:12	31561:12,14,19	31583:11 31584:4,16	choice 31530:11
bit 31440:23 31466:18	broadly 31483:6	canter 31481:17	31584:20	31532:15
31473:12,24 31517:1	broke 31525:8	canvassed 31546:15	central 31491:12,25	choose 31458:11
31518:6,7 31522:20	broken 31505:1	can't 31455:11 31457:7	31572:13 31580:14	choreography 31453:4
31533:7 31569:8	brought 31468:18	31460:16 31464:14	centre 31496:1	circumstances 31441:6
31603:21	31485:5 31500:2	31494:18 31509:17	31590:16	31441:13,18,23,24
bits 31471:3 31547:10	31555:19 31557:1	31511:6 31561:15	centuries 31472:20	31443:18 31445:20
31571:6,8 31587:8	31564:9 31569:16,21	31577:24 31584:12	century 31572:10,10	31448:11 31449:3
313/1.0.0 3130/.0				
		31611:5.6.9.22	certain 31453:1	31455:11 31458:15
Bizos 31458:6 blame 31444:21	31572:20 31583:12 brutality 31576:22	31611:5,6,9,22 capability 31585:21	certain 31453:1 31463:12 31474:17	31455:11 31458:15 31459:3 31460:19

				Page 4
31465:10 31468:16	combination 31568:3	commencing 31449:17	31472:10,24	concessions 31449:22
31494:15 31495:5	come 31447:5 31456:6	31461:25 31462:10	31480:16 31554:23	conciliatory 31504:10
31509:25 31516:7	31461:1,4,13	31546:19	communications	conclusion 31500:20
31519:17 31524:24	31466:20 31468:21	comment 31458:11	31465:23 31470:16	31543:11 31558:8
31528:7,15 31529:3	31471:24 31472:3	31459:22 31460:1	31473:23 31474:8	31564:22
31530:12,14	31500:23,23,23,24	31463:19 31491:9	communities 31490:25	conclusions 31449:8,11
31531:23 31538:1,9	31501:13 31502:24	31496:25 31497:24	community 31498:3,7	31464:24 31475:22
31538:19 31540:12	31505:3 31508:14	31514:1 31517:15	31499:18 31594:17	31504:5 31540:14
31543:12 31545:10	31511:2,5 31513:11	31527:16 31540:17	31597:10,20,23	conclusive 31486:9
31552:7 31554:3	31515:19 31517:3	31563:13 31587:21	31598:15,20,21,23	conduct 31496:19
31556:15 31558:17	31518:20 31519:2	commented 31502:14	31604:20,20 31608:6	31498:14 31499:3,10
31559:25 31560:16	31525:18,23	31516:25 31540:18	company 31503:14	31500:4,9 31506:18
31562:11,22	31527:13 31535:22	31589:19	compare 31512:1	31507:10 31516:6
circumstantial	31538:1 31547:1	commenting 31496:22	compelled 31486:14	31545:20 31582:24
31543:12	31561:3 31565:20	comments 31458:8	competently 31498:12	confidence 31496:2
citizens 31527:6	31566:6 31570:10,19	31466:3 31516:23	complaining 31526:7	confident 31522:7,11
city 31590:16	31571:16,22,25	31540:9 31563:18	complaint 31526:6	31522:14 31592:24
civic 31524:21	31572:2,4,13	commission 31438:2	complete 31467:10,13	configured 31456:14
31525:15	31575:15 31577:4,5	31447:24 31481:11	31477:15	confines 31439:9
civilians 31532:3	31592:12 31596:16	31481:11,12	completely 31501:1	confirm 31482:13
clarification 31574:18	31599:13 31602:9	31483:20 31486:6	completeness 31495:20	confirmation 31474:8
31589:18 31611:12	31604:21 31605:16	31495:10,15	completion 31522:21	confluence 31491:21
clarify 31516:9	31605:17 31607:7	31500:15,19 31501:9	complex 31466:5	31510:16
31523:21	comes 31442:22	31501:14,20,23	31483:23 31484:9	confronted 31541:10
clarity 31440:19	31468:24 31478:16	31502:9,17 31503:25	31490:5 31491:2	confronting 31456:13
clause 31549:10,22	31492:18 31495:22	31504:15,16	complexities 31484:19	confused 31459:13
31555:12 31556:1	31498:20 31501:19	31506:17 31518:18	complexities 51484.19 compliant 31517:22	confusing 31467:2
clear 31440:20	31505:25 31515:6	31519:9,15,23	complication 31570:5	confusion 31445:22
31441:11 31445:5	31526:17 31590:12	31520:14,15 31523:1	complied 31454:14	31449:24 31466:24
31446:13,14	coming 31454:19	31523:4,7,8 31524:8	complying 31457:16	congratulate 31464:7
31450:12 31465:3	31474:2 31569:18,19	31525:12,18 31543:2	31551:13	31606:11
31515:23 31525:3	31590:17 31598:16	31546:4,4,5 31552:16	composed 31571:6	conjecture 31608:9
31527:3 31538:18	31599:15	31553:4,18 31559:15	composite 31586:16	connected 31470:17
	command 31442:8,10	-	31605:2 31607:10	
31541:15 31544:1 31550:18 31551:2	31442:11,13	31578:18,19,22 31582:16 31593:19	comprehend 31468:16	31472:9,11 31580:9 connection 31585:2
	31443:23 31449:23		comprehension	31611:19
31552:20 31553:1		31593:19,20 31605:8	31468:5	
31566:12 31582:7	31453:8,15 31454:21	31605:21 31607:6		conscious 31491:3
31599:9 31609:6	31463:19 31464:12	31608:15 31609:15	compromise 31525:5	31540:8 31553:3
31610:16	31464:20,23	31611:25	31526:18 31585:20	31590:24
clearly 31444:2	31466:11 31475:16	Commissioner	compromised 31585:12	consent 31490:21,25
31447:23 31458:19	31479:24 31578:15	31463:11 31470:9	31585:15 31587:24	31491:4
31474:23 31475:1,10	commanded 31443:2	31472:22 31485:15	compromises 31585:18	consequence 31602:4
31476:22 31493:6	commander 31445:15	31514:14 31515:11	computer 31508:9	consequences 31445:9
31498:22 31505:19	31446:18 31453:10	31515:16 31516:23	concede 31551:12	Consequently
31506:18 31522:9	31454:22 31455:1,3,7	31520:20,24 31521:7	conceded 31509:21	31484:23
31535:18 31542:9	31455:9,12,14	31521:14,18	31552:3	consider 31438:15
31569:4 31581:18	31460:3,12,13,13	31523:13 31546:18	conceivably 31482:4	31443:9 31484:23
31596:19	31463:5 31465:12,12	31577:9,15 31595:12	conceive 31489:14	31485:6 31525:14
client 31506:16	31467:18,19	31596:25 31597:7	conceived 31555:22	31572:22 31587:13
climate 31607:22	31469:21 31471:20	31598:19 31599:4,8	concentrated 31600:24	31594:22 31607:11
close 31469:9,10	31471:22 31472:16	31599:17 31604:17	concentration	considerable 31445:21
31476:20 31489:12	31474:8,9,10,22	31607:21	31454:11 31481:6	31448:5 31468:13
closed 31536:14	31518:15 31529:16	Commissioners	concept 31529:1	31565:12 31604:5
closely 31489:10	31529:20 31530:6,10	31534:15	31564:6 31579:15	considerably 31609:25
closing 31497:11	31562:4 31590:5	Commission's	concern 31580:17	consideration 31466:10
cocktail 31569:14,15	commanders 31447:12	31523:23	concerned 31454:17	31480:12 31529:16
cocktails 31560:5	31465:18 31471:11	common 31581:8	31455:5 31479:5	31558:24 31561:12
cognisant 31519:5	31493:10	COMMSSION	31597:23 31601:24	31598:9
collating 31585:9	commander's	31520:14	concerning 31584:23	considered 31526:2
colleagues 31444:24	31472:13	communicate 31446:20	concerns 31475:24	consistent 31479:12
31602:6	commence 31486:23	31474:7 31610:21	31506:16 31519:21	31559:6 31567:8
collecting 31591:23	commenced 31512:16	communicated	31545:9 31609:17	constable 31529:20,24
Colonel 31469:22,24	commencement	31554:24 31610:20	concert 31577:19	31530:22
31476:6 31508:8	31543:24 31544:15	31610:22,24	31578:21 31579:7,13	constantly 31522:16
01 = 00 01 01 = 01 0				
31522:24 31594:3	31544:17	communication	31585:18	Constitution 31510:1
31522:24 31594:3 31597:9 31599:1,12	31544:17 commences 31546:10	communication 31471:3,14,17	31585:18 concerted 31578:14	Constitution 31510:1 constitutional 31488:6

RealTime Transcriptions

Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page
31489:4	conversation 31473:4,7	counsel 31438:3	31462:20 31509:8	cut 31576:17
constraint 31528:14	31473:11,16,18	31458:6 31547:9	31536:7 31552:6	cynical 31506:5
constraints 31488:23	31476:12,14	31553:24 31573:4	31582:25	
construct 31565:21	31525:22 31587:15	countries 31487:17	criticism 31447:23	D
contact 31462:21,25	31591:5,10 31604:16	country 31489:5	31451:6 31452:4	d 31462:18 31562:7
31463:3,6 31465:11	31608:4	31502:23 31519:7	31453:7 31460:18	31602:10
31465:15,17	conversations 31570:1	31525:12 31538:13	31463:24 31464:9,24	daily 31446:19
31469:24 31470:12	31570:6	31559:19 31569:20	31596:16 31607:8	danger 31441:24
31474:21	converse 31532:18	31571:24 31572:10	31608:20 31609:23	31442:2 31444:7
contacts 31589:21	conversely 31493:21	31572:12 31590:10	31610:19	31456:13 31549:25
31590:4	convey 31471:24	couple 31441:2	criticisms 31449:7	31565:12
contain 31500:25 31519:8 31528:8	31535:13 conveyed 31608:12	31523:16 course 31439:6	31455:23,25 31464:11 31465:25	dangerous 31444:17
31532:8,21	31610:15	31444:25 31450:10	31466:3 31474:19,21	31483:24 31484:10 31602:6
contained 31543:4,6	conveying 31565:3	31451:13 31465:25	31475:24 31479:22	dangers 31494:15
container 31576:14	convince 31529:24	31470:15 31472:13	31485:1 31505:17	date 31580:17
containing 31487:3	convinced 31530:23	31477:14,15,17	31506:6 31509:1,2	dated 31478:20
31527:23	cooperate 31492:2,5	31482:23 31484:6	31519:12,13,21	day 31459:21 31466:2
containment 31538:14	cooperation 31491:14	31488:8 31492:9	31520:1,5 31524:18	31510:10 31524:8
CONTD 31438:13	31491:21	31494:11 31504:22	31545:9 31595:22	31543:4,21 31546:18
31481:19 31524:6	coordinated 31453:17	31505:13 31506:7	31605:14 31609:17	31547:7 31583:24
31547:22 31593:24	copy 31438:18	31507:1 31508:16,22	31609:18,18	31598:4 31602:11
contemplated 31489:11	31446:24	31509:9,24 31513:24	critique 31545:3	days 31519:20
31555:12 31556:1	cordon 31601:12,16	31522:15 31526:1,3	critiques 31545:2,5	31569:24
contend 31508:21	31603:1,6 31604:12	31527:11 31532:15	cross 31486:23 31547:8	day-by-day 31531:3
contends 31483:15	cordoning 31549:17	31538:24 31541:7	31554:2	DDA 31450:14,23
contents 31480:7	31604:23 31605:25	31542:10 31544:19	crossed 31448:22	31451:25 31457:15
context 31481:18	corner 31454:14	31551:24 31553:23	cross-examination	31457:21,23
31484:15 31487:16	correct 31443:15	31558:22 31561:6	31458:7 31487:12	de 31451:10 31509:4
31503:11 31525:8,25	31445:17 31463:22	31562:21 31569:8	31508:5,9 31509:4	31513:21 31540:9,16
31530:2 31558:20	31467:10 31478:12	31572:5 31573:9	31510:24 31524:6	31553:6 31580:2
31570:3 31575:8	31479:1 31488:3,7,16	31575:5 31582:19	31547:22 31593:24	dead 31452:18 31468:2
31579:15 31581:18 31588:23 31609:23	31489:7 31493:14,23 31495:8,17 31496:20	31586:2,7 31588:13 31592:8 31602:9	cross-examined 31507:11,14,18	31476:23 deal 31438:17,22
contingency 31451:5	31498:4 31499:17	31603:8,19 31606:16	31508:1 31515:22	31439:21 31444:10
continuation 31453:2	31501:21 31502:2	31609:12 31610:14	cross-examining	31444:13,17
continue 31456:9	31503:22 31509:9	court 31521:15	31542:21	31446:19 31451:4
31511:5 31544:25	31510:7 31512:20	31582:12	cross-reference	31457:10 31458:7,10
31547:20	31514:20 31515:10	courtesy 31553:20	31443:18	31458:11 31462:11
continued 31485:13	31516:4 31521:22	courts 31447:5,18	crowd 31458:21	31464:22 31465:24
continues 31491:6	31524:11 31528:11	31582:1 31583:3	31479:14 31484:16	31477:17 31484:13
31547:3	31532:22 31533:25	cover 31456:22	31484:17,19 31485:7	31491:2 31494:12
continuing 31475:2	31543:14,16	covered 31445:10	31485:8,11 31488:14	31501:11 31505:11
contract 31514:24	31545:14 31546:10	31464:21 31475:20	31498:21 31550:22	31507:2,21 31509:16
contradict 31550:13	31549:7 31551:12,21	31479:22 31509:25	31551:1,3,17	31509:23 31511:6,7
contradicted 31544:23	31552:4,5,10,22,25	31532:23 31581:25	31557:24 31558:11	31514:23 31518:10
contradiction 31445:12	31557:24 31558:5	31587:7	31558:18,22,25	31518:15,16 31520:7
31446:3,4	31563:16 31567:6	co-operative 31498:22	31560:2,9,13,22	31530:16,17
contrary 31514:5	31568:17 31573:9,17	31508:20	31561:1,7,8,10,16,19	31533:15 31534:1
31561:23	31574:9 31584:17	create 31459:11	31562:17,24,25	31547:23 31572:12
contribute 31492:6 31500:16	31586:19 31587:11 31589:5,7 31602:13	31493:4 31558:11,22 31562:14	31565:5,20 31566:3 31579:2,4 31580:18	31573:6,21 31594:12 31597:21 31599:25
contributed 31502:12	31609:11	created 31509:7	31580:20 31581:4,6	31602:23 31610:3,4
31506:20	corrected 31489:24,25	creates 31445:21	31581:13,16	31611:13,14
contributing 31492:24	correcting 31547:13	31554:4 31557:23	31597:12	dealing 31447:5
31503:6	correction 31539:4	31559:16 31562:12	crowds 31487:22	31460:20 31481:20
contributory 31596:8	correctly 31449:20	criminal 31445:10	31557:18 31565:6,7	31498:6 31499:13,15
control 31449:23	31549:5 31557:20	31528:13	31565:18 31578:24	31500:6,17 31505:14
31453:8,15 31454:21	31564:18 31572:18	critical 31481:2	31579:20	31506:2 31512:12
31464:12,20,23	31590:9	31499:24 31518:9	crystal 31541:15	31515:25 31517:24
31479:24 31576:1	Costa 31509:4	criticise 31450:3	31566:12	31526:16 31527:19
controlled 31445:3	costs 31443:11,14	31459:16 31461:15	CS 31531:9	31528:17 31529:10
convenient 31481:4	couched 31443:8	31509:20 31548:1,12	culpably 31611:7	31543:18 31544:16
- Contraction of Local dial		21551 12 21592 21	cursory 31477:5,10	31549:10 31557:19
31520:10,12	couldn't 31455:7,12	31551:12 31582:21		
31520:10,12 31545:25	31457:22 31471:25	31583:4 31611:6	curtain 31603:20	31565:3,16,17
31520:10,12	31457:22 31471:25 31517:2 31610:7			

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Pretoria

				Page
deals 31439:6 31462:1	31501:14 31518:21	31610:20,21 31611:2	31444:16 31445:8	31581:11 31582:18
31478:17,20,25	demonstrating	die 31485:19	discuss 31500:6	31582:22 31583:3
dealt 31440:13 31451:2	31577:18	died 31468:7,8	31591:21	doctrines 31445:10,19
31481:22 31515:5	demonstrations	31477:11	discussed 31466:10	document 31490:21
31517:3 31534:14	31489:23	different 31439:6,13	31534:17 31557:12	31491:1 31492:10
31540:14 31553:10	deny 31484:8 31592:10	31442:21 31474:13	31602:19	31493:8 31495:22
dearth 31596:18	department 31466:13	31499:15 31502:12	discusses 31536:11	31587:6 31608:19
death 31441:11	31593:5	31502:16 31517:23	discussing 31591:21	documents 31508:7,10
31584:19,23	departments 31535:9	31517:25 31518:16	discussion 31515:4	31534:8
debating 31582:20	dependant 31601:25	31527:18 31534:4	discussions 31584:10	doesn't 31460:15,17
debriefings 31539:2	dependence 31491:13	31536:19 31543:9	31584:25	31475:10 31493:4,7
decades 31583:4	depends 31563:8	31565:4,6,7 31566:18	diseases 31505:2	31494:17 31518:13
decide 31569:9,10	deploy 31529:4	31568:25 31569:19	disobey 31445:18	31560:17 31588:20
decided 31602:17,18	31530:8,24 31533:1	31570:11 31571:2,2	disorder 31474:13	doing 31442:1 31460:8
decides 31445:1	deployed 31449:25	31573:12 31582:24	31500:22 31505:15	31461:9 31464:7
deciding 31519:23	31556:6	31602:20 31606:9	31513:17,21	31516:24 31517:11
decision 31442:24	deploying 31442:20	31607:17 31608:4	31527:24 31528:8	31533:12 31547:6,11
31446:25 31447:14	31533:11	differently 31451:12	31538:12,15,17	doubt 31470:9
31448:10 31449:1	deprive 31441:8	31502:4,6,7,15	31539:20 31565:5	31485:15
31453:11 31454:24	depth 31511:7	31526:10 31580:22	31567:9 31577:1	doubts 31465:6
31457:2,8 31475:7	describe 31440:8	difficult 31483:23	disorderly 31505:14	downloaded 31438:7
31575:12,13	31452:24 31471:23	31484:9 31491:2,18	disorders 31539:15	downwards 31600:2
31577:10 31583:10	31535:21	31492:11 31506:5	dispersal 31452:19	dramatic 31589:9
31602:9	described 31533:8	31517:14 31518:14	31462:22 31463:4,15	31596:14
decisions 31545:12	31542:14 31594:21	31519:17 31565:10	disperse 31450:15	dramatically 31588:20
31599:21 31607:15	31597:14,15	31583:4 31586:7	31453:6 31456:11	draw 31494:24
deemed 31510:13	describes 31575:11	31590:6 31600:13	31458:14	31540:13 31558:7
defective 31447:11	describing 31532:9	difficulties 31474:16	dispersing 31494:14	31581:5
31452:3	31574:22 31575:3,3	31493:4 31500:11	dispersion 31543:24	drill 31570:18,19
defence 31486:10	description 31483:12	31592:11 31594:9	31544:15,17	drive 31504:19
31550:9	31576:22 31597:14	31607:22	31546:25	31522:18,24 31585:9
defend 31441:10	designed 31563:19	difficulty 31504:22	dispute 31454:24	due 31481:6 31482:23
31444:5 31447:9	desirable 31492:1,17	31521:23	31483:2,11 31484:3	31506:7 31508:22
defended 31546:23	31500:2 31504:2	Dira 31572:23	31484:24,25	duty 31524:21
defending 31441:13	desired 31492:14,25	direct 31477:8	31489:15 31493:24	31525:15 31528:19
defensive 31549:12,14	31510:18	31485:25 31524:18	31494:1 31511:14	dying 31468:8
31550:1,7 31555:13	despite 31578:25	31554:16 31557:11	31516:19 31526:14	dynamic 31450:8
31555:16,21	31594:3 31610:18	31575:23 31583:18	31527:15	31451:18 31459:7
define 31489:10	31611:22	directed 31457:11	disputes 31490:7	31561:17 31562:5
31494:23	details 31600:6	31494:16 31509:2	31493:3 31499:14	
defined 31530:25	detectives 31600:20	31521:16 31546:11	31518:2	Ε
definitely 31473:22	deter 31591:2	31560:18	disrupted 31450:14	ear 31470:24 31474:3
31531:22	detrimental 31599:16	directing 31442:5	31451:19 31556:14	earlier 31468:25
definition 31455:13	develop 31447:13	31457:4	31556:17	31477:10 31478:24
31489:15,22	31580:13	direction 31471:9	disruption 31450:13	31491:9 31502:19
31549:11	develops 31530:4	31519:9 31578:12	dissatisfied 31588:11	31504:7 31524:18
definitions 31549:11	deviated 31541:2	directions 31467:2	dissent 31584:14,14	31526:12 31536:7
degree 31447:1	de-individuated	31536:20 31566:18	dissolve 31516:19	31539:23 31546:11
31449:24 31458:19	31579:22 31581:23	directly 31467:5	distance 31558:22	31564:7 31581:1
31470:17 31515:10	de-individuation	31480:5 31505:16	31560:2,3	31604:17 31609:8
31515:13 31522:10	31566:3 31579:25	31535:21	distinct 31438:8	early 31511:12 31582:1
31535:25 31539:14	dialogue 31516:14,16	disagree 31488:11	31488:4 31490:19	earned 31572:4
31577:22,23	didn't 31453:3,13	31525:24 31526:25	31570:11 31591:18	31573:8
31579:18 31588:19	31454:8,9 31455:4	disagreement 31478:16	distracted 31462:6,16	earning 31512:23,24
31598:6 31607:13	31458:5,10,10,11,17	31503:9	distracting 31454:10	31513:4
delayed 31569:9	31459:16,19 31464:9	disallowed 31515:14	31473:9	earphones 31473:3,4
deletion 31515:7	31467:20,22 31469:5	disappeared 31566:17	disturbs 31470:18	earpiece 31470:17,20
deliberate 31442:10	31475:16 31478:24	disappointment	diverted 31461:2	31472:9,12,24
demand 31513:16	31488:25 31489:1	31589:3	divulge 31606:14,17	31473:5,20 31474:4,6
	31527:9,15 31562:25	disarm 31450:15,15	docket 31534:7	easier 31467:13
demanded 31513:10			dockets 31533:24	31518:8
		31453:6 31456:11	UUCKELS 515.5.24	
demanded 31513:10 demanding 31511:17 31512:18	31563:12 31567:3	31453:6 31456:11 31458:14 31480:14		
demanding 31511:17 31512:18	31563:12 31567:3 31568:21,22 31569:3	31458:14 31480:14	doctors 31505:3	easiest 31455:20
demanding 31511:17 31512:18 demands 31535:12	31563:12 31567:3 31568:21,22 31569:3 31569:6 31570:19	31458:14 31480:14 disarming 31494:14	doctors 31505:3 doctrine 31443:4,12	easiest 31455:20 31483:5
demanding 31511:17 31512:18 demands 31535:12 31537:6	31563:12 31567:3 31568:21,22 31569:3 31569:6 31570:19 31587:17 31588:7	31458:14 31480:14 disarming 31494:14 disbelief 31468:15	doctors 31505:3 doctrine 31443:4,12 31444:17 31493:1	easiest 31455:20 31483:5 east 31461:3
demanding 31511:17 31512:18 demands 31535:12	31563:12 31567:3 31568:21,22 31569:3 31569:6 31570:19	31458:14 31480:14 disarming 31494:14	doctors 31505:3 doctrine 31443:4,12	easiest 31455:20 31483:5

