

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSIONSECTION 29 HEARINGS"IN CAMERA"

DATE: 24 APRIL 1997 NAME: LEON VAN LOGGERENBERG

HELD AT: JOHANNESBURG

DAY 2

---

CHAIRPERSON: Are we ready to begin? Good afternoon. Would you state your full names for the record please.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It is Leon van Loggerenberg.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr van Loggerenberg, would you stand please so that Dr Randerera can administer the oath please.

DR RANDERA: Mr van Loggerenberg, can you stand up? Good afternoon to you. My name is Dr Randerera, I am one of the Commissioners here in this office. If you will just repeat after me.

LEON VAN LOGGERENBERG: (Duly sworn in, states).

DR RANDERA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Are you able to hear the interpretation services clearly?

INTERPRETER: The speaker's mike is not on.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I can hear him.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr van Loggerenberg, this is a hearing in terms of Section 29, the purpose of which is to obtain more information in regard to your involvement in the disposal of the body of Stanza Bopape and other related matters. You are warned that you are on oath and that it is your duty to be truthful in this enquiry. If you commit perjury you may be prosecuted in terms of the Criminal Procedure Act. I have with me members of the Human Rights Violations Committee, Dr Russell Ally on my right-hand side. On my

extreme right I have Piers Pigou, a member of the Investigation Unit. On my extreme left I have Colonel Fanie Killian, a member of the Gauteng Investigation Unit. Mr Andre Steenkamp, the head of the Gauteng Investigation Unit and Mr Kobus Swart, a member of the Gauteng Investigation Unit. Present in the room we have people who are in the employ of the Truth Commission. We also have Mr Mike Bopape, the brother of the slain Stanza Bopape. We do have your statement which has come through with your amnesty application and at this stage I would like to ask you if there is anything you would like to change in that application or to state if you feel comfortable with all the facts that have been placed before us in that application.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: There is a single aspect which I would like to change in the application. I note that I mentioned the date 13th June 1988 and in, at the end I mention 14 June. I am just going to check to make sure. I conclude then on 14th of June in the statement. I want to correct that. It was a Sunday evening. If I look at the date it should be the 12th of June and then on the 13th of June I would have been back at my office on the Monday morning, if I have the dates correct. I think when I made the statement I may have looked at a calendar that was mistaken, but it was the Sunday evening and the Monday morning when I returned to my office.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. We will note those corrections. I would also advise your legal representatives, at some stage, to make sure that that amendment is sent in in writing to the amnesty application as well.

MR PIENAAR: We will do that.

MR SWART: Mr van Loggerenberg, would I be mistaken if I comment that you are leaving the service under medical reasons?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No, it is a severance package for the end of May.

MR SWART: Do you have any medical problems through the course of your career in the force?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I would not say that it is due to the force. I do have a medical problem at the moment, two of my neck vertebrae are disintegrating, the cushions are disintegrating and some months ago I had a certain illness on my back muscles. I received a neck brace or wore a neck brace for about four or five weeks. I am able to cope without the neck brace, but I am still sleeping with a neck brace at night. I will have to go for a neck operation to deal with the vertebrae in my neck.

MR SWART: Okay, ~~I want to ask~~ you about crocodiles. Do crocodiles eat corpses?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not have personal knowledge, but from general knowledge, as I have spoken to people, I assume that crocodiles will eat any meat. They would take it to their den or their nest, wherever they live, they would drag it there and at times then they would eat from this meat.

MR SWART: You do not have any personal knowledge that this would be the case?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: And do you know whether hippopotami have any such behavioral patterns?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No. I do know that they are dangerous, but I have nothing about their behaviour patterns.

MR SWART: If I understand you correctly, you grew up in the Komatipoort area?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No, I did not.

MR SWART: Do you know the Komatipoort area well?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes, I started, I arrived in the then Eastern Transvaal and started working in the now Mpumalanga in 1983. I worked at the provincial office. You must, we are talking about provincial offices at the moment and that was then the regional office, Middelburg, and I worked in the entire Eastern Transvaal, now Mpumalanga.

MR SWART: Do you know any information about corpses found in the Komati River.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not have any information about corpses that have already been found in the Komati River, but I do know about corpses that had been eaten by crocodiles. I know about people who had been caught in the Komati River by crocodiles.

MR SWART: The place which you indicated to us during our excursion to the Komatipoort River, how far from the Mozambique border is this place which you indicated to us?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I will have to guess my estimate and as I got to know the particular place. I have never been to the border itself, but I would guess about 150m to 200m, that would be my estimate.

MR SWART: The river as you indicated it to us first flows through the Kruger National Park. Would you agree with that or do you not know about that?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not know about it, but I would agree with that. I have never traced the route of the river personally.

MR SWART: So, in conclusion, despite the fact that the, you

do not have any particular personal knowledge with regard to the behavioral patterns of animals in the area, you have no personal particular knowledge of the area and the river, you none the less considered this an appropriate place to get rid of a corpse?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I must be honest, it is the only place which I could think of at the time. You will have to consider that I was very nervous and I was on my own. While driving there I considered a variety of options and this was the only option at that time which I could really think of which should have been a fairly safe place to get rid of a corpse.

MR SWART: Is this particular place a well known place where people have picnics and braai?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Well known to police officers. I must tell you that my first visit there to Komatipoort environment, I was taken there for a braai, a barbecue. It was a place well known to police officers. My colleagues in the police knew this place well in that area for having barbecues or braais. Not only the particular place which I indicated to you, but that entire area.

MR SWART: Despite the fact that this place is regularly visited you did not have any difficulty throwing the corpse into the river there? You did not worry that it was going to come out of the river the next day or so?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes, I was very worried and concerned, because if the corpse were to be found there would have been considerable difficulties. I did not think of difficulties that I would personally have had, but on the behalf of the people who gave me the corpse since the corpse would have been identified then. So I was very worried. I hoped,

however, that the corpse would not be found again.

MR SWART: This corpse was not tied to any weights so that it would stay at the bottom?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: I have some difficulty with the fact that you as a single person on your own removed the corpse from the vehicle, it was a corpse in a fetal position, and that you rolled this rigid body to the river. It should be difficult to roll a person in that position.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Roll, drag, if I or as I tried to explain to you on the day there. From the vehicle onto the ground I then had to pick it up, I could not get it very deep into the river, maybe half a metre or even less than that. Then I rolled the body into the river and the body, the corpse sunk away into the water. I cannot tell you that it immediately disappeared, but I did not stay to look.

MR SWART: Apologies, we will continue in a moment. You mention that you were concerned and that there was a possibility that the corpse could have somehow come out of the river again?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes, I was concerned about this.

MR SWART: Did you return the next day to see whether this was the case?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not immediately in the next following days, but a considerable time afterwards. I would lie to you if I told you exactly how long, some weeks, maybe a month. I went back to that area and then I went back to that particular place, but not in the next day or the next couple of days?

---

MR SWART: Did you make any enquiries from Komatipoort with regard to corpses found in the river?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No, should a corpse have been found, one would have been informed about that in your daily crime reports.

MR SWART: That is interesting, because several corpses were found in that river. You said initially that you would not know about any corpses found. Now you are telling us that you would have known about it.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Could you indicate to what period you are referring, Mr Swart, with regard to corpses found? Was it long ago or recently?

MR SWART: From 1985 until recently corpses have been found in the river.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Let me put this clearly to you. You are asking whether if I visited the corpse immediately afterwards to determine whether the body has surfaced again which had concerned me? What I mean by that is in that particular area I tried to keep my ears open on the crime reports should some corpse have been found. Surely, afterwards there would have been corpses found, but I was not concerned about that after such an extended period of time. The corpse that was given to me was not identified. I did not know who this was.

MR SWART: I want to ask you a question about something I do not understand whatsoever. In your amnesty application it would appear that you were not involved in this entire matter. You just had to get rid of this package?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct.

MR SWART: Why would a person who is not at all involved, who'd risk his career, his family, his position from 1968, why would you dispose of a corpse and become an accomplice to murder under these circumstances?

Why did they pick you to do this? Why not someone else, why Captain van Loggerenberg?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Mr Chair I might be able to answer you in this way. Brigadier Visser and I have known each other for many many years. I could estimate that would have from 1976-77, we have been colleagues all the time, he has been my commanding officer all that time and why he particularly approached me that evening and met with me to go to Bronkhorstspuit, I cannot give you any answer. I would assume from my side, it was because he trusted me and because we knew each other well. Only once we stopped on the highway did I find out that this was a sensitive package that had to be removed.

MR SWART: We now see the corpse, the body of a person and you assume the responsibility for getting rid of this package, does this make sense to you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I'm sure it will not make sense to the Commission, but at that time, why I agreed to this was that I was requested. I cannot say that I've been given an instruction, but I was requested to take the package and to get rid of the package. I cannot explain why I agreed to this. If I think about this clearly I might well have acted differently at that time and under those circumstances. I cannot explain why I agreed to that. That's why I have said to you from the very beginning I was very very nervous.

MR SWART: Have you actually done work like this previously for Mr Visser?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: Weren't you involved previously with the disposal of bodies?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.



MR SWART: I must say to you honestly that I find it astounding that a person would risk his entire career to involve himself in a matter like this, just out of the blue, get rid of this package, I must honestly say to you that I cannot accept what you're telling me. It doesn't make any sense to me.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It might be very difficult for you but personally I cannot even determine why I agreed to assist with the disposal of this human body.

MR SWART: Mr van Loggerenberg. I'd like to ask you. I think there is another reason why you did this little favour for them. It's more than a favour, you jeopardised your entire career, is there any other reason why you did this? Did these people not have something on you? Were you not previously involved in other incidents where you had to do them a favour for something which could possibly have been prejudicial for you? I want you to think very carefully about this.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot think of any problems or that I was to do him a favour. I cannot think of anything like that right now. If I were to answer you I would say no.

MR SWART: Did you regard it as a favour?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: How did you view it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I viewed it as an instruction.

MR SWART: You as an experienced policeman in the police force and you want to tell us today that you regarded the disposing of the body as an instruction?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes it is quite clear that if I were to receive such an instruction that I was to execute it

where our working conditions and the position of trust was of such a quality between the Brigadier and I at that stage, and I just did it.

MR SWART: Perhaps you should tell us which circumstances we are referring to?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Where we were involved in the discussion at Bronkhorstspuit, where he said that we were to get rid of the package.

MR SWART: Could I just ask you one thing. Why are you only coming to the fore now with this information? Why are you only applying for amnesty now, surely you know that there were several enquiries into this matter?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Because I decided to apply for amnesty in December after it was spoken about amnesty several times and I spoke to the Brigadier and told him that I intended applying for amnesty and he agreed and said that if I felt that way, that it was my decision and he also applied for amnesty, and we did this together.