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page
easy 31607:3	31523:17 31531:14	error 31478:11	exceeded 31483:17	31504:20,23
edited 31604:3	31531:24 31541:21	escalate 31566:25	exception 31595:2	31505:11 31510:16
effect 31453:18	31545:7,9 31565:9	escorting 31549:18	exceptional 31528:7	31538:21 31552:16
31485:19 31540:18	31583:17 31598:16	especially 31456:14	excerpts 31536:2	31555:24 31558:8
31543:6 31561:23	engaged 31452:14	essentially 31486:2	excuse 31474:6	31579:23 31581:19
31563:11 31564:14	31473:17 31483:22	31514:7 31603:20	31567:22	31608:13
31564:15,16	31514:18 31522:14	establish 31542:22	execution 31463:16	expertise 31498:2,8
31565:25 31569:23	31522:16,17,23	31597:9	31486:13 31555:11	31499:1,8,11,13
31570:9 31580:3	31523:19 31526:23	established 31485:8	exercise 31444:15	31500:3,4,9 31501:22
31596:14 31599:5,16	31530:18 31531:18	31495:10 31543:15	31488:21,23	31502:2,11 31503:10
effective 31601:18	31538:17 31540:11	31553:25	exercised 31489:6	31503:16,24 31504:2
effectively 31444:13	31561:20 31580:17	et 31496:14 31503:1,1	exhausted 31609:21	31504:24 31505:13
31452:23 31454:25	31605:5,13,21	31550:10 31600:10	exhaustively 31581:25	31505:24 31511:1
31457:16 31471:8	31606:2,2,8,25	etcetera 31494:7,8	exhibit 31438:16	31516:6 31518:22
31478:18	engagement 31495:23	31522:24,24,24	31533:17 31534:6	31524:7,23 31526:9
effort 31470:2	31498:6	31525:21 31609:7,7	31557:7 31573:24	31527:2 31581:21
31516:18	engaging 31454:23	ethnic 31571:2	31586:15 31608:19	experts 31579:24
efforts 31610:18	31459:6 31491:18	31573:12	exhibits 31487:6	31582:3
31611:3	31537:13 31538:4	Europe 31571:23	exists 31538:14	explain 31501:6
either 31439:9 31446:5	31542:11 31545:11	31581:12	expect 31444:6	31570:2 31581:22
31447:16 31454:18	31580:14 31586:15	European 31502:22	31450:12,24,25	explained 31442:16
31455:8 31508:22	31587:12 31595:22	31581:18	31454:13 31468:21	31471:7 31500:11
31532:20 31538:4	Engelbrecht 31587:15	evening 31600:8	31490:4 31505:8	31529:15 31531:7
31547:2 31589:11	31587:17 31588:10	31604:12	31519:6 31548:20	31532:17 31533:3
elaborate 31505:20	31589:21 31590:2	event 31447:25	31562:18	31559:15
31510:6	31591:6,17 31600:17	31458:3 31468:5	expectation 31541:20	explanation 31465:21
elaborated 31447:16	England 31439:11	31492:2,5 31495:15	31542:10 31560:14	31474:6 31555:10
31580:23 31581:10	English 31523:22,22	31512:13 31519:2	expectations 31542:6	31584:18 31592:6
elaboration 31439:8	31524:2	31540:24 31547:24	expected 31450:17,24	explicate 31566:15
31455:25	enjoined 31551:11	31548:7,8 31604:7	31463:5 31550:8	exploration 31439:8
elapsed 31602:15	enquiry 31532:5	events 31449:16,20	31557:12 31587:20	explore 31598:25
element 31448:5,7	31554:24	31450:2 31453:1	31600:3,10 31601:2	exploring 31500:3
31550:16 31578:11	ensure 31474:8	31455:20 31469:14	31609:24 31610:1,2,5	exposed 31448:25
31579:14,25	31490:24 31491:2	31479:15 31483:10	expects 31543:10	31449:5 31456:13
else's 31448:22	ensuring 31439:1	31484:5 31485:9	experience 31443:22	31538:12 31556:19
emanating 31533:16	31474:7 31491:3	31504:8 31519:20	31448:1 31470:14	31557:3
emotion 31558:18	entail 31496:11	31541:20	31471:19 31474:12	exposure 31448:13
emphasis 31496:1	31611:18	eventually 31569:9	31497:13,16 31498:5	expounded 31582:17
31510:21	entails 31491:21	everybody 31439:3	31499:15 31500:6,8	express 31478:6,13
emphasise 31576:2	enter 31525:4 31538:7	31454:16 31484:17	31500:16 31502:19	31504:23 31540:25
employed 31528:4	entire 31442:17	31493:2,15 31584:12	31503:24 31504:21	31584:14
31574:23	31522:12 31555:21	evidence-in-chief	31506:9 31511:1	expressed 31480:8
employees 31511:17	entirely 31471:18	31482:16	31513:15,19	31505:17 31517:4,7
31512:16	31494:16 31506:11	exactly 31469:12	31517:24 31518:1	31589:3
employer 31509:18	31516:15 31564:3	31518:25 31551:18	31519:22 31525:3,8	expressing 31468:14,15
31510:22 31513:11	31566:22 31606:16	31551:21 31560:14	31525:10 31526:16	expression 31450:13
31515:19 31517:11	31609:4	31561:6 31590:17,17	31538:24 31540:24	31468:2,3 31489:3
31535:11,24	entirety 31523:8	examination 31438:13	31545:2 31548:5,15	31496:11 31573:10
employers 31506:4	entitled 31444:15	31481:19 31486:24	31548:19 31550:19	extends 31487:21
31516:2,3 31525:21	31447:9 31461:8	examine 31515:12	31550:20 31551:2,14	31528:1
employment 31569:17	31509:10	examined 31507:16	31551:25 31552:1	extension 31506:24
encirclement 31459:25	entity 31581:14	31509:12,13,13	31556:8 31558:1,8,10	31507:1
encountered 31580:4	entries 31586:19,22	31547:9	31559:14,22 31562:4	extensively 31507:11
31611:4	31607:10	examiner 31554:3	31562:9 31567:8	31507:14,19 31508:1
encourage 31492:8	environment 31569:17	examining 31511:11	31571:25 31577:5	extent 31440:14
31548:10 31563:24	31577:1	example 31441:22	31578:23 31579:7,12	31441:24 31452:10
encouraging 31516:14	equal 31510:25	31473:6 31497:8	31579:18 31580:5	31459:14,17 31511:3
31516:16	Equally 31599:17	31500:10 31509:15	31581:21 31590:14	31516:18 31580:25
endeavour 31451:21	equate 31598:20	31510:14 31521:12	31598:24 31607:20	31581:11 31599:1,23
endorse 31516:22	equation 31500:22	31531:14 31560:17	experiences 31538:23	extra 31547:10
energy 31527:22	31503:19	31561:25 31579:11	31539:14 31541:5	extreme 31442:9
	oguinmont 31/65.2/	31590:14 31592:2,20	experiencing 31581:8	extremely 31485:10
enforce 31543:3	equipment 31465:24			
enforce 31543:3 engage 31459:3	equivalent 31446:6	31593:1 31596:18	expert 31489:19	31519:5
enforce 31543:3 engage 31459:3 31476:11 31477:25	equivalent 31446:6 3150 0 :25	31598:7 31608:1	31496:22 31497:15	eye 31455:1
enforce 31543:3 engage 31459:3 31476:11 31477:25 31479:13 31492:8	equivalent 31446:6 31500:25 erred 31502:1	31598:7 31608:1 examples 31606:25	31496:22 31497:15 31498:13 31499:2,8	
enforce 31543:3 engage 31459:3 31476:11 31477:25	equivalent 31446:6 3150 0 :25	31598:7 31608:1	31496:22 31497:15	eye 31455:1

Marikana Commission of Inquiry

				Page
F	31541:19 31542:6,17	31481:18 31482:17	31477:2,5,6,10	forget 31469:20
F 31549:11	31545:23 31553:19	31485:25 31486:1	31478:1 31480:20	forgive 31581:2
face 31531:10 31576:6	31559:5 31577:21,24	31522:21 31523:9	31482:20 31487:2	forgotten 31583:15
faced 31484:25	31595:23 31596:12	31532:23 31580:8	31513:1 31532:15	form 31537:19
faceless 31515:12	31609:23	31594:13	31534:16,20	31602:16
facie 31439:5 31445:4	fairly 31467:21	finality 31601:7	31536:16 31552:15	formations 31501:12
31458:3 31547:4	31507:24 31522:22	31603:17	31555:22 31564:19	forming 31539:3
31563:18 31564:2	fairness 31591:9	finally 31438:5	31570:17 31571:3	forms 31458:23
facilitative 31524:10	fall 31561:1	31477:13 31480:20	31574:21 31580:14	forth 31506:3 31507:8
facing 31456:17	falls 31445:4	31480:22 31485:24	31586:21 31591:3	31517:10
31484:4	falter 31541:12	31485:25 31508:8	31603:1 31605:3,15	fortifying 31564:25
fact 31441:14 31451:1	familiar 31443:19	31604:4	31605:25	forward 31452:25
31452:9,12,13,17	31470:10 31489:19	final-final 31482:16,21	firstly 31441:3 31453:9	31456:16 31458:14
31453:12 31454:21	31495:14,24 31526:5	final-final-final	31541:14 31546:16	31458:24 31460:25
31455:4 31457:18	31526:13 31537:11	31481:6 31482:22	31590:19	31461:10,11 31463:1
31458:18 31460:11	31537:15 31539:16	find 31440:24 31441:4	Fit 31468:2	31472:3 31508:10
31460:14 31464:12	31556:23 31568:10	31455:11,18	five 31535:10,23	31519:24 31542:6,8
31466:14 31468:8,11	31570:4 31579:16	31512:12 31516:20	flesh 31489:6	31561:3,17 31597:19
31477:2,3,9 31483:22	31584:22,24 31585:1	31554:3 31555:23	fleshing 31490:12	found 31457:22
31483:25 31484:2,9	familiarise 31549:5	31569:18 31577:1	flipping 31462:3	31507:8 31516:6
31485:2,4 31492:10	families 31572:5	31597:11 31603:4	focus 31480:15	31584:19
31492:22 31494:4	Fanagalo 31571:5,13	finding 31447:11	focusing 31466:1	four 31523:14
31497:21 31502:23	far 31438:7 31439:2	31504:16 31585:21	31597:13	31586:21
31505:21 31518:14	31445:3 31460:24	fine 31481:8	focussing 31568:9	fourth 31586:23
31519:3 31527:19	31479:4 31495:1	finish 31476:14	foggy 31513:6	fractured 31505:7,10
31533:4 31534:10	31503:12 31507:19	31507:4	follow 31455:22	frame 31506:20,23
31535:22 31537:21	31508:6 31522:3	fire 31439:4 31442:10	31463:7 31477:23	framework 31442:16
31539:17 31547:24	31528:10 31531:23	31442:11 31443:24	31488:20 31489:1	31442:17,17
31553:3 31557:4,9	31534:14 31560:9	31444:22,23 31445:2	31493:13 31548:12	31455:12 31459:5
31558:3 31559:11	31577:23 31580:19	31445:2,8,11,15,24	31556:13,16	31487:25
31563:24 31565:3	31588:17 31601:24	31445:24 31448:2,10	31557:20 31564:7,17	franca 31571:5,14
31566:9 31567:13,15	fatally 31468:22	31448:12,23,25	31577:7 31586:9	frankly 31505:25
31568:11 31572:23	fate 31585:5	31449:2,5 31456:6,17	31588:20	31506:7
31578:17,25 31581:3	fear 31606:15	31486:14 31530:13	followed 31549:25	frequently 31483:23
31582:15 31583:16	February 31478:2,2,20	31563:2 31576:15	following 31441:6	31498:19 31607:2
31584:25 31585:18	31478:23 31479:7,11	31579:3	31463:15 31471:21	Friday 31535:5,5
31589:10,20 31590:2	31480:9 31534:14,17	firearm 31575:18	31481:23 31501:4	31602:18
31591:13 31594:14	31534:19,21,22	31576:8,10	31549:25	friend 31546:10
31595:1,23 31597:21	31574:21 31586:23	firearms 31441:5,15,22	follows 31483:6	frightened 31459:12
31599:10 31604:1,2	fed 31600:11	31442:20 31443:3	follow-up 31462:22	31597:22
31606:19 31608:9	feed 31607:14	31446:17,18	31601:15	front 31463:2 31513:3
31610:9 31611:1	feedback 31594:3	31447:22,25	footage 31472:8	31530:14 31552:16
factor 31596:8	feel 31503:4,6 31527:16	31456:13 31457:3,7	31611:14,15	31560:8 31569:1
factored 31548:2,13	31587:17	31469:19 31484:5,6	football 31487:22	31574:16 31605:12
31598:7	feelings 31573:14	31528:25 31529:6,9	footnote 31544:13	frustrated 31468:4
facts 31454:1 31455:14	31607:2	31531:17 31533:1,6	31546:12	31518:12
31468:12 31478:23	feels 31445:13 31464:4	31600:10 31601:1	force 31441:19	frustrating 31518:3
31480:2 31507:7	31590:3 31599:12,15	31610:13	31443:10,13,17,17	frustration 31468:14
31569:12 31585:13	felt 31486:14 31522:9	fired 31448:17,24	31476:3 31486:8	fulcrum 31490:20
factual 31451:13	31580:15	31459:8,9 31486:9	31488:24 31525:7,13	full 31486:19 31565:18
factually 31558:4	femur 31505:1,7,10	31557:22 31559:3	31526:20,20	31592:6
fail 31549:24 31555:16	field 31470:14	31560:21,23	31527:20 31528:8	fully 31464:2 31507:2
failings 31606:24	31503:17,17	31563:22 31564:1	31529:3,3,11 31532:5	31507:16 31509:3
failure 31451:17	31510:16	firework 31563:21	31532:21 31550:4,12	31517:3 31592:9
31457:13,13	fight 31575:14,16	firing 31439:4	31558:19 31561:23	31596:1
31462:20 31486:11	31577:12	31444:19,21	31562:16 31565:14	function 31532:17
31486:17,18	figure 31513:7	31445:17 31536:18	31567:10	31542:20 31586:11
failures 31539:5	figures 31512:2	31560:12,19	forces 31458:24	31592:16
31596:15	file 31461:24 31462:3	31561:10 31563:4	31588:14,14	functions 31457:22
fair 31447:1 31451:16	31487:3	firmly 31518:5	foreigners 31573:10,12	31471:12
31452:2 31459:15	files 31523:15	first 31441:25 31443:9	foresaw 31546:24	fundamental 31456:9
31461:22 31471:18	final 31442:24	31444:11 31448:6	foresee 31451:17	fundamentally 31598:5
31496:15 31497:2,4	31449:16 31455:21	31449:21 31451:15	31552:2	furnished 31520:22
31497:20 31509:8,10	31463:4 31465:23	31451:15 31454:23	foreseeable 31541:13	further 31439:8
31510:18 31532:10	31467:17 31475:21	31469:1 31475:22,24	foreseeing 31552:6	31441:9 31451:20
51510.10 51552.10	31480:8,23 31481:17	31476:5,6,24,25	foreseen 31558:5	31454:13 31456:24
ARCHIVE EQ				

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 9
31470:5 31483:11	getting 31474:16	31568:12,20,21	31576:22	hand-held 31472:9,23
31486:21 31499:22	31521:23	31569:5 31572:3,6	ground 31451:6	31474:6
31515:16 31517:1	give 31442:7 31445:11	31573:24 31575:6,12	31453:10 31460:4,13	happen 31449:4
31522:23 31523:3	31446:12 31450:20	31575:21 31577:17	31468:6,10 31471:5	31450:13,22,25
31530:9 31537:3	31450:21 31452:25	31578:7,12 31583:7	31507:7,15 31518:6,7	31451:1,1,4,5,18,25
31543:17 31552:18	31456:20 31457:14	31600:18 31602:17 31603:4	31562:4 31609:9 grounds 31445:14	31453:1 31458:5
31563:13 31568:19 31571:15 31577:9	31457:19 31458:3 31459:4 31477:4	goes 31439:10 31464:6	31447:7	31475:2 31481:3 31494:23 31495:6
31581:12 31592:4	31481:5 31487:17	31472:20 31473:25	group 31439:2 31444:9	31518:5 31541:21
31599:22 31603:25	31496:25 31499:2	31476:8 31499:6	31444:14,21	31548:8 31550:3
future 31519:25	31504:7 31505:3	31515:16 31546:20	31479:15,17 31480:3	31552:6 31553:16
	31506:1 31507:5	31563:22 31572:14	31480:10 31481:24	31555:25 31559:6,9
G	31515:6 31518:6,7	31603:20	31482:3,5,11	31560:15,16 31562:7
gaps 31467:11,12	31529:16,25	going 31444:20,22	31483:14,16	31562:7,8,18,20
31547:2	31546:10,14	31450:16,20,21,22,23	31497:13 31504:1,1,2	31584:15 31591:9,10
GARY 31438:11	31547:18 31549:2	31454:4 31455:3,10	31520:7 31535:14,15	happened 31447:10
31481:14 31520:17	31551:8 31553:12	31458:4 31461:13,24	31535:15,15,21	31451:1,2,6,21
31546:7 31593:22	31572:15 31593:2	31464:17 31470:25	31556:20 31565:4	31455:16 31457:20
gastarbeiters 31571:18	31599:22 31609:16	31473:8,21 31474:14	31566:5,9,16 31568:8	31458:18 31467:12
31571:19 31572:2	given 31439:20 31457:20 31458:18	31482:22 31485:18	31568:12,23 31569:1	31467:12,22 31475:4
gate 31535:7 31536:16 gather 31496:10	31457:20 31458:18 31460:19 31463:1	31488:22,22 31494:5 31494:7 31498:22	31571:2 31573:12 31577:18 31578:7,14	31496:10 31508:22 31508:23 31519:18
31594:10	31465:16 31466:10	31501:17 31502:19	31579:9 31580:1	31519:19 31522:1
gathered 31481:25	31466:16,25 31467:3	31507:22 31508:17	31584:6 31585:10,17	31541:25 31542:5
31601:20 31602:14	31469:4,7,14	31511:5 31517:6	31585:24 31586:1,5	31548:6,17,24
31602:15 31604:8,25	31470:23 31474:23	31518:17,23	31597:14 31598:10	31552:1,7 31553:14
31605:1	31474:25 31477:9,11	31519:24 31526:25	31598:13,17	31556:6,10 31559:12
gathering 31458:21	31480:13 31487:3	31529:17 31530:13	groups 31518:4	31561:4 31563:6
31480:15 31509:25	31498:13 31499:8	31532:15 31535:12	31530:16 31600:7	31564:1 31571:10
31587:9 31594:2	31506:20 31516:5	31536:2 31537:5	guards 31574:23	31574:5,8,22 31575:3
31604:10 31606:10	31517:7 31522:22	31538:25 31540:21	31575:15 31588:9	31575:4 31586:22
gatherings 31457:17	31523:21 31525:25	31545:18 31550:9,23	guidance 31445:6	31588:4 31606:18
31489:7,11,14,16,23	31530:13 31539:18 31540:6 31541:8	31551:7 31558:23	31493:5	happening 31455:2,16
31490:13 31491:7 31494:3,17 31510:1	31543:6,7 31548:1	31562:2 31574:17 31575:14,16	guide 31493:9 31531:19	31464:1 31555:22 31561:8
Gauteng 31600:20	31550:19 31552:24	31578:10 31583:23	guided 31490:8	happens 31453:15
general 31439:3	31553:10 31555:9,10	31586:3 31590:15	31531:16	31456:21 31471:4
31451:22 31454:22	31556:8 31557:9,17	31593:10 31597:16	gun 31579:3	31503:11 31562:7,11
31454:24 31455:5	31558:8 31564:6	31598:11,13,16,17	gunfire 31458:20	31563:23 31572:1
31460:25 31483:7	31565:24 31569:12	31599:13 31603:5	31459:10 31463:23	happy 31493:16,18
31496:4 31514:10,14	31579:23,24	31604:9 31606:17	31464:3	31500:5 31535:17
31514:22 31515:4	31589:19 31590:10	gold 31529:20	gunman 31579:3,6	31540:15 31553:7,15
31523:13,13,14	31594:4 31601:8,19	good 31477:1 31487:13	guns 31603:4	31554:19 31578:3
31529:1 31551:7	31603:22,25 31604:5	31487:14 31523:9	gunshot 31477:7	31583:17,20 31586:2
31557:17 31559:7,14 31562:10,17 31563:1	31604:6 31607:21 gives 31453:18	31542:21 31544:20 31603:2	Gustave 31580:19 guy 31576:19	31586:6 31611:12 hard 31456:22 31514:8
31583:19 31587:16	31465:14 31506:1	Google 31447:2	GW10 31477:18,19	31522:18,24 31586:1
31588:10 31589:21	31530:7,24 31575:8	gradually 31589:24	0,0,10,0,17,110,17	31607:6,23 31610:7
31602:4	31594:24,25	granted 31439:3	Н	harshly 31597:22
generally 31531:10	giving 31459:6,17	31507:1	hadn't 31457:19	hasn't 31494:10
31554:19 31567:1	31476:24 31503:6	grateful 31462:14	31523:25 31588:11	haven't 31461:13
31572:1,14 31580:12	31547:15	31506:13 31547:18	31589:4 31608:22,24	31467:10 31470:4,5
31597:12	go 31441:23 31444:9	great 31491:13	half 31512:19,24	31491:8,11 31521:16
genie 31554:4	31446:9,16 31450:14	31509:23 31525:12	31513:5 31572:11	31522:2,12,16
gentleman 31454:14	31454:25 31455:21	31573:6	31584:5	31526:23 31565:24
31568:7 31584:23	31461:2 31469:10 31480:5,18 31481:5	greater 31440:19 31480:11,12,15	halt 31465:13 hand 31473:7,20	31569:22 31577:4,8 31592:5 31593:11
genuinely 31501:3 31526:21 31539:22	31480:3,18 31481:3	grenade 31557:11,14	31510:2 31517:8	head 31446:9 31553:7
31540:10,17	31482:20 31484:21 31487:3 31488:17	31557:21 31558:2,6	handcuffs 31531:9	heading 31534:5
31562:19 31568:4	31505:22 31508:5	31558:12,13 31559:3	handed 31602:10	heal 31505:4
31607:17 31608:16	31512:8,11 31517:1	31563:19,21,23,25	handicapped 31607:8	hear 31471:2,14,16
31609:1	31518:11 31525:1	grenades 31562:16,20	handing 31469:19	31473:4,14,19
geographic 31530:25	31528:4 31531:14	31563:11,14 31564:5	handle 31487:7	31474:4 31489:2
German 31571:18	31536:11,14	grief 31519:14	handling 31440:12	31506:7 31511:4
Germany 31571:20	31549:11 31552:17	grip 31454:4 31475:8	hands 31438:17	31560:23,24
gestures 31597:25	31556:1 31562:17	grisly 31573:23	31522:10	31583:20
ARCHIVE FO	K JUSIICE			L]

Pretoria

				Page 10
heard 31451:15	hide 31497:6 31561:15	hypothetical 31510:14	31553:9 31557:10	31583:14 31584:21
31458:21 31470:13	hierarchy 31516:11		31586:22 31588:8	31587:8 31588:7,21
31523:1,9 31537:14	high 31443:13 31476:3	I	include 31448:5	31589:2 31595:1,2
31555:8 31564:19	31514:16,21,21	ID 31606:14	31549:19,21	31596:9 31597:11,15
hearing 31463:23	31539:14 31540:1	idea 31439:5 31450:16	included 31484:5	31598:18,23 31599:7
31470:18 31474:24	31542:14	31544:20	31600:4	31599:12,14,18,21
31506:17	higher 31447:5,18	ideal 31524:13	including 31442:18	31600:3,4,11,12,18
hears 31464:3 31471:8	31488:24 31526:20	identifiable 31591:14	31459:12 31539:10	31601:23 31602:2,19
	31533:4		31539:11 31553:4	,
31471:9,10		identified 31535:19		31602:24 31603:6,15
heart 31505:5,6	highest 31514:2,6,11	31560:19	31592:2	31603:21,22,25
heavily 31484:1	31514:13,15,17	identify 31600:23	increase 31511:18	31604:22 31605:24
31604:3	31515:3,7 31527:21	identity 31580:23	31512:1,18,25	31606:19 31607:15
heavy 31474:14	31527:23	31581:8,10	31588:14	31609:25 31610:5,10
heightened 31480:3	highlighted 31456:3	IDs 31606:15	increased 31530:20	31610:13,16,17,18,19
31590:25	31466:14	ignored 31509:3	31588:19	31610:22,24 31611:2
heists 31528:22	highway 31438:4	ii 31543:20 31544:10	incredibly 31518:3	information/intellige
held 31438:3 31447:6	hill 31555:1,8	illegal 31445:21	incumbent 31460:6	31603:5
31447:10 31460:17	hindsight 31545:4,6,17	illustration 31579:9	indebted 31534:25	informative 31597:17
31463:8 31518:5	Hippos 31485:18	imagine 31473:1,5	independent 31496:22	informed 31503:24
helicopter 31454:23,25	history 31539:16,17	imagining 31584:4	indicated 31440:25	31511:23 31563:5
	•	immediate 31530:24		
helmet 31470:21	31541:8,16 31542:12		31442:13 31587:9	31580:16,18
help 31439:14 31446:6	31547:24 31557:10	immediately 31445:12	indicates 31592:3	31606:21,22
31477:9 31493:5	hit 31560:25	31506:15 31579:4	31595:10	31607:15
31499:22 31509:1,16	HMIC 31495:22	imminent 31445:13	indications 31600:15	informers 31590:11
31509:17 31512:7	hold 31471:25 31475:7	31447:8 31448:14,21	indicators 31594:18	informing 31538:6
31513:7 31522:15	31498:2 31499:1,8,11	impact 31497:2	indistinct 31518:4	31539:3 31592:14
31594:23 31607:19	31504:17 31536:24	31564:10 31585:23	individual 31442:22	ingredient 31581:20
helped 31596:5,6	holding 31460:25	31586:3 31596:10,23	31443:5 31447:6	initially 31445:24
helpful 31441:3	31461:10,11 31463:1	impacted 31595:14,20	31448:4,19,20	31522:17
31452:5 31500:10	31473:6	impasse 31516:14	31457:6 31471:3	initiative 31578:3
31504:6 31519:14,22	home 31518:11	implement 31451:22	31474:17 31486:7	injure 31510:3
31522:15 31556:4	31523:11 31578:10	implementation	31530:11 31531:9	injured 31439:2
31578:19,23 31580:6	31610:11	31451:25	31560:18,18 31593:3	31468:9,23 31476:23
	homework 31438:15			
31594:14 31595:5		implementing	31600:6	31520:23
31602:23	31440:23 31446:16	31457:16	individuals 31536:22	injuring 31505:23
helping 31521:4	31447:20	implication 31499:20	31578:2,22 31580:25	injury 31441:11
31580:13	honest 31503:8	31505:16,16	31581:7	31560:11
helps 31493:9 31596:20	31597:24	31509:19 31511:9	individuation 31580:3	innocent 31439:1
Hemraj 31463:11	honestly 31447:7	31563:2	indulge 31586:20	inputs 31439:14
31470:9 31472:22	31577:24	implied 31548:16	industrial 31489:15	inside 31470:21
31485:15 31515:16	honesty 31569:22	importance 31442:6	31490:6 31499:14	insofar 31521:15
31520:20 31521:7,14	hope 31440:2 31446:13	important 31467:11	31506:3 31511:13	insomuch 31442:16
31521:18 31546:18	31492:21 31501:19	31525:19,22	industries 31572:3	31453:22 31561:19
31577:9 31595:12	31519:1,22 31545:7	31589:25 31590:4	inefficient 31610:25	instance 31489:13
31596:25 31597:7	31551:1	importantly 31483:24	infested 31572:24	31490:6,18 31498:3
31598:19 31599:4,17	hoped 31601:22	31605:17 31606:22	inflame 31558:23	31499:4,25 31603:1
31607:21	31602:3		31561:16	
		impossible 31523:11		instances 31495:3
henceforth 31536:24	hopefully 31519:14	31586:5	inflamed 31561:3	institutions 31500:14
here's 31523:5	31525:2 31548:14	imprecise 31440:4	inflames 31561:24	instructing 31446:11
31562:24 31591:7	31567:11 31579:11	impression 31509:7	influence 31537:18	instruction 31454:12
31608:25	31579:16	31521:21,22	influenced 31557:18	31455:11 31475:9
Hermanus 31606:7	hoping 31446:3	inadequate 31586:9,11	influx 31573:7	31556:20 31578:15
he'd 31451:7	31603:11,13	31587:9	inform 31538:25	instructions 31463:20
he'll 31471:11	horrendous 31438:4	inadequately 31588:22	31585:22	31466:24 31470:23
he's 31440:25 31445:14	hostel 31536:16	inappropriate	informal 31463:2,21	31474:25 31591:12
31445:17 31455:13	31574:11,25 31601:3	31518:20	31464:5 31536:21	instrument 31495:21
31460:13,23	hostility 31573:14	inappropriately	31601:4	instruments 31488:18
31464:17 31469:6,20	housekeeping 31487:2	31445:9	information 31439:13	31490:17,19
31473:14 31487:5	huge 31459:11	inaudible 31457:9	31439:20 31446:10	31491:20 31560:10
31509:21 31530:13	31539:14,22 31553:8	31521:20 31595:13	31465:18 31468:17	intend 31611:13,20
31574:22 31575:3,3	31561:15 31594:9	31609:22	31470:2,7 31471:25	intended 31450:14
31578:12 31594:20	human 31448:6	incident 31495:13	31475:11,15 31513:3	31454:12 31457:19
The La Derive	21502.00 21502.4 7	31531:17 31554:17	31537:20 31539:19	31462:21 31474:24
31606:7,16	31502:22 31523:4,7			
31606:7,16 he/she 31530:7	31576:23 31600:22	incidents 31531:3	31545:16,20	31487:17 31495:14
31606:7,16 he/she 31530:7 hiatus 31522:20	31576:23 31600:22 hundred 31486:13			31495:15 31510:17
31606:7,16 he/she 31530:7	31576:23 31600:22	incidents 31531:3	31545:16,20	

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 11
31532:8 31558:14	involves 31543:11	31565:23,24	31464:2,13	31591:25 31592:1
31591:11 31600:6,14	involving 31466:17	31567:17,21 31568:5	Kidd's 31462:25	31595:13,19 31597:2
31600:15	31569:17	31569:11,12,25	kill 31468:2 31577:11	31599:23 31605:15
intensity 31588:19	invulnerable 31565:22	31570:1,6,8 31573:20	31577:13	land 31572:24
intent 31484:18	inyanga 31537:6	31578:19,24 31579:6	killed 31445:17	language 31443:8,16
31496:4 31497:12,20	iPhone 31473:2,24	31583:14,15	31467:20 31519:4	31570:11,12,15,24
31500:24 31501:12	IPID 31465:5	31594:21 31605:4	31568:21,23 31569:6	31571:1,2,6,12,13
31501:13 31518:20	Ireland 31438:21	31606:25 31608:2,15	31574:24 31577:6	31581:3 31594:19
31519:3 31577:23	31439:10,12	31609:1	killing 31501:13	languages 31450:22
intention 31559:23	31442:18 31446:5	i.e 31441:12 31479:13	31577:2,2 31588:25	31571:7,8
31560:1,12 31561:10	31467:6,14 31468:2	31488:6 31568:2	kind 31440:12	lap 31481:18
31567:12 31600:13	31500:12 31528:1	31600:5	31444:18 31469:2	large 31466:5,16
intentions 31565:7	irenic 31494:17		31491:22 31504:17	31474:12 31484:16
31600:5	Irrespective 31462:18	J	31509:5 31516:1	31484:17 31539:20
interaction 31597:18	isn't 31475:4 31494:16	ja 31535:17 31545:17	31528:25 31572:7	31576:2,3 31579:1
interest 31480:4	31515:2,9 31528:8	31594:25	31580:5 31582:2,6	31581:11 31598:25
interested 31438:20,24	31559:22 31574:5	Jacobus 31606:6	31600:3 31602:19	largely 31488:22,22
31439:9 31440:25	isolating 31549:17	jam 31438:4	31610:2,10	31522:18 31580:17
31447:4,14 31506:9	issue 31447:21	jobs 31573:7	kindly 31473:2	larger 31479:14
31517:5	31459:16 31461:22	JOC 31451:8,9,15	Kingdom 31439:11	late 31438:3 31580:19
interjection 31526:12	31464:10 31466:9	31453:22,23 31455:8	knees 31568:15,20	launcher 31561:15
intermediary 31516:1	31529:23 31530:1	31461:18,18	31569:6	law 31445:10 31501:15
internal 31488:6	31546:15 31562:1	31464:16,23 31465:2	knew 31451:9	31524:21 31527:6
international 31443:20	31564:15 31570:3	31465:3,11,16	31453:11 31454:5	31581:17
internet 31438:6	31581:20 31599:14	31466:12 31469:1	31455:4 31479:14	lawfully 31532:3
interpose 31547:10	31608:1	31470:7 31474:22	knife 31576:7	lawyer 31491:10,10
interposed 31508:16	issued 31596:4,5	31475:12,13,15	knives 31575:18	lay 31515:24 31517:9
interrelation 31438:24	31599:2,10	31479:18 31600:11	knobkerries 31575:17	lazy 31610:25
31439:7 31440:7	issues 31453:8,12,14	Johannes 31606:6	knowing 31461:15	le 31438:12,13
interrogation 31584:20	31454:1 31456:3	joined 31535:8	31611:2,3,4	31439:23 31440:6,11
interrogatories	31465:24 31479:22	joint 31475:16	knowledge 31552:23	31440:15,18,22
31478:5	31503:3 31509:4	Jones 31601:3	31553:11 31563:10	31446:11,22
interrupt 31454:6	31569:10 31592:22	judge 31486:6	known 31451:7	31447:19 31448:16
31467:4 31478:4	31594:12 31595:7,24	31540:10	31453:25 31545:19	31449:6,14 31455:19
31537:10	31604:21	judgement 31515:10	31570:20 31571:5,18	31457:11 31459:20
interrupted 31477:15	item 31534:9	judging 31582:24	knows 31460:7	31461:23 31462:6,9
31478:9,11 31555:21	items 31587:2,3	judgment 31447:15	31474:20 31475:4	31462:15 31464:19
interrupting 31590:21	it'll 31441:23	31457:6 31475:5	31583:24 31604:10	31465:20 31466:22
interruption 31574:13	I'd 31454:13 31467:25	31530:7 31537:20	koppie 31450:18,19	31467:17 31468:19
interviewing 31606:12	31470:19 31480:21	31545:12 31549:2	31456:5,6,7,9,15,18	31471:19 31474:5
interviews 31606:18	31490:8 31563:13	31605:19 31611:5,10	31456:25 31458:4	31475:19 31477:13
intricacies 31503:13	31564:6	judgmental 31448:8	31459:23 31460:24	31477:20 31478:4
31527:14	I'll 31444:2 31446:15	judgments 31538:6	31461:14,21	31479:3,6 31480:17
intricacy 31569:25	31446:18,20	June 31438:1 31605:12	31463:10,13 31475:6	31480:23 31481:1,8
intrigued 31511:21	31454:17 31473:15	jurisdictions 31440:24	31482:3 31513:10	31481:15,16,19
introduces 31445:12	31477:22 31478:12	31441:20	31514:3 31517:9	31482:2,9,15,24
introduction 31581:19	31492:15 31498:25	justifiable 31486:10	31536:20 31566:16	31485:24 31486:20
investigate 31495:10	31498:25 31499:5,21	31532:4	31567:21 31568:9	31486:22 31497:10
investigated 31509:3	31505:9,10 31507:4	justified 31441:5	31583:10 31584:4,10	31523:20 31543:18
investigation 31496:10	31515:7 31522:9	31448:4 31532:4	31585:5 31597:13	31544:6,9,12 31546:9
investigative 31606:3	31536:3 31548:14	justify 31448:11	31600:8,9 31610:12	31547:13 31580:19
invincible 31537:24	31552:18	K	koppies 31463:14	31581:13,24 31582:4
31565:22	I've 31440:20 31453:3		kraal 31578:8	31582:17,22 31595:6
invisible 31565:22	31454:23 31456:3	keep 31454:7 31467:6	K9 31463:3	31595:9 logd 21448:22
invite 31514:1 21522:17 21540:0	31466:25 31474:18	31602:7	L	lead 31448:23
31533:17 31549:9	31482:19 31483:22	Keeping 31490:18		31517:20 31520:5 31525:5 31542:23
inviting 31558:4 31567:14 31578:11	31483:24 31484:2,10 31484:11 31485:21	31491:1,20 31492:7	labelled 31586:16 labour 31490:6	31525:5 31542:23 31572:7
involve 31488:22	31484:11 31485:21 31500:16 31511:8,19	31492:10 31493:2,9 31551:5	31569:18 31570:3	leader 31567:22
31494:23		31551:5 kov 31440:7 31455:23		
involved 31451:14,21	31513:12 31515:14 31516:4,24 31519:12	key 31449:7 31455:23	31572:9 labourers 31571:17	leaders 31535:19 leadership 31486:12
31481:25 31491:22	31510:4,24 31519:12 31520:24 31521:2,5	31464:11 31466:3 31479:22 31519:11	31573:7	leading 31578:12
31500:7 31508:3	31521:10 31523:5,19	31523:12 31595:21	labour-sending	leads 31547:9
31569:17 31580:12	31527:3 31532:22	31600:7 31605:14	31570:21	learn 31539:4
31580:12 31582:4	31540:11 31559:7,14	31608:19	lack 31463:9 31466:25	learned 31541:5
31601:14,16	31564:9,11,14	Kidd 31463:20,21	31587:25 31588:25	31546:10
ARCHIVE FO	31304.9,11,14 R I I S T I C F	ANUU 31703.20,21	51507.25 51500.25	51510.10