MR SWART: And in all these years you never considered coming to the fore with the truth? You've kept quiet about this for years.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes.

MR SWART: Why, didn't it ever bother you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Of course it did. It would bother any normal person. It will always stay with you. This is an act which you committed and you'll never get rid of it. It's something which you have to live with and it's very difficult to do so, with which I have difficulty living with but I felt that I was doing it for work, political work and the political system which I was involved in at the time. I did it for that.

MR SWART: Do you know of an incident where another person died during interrogation in the Eastern Transvaal, where the body was taken to Pretoria to be disposed of? ?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not know about it being blown up but I do know of a person who was interrogated in the Eastern Transvaal and who is alleged to have died during interrogation. That is a matter which appeared in the Middelburg Supreme Court.

MR SWART: That is a problem which I have. Didn't anyone die in the Eastern Transvaal during interrogation and Eastern Transvaal would not make a plan with that, they'd bring it to Pretoria to be blown up and they would blow it up about three or four times to make sure nothing remained, and then someone dies in Johannesburg and all of a sudden he would have to be sent to the Eastern Transvaal to be disposed of?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: As I said I knew about it, I've heard about it and I've read about this matter that you're referring to. But what the reason for the decision was, the reaction which you've just mentioned, is not in my hands. As I said, if there were other decisions taken by seniors they would do it but as far as I'm concerned I was not the person making the decisions and I cannot be of assistance to you in that regard.

MR SWART: Perhaps I should ask you, were you previously involved in the interrogation of people?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes.

MR SWART: Where people were shocked or in your terms, they were tubed or dealt with in the broomstick method? Were you ever personally involved in such incidents.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I was.

MR SWART: Can you tell us, how many, where and when?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: There were several.

MR SWART: How many Mr van Loggerenberg? More than 10 more than 20? Surely you can answer?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes but to tell you now after all these years, several, it could be more than 10, it could be more than 20. But if we talk about it there are various methods which were used, the shocking method and several other methods.

MR SWART: Have you ever applied shocks to yourself?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I have.

MR SWART: Which other methods have you used?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: The broomstick method.

MR SWART: Tell us how it works.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: You make a person hang between two chairs, the other method is making him hang by his arms where he has been handcuffed, and the other one is where a person stands on a brick balancing on his heels or on his toes for hours while you are conducting interrogation.

MR SWART: And the other methods?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: With the old type of telephones, the winding telephones, where you apply the electrodes to a persons's body and you wind the telephone.

MR SWART: Was it standard practice in the police force or was it standard practice where you were to elicit information from people in this manner?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I think it was general practice in the entire police force at the time, not just security branch.

MR SWART: Were any of the people that you interrogated charged and prosecuted and found guilty of any of the

crimes?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I would say yes, if I could.

MR SWART: In other words you did not even make that information available to the court at the time when you tortured these people?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: We would say that we denied that it happened.

MR SWART: You mean you would have committed perjury in the Supreme Court and have someone found guilty?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes they would be...(intervention)

MR SWART: Information would not have been acceptable in court if the court knew that you had tortured these people? The people went to jail. Innocent people could have gone to jail, does Brigadier Visser know about these actions?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I believe that as commanding officer at the time he would have known.

MR SWART: I do not want to know what you believe, I want to know if he knew.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes he knew.

MR SWART: And did you report to him as well?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: To tell him that people were being tortured?

MR SWART: Yes in matters which you investigated?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I don't believe that it was necessary to go to him and say, Brigadier we dealt with this person harshly, it would have been commonly acceptable.

MR SWART: And I trust that you are going to apply for amnesty in this regard as well? At least let me ask you why is it not contained in your amnesty application?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Because it was said that ordinary assaults are not in question here but serious gross human

rights violations.

MR SWART: Are you saying that where you tortured someone with the broomstick method and shocked them and tubed them are the ones that you don't regard as gross human rights violations?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I regard them as assault.

MR SWART: You mean they are not gross human rights violations?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I suppose the manner in which you have done it would have been.

MR SWART: Why should I believe that what you're saying here is the truth? You've already committed perjury in court and someone has gone to jail as a result, why wouldn't you lie to us today as well?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Madam Chairperson, what I am saying here today are the facts. I acknowledge that I previously committed perjury in court about people being assaulted and that it was standard practice and from my side, I've done that. I admit to having assaulted people before. I did not include it in my application and what I am saying to you is true, I cannot add anything more to that.

MR SWART: I think the truth is perhaps I am concerned that you are telling a half truth before this Commission, not the whole truth. That you are omitting certain things. People have been sentenced to jail as a result of your untruth. People are still serving prison sentences.

ADV PRINSLOO: I object to that question. My presence here is being undermined. The witness said that he did not regard it as a gross human rights violation. Now my learned colleague is proceeding to say that ... (end of tape)

...and that is not put in his application and that is not a

fair question and my learned colleague is becoming irritated and I don't understand it why.

MR SWART: Sir I want to put it to you very briefly. I really cannot understand - I understand why we cannot make sense of your activities that day because I think that you are busy lying to us. I'm putting it to you, you have lied before and I'm putting it to you that you that you are lying again.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I am telling the truth and I maintain that.

MR SWART: Let me refresh your memory a bit. I'm going to sketch a hypothetical situation. I will tell you why you did this favour for Brigadier Visser. You were the investigating officer in the so-called Popular Fourie murders in KwaNdebele. Is that not so?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: The docket was part of the investigation.