				Page 1
learning 31539:8	31452:17 31456:25	logic 31488:20	31555:4,5,10	31495:13 31496:11
31552:17 31580:7	31515:21 31533:10	31498:21 31532:18	love 31562:5	31498:15 31499:25
leave 31454:18	31543:22 31544:3	31564:7 31599:11	low-key 31588:17	31501:9,20 31504:25
31458:14 31500:19	31546:13 31553:16	logical 31564:21	lunch 31546:1	31507:16 31511:13
31501:9 31517:9	31571:11 31592:21	31565:13,17	lung 31505:1,11	31512:13,17 31524:9
31567:20 31569:10	31594:15,24 31596:3	logically 31498:20	luxury 31545:16	31524:19 31533:16
leaving 31447:22	31596:8 31604:18	logist 31471:8	lying 31476:21	31547:24 31550:6
31456:18 31568:9	31605:22	logistic 31508:17	31523:18 31576:13	31567:15 31570:25
lecture 31572:16	Lieutenant-General	long 31477:5,5 31513:2	31576:18	31586:10 31596:24
led 31454:10 31507:9	31514:7,12,18	31600:5,14		31598:23
31507:25 31508:2,9	life 31441:13,19,24	longer 31485:12	M	mark 31487:6 31609:1
31517:22 31553:24	31442:1 31448:21,22	31507:6 31508:6	Magidiwana 31507:17	31610:9
31582:3,10 31601:15	31456:10 31493:7	longstanding 31590:10	magnitude 31468:17	marked 31585:5
31607:17	31549:24 31572:8	Lonmin 31496:13	31469:8 31505:18	marshalling 31494:7
left 31567:24 31568:7	life's 31527:12	31497:8 31499:10	31596:17	massive 31588:14
31600:8	light 31440:24	31501:24,25 31502:4	main 31478:19 31510:7	material 31509:5
legal 31445:20	31465:18 31547:20	31502:25 31504:6,19	31534:16,21	31603:12 31611:9
31446:11,20 31459:5	31585:13 31588:6	31508:17,19,20	31596:16	math 31448:18
31487:25 31490:5	likelihood 31525:6	31509:2 31511:2,3,5	maintain 31560:2,3	Mathunjwa 31507:10
31496:24 31497:5,21	limit 31514:21 31527:7	31514:2,7,18,23,23	31600:6	31569:3,4
31503:5 31521:4	limitations 31488:6	31515:20 31517:4,13	maintaining 31474:21	matter 31442:1
31522:9 31540:20	limited 31499:13	31517:21 31520:23	maintains 31490:24	31445:5 31457:24
31570:1,6 31605:9	31500:4	31521:12 31524:9,24	31491:4	31486:6 31487:7
legislation 31441:21	line 31439:4 31440:10	31572:14 31574:23	maintenance 31491:13	31506:6 31510:21
31489:12,20	31443:10 31444:9,11	31600:22 31601:2	31491:14 31501:16	31515:25 31517:2
31502:24	31444:13 31445:13	31602:3 31603:14	majority 31530:17	31532:4 31545:21
lengths 31573:22	31447:24 31448:16	Lonmin's 31511:6	31554:25 31555:7	31550:16 31554:22
lengthy 31467:21	31452:12 31456:20	31512:17 31521:3	31560:6 31566:19	31582:4 31583:24
31498:5 31508:9	31462:19 31514:8	look 31438:25	31569:18 31600:7	31595:11
31522:22	31518:10 31546:19	31439:18 31490:16	Major-General	matters 31504:24
Lesotho 31570:22	31546:19 31600:2	31494:2 31496:12,13	31465:15	31506:2,21 31572:12
lessens 31525:6	31610:1	31496:13,18	makarapas 31569:2	31581:25
lessons 31539:4,5	lines 31560:11	31497:18 31502:10	making 31438:9	Mbombo 31514:7,12
31541:4	lingering 31465:6	31510:10 31519:19	31443:23 31465:17	31514:18 31515:4
less-than-lethal	lingua 31571:5,14	31521:3 31538:9	31471:8 31473:7	31523:13
31528:19	linked 31441:12	31549:10,22	31474:22 31475:4,7	McCann 31438:7
lethal 31441:19	31505:24	31596:15 31597:24	31475:11 31496:1	31446:23,24
31486:7 31531:13	links 31535:21	31598:3 31601:9	31505:23 31508:12	McIntosh 31485:22
letting 31476:14	list 31534:8	31602:25 31609:9	31508:25 31510:15	31515:22 31516:24
let's 31487:11 31499:6	listed 31509:11,11	looked 31594:11	31515:3 31525:9	31571:12
31513:8 31514:15,20	31534:10	looking 31442:19	31545:13 31559:11	mean 31446:15
31515:12 31516:13	listen 31454:8	31462:7,16 31492:14	31563:11 31571:21	31460:16 31461:15
31529:4 31567:25	31470:22	31499:24 31516:18	31582:21 31583:19	31467:2 31476:2
31593:15 31603:4	listened 31466:25	31586:21 31593:9	31587:22 31589:8	31485:11 31487:21
level 31480:3 31500:21	literally 31523:2,15	looks 31439:11	31597:25 31604:24	31489:19 31493:2,6
31500:25 31501:11	literature 31447:1	31580:21	maladies 31505:2	31494:19 31497:7
31514:2,6,11,13,15	litre 31576:14	lot 31445:19 31447:3	Mambush 31576:11	31494:19 31497:7
31514:16,17,21,21	little 31492:16 31513:8	31459:10 31464:21	man 31444:22	31514:5 31521:10
31515:3 31516:14	31518:6,7 31543:20	31474:13 31484:1	manage 31483:18	31523:11 31526:12
31519:7 31527:22,23	31544:10 31547:10	31497:9 31500:11	managed 31485:7	31527:4 31528:22,23
31527:25 31528:3	31570:4 31572:15	31508:3,10 31513:12	management 31483:15	31528:24 31534:15
31529:11,23 31530:5	31587:22	31517:25 31518:8	31484:19 31485:7,8	31538:21 31539:14
31530:9 31531:16	live 31456:13,17	31525:10 31526:20	31485:12 31488:14	31540:15 31581:10
31532:3,20,25	31486:14 31525:14	31528:2 31535:7	31485:12 31488:14 31491:21 31498:10	31585:24 31604:9
31535:13 31536:4	31526:2 31528:5	31537:25 31540:3	31499:2 31516:11	31606:22 31608:15
31535:13 31536:4 31537:21 31538:5	31526:2 31528:5 31532:1 31560:8	31565:8 31566:8		meaning 31487:18
31558:18 31592:13	31570:12 31571:21	31567:2,2 31570:7	31521:12 31551:4 31580:18	meaning 31487:18 means 31566:11
levels 31442:18,20,23	lived 31517:19	31571:19 31579:12	manifested 31526:8	measure 31487:17
1 = y = 1 $1 = 44 / 10 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 / 0 /$	31603:16			
		31580:11 31582:3,6 31600:20 31609:5,6,6	manner 31526:8	31495:6 31540:23
31476:3 31526:20	Linemacl 21500 10		31573:22	31545:20 31549:12
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7	Liverpool 31580:10		manuals 21502 16 17	21550.1 7 20
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7 31533:4	lives 31444:7 31457:5	31610:5	manuals 31582:16,17	31550:1,7,20
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7 31533:4 lever 31523:15	lives 31444:7 31457:5 31601:3,4	31610:5 lots 31441:20 31449:3	map 31443:4	31555:13,16,21
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7 31533:4 lever 31523:15 liable 31447:7	lives 31444:7 31457:5 31601:3,4 local 31573:15	31610:5 lots 31441:20 31449:3 31458:20 31459:11	map 31443:4 march 31494:6	31555:13,16,21 measures 31549:15,15
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7 31533:4 lever 31523:15 liable 31447:7 Lieutenant 31476:5	lives 31444:7 31457:5 31601:3,4 local 31573:15 31597:10	31610:5 lots 31441:20 31449:3 31458:20 31459:11 31473:8 31500:16	map 31443:4 march 31494:6 Marikana 31465:22	31555:13,16,21 measures 31549:15,15 medical 31494:6
31476:3 31526:20 31529:22 31532:7 31533:4 lever 31523:15 liable 31447:7	lives 31444:7 31457:5 31601:3,4 local 31573:15	31610:5 lots 31441:20 31449:3 31458:20 31459:11	map 31443:4 march 31494:6	31555:13,16,21 measures 31549:15,15

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 1
meeting 31494:5	minutes 31450:16	movement 31591:2	31489:25 31493:1,5	31569:20
31513:17	31457:20 31458:13	moving 31450:6	31501:14 31518:15	Northern 31438:21
meetings 31466:12	31466:12 31480:21	31458:22 31475:19	31520:2 31521:3	31439:10,12
31497:8 31521:11	31481:10 31593:18	31590:21	31522:2 31530:6,23	31442:18 31446:5
31536:24	31604:3,4 31611:16	Mozambique 31570:23	31531:16 31546:23	31467:6,14 31500:12
meets 31461:4	31611:18	Mpembe 31451:23	31572:16 31594:23	31528:1
member 31442:7	misbehaviour 31510:5	31454:22,25 31455:6	31607:14	north-east 31461:5
members 31442:8,11	misconstrued 31520:9	31514:10,22	needed 31556:22	note 31513:21
31463:7 31465:3,11	misinterpreted	31523:13 31587:16	needs 31464:4	31589:25 31601:14
31485:6 31532:10,12	31584:3			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		31587:19 31588:10	31564:17	noted 31536:25
31535:24 31579:9	misleading 31602:25	31589:2,21 31591:6,9	negate 31460:15	31589:25
31580:1,1 31588:15	missed 31471:4	31591:12,17	31564:13	notes 31481:5 31534:12
31600:7 31606:13	31489:1	31601:12 31602:4	negligence 31586:12	notice 31454:13
memory 31443:15	missing 31470:6	Mpembe's 31523:14	negotiate 31456:23	31487:4
31463:22 31477:24	mistake 31603:23	31603:12	31516:12 31526:18	notorious 31582:5
31521:4 31586:19,20	31604:2	Mpofu 31507:20	negotiated 31571:12	Notwithstanding
mentality 31580:20	mob 31579:23 31580:3	31515:22	negotiation 31517:12	31485:4
mentioned 31600:19	31580:20 31582:2	multiple 31503:18	negotiations 31515:17	no-one 31605:16,17
31602:1 31603:22	mobile 31470:20	31506:19	31549:24	nub 31447:13
31610:11	31471:1 31473:1,3,5	murder 31510:3	negotiators 31515:18	NUM 31507:12,13,14
mentions 31537:3	31585:1,3	murdering 31505:22	neighbourhoods	31508:13 31520:23
Mere 31469:20,22,24	model 31580:23	murderous 31500:22	31570:12	31536:14,14,15,17
merely 31490:3	31581:10	31501:12 31518:20	neither 31523:6	31574:24 31575:13
31498:2 31513:11	Mogale 31572:24	31519:3 31578:15	31538:11	31602:4,5
message 31501:13	31573:1,2	Murray 31469:20	neutralise 31531:24	number 31441:3
31515:18 31519:10	Mokwena 31515:5,6	mustn't 31599:19	never 31443:11	31442:12 31444:4
31525:17,23 31589:2	Molotov 31560:5	muti 31481:25	31444:20 31537:14	31445:12 31448:1
messages 31472:17	moment 31447:23	31537:12,23	31541:9,25 31542:5	31452:24 31458:6
31516:2,10	31454:7 31461:3	31538:13 31556:23	31542:15 31547:25	31466:17 31472:15
messenger 31516:1	31467:5 31525:9	31563:17,24 31564:5	31548:5,17,24	31478:18,23
met 31472:13 31535:6	31540:15 31563:15	31564:11,13,13,15	31551:15 31552:1,7	31479:23 31484:11
31536:13,20	31605:10	31565:22 31566:10	31553:14 31558:1	31487:4 31495:10
metaphorical 31509:15	Monday 31515:11	31567:16 31568:12	31559:4,12 31563:6	31500:13 31505:3
Metropolitan 31472:4	31571:11	31579:15 31581:20	31592:24	31507:25 31508:2,13
31472:6,19	money 31504:8,10	mutual 31577:23	nevertheless 31445:11	31518:3 31519:20
Microphone 31457:9	31572:4,5,6 31573:8		new 31523:5	31520:25 31534:9
31521:20 31595:13	monitor 31471:13	N	Nguni 31571:7	31539:15,20
31609:22	monitoring 31473:16	Naidoo 31460:25	nice 31473:2	31542:14 31553:8
microscope 31508:13	month 31506:21	31461:11 31465:16	night 31438:6 31443:7	31554:15 31564:4,5
31508:13 31511:3	31507:2 31512:19	31469:6	31447:2 31518:11	31567:20 31569:24
middle 31468:9	months 31506:16	name 31531:13	31557:1 31564:9,20	31576:2,3 31578:20
31579:1	morning 31466:19	names 31537:3	31602:8,9 31610:11	31579:3,22 31580:1
migrant 31569:18	31487:13,14 31574:8	National 31514:14	nine 31534:9	31580:15 31581:25
8	31574:22 31603:21		NIU 31461:4,10	
31570:3 31571:17		31515:10 31523:12	·	31582:7,13 31590:22
31572:9 31573:7	31603:24 31611:19	nature 31468:5	31462:23 31463:6,9	31598:1 31600:9
militant 31480:10				
31/18/2+11/21/19/2+17	31611:23	31483:4,4,12	Nkaneng 31536:21	31610:12
31482:11 31483:14	mortem 31577:8	31484:24 31489:14	nodding 31564:18	numbered 31556:13
31535:15	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4	noiding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20 31475:5,6 31483:13	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20 31475:5,6 31483:13 31513:8 31543:25	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20 31475:5,6 31483:13 31513:8 31543:25 31558:15,22</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20 31475:5,6 31483:13 31513:8 31543:25 31558:15,22 31559:21 31560:2	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14 31572:2,14	mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23 31576:6 move 31449:7 31452:19,25 31458:14,23 31459:15 31465:20 31475:5,6 31483:13 31513:8 31543:25 31558:15,22 31559:21 31560:2 31561:5,11 31566:20 31567:1,4 31568:1 31579:5	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14 necessity 31442:9	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4 normally 31457:18	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15 objection 31515:13,15
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14 31572:2,14 mineworkers 31535:10	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14 necessity 31442:9 necklacing 31582:2	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4 normally 31457:18 31471:5 31542:19	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15 objection 31515:13,15 objections 31543:19
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14 31572:2,14 mineworkers 31535:10 minimal 31529:3	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14 necessity 31442:9	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4 normally 31457:18	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15 objection 31515:13,15
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14 31572:2,14 mineworkers 31535:10	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14 necessity 31442:9 necklacing 31582:2	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4 normally 31457:18 31471:5 31542:19	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15 objection 31515:13,15 objections 31543:19
31535:15 mind 31452:17,21 31454:16 31461:21 31491:17 31495:22 31551:15 31564:20 31594:20 mindset 31581:16 mine 31503:13 31512:17 31536:18 31536:23 31564:2 31572:14 miners 31504:8 31602:6 mines 31571:4,14 31572:2,14 mineworkers 31535:10 minimal 31529:3	<pre>mortem 31577:8 motor 31571:21 mountain 31536:20,24 mouth 31513:23</pre>	31484:24 31489:14 31513:16 31533:16 31590:11 31609:4 near 31508:15 31536:17,20 necessarily 31446:8 31470:5 31471:16 31489:14 31492:12 31492:13 31525:10 31532:10 31577:2 31585:2 31589:11 31601:17 31602:13 necessary 31444:8 31489:18 31494:6,7 31514:25 31532:14 necessity 31442:9 necklacing 31582:2 need 31455:24	nodding 31564:18 noise 31454:10 31459:11 31470:11 31472:2 31474:1 noises 31474:3 Noki 31554:11,14 31578:8 nominated 31535:10 31535:19,23 non-English 31524:3 non-existent 31508:8 non-lethal 31528:7 non-public 31529:5 normal 31445:25 31565:4 normally 31457:18 31471:5 31542:19 31547:8 31554:1	numbered 31556:13 numbers 31512:4,23 numerous 31472:2 31608:18 Nyala 31546:23 Nyalas 31452:11 31470:12 31568:2 O oath 31438:10 31481:13 31520:16 31546:6 31593:21 obdurate 31524:10 obey 31445:21 obeying 31454:15 objection 31515:13,15 objective 31445:14

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 1
allian 41459.2	21477.4 21494.4	21455.0 21460.2 12	21570.12.10	
obligation 31458:3 obligations 31524:21	31477:4 31484:4 31486:7,14 31519:4	31455:9 31460:3,13 31463:5 31465:12,18	31579:12,19 organisations 31590:12	paint 31487:15 31573:20
observed 31519:20	31529:4,6 31531:2,6	31467:19 31471:20	organise 31537:6	painting 31565:2
obstacles 31611:3	31531:11 31533:2	31471:22 31474:9	origin 31472:18	31585:8,13
obstinate 31506:5	31545:11 31588:25	31475:16 31485:2	31511:13	palliative 31515:10
obtain 31491:15	31604:19 31606:13	31502:18 31503:10	original 31459:4	panga 31576:16
31494:4 31592:4,11	offices 31536:14,14,15	31541:4 31601:14	31463:13	pangas 31500:23
31606:13	31575:12	operations 31466:5,5	orthopaedic 31505:7	31575:17 31600:25
obtainable 31608:11	official 31576:9,21	31488:14 31494:22	outcome 31492:7,14,17	paper 31586:18
obtained 31543:16	officials 31507:11	31496:1,3 31498:4,10	31492:19,25 31497:2	parade 31518:2
31608:11,11	31575:23 31576:4	31499:2 31505:12,15	31500:2 31502:16	Parades 31500:15
obtains 31487:16	official's 31576:13	31538:22 31539:3	31504:2 31510:18	parading 31500:12,13
obtuse 31498:24	Oh 31469:23 31574:7	31541:9 31592:12,14	31517:21,23	paragraph 31441:9,25
obvious 31476:13	31591:1	31601:15	31519:18 31525:5	31442:3,5 31443:21
31587:16	okay 31489:3 31499:5	operation's 31466:16	31527:11 31558:2	31449:10 31464:22
obviously 31440:22	31536:10 31537:2	operative 31572:9	31594:11 31596:11	31477:20 31478:20
31448:4 31458:20	31550:2 31556:18	operators 31570:18,19	31596:23 31607:17	31482:17,18 31486:1
31469:25 31470:24	31567:25	opinion 31478:6,7,8,13	outcomes 31492:1	31512:12 31532:24
31473:15 31476:23	old 31526:7	31478:13 31486:10	31493:15,18	31534:3,22,23
31477:7 31495:3	once 31448:13 31451:6	31497:16 31499:2,9	31524:25	31535:20 31537:2
31497:22 31508:2	31451:8,9 31457:15	31503:7,24 31504:17	outraged 31467:25	31544:8,8,9 31573:25
31510:22 31513:3	31546:21 31554:4	31504:18,20 31511:7	outside 31535:7	31574:3 31575:7,7,22
31517:3 31522:9,10	31555:4 31566:17	31550:14 31555:20	31576:13,18	31594:13 31601:13
31522:21 31537:15	31583:16	31558:4 31566:21	overall 31454:22	paragraphs 31441:4
31552:4 31560:8 31564:5 31565:20	oncologist 31505:6 ones 31454:11 31569:2	31567:14 31578:11 opinions 31480:8	31455:1,3,7,12,14 31460:12,14	31534:1 parameters 31525:19
31570:7 31577:6	oneself 31439:10	31490:18 31498:13	31465:12,18	paraphrase 31594:14
31578:18 31579:5	ongoing 31526:13	31504:24 31505:3	31467:18 31474:9,22	park 31531:1
31599:20,22	31535:18 31538:25	31518:22 31537:22	31590:5 31594:5	part 31439:20,20
occasion 31542:7	31585:9 31600:12	31540:25	31596:15,21	31451:3,3 31453:5,19
31548:21 31549:1	31601:5 31603:16	opportunity 31487:5	overarching 31607:7	31461:14 31462:21
31552:3 31559:9	31605:6	31491:6 31507:5	overly 31489:19	31463:4,7,9,13
31562:19,21	open 31522:9 31578:24	31521:8 31556:12,16	31498:22	31466:21 31474:20
occasions 31472:3	31579:2	opposed 31443:2	overnight 31600:9	31476:5 31493:15,17
31479:23 31527:25	opening 31508:19	31450:5 31456:17	override 31474:3	31502:19 31504:1
31554:15 31608:18	31517:17	31472:11,24	31475:9	31505:12 31512:6
occupations 31582:9	openly 31523:5	31531:25 31545:16	overseeing 31453:24	31524:23 31525:11
occurred 31483:10	operate 31472:5	31570:7 31578:21	oversight 31605:7	31529:19 31533:8
October 31523:10	31510:17 31525:19	31584:6 31585:18,19	overstepped 31608:15	31556:22 31561:5
31546:19	31589:11	31586:20	31609:1	31566:13 31573:15
offer 31578:22	operates 31503:18	opposition 31543:11	o'clock 31611:23	31578:13 31580:25
31581:21	operating 31479:18	option 31480:13	o'clock 31535:4	31586:12 31589:4,7
offering 31545:8	31492:24 31515:23	31529:14 31559:24	31604:1,6,11	31591:22 31593:2,4,7
office 31523:11	31579:13 31580:3	options 31531:8,20		participant 31492:23
31574:24	operation 31449:12	31558:21	P	participants 31492:12
officer 31442:6,22	31450:5 31451:11	oral 31453:18 31457:1	page 31449:10,17	31555:14
31445:1 31448:17,20	31465:4,13 31467:19	31463:22 31470:5	31455:21 31461:25	particular 31442:12,19
31449:1 31453:9	31468:7,9,22 31469:2	31521:17 31522:13	31462:2,10,12	31443:1,12 31444:10
31458:17,23 31460:4	31475:1,6 31476:2	31522:25 31523:14	31464:22 31465:23	31451:23 31462:2,17
31460:5,18 31463:25	31477:1 31483:24	31592:24 31594:24	31475:20 31477:19	31463:18 31477:20
31464:2,3,16 31468:6	31484:10 31485:14	31594:25 31595:5	31477:21 31480:18	31480:5 31489:20
31468:10 31469:4,6	31486:2,11 31491:22	31599:22	31482:17 31483:1	31492:2,5,23 31500:8
31469:18 31470:3,8	31492:20 31496:23	ordered 31444:9	31485:25,25	31510:17 31512:6
31471:5,15 31474:19	31498:18 31499:25	orders 31438:22,23	31512:11,12	31516:24 31518:12
31474:25 31475:3,10	31502:13 31529:15	31440:14 31444:7	31523:19 31543:20	31518:13 31526:16
31526:15 31530:12	31545:3 31586:10,18	31445:11,23 31446:2	31543:21,22 31544:5	31527:13,14
31531:18 31545:19 31557:13 31592:3	31587:24 31588:17	31446:4,6 31461:22 31470:11	31544:6,10,23	31530:25 31532:24 31535:20 31536:4
31557:13 31592:3 officers 31442:21	31588:19 31589:23 31595:18,21	31470:11 ordinarily 31448:11	31546:10,19,19 31574:17,17 31575:1	31535:20 31536:4 31539:15 31540:6
31445:23 31446:17	31596:11,16	31466:20	31575:6,8 31594:13	31548:7,8 31554:17
31445:23 31446:17 31447:22,25 31448:8	31601:17,19,20	ordinary 31444:3	31575:6,8 31594:13 31600:1 31601:13	31548:7,8 31554:17 31560:18,20 31566:5
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	51001.17,19,20	31528:24	31609:24 31610:1	31566:9 31567:19,23
1 1448 1/ 1456 6 1/	31603.2 8 9 31604.13		·	510000 010010101,40
31448:12 31456:6,12 31456:16 20 22	31603:2,8,9 31604:13 31605:1 25 31606:3			
31456:16,20,22	31605:1,25 31606:3	organisation 31462:19	pages 31455:22	31568:8 31570:15
31456:16,20,22 31457:3 31459:12	31605:1,25 31606:3 31606:22 31607:8	organisation 31462:19 31472:7 31484:12	pages 31455:22 31522:22 31523:16	31568:8 31570:15 31580:8 31583:14
31456:16,20,22	31605:1,25 31606:3	organisation 31462:19	pages 31455:22	31568:8 31570:15

				Page 15
31590:16 31591:7,11	persons 31441:10	31555:21 31561:22	31490:20,20	practice 31440:9,10
31596:2 31597:1	31442:13 31509:11	31579:13 31594:24	31492:23 31495:21	31543:2,3
31600:23 31605:20	persuade 31514:2	31601:14,16	31497:14 31502:18	practices 31440:9
31606:8,24 31608:1	pertinent 31442:3	planned 31599:18	31503:10,16	practise 31467:6
31611:14	petrol 31576:14	31609:5	31505:15 31527:11	precedent 31542:21
particularly 31438:24	Phatsha 31507:17	planner 31594:21	31527:18 31529:2	31554:4
31440:8 31442:4	Phiyega 31514:14,14	31597:3,6	31541:16,24	precedes 31544:17
31455:15 31456:17	phone 31469:4,5,8,9,17	planners 31447:11	31542:13 31588:6	preceding 31482:19
31458:6 31459:19	31470:13,21,22,23	planning 31447:9	31589:1 31590:7,19	predeterminant
31462:22 31466:7	31471:1 31473:1,3,5	31450:3,7 31451:16	31590:22,25 31591:3	31562:2
31475:13 31484:4,17	31576:10,11,12	31452:1,3,7,16	policy 31445:7	predeterminants
31506:10 31598:18	31583:11 31584:4,16	31464:12 31466:9,21	31455:12	31550:21
parties 31503:18	31584:20 31585:1,3	31476:2 31479:24	polite 31473:15	predictable 31466:8
31509:11 31520:23	phoned 31469:7	31480:16 31486:12	Pondoland 31570:22	31474:14,15,17
31520:25 31521:2	31473:12	31494:22 31495:6	31570:24	31566:19,23
parts 31439:19,21	photographic 31567:18	31529:15 31540:22	Pondos 31570:23	preferable 31531:23
31581:4	photographs 31454:8,9	31540:25 31541:4,12	poor 31517:7 31607:9	preference 31532:16
party 31492:18,18	31600:21 31602:2	31548:2,7,20	31611:7,7	prejudices 31447:17
31524:9,20,23	31603:14	31553:15 31559:5,8	POP 31444:11	premise 31483:13
passage 31457:10	physics 31562:11	31559:10 31561:17	31452:10 31457:22	31541:12,15,22
31544:23	pick 31469:5	31562:5 31563:1,9,9	31463:7 31485:6	31542:4,8,11,22,24
passed 31515:19	picking 31468:19	31582:25 31585:11	31532:9,12	31543:19 31548:23
31516:10 31536:15	31586:12	31585:11,12,22	POPs 31469:21	31551:7 31552:11,22
31536:16,16 31589:3	picture 31522:12	31595:15 31597:2,6	population 31594:17	31552:22,24,25
patient 31505:1,3,4	31565:2 31577:20	31599:5,16,23	posed 31555:4	31557:17 31562:10
patrolling 31549:18	31585:9	plannings 31495:4	posing 31560:20	31586:6 31598:8
pause 31456:21 31475:18	piece 31443:12 31471:16 31489:20	plans 31450:14 31544:19	position 31442:23 31457:4,5 31460:21	premises 31562:17 preparation 31481:6
paused 31450:5	31564:19 31583:14	plastic 31576:16,18	31461:17 31471:16	31486:12
pauseu 31430.5 pay 31569:3	31583:18 31586:18	play 31501:24 31517:8	31479:2 31486:23	prepared 31522:1,19
peace 31490:18	31589:22 31591:7,14	31525:11	31488:15 31509:14	31525:4 31526:18
31491:1,20 31492:7	31595:2 31596:22	played 31495:16	31517:15 31518:10	31586:20 31596:1
31492:10 31493:2,9	31605:20 31606:8	31504:1	31518:14 31524:11	preparing 31493:10
31494:16 31501:16	pieces 31587:13	players 31496:2	31525:16 31538:10	presence 31459:24
31551:5	31590:1 31592:7,19	31497:22 31510:17	31540:10 31541:3	31461:8 31590:19,23
peaceful 31494:17	31595:18 31596:2	playing 31493:3,15	31571:22 31573:18	31590:25
peacefully 31488:7	place 31444:10	31517:8	positions 31565:12	present 31442:7
penetrate 31564:25	31459:14 31467:21	plays 31493:17	possessed 31505:21	31460:8 31506:23
31586:1	31483:20 31484:15	pleaded 31568:19	possession 31510:2	presented 31479:18
perceive 31443:1	31515:17 31526:1	pleading 31568:12,18	31575:19	31483:14,16
31448:2 31560:22	31538:5 31549:3	31569:5	possibility 31546:24	presenting 31485:9
perceived 31443:5	31550:1 31563:9,10	please 31454:9,16	31548:2 31590:21	president 31507:14
31456:8	31588:8,25 31591:3	31462:7 31483:20	possible 31439:2	31567:22 31568:11
perceives 31448:21	31606:19	31489:2 31501:7	31492:6 31495:1	pressure 31477:8
perfectly 31536:10	placed 31442:23	31568:12	31501:23 31517:21	presumably 31487:5
perform 31457:22	31448:9 31524:24	pleased 31438:4	31528:10 31548:13	31505:20 31515:5
period 31458:13	31590:11	31511:4	31606:12 31607:23	31600:23 31601:1
31467:21 31468:13	places 31571:22	plenty 31578:23	possibly 31444:19	presume 31509:19
31530:22,25 31587:7	31572:3 31601:15	plinth 31490:17	31506:5 31523:17	Pretorius 31439:17
31595:18 31596:17	placing 31457:5	plus 31453:4 31459:9	31547:3 31586:21	31465:5,8,14 31469:3
31605:5,13	31540:23	pocket 31471:2	31587:1 31601:1	Pretorius's 31469:16
periods 31580:4	plain 31450:18	pointed 31479:9	31603:23	pretty 31469:25
peripheral 31470:18	plainly 31493:14	pointing 31596:2	post 31577:8	31473:4 31521:3
permanently 31571:20	plan 31450:15,15,23	points 31438:8 31441:3	potential 31473:22	31522:13
31571:24	31451:3,4,18,22,23	31455:5 31478:16	31485:3 31497:11	prevail 31492:9
permanents 31572:21	31451:25 31452:6,11	31510:12 31546:22	31543:19	previous 31458:16
permissible 31525:20	31452:23 31453:3,5	31547:2 31566:1	potentially 31459:9	31524:14 31539:4,5
permitted 31447:17	31453:19,24 31454:3	31570:17,17	31468:8 31479:16	31541:5,9 31556:8
perpetrator 31573:23	31456:11 31457:14	31596:21 31610:17	31498:20 31516:25	previously 31508:7
person 31442:12	31457:15,21,23	policeman 31444:3	31519:16,17 31533:9	31556:4 31565:24
31443:23 31471:24	31458:1,12 31459:4	31515:24	31560:24 31590:15	31581:6 31585:4
31559:11 31560:19	31462:19 31463:7,13	police's 31586:3	31591:17 31594:25	31594:21
31560:25 31563:4,19	31464:14 31474:21	police's 31547:1	31597:18 31598:7,11	pre-use 31581:3
31590:3 personalities 31582:9	31476:5 31485:2 31494:25 31529:17	policing 31483:8,18	31598:13	prima 31439:5 31445:4 31458:3 31547:4
personally 31576:5	31494:25 31529:17 31529:19 31530:5	31486:12,18,19 31487:16,21 31488:2	pour 31576:14 practicability 31483:9	31458:3 31547:4 31563:18 31564:2
personally 31576:5		51407.10,21 51400.2	practicability 51465.9	51505.10 51504:2
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A				

RealTime Transcriptions

primary 31502:23 principal 31559:24 principally 31468:25	mmofile 21572.20			
	profile 31573:20	31486:11,18	quest 31524:22	31558:11,11,13,15,25
nringinglly 21460.25	projectile 31527:22	31487:16,21 31488:1	questioned 31538:6	31559:16,16,18,21
principally 31468:25	proper 31496:9	31490:20 31491:4,13	questioning 31595:6	31561:8 31562:12,12
31470:8 31528:12	31501:24	31491:15,20	questions 31451:13	31562:14 31569:9
principle 31551:16	properly 31485:3	31492:19 31494:15	31477:23 31481:1	31581:5
31557:12	31501:5 31527:6	31494:22 31495:21	31486:21 31515:8	read 31438:6 31443:2,7
principles 31447:14	31588:2,8 31591:20	31496:3,23 31498:4,9	31517:18 31524:16	31462:16 31465:2
31448:7 31483:7,10	31596:20 31609:11	31498:10 31499:1	31540:19 31542:20	31467:1 31478:10,12
31485:8,12 31551:4	property 31536:23	31500:21 31501:16	31552:18 31553:21	31483:5 31487:6
31559:7	31549:17,24	31501:24 31503:16	31554:2 31588:2	31489:10,21
print 31523:12	proportionality	31505:14 31513:16	31594:11 31602:20	31494:10 31510:12
prior 31603:9	31443:21	31515:25 31527:18	31610:15 31611:19	31513:9 31521:12
priority 31550:2	proportionate	31527:23 31528:8	quite 31447:3 31466:17	31537:16,20
prisoners 31441:8	31443:17 31532:5	31529:13 31530:15	31467:11 31471:4,6	31547:17 31549:7
private 31486:10	proposal 31601:11	31530:17 31531:22	31477:7 31488:25	31555:2 31569:16
privilege 31441:20	proposes 31507:23	31532:19,24	31489:2 31496:17	31602:2
31569:24	proposing 31480:19	31538:12,14,16	31506:25 31511:21	reading 31486:3
proactive 31549:15	31601:22	31539:15,20,20	31515:2 31517:5	31566:6 31577:19
probably 31449:8	proposition 31457:1	31541:16,23	31565:4 31569:4	reads 31438:25
31459:12 31523:2	31492:16 31493:13	31542:13 31553:9	31570:11 31573:14	31512:15 31535:2
31558:14	31497:25 31501:19	31562:3 31565:5	31574:7 31582:5	ready 31530:9
probe 31495:14,15	31506:11 31527:18	31567:9 31577:1	31583:15 31590:9	31568:23 31601:10
31609:8,9	31543:4,13 31544:22	31606:13		read-across 31533:7,9
probing 31496:11	propositions 31494:19	published 31564:10	<u> </u>	31533:13
31506:17,19	protect 31444:23	puff 31560:24	radicalisation 31581:3	real 31498:18 31610:23
problem 31440:17	31464:5 31537:7	pull 31442:25	radio 31461:7	realise 31489:13
31444:1 31445:1	31549:16	pulling 31576:21	31463:23 31465:22	31511:12 31563:4
31446:1,12,13	protection 31441:19	purpose 31454:2	31465:24 31466:1,2	realised 31451:15
31451:17 31483:15	31463:21 31553:12	31462:18 31491:1	31466:13,15,17,23	reality 31493:7
31505:12,19	31553:19 31579:15	31547:12 31550:10	31467:1,7,11,23	really 31442:1 31450:7
31509:22,24	31581:15	31554:11,16,21	31468:20 31470:16	31450:19 31451:7
31517:12 31522:4	protective 31544:18 protest 31487:19,23	31558:21 31561:18	31470:17,20,24	31455:7 31473:14
31563:13 31595:25 problems 31440:4	31489:4 31600:6	purposes 31467:9 31478:19 31540:24	31471:9,13 31472:23	31490:12,20 31499:19 31513:10
31466:6,19 31467:7	protesters 31600:5,14	31605:7	31474:2,6,15,16,25 31576:12	31518:11,12,14
31467:23 31468:20	provably 31479:16	push 31560:9,13	radios 31466:6,19	31527:1,16 31528:7
31493:4 31505:24	31548:23,25	pushed 31503:5	31467:18 31472:9	31553:24 31567:10
31509:16 31572:11	31552:12 31553:13	pusited 31303.5	rage 31561:2	31572:16 31573:10
procedure 31439:1	31553:17,21	31447:10,23	raise 31467:5 31476:16	31597:21,22 31601:8
31549:25 31551:10	proven 31553:13	31449:15 31450:17	31519:7 31593:10	31611:5
procedures 31443:4	proves 31535:14	31471:1 31496:11	raised 31476:15	reason 31458:9,10
proceed 31450:23	provide 31439:14	31500:21 31509:15	31519:21 31525:7	31462:15 31467:20
31481:5 31516:4	31497:15 31524:2	31515:2 31517:6	raises 31451:13	31467:22 31472:2
proceeded 31451:12	31607:19	31542:18,22 31543:4	31558:18 31561:24	31492:9 31533:8
31457:21	provided 31439:24	31543:9,13 31544:22	31594:11	31560:3 31592:1
proceeding 31450:1	31465:21 31497:7,9	31547:4 31550:1,7	raising 31572:8	reasonable 31471:15
PROCEEDINGS	31523:24 31592:5	31554:5 31562:22	ran 31523:14 31563:16	31496:16 31497:25
31438:1	31603:14	31565:11 31571:23	31576:1	31542:9 31545:19
process 31454:24	provides 31473:2	31572:18 31573:13	range 31582:8	31548:19 31557:13
31522:16,22	province 31512:17	31576:16,18,19	ranging 31531:8	31558:5,7 31559:8,10
31535:18 31537:14	31569:20 31608:10	31582:16,18	rank 31469:20 31532:3	31563:3
31538:7,17,25	31608:12	31588:23 31590:22	31536:17 31574:11	reasonably 31450:12
31545:8 31600:17	provision 31475:25	31602:16 31606:20	31574:24	31496:5
31601:5 31603:16	31476:3,4,6,25	31607:5 31611:20	Rasta 31576:20	reasons 31477:1
31605:5,13 31607:3	provisional 31512:9	puts 31594:21	rates 31540:6	31508:4,11,17
processed 31602:16	31522:19 31605:4	putting 31492:16	rational 31565:16	31515:1
processes 31596:19	provisions 31457:17	31493:14 31494:19	rationale 31457:8	recall 31468:2
31607:13	31549:6	31506:11 31544:18	RDOs 31526:6 31535:3	31572:23
produce 31492:1	provoke 31544:21	31550:9 31558:3	reach 31474:2	recapping 31544:10
31510:18	31556:22	31572:17	31560:11	receive 31447:22
	provoked 31564:17	pyrotechnics 31559:20	reached 31474:9	31595:10 31599:6
produced 31507:20	1 1 01 17 (00 01		31593:11 31601:7	received 31522:17
produced 31507:20 31558:1 31604:4	proximity 31476:20,21	~		
produced 31507:20 31558:1 31604:4 producing 31500:2	psychologists 31582:3	Q	31603:17	31523:3 31588:7
produced 31507:20 31558:1 31604:4 producing 31500:2 professional 31464:3,8	psychologists 31582:3 public 31472:12	qualified 31539:21,24	react 31602:11	receives 31445:15
produced 31507:20 31558:1 31604:4 producing 31500:2	psychologists 31582:3			