MR SWART: You dealt with part of the investigation.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct.

MR SWART: We know today that that matter, that investigation was never finalised and according to our knowledge a proper inquest was never held and there were discrepancies in the investigation of the Fourie murders. Is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Negative. The Fourie's case was a Murder and Robbery docket that was opened and it was investigated by the security branch for people in possession of firearms and a firearm which was found in the possession of one of the suspects back then was linked forensically to the Fourie murders. And the post-mortems of the Fourie murders were held by Murder and Robbery themselves and it

was not linked in the original docket of the accused who were charged.

MR SWART: Thank you.

MR PIGOU: Can I come in Chair. You said earlier Mr van Loggerenberg that you approached Brigadier Visser sometime last year, end of last year December, in connection with your application for amnesty. Were you aware of any other movements in terms of any other people that have applied for amnesty in connection with this, as to what they were doing, there was a general feeling that those involved were going to apply for amnesty, had you been made aware of it or was the decision taken to apply for amnesty because there was a pending deadline on amnesty applications?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I was not aware of any other persons who were also applying for amnesty in this matter. I only discovered that during consultations.

DR ALLY: Sorry, what were you going to apply for amnesty for?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: As in this matter, defeating the ends of justice and also a gross human rights violation by removing a body without making it known to the authorities at the time. The identity of the body was unknown to me although I had the dates more or less when it happened, I had an idea when I spoke to Brigadier Visser and Brigadier Visser was also not sure who the person was who would have received that. When we consulted with the advocates my advocate advised me that it was possibly Bopape that we were talking about here.

MR PIGOU: Perhaps you could take us through actually how this situation arose that you ended up with your current legal counsel, because it seems to me that you didn't know



other people were applying for amnesty and that they were being represented, that other people that were applying for amnesty were represented by the same people. I'm a little bit confused how you all managed to get the same legal representation.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Could you explain to me, are you talking about everyone involved in this matter? Everyone who applied for amnesty with regard to this matter. As far as I know it's only myself and Brigadier Visser and then the two previous persons who gave testimony, Mr Zeelie and Mr Van Niekerk who are represented by these legal representatives, I don't know of anyone else.

MR PIGOU: Let me put it this way. Perhaps you can take us through the steps which you took in order to - how did you end up with Mrs van der Walt and Mr Prinsloo as your legal representatives?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Myself and Brigadier Visser discussed the matter, this particular matter. I went to him, I said to him I feel that we should apply for amnesty to put this matter on the table. I suggested to him because I know the advocate, I said that I would go to Advocate van der Walt, he had no difficulties with this, he also had no difficulties with the advocate, so he suggested that we go there together. We went to a joint consultation with the advocate and on that day when I gave these dates and explained that it was in June of 1988 or thereabouts that Brigadier Visser and myself at Bronkhorstspuit received a package or a person, a body and that I don't know who the person was, that the corpse had not been identified for me but that I want to apply for amnesty. Then the advocate informed me that would probably have been the Stanza Bopape

SECTION 29

case. Those were the steps taken up to when we met with the advocate.

CHAIRPERSON: Take us through the steps when you were asked first to dispose of the body please.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: You are talking about the receipt of the body at Bronkhorstspuit? When I was told to dispose of the body we drove off the highway at Bronkhorstspuit.

CHAIRPERSON: Please start right at the beginning.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: The very beginning?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: We waited for people from Johannesburg to arrive and we agreed to meet at a certain place that was arranged with Brigadier Visser. We stopped on the highway close to Bronkhorstspuit.

CHAIRPERSON: I want you to start at the very beginning.

MR PIGOU: Chair perhaps I could lead with questions with regard to going through this step by step or would you like to hear ... (intervention)

CHAIRPERSON: I would like to hear Mr van Loggerenberg's version.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Chair as I've said this was a Sunday evening, if my date is correct on the 12th of June. At about 8 o'clock in the evening I received a phone call from Brigadier Visser then my commanding officer. Brigadier Visser told me to accompany him to Bronkhorstspuit where members of the Internal Security Branch would be met and that we had to assist them with a problem that had arisen. I went from my home to the police station where I put petrol in the vehicle, met Brigadier Visser and drove to Bronkhorstspuit. In the area of Bronkhorstspuit we turned around on the highway and placed the vehicle in the

direction of Witbank. We parked underneath a bridge which was parked towards Pretoria and Witbank.

Some time later two other vehicles arrived, apparently people from the Johannesburg office. There was a conversation with Colonel Van Niekerk. Brigadier Visser and Colonel Van Niekerk discussed the matter with each other. Brigadier Visser returned to my vehicle which was parked immediately behind his vehicle, I was standing outside the vehicle, next to the vehicle and he told me that these people have a problem, we have to get rid of a very sensitive package and we must transfer this package somewhere.

I drove ahead, left the highway towards the left, turned over the highway on the road towards Bapsfontein and some distance after having left the highway there was a little dirt road on which we then went and the vehicles followed me and we parked there. The vehicle of what I later discovered to have been then Lt Zeelie, later Major Zeelie, the boot of his vehicle and the boot of my vehicle were parked next to each other, we opened the boots and the two of us moved a body wrapped in plastic from his boot to the boot of my vehicle. We closed the boot and if I remember correctly, Zeelie then asked me whether I will manage on my own? I don't whether it was Zeelie or Brigadier Visser but I said that I would cope on my own.