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page
recognise 31443:8,16	31467:2 31479:18	replaying 31611:18	respond 31444:6	revise 31478:7
recognised 31441:16	31485:16 31513:6,7	reply 31478:17	31452:4 31464:4	revision 31448:6
31442:15 31479:16	31551:2 31560:4	31591:10	31480:4 31483:2	re-examination
31551:3	31588:2 31592:6,20	report 31457:11	31506:22 31518:25	31547:19
recommendation	31595:11 31604:17	31496:25 31535:3	31564:2 31597:17	rifles 31452:15
31501:10	31606:23	reportable 31602:16	responded 31588:21	right 31487:18,18,24
recommendations	regroup 31465:14	reported 31461:17	31589:4	31487:25 31488:2,5,5
31501:25 31519:24	regular 31600:12	31604:6,9	responders 31476:6	31488:14,21,23,24
31520:5	regulation 31457:17	report-back 31608:5	responding 31455:8	31489:4,6 31490:13
reconsider 31475:18	31489:7 31490:6,13	represent 31480:3	31463:24 31536:9	31490:21 31491:15
record 31449:15	31491:7 31494:3	31535:11,24	31588:16	31491:23 31492:20
31478:5 31483:6	reinforce 31596:21	representatives	responds 31595:9	31493:14 31494:2,8
31486:4 31489:18	reinforces 31480:12	31511:3	response 31441:1	31494:25 31495:7,11
31514:19 31526:15	relate 31495:3	represents 31486:11	31467:24 31477:18	31496:9,14,19
31535:1 31544:1	31500:12 31586:22	request 31478:6,12	31477:22 31479:8,10	31498:10,15 31499:4
31547:16,17 31607:2	related 31487:23	31512:1 31513:13	31483:5,19 31485:1	31499:11 31501:2
recorded 31543:23	31588:3	31515:18 31594:3	31528:14 31531:5,6	31504:3,20 31509:25
recording 31467:7,10	relates 31546:17	31602:4,8 31603:12	31532:16,20 31533:1	31513:11 31516:8
31467:14	relating 31455:23	31610:3	31533:2 31546:16	31519:10 31527:5,24
refer 31485:22	31475:22 31538:19	requested 31595:14	31550:25 31552:11	31528:9 31538:15,23
31524:15 31534:23	relations 31490:6	31597:1 31605:23	31555:3 31562:24	31541:13 31545:4,22
31544:24 31549:15	31506:3 31600:22	require 31439:8	31564:8 31588:11	31549:19 31550:10
31567:6 31568:11	relative 31495:21	31505:15 31529:19	31592:9,25 31596:6	31552:8 31566:20
31574:1 31585:2	relatively 31551:3	required 31448:23	31597:2 31602:3	31574:7 31582:23
31591:3 31601:11	31588:17	31457:18 31529:16	31603:11 31610:4	31588:5 31589:1
reference 31449:15	relayed 31471:17	31601:17	responses 31590:18	31603:4 31604:15
31452:6 31462:3,9	relevance 31438:9	requirement 31460:5	responsibilities	31611:10
31484:2 31494:21	31483:9 31526:21	31460:20 31464:15	31459:21 31460:2,15	rightly 31479:9
31506:18 31509:12	relevant 31439:22	31476:4 31498:7	31502:21,24 31503:2	rights 31448:6
31543:7,21 31544:13	31445:10 31452:1	31592:22 31594:22	31517:20 31525:15	31502:20,23,24
31546:17 31547:6,14	31467:5 31510:13	31595:7 31596:4	responsibility 31460:9	31523:4,7 31598:5
31547:16,17,19	reliable 31585:21	31599:3,11 31604:18	31460:15 31475:14	ringing 31525:17,23
31554:18 31557:8	reliance 31540:6	requires 31502:13	31488:1 31524:20	rings 31471:2
31561:13 31568:15	relieve 31441:7	requiring 31533:1	31526:3 31527:4,5	riot 31441:22 31470:21
31580:7,8 31581:24	rely 31538:22	resentment 31573:6	responsible 31463:8	risk 31529:18 31543:23
31594:14 31606:5	relying 31559:10	reserved 31529:14	31488:13 31560:19	31548:13
referenced 31449:9	31608:19	residence 31601:16	rest 31443:14 31506:21	ritual 31577:7
references 31546:15	remain 31462:20	residents 31500:14	31518:18,19,21	rituals 31481:25
referencing 31462:13	31463:6 31600:14,15	resist 31611:22	31519:1,23 31560:21	31556:21,21
	remained 31600:8	resistance 31611:4	31519:1,25 51500.21	
referred 31450:2,6				31565:21 31566:10
31453:21 31456:4	31610:12	resistant 31598:13	result 31466:17	roads 31594:16
31482:5 31483:8	remains 31591:13	resisted 31479:20	31506:20,25	31595:3
31494:3 31497:13	remarks 31497:11	resisting 31510:25	31511:25 31548:21	robberies 31528:13,21
31524:17 31534:9	31559:7	31598:17	31549:1 31556:6	31528:21,22,24
31551:4 31580:22	remember 31451:23	resolution 31500:21	31558:25 31562:25	31531:3 31532:9
31587:14 31590:9	31460:24 31472:18	resolve 31453:13	31567:24 31570:1	robbery 31528:17,19
31600:2	31507:19 31553:6	31490:7 31493:3	31606:18	31528:24 31529:5,6,7
referring 31449:21	31583:17	resolved 31465:7	resultant 31497:2	31531:14 31532:13
31452:22 31474:12	remembered 31584:7	31567:9	31499:10	rock 31570:18,19
31489:21 31497:10	remind 31552:10	resolving 31513:16	resulted 31468:22	role 31453:22,23
31526:11 31553:5	remiss 31591:23	resources 31449:25	31499:11 31541:17	31455:1,6 31471:7,20
31581:1	31593:1 31594:2	31456:14 31460:7,21	31548:18 31559:4	31471:22 31493:3
refers 31581:9	31606:24 31608:22	31474:20 31494:6	results 31601:8	31495:16 31496:2,12
reflect 31456:22	remissness 31592:16	31589:10,10,23	31602:1	31496:13,14 31497:6
31518:2	31592:20 31594:1	31590:6	resumes 31438:2	31497:18,22,24
reflection 31511:24	remit 31572:5 31605:9	respect 31447:21	31481:11,12	31498:3,9
refuse 31444:12	remove 31479:19	31448:1 31449:11	31520:14,15 31546:4	roles 31460:1 31494:24
31445:20	removed 31550:15	31452:2 31465:22	31546:5 31593:19,20	31497:1
	render 31537:23	31472:7 31475:24	retaliated 31575:24	role-players 31492:2,5
	1 CHUCI 51551.45	31477:16,23	retreat 31452:11	31493:22 31494:23
refused 31510:2	reorganisation			
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14	reorganisation		returning 31/155.10	roll 31/15/22/21/150221
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14 31449:24 31463:12	31462:19	31481:22 31483:3	returning 31455:19	roll 31452:24 31459:21
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14 31449:24 31463:12 31499:15 31508:24	31462:19 repeat 31462:7 31489:2	31481:22 31483:3 31493:22 31510:7,19	reveal 31577:19	31566:24 31568:3
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14 31449:24 31463:12 31499:15 31508:24 31521:23 31524:19	31462:19 repeat 31462:7 31489:2 31498:25 31499:1	31481:22 31483:3 31493:22 31510:7,19 31523:21 31542:24	reveal 31577:19 revealed 31577:22	31566:24 31568:3 rolled 31453:1 31459:3
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14 31449:24 31463:12 31499:15 31508:24 31521:23 31524:19 31538:9 31587:6	31462:19 repeat 31462:7 31489:2 31498:25 31499:1 31548:15 31557:25	31481:22 31483:3 31493:22 31510:7,19 31523:21 31542:24 31543:2 31558:12	reveal 31577:19 revealed 31577:22 revealing 31579:2	31566:24 31568:3 rolled 31453:1 31459:3 31542:5,7,15
refused 31510:2 regard 31439:14 31449:24 31463:12 31499:15 31508:24 31521:23 31524:19	31462:19 repeat 31462:7 31489:2 31498:25 31499:1	31481:22 31483:3 31493:22 31510:7,19 31523:21 31542:24	reveal 31577:19 revealed 31577:22	31566:24 31568:3 rolled 31453:1 31459:3

				Page 18
31548:9,17,20	sangoma 31565:1	31561:12	31560:24 31561:19	31490:5 31560:16
31549:1 31568:6	Sangoma's 31556:19	scope 31445:21	31566:20 31568:2	31585:13
rollout 31458:12	SAPS 31465:21	Scotland 31439:12	31575:1,9,10,19	sets 31475:21
Roman 31544:10	31466:2,14 31477:18	Scott 31452:17 31453:3	31578:19 31582:12	Setswana 31571:1
roots 31571:23 31604:4	31477:22 31478:5,12	31476:6 31533:10	31590:25 31593:7	31573:3
round 31448:4	31478:16,17	31543:23 31544:3	31600:4,11 31606:24	setting 31543:10
31464:20 31480:20	31480:11 31483:3,6,7	31546:15 31553:16	31608:7 31609:24	settlement 31463:2,21
31531:25 31532:1	31483:15 31484:10	31561:22 31592:21	seeing 31537:4 31560:7	31464:5 31536:21
31560:21,23	31484:16,24 31485:2	31594:3,15,24	seeking 31445:5	31601:4
rounds 31442:12	31485:14 31486:13	31595:6 31596:4,8	31535:12 31594:20	seven 31611:16,17
31448:1 31459:8,9	31510:12 31522:18	31597:9 31599:1,12	31597:16	shack 31601:4
31528:5 31531:14	31540:20 31605:9	31604:18 31608:2,12	seen 31441:23 31461:6	sharp 31483:11
route 31578:15	satisfaction 31591:16	Scott's 31456:25	31470:4,5 31476:11	31484:23,25
routinely 31529:12,14	satisfied 31448:13	31508:8 31522:24	31485:21 31494:9	shield 31497:21
31530:19	Saturday 31536:12,12	31546:13 31605:22	31513:12 31516:17	shielding 31579:5
Roux 31438:12,13	save 31572:6	31610:3	31520:24 31521:1,2,5	shocking 31576:24
31439:23 31440:6,11	saw 31513:25 31533:10	screen 31534:3,6,20,22	31521:10,21 31522:2	shoot 31575:24
31440:15,18,22	31576:3,7,8,11,13,20	scrutiny 31499:24	31522:12 31558:19	shooting 31537:5
31446:11,23	31576:20 31586:15	31507:10 31511:4	31564:10,11	31575:24 31576:8,9
31447:19 31448:16	saying 31444:18	31545:22	31565:23 31567:17	shop 31507:15
31449:6,14 31455:19	31454:4 31463:12	search 31447:2	31567:22 31568:5	shops 31527:8
31457:11 31459:20	31470:1 31471:9,10	31601:12,17	31569:22 31570:8	short 31447:2 31480:20
31461:23 31462:6,9	31475:10 31490:3	31604:12 searched 31456:19	31578:24 31583:15	31481:9 31525:9
31462:15 31464:19 31465:20 31466:22	31496:18 31498:2 31499:19 31509:6	searching 31530:18	31592:2 sees 31530:14	shorthand 31481:21 shot 31449:2 31486:9
31465.20 31460.22 31467:17 31468:19	31510:21 31528:18	second 31438:15	self 31486:10	31537:7 31563:20
31407.17 31408.19	31532:6 31541:22	31452:20 31453:5,21	self-defence 31445:25	shots 31448:12,17,24
31475:19 31477:13	31543:15 31545:2	31475:5 31478:2	self-standing 31439:21	31448:25 31449:5
31477:20 31478:4	31548:4,12 31551:20	31480:1 31502:25	selves 31523:9	31563:25 31579:3
31479:3,6 31480:17	31553:11 31557:22	31534:19 31546:17	Semenya's 31551:9	shottists 31447:6
31480:23 31481:1,8	31564:21 31567:25	31555:14 31571:4	31582:15 31584:16	shoulder 31471:6,13,23
31481:15,16,19	31568:4 31572:24	31591:22 31606:1	send 31456:15 31519:9	shouldn't 31481:17
31482:2,9,15,24	31576:22 31584:7	secondly 31448:7	31531:3 31532:12,14	31504:11 31505:21
31485:24 31486:20	31591:24 31592:9,16	31450:1 31546:17	31532:16,19,20	31505:22 31506:4
31486:22 31497:10	31594:2,8 31596:3,21	31548:24 31587:25	31587:18	31608:10
31523:20 31543:18	31598:3 31599:10	section 31443:15	sending 31531:5	shouting 31470:11
31544:6,9,12 31546:9	31603:1 31605:15	31449:16 31457:17	senior 31442:7 31445:1	shoved 31470:21
31547:13 31595:6,9	31607:1 31608:10,25	31465:23 31475:20	31460:4 31468:6,10	show 31455:14 31468:3
rover 31451:10	says 31443:10	31483:2 31494:5,12	31469:17,20 31471:5	31498:21 31511:17
31513:22 31540:9,16	31444:17 31446:11	31498:20 31549:10	31472:12 31475:13	31522:11 31553:18
31553:6	31451:8 31458:17	31549:23 31555:12	31531:18 31590:3	31554:17 31561:23
rubber 31519:8	31462:17 31466:22	31556:1 31579:1	sense 31559:14	31596:19
31527:21 31536:19	31473:19 31479:11	sections 31535:9	31573:11 31611:7	showing 31522:4
31564:25	31494:10 31501:10	security 31536:18,18	sensible 31551:15	shown 31476:10
rule 31528:7	31501:14 31526:24	31537:5 31574:23	sent 31465:5 31589:2,2	31534:6
rules 31438:22	31534:3 31536:12	31575:15,23,25	separate 31441:14	shows 31459:23
31445:20 31490:5	31537:3,3 31547:11	31576:1,4,6,8,9,12,14	31466:11	31476:20 31497:10 21526:2
31495:22 31503:7 31552:17	31549:14,24 31550:1	31576:16,17,20,21	separately 31465:25 sequentially 31556:13	31536:3 sick 31504:25
31552:17 run 31472:16 31558:15	31551:15 31552:1 31577:12 31578:8	31588:9,25 31606:12 security's 31576:10	sequentially 31556:15 serious 31441:11	sick 31504:25 side 31450:18 31460:24
31563:11,12,15	31594:23 31605:2	see 31438:5,8 31440:23	31460:19 31486:11	31461:3,21 31508:14
31578:9	scale 31596:17	31443:12,18	31486:17,18	31547:1 31579:1
runners 31472:5,15,19	scattering 31459:8,14	31444:18 31445:22	31509:22 31510:5	sight 31579:5
running 31536:19	scene 31449:8,11,16,20	31447:2,14 31455:2	31528:22,24 31531:3	significant 31455:15
31596:17	31449:23 31450:2,2,6	31456:23 31461:24	31532:8	31480:9 31485:5
rush 31575:16	31450:12 31451:21	31462:3 31472:7	seriously 31568:22	31511:18,22 31512:2
Rustenburg 31570:20	31451:24 31452:18	31493:3,22 31497:1	31569:7 31585:12,15	31512:18,25
31570:25 31572:21	31453:2,3 31455:16	31499:6 31500:18	seriousness 31465:6	31539:24 31583:16
R12 31600:16	31455:20,23 31456:1	31502:1 31510:10	serves 31443:15	31590:4 31596:10
R5 31452:15	31456:4 31457:19,25	31512:20 31517:19	31463:22 31586:19	31598:18
20 40 400	31458:16,18,19	31518:17,23 31524:4	service 31438:21	significantly 31595:20
- R S C CC	31460:6,10 31461:1	31524:23 31527:17	31500:20 31588:15	31599:15
safeguard 31549:16	31469:18,25	31530:4 31531:23	set 31444:25 31447:15	signs 31466:1,25
safety 31606:15	31470:11 31475:4	31535:13 31536:11	31455:10,22	silver 31529:16
salaries 31512:19	31476:9,10,22	31537:7 31549:12	31460:19 31466:2	31530:6,10
salary 31511:18	31507:8 31515:19	31555:16,17 31558:9	31468:16 31483:19	similar 31451:10
ARCHIVE FO	R JUSTICE		1	1