I then drove from there back to the highway in the direction of Witbank, past Witbank towards Komatipoort where as I've explained previously, I went to this particular place known to me, I turned the vehicle around, removed the body from the boot and put it in the water.

MR PIGOU: Capt van Loggerenberg, when the members from

Johannesburg arrived at the scene and at Bronkhorstspuit and you later drove to the road, at what stage did you realise that the special package was a body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I only realised that when I physically handled the package, then I felt that it was a human body. I might well have imagined prior to this that it would have been a body. When I drove on to the dirt road I think I had thought that it probably was a human body but I only had this certain knowledge when I touched the actual package and handled it.

MR PIGOU: What was your reaction to discovering that this was actually a body and from my recollection it was the first time that you ever had to deal with this kind of thing?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct. I was very nervous and as I have already said, I had said that I would be able to do the work and ~~I didn't want to~~ turn back on this. I was very nervous and I had realised what I had let myself in for.

MR PIGOU: Did you know or were you introduced to the members that arrived from Johannesburg?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I was not introduced to them. The only person I might have known then was Colonel Van Niekerk and Zeelie. I did not know them personally, we knew of one another, we had spoken previously, we knew each other's surnames but we were not friends or anything like that, we just knew each other's surnames.

MR PIGOU: Captain van Loggerenberg at this stage in June 1988, you were stationed in Middelburg in the Security Branch, is it correct to say that you were a member of a very small unit, about six or seven members directly under

the command of Brigadier Visser?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That was the provincial head office of the Security Branch. If you are talking about six or seven members, you may be very close to correct but I cannot tell exactly how many staff persons there were in that office. He was in fact the provincial commanding officer.

MR PIGOU: Were you yourself, although you were stationed at head office, were you part of a small unit which included members such as Mr Labaschagne and Mr Botha?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Mr Botha and Mr Labaschagne, I can't remember any Botha, nor can I if I can remember correctly, a Mr Labaschagne, I don't think they were in that provincial office at that time. They are security branch members, I know whom you are talking about if we're talking about the same Botha but Mr Labaschagne was, if I remember correctly, not in the Middelburg office.

MR SWART: Chris Dietleefs?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Chris Dietleefs at that moment neither, Dietleefs was at that moment I believe Colonel Dietleefs at the Ermelo office, him and Labaschagne. I don't think I'm mistaken, I think they were stationed at the Ermelo office.

MR PIGOU: So precisely what was your function in this office? What was your role, what was your mandate, what did you do? What was your job?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: My task at the provincial office was an investigative officer and I was also involved with technical support services. Technical support services would include roughly speaking, listening in on meetings and on telephones at that time, the bugging of phones and meetings.

DR ALLY: Sorry just to go back to something you mentioned

earlier, you said that there were of these people who arrived from Johannesburg there were two people whom you knew, you were not necessarily intimate with them, but you knew them. You knew Charles Zeelie and also Van Niekerk. Is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct, I knew them.

DR ALLY: Did you ever have an occasion to communicate with them after this event?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I had no subsequent opportunity after these events. I did communicate with them some days ago when I saw them again during the consultation at the advocates office, but in-between I cannot recall having communicated with them or having been in their presence. I don't believe so.

DR ALLY: So when you were considering applying for amnesty you said that you went to speak to your commanding officer. Is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: With Brigadier Visser, that is correct.

DR ALLY: Why did you not think it important to speak to Zeelie and Van Niekerk, after all they're the people who gave you the body and you knew them? It's not that you didn't know who had given you the body. Did you not consider actually informing them of your intentions as well?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I would have informed them once I had spoken to my advocates and consulted with them. During the consultation, however, when the advocates informed me that they have knowledge in this regard and that these people made applications, then it was no longer necessary for me to have any conversation with them although, as I've mentioned, some days ago we were at the advocates' rooms for

SECTION 29

consultation.

DR ALLY: You don't find that people who were involved in one event and they're covering up for each other and there's this culture of loyalty, this is what we've heard all the time, that you trusted each other implicitly, that's why when we asked Charles Zeelie and Van Niekerk why they didn't bother to find out what happened to the body, they said no, we trusted our colleagues, there was a culture of trust, and yet you consider applying for amnesty and that culture of trust doesn't seem to apply. You don't bother to inform them. Isn't that a bit odd? And then you all arrive with the same legal representatives. Are you really expecting us to believe that this is just a coincidence?

MS VAN DER WAL OBJECTS: I want to object, the witness has said that when he arrived at the advocates, he was informed that the others are also applying for amnesty. He had the intention of informing them.

I want to make some comment that also with the questioning of the person here on the far left from my - that he considers it strange that these people should have arrived at the same advocates. Mr Prinsloo and myself are very busy advocates, we are representing 28 police officers and this is not at all strange.

CHAIRPERSON: I think the point Mrs van der Walt that is being made at present, is that an important matter like this where people are bound together by their involvement in the same act, your present client as well, that he never consulted with them according to his version about his desire to make an application for amnesty. But at the same time he finds all the others have arrived to use your services as well and I think that's the point which Dr Ally

is making at this point.

MS VAN DER WALT: But the witness has answered saying that if you heard from us he would have gone directly to these people.

DR ALLY: You objections are noted but if you would please allow to proceed, that what is strange is not that you have all of these people as your clients, that is accepted, what is strange is that an amnesty application is about full disclosure, it's about giving to the Amnesty Committee as much information as possible. This is about your client's involvement in the disposal of a body. Your client knew who the people were who gave him that body. In order for his amnesty application to meet that full criteria, your client would have had a responsibility to go to those two people and to say to them, I am considering a client for amnesty, who was this person who you asked me to get rid of? He doesn't do that, ~~he doesn't meet~~ with them at all, he puts in an amnesty application and in the process discovers that the others have also applied for amnesty and the things are tied up.

Now are you telling me that that is something that we are expected to believe is just a matter of sheer coincidence? That is what is asked. Are you asking us to believe that?

ADV PRINSLOO: I think another aspect which I would like to raise here is that there are several people who have applied for amnesty. There are several who have different legal representatives, they have consulted different legal reps and it appears from the application that that is the case where some have gone to the same one. So it is not completely correct as Dr Ally has put it before you. Surely



you are in possession of these applications?

CHAIRPERSON: Mr van Loggerenberg, would you answer Dr Ally's question please. And could you please also elucidate if you did not know the name of this person who's body you disposed of, in respect of what would you have applied for amnesty?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I'll answer the question in the following fashion. I said to you, after my discussion with Brigadier Visser where it was decided that we were to discuss the disposal of a body, we applied for amnesty and I would have informed these people about my decision. If the advocates told me that they did not know who I was talking about we would have informed these people and if they told me that they did not know at all we would have contacted the people and I would have approached them and said, people I intend applying for amnesty for this incident, for that ~~person whom you~~ handed to me that night, who is he and what was he, but I did not deem it necessary when the advocate said to me, we know which matter you are referring to. The specific dates were not in dispute, I knew what the dates were but I cannot tell you whether it was the 12th, 13th or 14th, I knew it was a Sunday night and they told me just to fill in the blanks and told me it was Stanza Bopape.

DR ALLY: So what happened to this sense of trust that existed amongst you and your colleagues that you first go to lawyers instead of consulting with the people who were directly involved?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not believe that I moved away from that position of trust.

DR ALLY: What if they felt that this was something that

they could get away with? That there was no need, no one knew anything?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not understand when you say they did not want me to apply for amnesty. It was my own decision to apply for amnesty.

DR ALLY: No it was not a decision on your own. You said that you consulted with Brigadier Visser and the two of you, you wanted, you had this idea but you didn't just go to the attorneys, you went to Brigadier Visser, not so? Now why only to Brigadier Visser and why not to the other co-accomplices who actually knew more, they knew who the person was, they knew the political circumstances. After all how were you to assume that this was necessarily a politically motivated killing, it could have been something else?

An amnesty application is very specific and it's about gross human rights violations committed in a political context. You knew nothing about this, you didn't know how the person died, why he died, who he was, yet you go along and you go to lawyers and you apply for amnesty. Isn't that a bit peculiar?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I do not regard it as strange. I went to the person who asked me to get rid of the package, who was Brigadier Visser. Brigadier Visser consulted with the people about this package. I was not there at the time of the consultation with regard to this package. It was only logical that I was to go to the person who was my commanding officer and go and tell him what my feeling was with regard to amnesty and he agreed with me and we went and consulted with our legal representatives. And that's when we established that there are other people, or the advocates knew what the matter was all about and it was Stanza Bopape.

DR ALLY: And Visser did not think also think it necessary to go and speak to the people from the Johannesburg office who had contacted him in the first place? Did he also find it a natural thing just to go to lawyers straight away? Did he know who this was, did he know that it was Stanza Bopape.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not know, I will not be able to comment on what his reaction was but he did not object to me going to a legal representative.

DR ALLY: Did you ask him who the body was, who the person was who you were dumping in the river?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I did ask him and he said that he wasn't sure.

DR ALLY: So you didn't know who you were applying for amnesty for, just for a body? That's what you are saying, and you didn't know whether this was a politically motivated killing or not, you didn't know those circumstances. Now I ask you again, how can you consider an amnesty application when all that you did was dump a body? It could have been criminal, did you just assume that it was political?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It would definitely have been political because why would Brigadier Visser who was the head of Internal Security mix with criminal matters? And that is the reason why I went to Brigadier Visser to try and establish if he knew exactly who the person was who was handed to me and he told me that he was not sure, that he did not know.

DR ALLY: Can I ask you then why did you not go to the people who knew who the body was? If you were serious about making an amnesty application, why did you not go to either Van Niekerk or to Zeelie whom you said you knew, to find out exactly what you had been involved in?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I would definitely have gotten to them if the advocates had not informed me about who this person was.

MR STEENKAMP: Mr van Loggerenberg, at which stage did the investigative unit confront you with these facts, was that before your consultation with the attorneys or thereafter in regard to this specific matter?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: After my application with the legal representatives.

MR STEENKAMP: Were you ever informed about the inquiry into your involvement into this?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: By which investigative unit?

MR STEENKAMP: Any investigative unit.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: After my application was submitted, yes I was.

MR PIGOU: You've suggested to us that you agreed to be part of this act of dumping of the body or because of your close association with Brigadier Visser. Is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I missed the first part of the question can you please repeat it?

MR PIGOU: Certainly. You agreed to participate in the dumping of Stanza Bopape's body although you didn't know who it was at the time on the request or instructions of Brigadier Visser on the basis that you had worked with him for some time, since in '76 I believe you said. And my understanding is that you worked together in Soweto together as well? I may be wrong. Was it because you had this close personal contact and loyalty to Brigadier Visser that you did this?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I am very close to that Brigadier and I am extremely loyal to that Brigadier. When I started

working in the Security Branch at Soweto he was my first commanding officer.