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 1
31513:22 31519:25	skill 31519:7 31562:3	South 31488:16	spread 31577:23	31479:7,10,12
31552:7 31582:14	slack 31610:25	31491:11 31500:20	SSU 31533:6,11	31480:1,6,8,9,18
similarly 31469:6	slightly 31439:6	31512:17 31518:19	stabbed 31576:6,7	31482:17,18,25
31524:9,24	31440:4 31450:19	31519:1 31520:6	stabbing 31576:20	31483:1 31484:22
simple 31445:25	31462:6 31527:18	31523:4,6 31539:14	stadium 31535:5,7	31486:1 31507:20
31467:15	31537:14 31541:2	31541:16,24	31536:13,23	31508:19 31512:6,9
simply 31439:9	slogans 31536:15	31542:13 31548:5,15	stage 31456:15	31513:2 31521:1
31452:3 31456:12	slow 31465:13 31469:2	31553:9 31562:21,23	31459:17 31476:22	31522:19,21 31523:6
31458:11 31465:2	31475:17	31563:6 31573:11,13	31490:1 31497:5	31523:10 31524:15
31468:15 31469:15	small 31595:2	31579:23 31593:4	31499:22 31504:7	31532:11,23 31533:3
31469:25 31472:25	smaller 31479:15	31595:23	31520:11 31522:3	31533:18,20,22,23
31473:24 31480:11	31482:4,10	so-called 31571:7	31535:22 31546:25	31534:13,18,19,21,23
31518:24 31519:19	smallholdings 31572:7	sparse 31592:14,15	31561:22 31583:25	31536:3 31543:5,10
31578:2 31598:22	smoke 31560:24	sparsity 31589:20	31593:11 31601:14	31543:20 31544:7,24
sincerely 31608:16	snipers 31533:10,11	31594:6,7	31601:16,24,24	31546:12 31553:5
singing 31536:15	social 31580:23	speak 31513:11	31603:7 31604:1	31574:19,20,21,21
single 31492:22,22	31581:10	31570:24 31571:1	staged 31496:3	31577:12 31580:8
31517:18 31521:1	societies 31490:25	31573:3 31587:19	stages 31452:24	31587:14 31592:2
31523:19 31531:25	society 31491:14	speaker 31473:6	stakeholder 31492:22	31594:13 31600:19
31562:19,20,23	sole 31509:7	speaking 31572:1	31502:1	31605:4,15 31606:5
31578:14 31581:14	solicit 31534:2	speaks 31490:21	stakeholders 31491:22	31606:12
31581:16 31584:3	31555:20 31566:21	spears 31500:23	31492:8,11 31495:16	statements 31477:25
31608:1	solve 31517:11	31520:7 31575:17	31499:16 31500:7,15	31478:18,19 31480:7
sir 31471:13 31488:25	somebody 31529:7	special 31533:6,11	31517:25 31518:13	31481:22 31483:8,22
31574:18 31605:12	someone's 31531:10	specialist 31446:17	31525:14 31526:1	31483:25 31484:11
31605:17 31606:23	songs 31536:15	31485:5 31488:13	stand 31489:24	31487:4 31507:22,23
31607:4,18	soon 31506:25	specially 31531:6	31587:23	31520:22,25 31521:2
sit 31503:18 31562:6	31507:24	31533:5	standard 31559:19	31521:5 31534:9,12
sitting 31454:14	sorry 31441:10	specific 31438:19	standing 31438:16,22	31534:16 31540:9
31605:12	31449:14 31454:6,18	31462:12 31473:11	31438:23 31439:19	31553:18 31564:10
situated 31524:9	31460:12 31467:4	31494:16 31536:8	31439:25 31440:14	31564:11,14
situation 31439:6	31476:13,13 31478:9	31549:2 31550:11	31443:21 31446:2,4,6	31573:21 31577:17
31440:13 31442:19	31478:10 31491:5	31556:25 31557:8	31476:20 31485:13	states 31466:13
31442:22 31444:3,4	31493:25 31507:4	31564:15,19 31570:8	31489:21 31490:11	static 31549:16
31444:10,18 31445:3	31514:4,22 31520:24	31580:7 31590:1,13	31490:12 31549:6,23	station 31441:6,12,15
31445:4,25 31447:6	31536:6 31541:1	31594:12 31595:4,13	31550:8 31551:11,13	31530:1
31447:10,13 31448:9	31548:11 31572:15	31595:24 31596:12	31551:15 31555:12	stationary 31463:2
31450:4 31451:2,18 31456:16 31459:7,13	31573:1 31580:20 31583:5 31585:14	31596:22 31601:11 specifically 31441:17	31556:2 31579:2 31598:4,5	31469:25 stations 31461:12
31460:2 31465:6	31589:16 31595:12	31444:9 31446:16	stands 31541:8	statute 31490:13
31469:8,14 31470:19	sort 31442:13,15	31456:4 31462:17	31575:14	statutes 31490.13
31474:23 31484:19	31444:2 31448:6,22	31466:13 31473:17	start 31438:14 31487:1	statutory 31459:5
31485:6,7,9 31486:13	31453:2,5 31456:24	31487:23 31511:19	31516:13 31520:20	stay 31450:17 31571:20
31490:24 31492:9,23	31457:1 31458:22	31526:23 31529:22	31534:2 31554:2	31571:24
31494:13 31500:12	31459:2,6,18 31466:9	31551:5 31557:20	31561:20 31574:2	staying 31459:20
31502:14 31504:25	31468:14 31470:3,17	31559:2 31560:17	31590:25	steal 31527:8
31518:8 31519:25	31474:1,3 31476:8	31562:16 31565:10	started 31507:5,25	step 31452:12 31455:13
31528:23 31529:4,5	31479:16 31484:8,20	31577:13 31579:19	31510:15 31523:11	31550:1 31555:14
31530:4,15,21	31486:16 31493:5,9	31584:25 31592:12	31535:3 31536:18,19	31556:1
31531:21 31532:25	31497:11,11	31592:23 31594:12	31567:20 31575:24	stepped 31561:5
31533:2 31541:10,23	31505:24 31513:4	31596:9	31580:14	steps 31609:14
31543:9 31559:3	31517:17 31518:9	specified 31442:12	starting 31438:3	stewards 31507:15
31560:8 31561:16,24	31524:1 31528:23	spectrum 31485:9	31462:16 31566:20	STF 31533:7,13
31562:13 31566:3,24	31541:3 31547:9	speculate 31610:8	31566:24,25 31568:1	sticks 31600:25
31575:25 31580:3	31570:2 31572:8	speed 31527:7	31568:3	stones 31578:25
31590:10	31577:7 31578:2	spelt 31569:4	starts 31458:23	stop 31445:17 31449:2
situations 31438:22	31580:19 31581:7,12	spent 31508:11	31550:2 31575:8	31453:11,14 31469:2
31442:21 31450:9	31581:13,14,15,16	31530:18 31570:7	state 31444:2 31483:6	31475:8,17 31486:19
31474:13 31491:3,18	31582:18 31594:18	31600:20	stated 31478:7,7,13,23	31535:12 31536:16
31492:11 31498:6	31597:25	spirit 31525:4	31508:18 31607:2	31565:18
31500:7 31513:24	sorts 31572:11 31582:8	31526:18	statement 31449:9,16	stopped 31450:5
31525:3 31526:17	31598:6	spoke 31547:7 31571:2	31449:21 31455:17	31451:11 31456:19
31538:15 31539:21	Sotho 31571:9	spoken 31465:8	31455:21 31461:25	31536:17
31567:9 31577:6	sought 31594:15,16	31568:7	31462:10 31464:22	stopping 31454:3
six 31455:22	sounds 31611:21	spontaneous 31495:4	31465:23 31475:21	31510:20,24
skew 31496:25	source 31598:23	spray 31531:9,9	31478:22,25 31479:4	Stott 31580:9,11
ARCHIVE FO	R JUSTICE			

RealTime Transcriptions

Pretoria

				Page 20
Stott's 31580:21	31502:25 31504:14	31532:23 31553:17	31598:8,8,9,15	telephone 31465:8,16
street 31472:19	31535:25 31567:5	31556:9 31558:13	31603:3,17 31606:19	31473:7
31527:9	31585:17 31599:12	31559:19 31580:10	31608:8 31611:15	television 31472:8
strength 31504:20	suggested 31452:11	31583:14,16	taken 31444:12	tell 31445:24 31446:8
31538:3	31461:5,6 31556:5	31590:16 31592:10	31453:11 31454:8,9	31464:9 31469:11
stress 31448:24	31561:22 31564:10	31594:9 31599:4	31467:21 31485:3	31501:23 31505:9,10
31455:16 31548:9	31564:11 31587:8	31604:2 31605:8	31490:7 31555:13,15	31506:8 31518:18
stretching 31526:14	suggesting 31452:6,19	31607:6	31556:7,10 31559:15	31519:1 31521:21
strike 31512:16	31520:1,4 31566:5	surely 31475:6	31563:17 31569:7	31588:17 31602:5
31535:2	31578:13 31585:16	31611:10	31587:18 31602:9	telling 31460:16
strikers 31450:17	suggestion 31510:25	surgeon 31505:7	31609:14	31514:7 31598:10
31480:14 31481:24	31540:16 31544:19	surprise 31466:20	takes 31451:10	tells 31506:3 31565:1
31483:14 31498:14	31548:25 31603:24	31550:16 31555:24	31464:13	31600:17
31499:4 31502:7	suggests 31475:1	31556:8,10 31557:22	talk 31446:17,18	tend 31585:17
31503:1 31504:11	31480:10 31531:13	31557:23 31578:10	31502:21 31503:12	tends 31448:14
31505:17 31507:18	31539:19 31555:3	surprised 31441:4	31505:20,25	tension 31561:24
31509:21,24	31563:5 31567:18	31470:1 31472:6,14	31506:23 31513:24	31594:18
31510:23 31511:9	31585:25 31594:15	31496:17 31587:6,21	31515:19 31521:25	term 31442:14
31513:10,13 31514:3	31598:16	31591:25	31532:13,24	31466:14 31571:16
31514:8,23 31516:2,3	summarise 31449:11	surprises 31551:6,16	31533:10 31540:22	31592:22
31516:10 31517:9	31464:24 31475:23	surrounded 31456:15	31551:5 31557:5	terms 31441:21
31525:21 31533:17	31477:21 31479:1	31456:18	31580:24 31584:13	31443:22 31452:7
31543:24 31544:21	31524:2	survived 31477:12	31584:23 31598:20	31459:7 31466:9,23
31564:12	summarised 31569:11	suspects 31606:14	31600:2 31603:1	31483:7 31484:12
striker's 31508:14	summarises 31486:2	Swaziland 31570:22	talked 31441:4,17	31489:11 31497:6
strong 31537:7	summary 31478:3	sweeping 31463:14	31450:8 31469:3	31506:18 31509:11
31573:14	31480:2 31512:13	swotting 31528:19	31505:17,18	31517:6 31538:17
strongly 31573:17	31573:17	sympathy 31484:12	31516:23 31563:9	31550:8 31553:12
31589:11	summing 31484:21	31598:6	31580:20 31601:13	31561:17 31562:5
structure 31494:4	Sunday 31574:8,22	sync 31464:14	31608:2	31563:1 31565:14,22
struggled 31595:17	31575:9 31588:4,4,18	system 31472:5,14	talking 31473:10	31566:11 31575:12
study 31491:7	31588:22	31490:5 31572:9	31476:12 31490:23	31577:7
stun 31557:10,14,21	supervision 31442:8	31606:21	31502:20 31514:2	tersely 31447:15
31558:2,6,12,13	supplementary	s.u.o 31438:11	31535:11,24	test 31483:9 31545:19
31559:3 31562:16,20	31449:9,21 31461:25	31481:14 31520:17	31544:15 31554:18	31557:13
31563:10,14,18,21,23	31462:10 31464:21	31546:7 31593:22	31562:13 31567:20	testified 31521:24
31563:25 31564:5	31480:18 31482:25		31584:7 31588:9	31522:6
subject 31447:1,3	31483:1 31484:22	T	31597:12	testify 31510:25
31457:12 31515:6	31523:6 31524:15	tactical 31471:7,10	talks 31441:9 31442:5	testimony 31477:16
31603:22	31533:18,20,22	31480:13 31528:3	31443:16 31463:23	text 31465:5 31587:18
subjected 31564:12	31534:18 31543:20	31529:14,19	31492:7 31505:5,6,7	thank 31438:9,14
submission 31504:19	31544:7,24 31566:13	31530:16 31531:7,19	31513:22 31553:6	31446:22,23
submissions 31508:24	support 31496:2	31549:15 31558:21	31566:9 31594:25	31449:18 31465:1
subsequent 31478:22	31530:16 31533:6,12	31559:24 31603:2	31595:7 31600:18	31469:23 31476:18
31591:10	31542:24 31547:10	tactics 31528:4	31606:8,11	31481:16 31486:20
subsequently 31477:11	31601:20 31605:1	take 31441:25 31445:8	tap 31471:13	31486:22 31487:13
31587:19	31606:10	31446:16 31457:24	target 31448:13,25	31493:20 31499:7
substance 31515:2	supportive 31516:15	31458:24 31461:14	31449:4	31506:12 31516:5
substantial 31449:22	31598:12	31463:4 31464:8,18	Taser 31531:11	31520:19 31521:18
substantially 31455:10	suppose 31452:23	31471:1 31475:7	task 31464:4 31467:13	31524:4,7 31545:1
31480:12,15	31453:8 31468:14	31480:19 31481:4,9	31517:14	31547:5,23 31554:8
succeed 31607:23	31469:12 31585:1	31484:15 31489:15	tasked 31463:14,17	31575:5 31577:15
success 31540:6	supposed 31451:25	31490:11 31494:13	taught 31583:2	31584:18 31593:17
31595:20	31453:24 31457:23	31508:18,22 31510:5	taxi 31536:17 31574:11	31593:25 31611:11
successes 31539:4	31458:24 31460:25	31512:3 31514:8,15	31574:24	31611:24
31541:8	31461:20 31463:1,4,7	31524:7 31527:5	tea 31520:11 31593:12	thanked 31446:24
successful 31492:19	31588:5 31608:24	31529:4 31530:8	31593:16 31594:7	themes 31580:14
sudden 31581:7	sure 31438:19 31439:7	31534:7 31536:2	team 31446:11,20	theories 31580:18
31590:24	31452:2 31459:8,11	31543:17 31546:1	31496:24 31497:5,21	31581:24
suffice 31471:3	31460:7 31464:16	31558:23 31560:17	31503:5 31521:4	theory 31581:13
51505.6	31469:5 31471:14	31561:11 31562:10	31522:9 31532:20	31582:4,17,22
sufficient 31469:17	31474:23 31490:9	31563:19 31564:15	31540:20 31570:2,6	there'd 31577:2
31476:7 31529:25	31496:1 31498:16,23	31568:1,22 31574:13	31605:9	31584:15
suggest 31451:16	31503:11 31504:4	31575:12 31580:4	teargas 31558:6	there's 31438:25
31452:20 31456:23	31506:7,10 31508:25	31581:16 31582:20	31559:21	31439:13,18
		- 71507777150771716		
31484:16 31496:21	31511:4 31521:2,3	31583:7 31593:12,16	teeth 31520:6	31440:23 31441:8

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

Pretoria

				Page 21
31443:2,9 31444:20	31518:2 31519:15	thrust 31510:7	31524:11 31596:23	31492:8 31493:12
31446:25 31447:3	31521:11 31527:8,10	Thursday 31534:3	tragic 31519:18	31497:21 31502:25
31449:3 31454:14	31530:6 31537:11	31535:2 31602:10,17	trailer 31546:23	31512:7 31513:20
31456:7 31457:4	31538:1 31553:21	31603:20,24	trailers 31544:20	31515:12 31523:17
31458:25 31459:25	31555:25 31556:4,9	31604:11	trained 31446:18	31523:25 31546:3
31460:10 31461:6	31559:20 31561:11	tidy 31589:16 31591:19	31447:25 31448:12	31547:1 31558:21
31466:15 31469:18	31564:11 31568:3	tight 31535:15	31449:4 31531:6	31559:13 31560:1,9
31474:1,13 31476:4	31585:15,17	tight-knit 31586:1	31532:10,21 31533:5	31565:10,11
31476:25 31478:11	31591:19 31594:18	time 31443:1 31449:2	training 31447:22	31566:15 31571:15
31482:4,19 31484:3,5	31598:6 31601:25	31451:24 31455:13	31448:3,5,7,15,24	31572:6 31573:21
31484:23 31503:8	31603:11 31606:9	31465:4,7 31467:21	31477:6 31532:6,7,7	31576:4 31590:7
31513:20 31528:20	31607:4,5	31468:13 31471:4	31580:12 31582:15	31592:4 31597:10
31529:25 31530:9	thinking 31445:14 31473:13 31561:18	31473:8 31477:5	31582:17,23	31600:22
31533:13 31535:20 31543:21 31544:12	31580:16 31581:17	31502:22 31506:20 31506:23 31508:11	transcript 31510:10 31515:4 31521:9	trying 31459:3 31469:4 31469:16 31470:12
31562:1 31564:16	31585:10	31513:2 31530:18,25	31543:5,7,21	31409.10 31470.12 31470.22 31499:21
31567:5 31572:11	thinks 31506:2,4	31531:12,18	31544:13 31546:11	31500:18 31514:2
31577:9 31579:24	31526:24	31540:15 31545:11	31595:4,5,8	31515:24 31516:19
31588:13 31590:21	third 31441:17 31454:5	31545:13,21	transcripts 31467:1	31521:25 31523:7
31593:1 31598:2	31454:7,19,20	31552:15 31555:5,22	31497:7 31521:11,23	31524:25 31536:2,4,7
31603:24 31610:9	31471:24 31600:2	31560:20 31562:23	31522:5,13 31523:12	31543:3 31562:4
they'd 31457:19	thought 31442:3	31567:19 31570:7	31523:23 31595:4	31572:25 31575:22
31568:21 31569:6	31451:7 31453:10	31573:5 31580:9	translate 31524:2	31577:24 31578:1
31604:12	31459:18 31480:21	31581:9 31582:5	translated 31450:21	31581:22 31591:19
they'll 31500:23	31503:15 31507:6	31588:18 31590:17	31523:25	31592:11 31594:9
31560:22,23,24	31508:6 31509:14	31596:17 31600:21	translation 31524:1	31597:9 31603:3
they're 31441:14	31510:8 31536:8	31602:11,15 31604:5	translations 31521:25	Tswana 31571:1,9
31444:5 31449:4	31537:23 31541:2,3	31605:5,10,14	31523:22	31573:3
31453:23 31456:16	31550:14 31585:15	times 31470:19	transmit 31472:16	TTT 31605:8
31460:8 31461:9,12	31604:1	31484:11 31510:4	transported 31496:6	TTT4 31466:11
31461:13,20 31472:9	thousand 31512:19,25	31564:16	treated 31573:11	TT4 31610:4
31474:24 31475:3,9	31513:5 31523:16	title 31567:23	treating 31477:2	TT5 31557:7 31586:15
31476:12 31477:3	thousands 31523:15	Tjevi 31576:11	tribal 31573:2	31605:2,8,10,16,18
31485:23 31525:16	threat 31443:1,5	today 31485:19	tribe 31573:3	31606:21 31607:10
31531:10,13	31445:13,16 31447:8	toilets 31536:17	trickier 31495:2	31608:19 31610:4
31532:21 31561:2,15	31448:2,14,21	Tokota 31476:15	tried 31479:19 31497:5	Turkey 31571:22
31563:20,20	31456:10 31457:4	told 31439:17 31445:7	31517:8 31522:11	turn 31479:7 31508:17
31565:14 31568:23 31572:5 31573:10,11	31464:6 31480:3,10 31483:4,12,13,16	31461:9,18 31467:22 31522:4 31536:22	31538:7 31545:7,8,9 31545:10 31570:2	turned 31547:20 Twala 31584:19
31578:25 31581:8	31484:3,5,25 31485:1	31537:6 31568:20	31573:20 31586:8	twelve 31512:19,24
31590:24	31485:3,4 31498:18	31569:4,6 31578:6	31607:23 31610:7	31513:5
they've 31450:13	31505:18 31527:25	31588:24 31603:19	tries 31506:1	two 31438:23,25
31522:3 31570:2	31528:3 31529:18,25	31604:3	trigger 31442:25	31439:7 31440:8,14
31571:24 31572:4	31530:5,20 31531:24	tolerance 31501:15	31541:11 31557:14	31448:12,24,25
thing 31446:19	31531:25 31532:5,25	tomorrow 31611:23	31558:7	31449:5 31450:21
31455:10 31469:2	31533:16 31560:5,20	tongue 31576:17	triggered 31557:11	31469:16 31471:6,7
31488:4 31490:19	31588:16 31590:8,23	top 31446:8 31490:10	triggering 31547:25	31471:23 31477:25
31517:24 31526:7	31591:4 31603:3	31543:20 31544:10	triggers 31558:2	31478:18,19
31528:25 31532:19	31609:7	31553:7 31609:24	trouble 31505:5	31481:22 31506:14
31572:8 31577:5	threatening 31529:8	topic 31449:7 31475:20	31587:18	31507:23 31512:2
31579:19 31580:25	threats 31482:12	31480:23	troubling 31490:3	31514:24,24
31581:8 31582:2	31484:15,20	topics 31439:21	TRT 31447:24	31515:23 31519:4
31588:23 31610:2,15	31485:16,20,23	totally 31580:2	31452:12 31456:20	31530:22 31534:16
things 31454:4 31455:3	31494:15 31505:23	track 31451:24	31457:23 31458:25	31546:3,14 31550:2
31464:11 31467:12	31597:25	31457:14 31458:1	31462:22,25 31463:6	31559:24 31563:25
31468:3 31470:19	three 31483:22,25	31604:5	31463:19	31570:16,17
31472:5 31473:8	31523:3 31565:23 31584:5 31586:21 22	trade 31506:2	true 31479:8 31480:7	31574:23 31576:3,12 31576:14 31578:2
31474:14,18 31477:6	31584:5 31586:21,22	31510:23 31511:10	31548:23,25	31576:14 31578:2
31479:13 31481:3 31487:20,22	31586:25 31587:1,2,8 31590:1 31592:7	traditional 31482:3,6 31484:1 31531:8	31552:12 31553:2,13 31553:17,22	31587:1,2,7 31590:1 31591:18 31592:7
31487:20,22 31488:20 31489:11	threefold 31453:8	31572:7 31580:18	31573:15	31591:18 31592:7 31601:25 31603:11
31493:10 31495:11	threshold 31443:13	traffic 31438:4 31466:7	truncheon 31531:8	31606:25 31608:8
31497:23 31502:4,5,6	31448:22	31466:18,18 31467:7	Truth 31461:17	31610:15,17
31502:21 31505:20	throwing 31578:25	31467:11 31474:15	truthful 31478:9,15	two/three 31607:11
31506:14 31508:20	31608:9	tragedy 31498:15	try 31469:24 31484:8	type 31446:19 31488:1
31506:14 31508:20 31510:11 31515:12		tragedy 31498:15 31499:10 31511:13	try 31469:24 31484:8 31488:17 31490:24	type 31446:19 31488:1 31490:19 31500:3