MR PIGOU: Do you think the same kind of loyalty existed with other members, from your experience with other members of the Security Branch in Middelburg and elsewhere perhaps in the Eastern Transvaal, as he was I understand, the area head of the Security Branch at that time?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do believe that there would have been close ties with other members in the province or the region as well. I am not too sure. He was a popular officer amongst the staff.

MR PIGOU: Did your unit in the Security Branch have any direct contact with members of C-Section of the Security Branch, the Counter Insurgency Unit?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not personally but there was direct liaison from the province with that unit.

MR PIGOU: Are you aware of the allegations which have been levelled against Brigadier Visser and other members of the Eastern Transvaal Security Branch in the nefarious activities conducted by Eugene de Kock and his unit?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I am aware from what I have read in the news, on TV and in the printed media.

MR PIGOU: Does this come as a surprise to you Captain van Loggerenberg?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That allegations are being made to and fro between Visser and them? It may be surprising but there was liaison because the C-Unit worked in the Province on a regular basis. It was well known that they operated there.

MR PIGOU: Are you surprised that the man that you worked with for so long and trusted could have been involved in

these kinds of activities?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes, to an extent I would say yes, it was surprising.

MR PIGOU: When you took the body out of the boot of Charles Zeelie's vehicle, can you tell me, or would you confirm whether the body was wrapped in black plastic bags as indicated in your amnesty application?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot specifically say that it was plastic bags, I would like to be honest and say it was black but it could have been any colour, it could have been plastic or something in that line, I cannot say black plastic bags, but that he was totally wrapped up, yes. But whether or not it was black plastic bags or not, I cannot say.

MR PIGOU: But it was something of the texture or consistency of plastic, I mean plastic makes a specific noise and has a specific feel, you would recall that would you not?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Something similar to plastic, yes.

MR PIGOU: Do you remember whether there was a blanket also wrapped around the body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No as far as I can recall there was no blanket wrapped around the deceased.

MR SWART: Could I perhaps just ask you, just take up a question, when you met the person at Bronkhorstspuit, what did you and Brigadier Visser say to each other there? Did Brigadier Visser know the people, did he know where they came from?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes he knew the people.

MR SWART: And you spoke?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not with the transfer of the body.

We stopped at the freeway. When we stopped at the freeway Brigadier Visser and Colonel Van Niekerk spoke if I remember correctly, I do not recall any other people being there. It was not very long and then the Brigadier came over to me at the car where I stood and said that we were to find a place where we could receive a sensitive package and that is ... (tape ends)

MR SWART: Why I am putting this question is because in Brigadier Visser's amnesty application he says the following.

"I did not discuss anything with the other members and I cannot identify them".

MR STEENKAMP: Why would he say that?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I do not believe that he spoke to everyone but he definitely spoke to Colonel van Niekerk, and he says that he cannot identify the people at all. If he says he cannot identify them then it means he doesn't know them.

MR STEENKAMP: That is very strange to me but I can assure you that he would know Colonel van Niekerk and also Zeelie. These are people who he worked with at some stage.

ADV PRINSLOO: Chairperson may I just establish does he say that he doesn't know anyone there because that seems strange.

MR STEENKAMP: I don't have his application before me.

EVERYBODY TALKING OVER EACH OTHER

ADV PRINSLOO: (?) If my memory serves me correctly then he was referring to van Niekerk.

MR STEENKAMP: In the following paragraph he says that he could not identify the members. That is not what your client just said to us.

ADV PRINSLOO: As you are putting the question, if I understand you correctly, as you were saying that he didn't know anyone there.

MR STEENKAMP: I will say to you, "I did not discuss with the other members and cannot identify them". But that is not what your client is saying.

ADV PRINSLOO: But read the whole thing.

MR STEENKAMP: Yes I've read the whole thing.

ADV PRINSLOO: Does he not mention van Niekerk's name?

MR STEENKAMP: Yes he mentions van Niekerk's name but he says he could not identify the other members.

ADV PRINSLOO: Chairperson then that is incorrect.  
...(intervention)

MR STEENKAMP: I will repeat, you say that he knew the other members?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I wouldn't say he knew all the members but there were definitely two members whom you would have known and that was Zeelie and van Niekerk. I cannot say to you whether he knew the other members or not.

MR STEENKAMP: The reason I am asking you is because it appears that he is omitting the identities of certain people. Why would he omit Zeelie's name for example? Because he specifically says he cannot identify the other members.

MS VAN DER WALT: I really do not think that this question can be put to this witness. Perhaps it should be put to Mr Visser. Perhaps he should be subpoenaed.

MR STEENKAMP: Mrs van der Walt your client chose to answer this question.

MS VAN DER WALT: You misinterpreted the question completely.



CHAIRPERSON: I think he's quite aware of the content of the question, could you please answer.

MR STEENKAMP: Do you want to repeat what I said to you.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It would be strange for me if the Brigadier came and said he does not know these people and by people, by name I refer to van Niekerk and Zeelie. The other people I also did not know, I also knew only van Niekerk and Zeelie. I saw other persons there present that evening.

CHAIRPERSON: I must say I find it very strange considering the effect that this could have had on your career and on your life that you were prepared to take the kind of risk that you did without knowing the names and identities of the other people who were involved in this matter. You say you were "nervous", that's the phrase you used, but I would be dead with worry really and not simply nervous.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I had trust in my commanding officer as I have already mentioned. I trusted my commanding officer. He was on the scene and I was sure that he would ensure that that which occurred would have been in good order.