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 22
31517:24 31519:8,25	31571:16 31572:17	ups 31577:7	31517:4,6 31518:8,12	31597:13 31598:10
31525:7 31531:21	31577:25 31586:10	upsets 31454:11	31540:10 31547:4	wasn't 31452:6
31539:20 31577:5	31589:22 31592:9	upwards 31536:18	31563:18 31564:2	31454:12 31461:8
31579:18 31581:20	31593:12 31594:1,8	urged 31508:21	31597:10	31467:8,9 31470:2
typed 31534:11,13,20	31595:17 31596:2	use 31441:14,19,22	views 31506:10	31474:24 31514:25
types 31500:7 31525:3	31601:7 31607:3	31443:3,10,13,17,17	31517:5 31518:5	31523:21 31591:16
31526:17 31530:18	understandable	31445:8 31457:7	vigorous 31610:18	31609:4 31610:6,7,14
31531:2,19 31559:24	31462:24 31555:23	31465:25 31466:23	violence 31519:8	wasn't 31445:9
31560:4,6,10	understanding	31481:18 31488:24	31579:24 31582:2	31451:3,3 31505:16
31565:20 31582:9	31453:23 31459:13	31517:8 31525:6	violent 31479:16	31557:6 31602:11,11
31596:12	31485:13 31489:24	31526:20 31527:20	31484:18 31497:12	water 31558:20
typical 31576:25	31494:22 31497:15	31528:19 31529:2,3	31504:12 31520:7	31559:25 31560:12
typically 31545:19	31498:9 31579:13	31529:10 31530:10	31528:13 31532:8	31561:12,14,19
typing 31478:11	31601:21 31609:7	31530:13 31532:4	visible 31588:6 31589:1	way 31449:4 31453:16
typographical	understands 31460:5	31537:11 31539:23	31590:7,19,22	31454:24 31455:20
31603:23	understood 31587:10	31540:2 31553:8	visibly 31600:24	31456:14 31461:1,18
51005.25	undertaken 31592:4	31557:10 31558:2,12	vocalised 31584:14	31466:18 31470:15
U	underwent 31481:25	31559:20,20,20,25	volition 31460:11	31474:24 31480:9
UK 31440:9 31441:16	unexhibited 31606:6	31562:4,20 31564:5	31463:24	31487:11 31488:19
31442:15,17 31443:3	unfair 31545:24	31565:14 31567:10	volume 31466:7	31489:19 31491:4
31443:11,25 31446:5	unfamiliar 31564:6	31571:15 31573:9	31473:25	31492:12,19,24
31448:15 31493:1	unfold 31474:24	31594:19 31609:23	51175.45	31493:4 31502:12
31527:22 31529:2	unfolded 31538:10	useful 31547:16	W	31505:9 31506:5
31558:13 31580:11	unfolding 31469:15	usefully 31449:9	wage 31514:24	31510:17 31520:2
31581:11	31474:23 31530:5	utmost 31442:6	wagon 31493:21	31524:19 31529:15
ultimate 31490:23	unforeseen 31458:15	utiliost 51112.0	wajt 31480:21	31556:10 31575:14
31596:11	31495:5	V	31602:18	31576:12 31577:11
ultimately 31442:21	unfortunately	valid 31488:23	wake 31572:12	31577:14 31580:2
31479:21 31493:2	31451:14 31525:10	validity 31486:6	Wales 31439:11	31587:20 31602:24
31498:23 31504:4	31527:12 31562:9	valuable 31606:19	walk 31536:5	31602:25
31517:20 31518:18	unfurled 31566:17	value 31504:13,15	walked 31566:18	ways 31469:11
31520:5 31524:16	unfurling 31541:10	31540:23 31542:23	want 31454:8,9,18	31479:12 31565:7
31526:19 31535:14	31547:25 31554:10	31543:17 31599:13	31466:13 31487:2,6,7	weak 31546:22 31547:2
31536:3 31545:6	unhelpful 31517:13	varied 31559:17	31487:11 31489:16	wealth 31504:21
31578:16 31597:8	unions 31496:14	31561:9	31492:13 31493:7,21	weapon 31513:23
31607:17	31499:25 31500:9	various 31459:23	31496:21 31504:23	weaponry 31560:6
unacceptable 31455:18	31502:5 31503:13	31491:21 31495:16	31508:4 31510:6,10	weapons 31479:19
unaware 31459:24,25	31504:9 31506:2	31508:11 31510:4,17	31518:21 31519:23	31482:3,6 31484:1
uncoordinated	31509:18 31510:23	31515:1 31529:22	31521:22 31524:13	31505:22 31510:2
31453:19	31511:10 31516:11	31532:7 31534:1	31525:11 31526:1	31528:20 31529:9
undergoing 31556:21	31526:5,10,13,22	31536:22 31566:18	31534:1 31543:25	31575:17 31576:5
undergone 31565:20	31527:15	31571:6,22 31577:17	31547:23 31551:17	31602:7,10 31603:15
31566:10	unison 31520:3	31584:10	31554:17 31555:19	weary 31561:23
undermined 31572:22	unit 31462:25 31463:1	vast 31560:6	31560:3,8 31561:4,6	website 31523:23
31599:23	31463:3 31464:13	vehicle 31469:10	31563:18 31573:21	Wednesday 31544:21
underneath 31547:3	31471:11 31488:13	31530:2,3,8 31576:4	31573:25 31574:13	31602:8
understand 31439:24	31533:6,12	31576:13,15,18,21	31583:18 31591:21	week 31592:8 31595:18
31440:4 31444:3,6,20	unite 31537:4	vehicles 31529:13	31597:20 31599:25	weeks 31523:3
31445:25 31449:20	United 31439:11	31531:5,6	31602:23	31530:22
31449:22 31457:7	units 31453:16	vernacular 31450:22	wanted 31455:25	weight 31493:23
31459:5 31461:7	31459:23,24	31571:7	31498:17 31516:12	31503:19
31464:2 31465:10	31460:10 31462:21	version 31534:11,13,20	31589:13 31591:8	went 31463:12
31466:11 31469:15	31463:6,12,14,16	versus 31474:6	31593:25	31465:22 31473:13
31469:17 31471:22	31464:17 31466:17	vicinity 31574:10,24	wants 31542:23	31496:23 31507:7
31472:23 31476:5	31485:5 31532:16	Victor 31592:3 31606:5	warn 31550:25	31536:15 31568:20
31477:16 31480:25	University 31580:10	31606:7	31555:14	31569:5 31575:25
31481:3 31488:15	unknown 31548:13	video 31476:19	warning 31452:25	31587:12 31588:18
31489:22 31491:19	unnumbered 31575:7	31567:18 31611:14	31457:14,18 31458:4	31600:8 31604:8
31495:18 31499:20	unreasonable 31445:19	31611:15	31458:13 31459:4,6	31610:11
31501:4,4 31502:8	31501:19	videos 31476:11	31459:17 31550:2	weren't 31453:17
31507:24 31509:6,23	unrest 31566:3	31600:22	31551:8 31555:8,9	weren't 31550:8
31515:3 31526:21	unusual 31443:22	view 31441:21 31445:5	warnings 31450:20,21	31601:10 31602:10
31538:2 31544:14	31466:6,8 31497:17	31451:10 31455:1	31450:21 31457:19	31604:9
31545:8,10 31547:11	updated 31600:11	31472:8 31480:12	31457:21	west 31450:19
31548:3 31549:4	Upington 31582:5	31502:10 31503:9	warrior 31482:5	31456:21 31460:24
31551:14 31566:2	upped 31501:10	31507:20 31508:18	31535:14,21	31512:17 31569:20
ARCHIVE FO	R JUSTICE	l	I	

Tel: 011 021 6457 Fax: 011 440 9119

RealTime Transcriptions

				Page 23
we'll 31447:19	31534:23 31611:22	writing 31447:3,16	31492:14 31506:11	31604:1,6
31476:16 31481:9	wished 31547:21	31471:11	31510:15 31512:12	12th 31574:6,8 31588:4
31495:6 31510:10	withdraw 31561:21	written 31441:21	31515:3 31520:4,16	12:01 31520:9
31536:24 31547:17	witness 31494:17	31443:12 31470:4	31526:5 31528:16	12:22 31520:15
31547:19 31561:17	31508:16 31509:1,14	31494:24	31537:11 31546:6	12:41 31533:25
31611:23	31510:13,15 31517:3	wrong 31454:4 31455:3	31547:6,11,15	120 31448:17
we're 31438:17	31534:8,15,18,24	31455:10 31465:4,22	31548:4 31551:20	122 31475:20
31460:20 31464:10	31547:8,9 31552:16	31482:19 31501:1	31557:20,22 31559:6	127 31482:17 31485:25
31482:22 31485:18	31573:2,16	31504:20 31519:2,9	31560:1,7 31561:18	13 31478:2,20 31479:11
31491:3 31506:9	witnesses 31451:22	31533:14 31578:10	31561:21,23	13th 31479:15
31508:14,15,17	31458:1 31493:12	31582:23 31588:24	31564:18,21 31568:8	31508:24 31557:5,20
31518:17 31532:15	31507:23 31508:1,2	31599:1 31604:2	31568:10 31578:1	31563:10,12
31538:20 31543:18	31508:14 31511:5	wrote 31513:1	31583:19 31584:7	31570:14 31571:11
31544:1 31554:18	31521:24 31523:25	WW2 31512:9	31586:20 31593:21	31574:5 31592:13
31557:19 31562:13	31524:3 31542:20		31608:16	13:52 31546:5
31565:16 31567:20	31554:2 31577:17	X	you've 31446:14	130 31522:22
31575:8 31590:16	31606:12,14	X 31477:14,23 31478:1	31447:23 31453:21	13418 31595:5
31597:12,22,22	woman 31444:4	31478:3,8,14,15,19	31471:21 31477:15	137 31543:22 31546:18
31598:16 31603:19	wonder 31475:12	31481:21 31507:20	31481:21 31487:3	14 31478:2 31512:11
we've 31439:19,24	wondered 31456:12	31507:22 31513:5	31518:25 31521:21	14th 31584:19
31445:6 31446:2	Wonderkop 31535:5,6	31533:18 31534:16	31539:22 31547:20	14:12 31558:9
31458:16 31459:18	31536:13	31569:2 31574:19	31552:3 31554:5	14:32 31571:19
31464:20 31507:22	won't 31461:2	31577:10 31583:22	31582:20 31598:8	14:52 31584:3
31509:3 31521:25	31473:19 31560:10	31584:9,9	31600:1	14564 31546:19,19
31534:11,14,19,22	word 31442:10	xenophobia 31573:10		14579 31543:22
31543:10 31579:22	31453:20 31473:19	Xhosa 31570:25	Z	15 31449:10 31481:10
31582:15 31588:9	31481:18 31489:1	31571:8	Zokwana 31602:5	31593:18
31597:13	31515:7 31537:14	X's 31477:16 31479:7	31603:12	15th 31546:18
what's 31450:1,6	31539:23 31540:1	31479:11 31480:7	Zulu 31571:8	15:25 31593:20
31455:2 31456:4	31553:8 31556:5	31507:24 31574:20	ZZZ8 31438:16	15:45 31606:25
31470:25 31482:4	31579:22 31581:23	31583:23		15125 31595:8
31522:1	31588:6,14 31609:23	Y	0	16 31464:22
what-if 31602:20	words 31448:8		000 31535:8 31567:6	16th 31484:5 31486:8
wheel 31493:23	31461:12 31485:19	yeah 31586:2	31598:11,17,21	31508:23 31538:19
wheels 31493:21	31513:23 31565:23	year 31478:22	000-odd 31566:16	31540:12 31541:20
31496:12 whilst 31452:7	31604:24 31608:22 31611:1	31514:24,24	08:00 31536:12	31578:8 31592:13 16:03 31465:5
		31534:19 31539:15	08:00AM 31535:6 09:36 31438:2	16:06 31465:9
31462:24 31538:20 31561:1 31597:13	work 31453:4 31460:23 31468:1 31470:16	31540:7 31572:13	09:56 31458:2 09:56 31451:12	17 31452:18 31462:1,10
White's 31449:16	31472:4 31493:8	31580:15	09:50 51451:12	31468:8,22
31461:25 31543:19	31524:13 31535:4	yesterday 31442:14,16	1	18 31506:16
31544:6 31546:12	31539:8 31556:23	31450:8 31452:8	1 31450:2,12 31452:18	1800s 31580:20
who'd 31563:16	31562:3 31565:10	31454:7,11,12	31453:2,3 31455:16	1900s 31580:20 1900s 31580:19
who's 31443:23	31569:19 31570:10	31471:7 31473:13	31457:19 31458:16	1989 31439:25
31454:15,22	31571:20,25 31572:2	31479:23 31484:14	31458:18,19 31461:1	1995 31446:25
31460:25 31469:9,18	31580:8,11,21,22	31497:13 31499:12	31461:1,11 31469:18	1775 51440.25
31505:1,1 31531:18	31581:24	31500:11 31518:1	31469:25 31475:4	2
31560:19 31563:4	worked 31466:22	31528:2 31529:15	31476:9,10,22	2 31449:8,11,16,20,23
who've 31461:4	workers 31571:17	31531:7 31538:18	31550:1 31564:4	31450:2,6 31451:21
wide 31473:2 31485:8	working 31559:6	31551:1,6 31560:4	1.2 31535:1	31451:24 31455:20
31582:8	31563:25 31572:6	31561:13,25	10 31512:16 31543:20	31455:23 31456:1,4
wider 31503:11	31596:20	31589:19 31590:9	31544:6,23 31586:18	31457:25 31460:10
wire 31452:24 31453:1	works 31539:6	31592:21 31600:19	31607:10	31461:11 31463:1,14
31458:12 31541:10	world 31440:8,10	31602:1 31608:18	10.1.3 31482:17	31549:10,11 31556:1
31541:17,18,25	31518:19 31519:1	you'd 31438:17	31486:1,5	31561:22 31564:5
31542:5,7,15,16	worth 31582:19	31516:20 31536:8	10:16 31465:10	31590:22 31610:1
31544:20 31546:14	wouldn't 31461:22	31572:23	10:35 31478:22	2.3 31524:15
31546:21 31547:25	31471:16 31508:23	you'll 31472:7	106 31465:23	2.5 31449:10,21
		31494:12 31607:18	11 31443:15 31549:23	2.5.11 31462:16
31548:10,17,21	31516:20			
31548:10,17,21 31549:2,19,21	31516:20 wouldn't 31444:22	you're 31438:10	31555:12 31556:2	2.5.11(d) 31462:2,11
			31555:12 31556:2 11.2 31549:23	2.5.11(d) 31462:2,11 2.5.6 31464:22
31549:2,19,21	wouldn't 31444:22	you're 31438:10		
31549:2,19,21 31550:7,9 31554:10	wouldn't 31444:22 31538:3 31539:21	you're 31438:10 31441:13 31442:1	11.2 31549:23	2.5.6 31464:22
31549:2,19,21 31550:7,9 31554:10 31554:12,16,21	wouldn't 31444:22 31538:3 31539:21 31542:8 31544:20	you're 31438:10 31441:13 31442:1 31470:9 31473:6,7,10	11.2 31549:23 11:02 31481:12	2.5.6 31464:22 2.5.7 31462:1
31549:2,19,21 31550:7,9 31554:10 31554:12,16,21 31556:6 31566:17,24 31568:2,6 wise 31554:1	wouldn't 31444:22 31538:3 31539:21 31542:8 31544:20 31548:6,21 31596:5 wounded 31468:22 31475:23	you're 31438:10 31441:13 31442:1 31470:9 31473:6,7,10 31473:13,16,16,21,23	11.2 31549:23 11:02 31481:12 11:22 31495:2	2.5.6 31464:22 2.5.7 31462:1 2/3 31595:18
31549:2,19,21 31550:7,9 31554:10 31554:12,16,21 31556:6 31566:17,24 31568:2,6	wouldn't 31444:22 31538:3 31539:21 31542:8 31544:20 31548:6,21 31596:5 wounded 31468:22 31475:23 wounds 31477:7	you're 31438:10 31441:13 31442:1 31470:9 31473:6,7,10 31473:13,16,16,21,23 31476:2 31477:14	11.2 31549:23 11:02 31481:12 11:22 31495:2 11:41 31507:13	 2.5.6 31464:22 2.5.7 31462:1 2/3 31595:18 20 31450:16 31457:20

		I	Paç
200 31578:24	31601:14,24 31603:7		
2004 31472:13	500 31600:16		
2009 31526:7,14			
2012 31486:8 31512:16	6		
31526:8 31557:5	6 31477:21 31536:11		
2012-08 31534:3			
	31601:16,24		
2012-08-09 31535:2	31604:11		
2012-08-10 31535:5,6	6.2.2 31594:13		
2012-08-11 31536:12	6.2.3 31601:13		
2013 31479:7 31523:10	31602:25 31604:24		
31534:14,17,21	6:30 31603:23 31604:6		
31574:21	60 31439:4 31444:15,19		
2014 31438:1 31478:23			
	31444:19,21 31445:2		
31480:1,9 31605:13	31445:7 31447:24		
205/8/2012 31534:7	31448:16 31594:13		
24 31480:18 31483:1	31600:1 31609:24		
25 31546:19,20	31610:1		
251 31438:16,25	61 31601:13		
,	01 31001.15		
31439:5,25 31443:22			
31444:17 31447:21	7		
251.5 31441:4	7 31537:2 31574:17		
251.8 31442:5 31443:21	31575:1,8		
31444:18,25 31446:1	7th 31534:14,17,21		
26 31438:1	7.4 31465:24		
262 31439:6 31443:7,7	7.6 31449:17		
31443:19 31446:2			
31485:13 31489:22	8		
31490:11 31549:6,8	8 31475:20 31534:9		
31551:11 31556:2,13	31535:4,8 31574:17		
51551.11 51550.2,15			
3	80s 31582:1		
3 31439:20,20 31445:12	9		
31456:5,6,9 31459:24	9 31457:17 31494:12		
31461:14 31463:10	31512:15 31595:5		
31463:14 31475:6	31611:23		
31566:16 31567:6	9th 31538:19 31540:11		
31584:5 31593:8	90s 31582:1		
31598:11,17,21	90% 31506:17		
3.1.2 31512:12			
3.2 31483:2			
3.2.3 31484:22			
30 31497:14			
300 31573:20 31577:24			
31578:6,7,24 31584:5			
31598:14			
3000 31512:16			
328 31459:8			
34 31467:19 31468:7,23			
36 31544:13			
38 31466:15			
4			
4 31477:21 31494:5			
31534:3,22 31603:7			
4.2 31478:20			
4.3 31478:21			
4.4 31478:21			
4.5 31478:25 31479:10			
4.6 31478:25 31479:10			
4.7 31479:1 31480:5	54		
4.9 31606:11	1 0 A 20.12		
400 31483:14 31573:21	a form		
Di II Dette	the little		
31578:6,7	- / m/m		
Junify home, ban	on to have		
5	10		
the first state			
5 31535:8 31593:7	- 17er		