MR STEENKAMP: Did you have explosives training?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I did.

MR STEENKAMP: I want to just find out from you what was Brigadier Visser's instruction to you with regard to the package?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I had to get rid of the package, I had to dispose of the package.

MR STEENKAMP: In Brigadier Visser's application I see that he says that he requested you to destroy the body.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: He might have said - I understood it

as meaning that I had to dispose of it. He might have said that I should destroy it. I can't deny with regard to his specific words.

MR PIGOU: Capt van Loggerenberg you just a moment ago indicated that, in response to the Chair, that you had trust in Brigadier Visser, your commanding officer. Now I put it to you that that must have been based on experience of Brigadier Visser covering up other illegal acts that you have been involved in, we have already spoken about perjury. Would that be true to say that that's where the trust came from that you knew your back was covered even though this was an unlawful act that you were participating in?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes he would have protected me, that is correct.

MR PIGOU: Just one last question. Around that time, following something which must have been fairly significant in your life, you know having to go and dump a body, it's not something - and as you've said it's still with you and will remain with you, were you suspicious at all with the domestic and international furore that erupted around "where is Stanza Bopape"? Did you not make any connection at all during that time that this was possibly the man that you had actually got rid of? I mean there was an official escape story being peddled by the State, but were you not making any connections at that point that that possibly whose body you had dumped?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No that is very difficult to answer whether I could have or not. I cannot tell you whether I could link the corpse to the name Stanza Bopape even if I had read about it. I didn't know of any link.

DR ALLY: Were you not interested in the identity of this

person who you had disposed of? Didn't it concern you to actually have - weren't you curious at least who is this person I dumped in a river?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No, I can answer you to say no, the less I knew the safer the situation would have been for me.

DR ALLY: Just repeat that - the less you knew the safer you were....

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I did not - I was not interested in identifying the person because if some problem emerged and were someone to ask me questions about Stanza Bopape I would not have been able to give any answers because I would not have known who it was. I would not have been able to give any information ...(intervention)

DR ALLY: In your official capacity, we are speaking about this in a personal capacity - another human being, you've just dumped a body it doesn't in any way interest you to want to know who is this you have just disposed of?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot say to you that I was at all interested in knowing who it was.

CHAIRPERSON: Are you a religious man, do you consider yourself to be a man who believes in God?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I do and I am.

CHAIRPERSON: Did this never trouble your conscience?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I have said to you that it troubled me and I was also very nervous at times about the matter. I did, however, clear this matter with God.

CHAIRPERSON: Assisting in dumping someone's body.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not that which I did, I have asked God for forgiveness which must be very clear what I did was wrong.

CHAIRPERSON: Did you ever consider what this could mean to

the family of the person whose body you dumped?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I understand the sadness of the family and also in the absence of the body and also if I could make the body available, show it to them I would have had far more peace of mind. I am sure they would also have had peace of mind. Unfortunately I don't have such a body available to show to them. I can only show them the place where I left the body. And I understand that they must be unhappy.

CHAIRPERSON: Why did you do all of this? What did you believe in which allowed you to do these kind of unlawful acts which also affect one's moral conscience?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I believe under the circumstances of those years and the struggle at the time one would have been so politically indoctrinated that I believe that I was able to do this. Today I am no longer politically inspired to do this kind of thing. I would stay away from things like this. I would not be interested in this kind of act. But within the political system and the activities of that time you would be inspired daily, in that context there would have been political influences and I believe that is what had driven me.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you have a family yourself?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I have a family.

CHAIRPERSON: What do they think of this?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: They are very unhappy. I wouldn't say there are difficulties at home but my wife and I talk about this often and it's not pleasant at all.

CHAIRPERSON: Was this the only instance in which you assisted to dispose of a body, or was this normal for you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: This was the only occasion during

which I disposed of a body. I was not involved in any other such events. This was not normal for me. I did, however, do it although it is difficult to explain to you why I did so. I do not even understand this myself except that I was politically motivated and it was in the context of struggle.

CHAIRPERSON: You say all that, but there seems to be an indifference in terms of who the person was whose body you disposed of.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It is difficult to understand. If I said I was not interested in the identity of the body what would it have brought about if I knew the identity of the body. It would have brought about more safety for the entire operation if I did not know about the body. Were I questioned about a Stanza Bopape I would not have been able to provide information and that is why the role was played in that way. When the package was handed over it was intended that I not know.

CHAIRPERSON: You yourself have earlier in your evidence admitted that you were involved in the commission of other human rights violations, you were involved in torture, why did it not enter your mind to apply for amnesty for those deeds, why only for this one?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I have discussed this already. To the best of my knowledge it was said that these would be normal assaults. These would not have been torture and the killing of people, these were normal assaults, that is why I have not applied for amnesty or why I included this in my amnesty application.

DR ALLY: We would actually ask you to reconsider that because torture is a gross human rights violation and torture is covered by the Act, and if there are people that

you had any involvement in the torture of people they can bring civil claims against you. So I would just alert you to that.

But one of the things that still puzzles me is after this - sorry did you want to say something?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I am waiting.

DR ALLY: After the disposal of the body of Stanza Bopape on the night of the 12th of June, very soon after that the people who were involved in this matter concocted this escape story. Now did you hear anything about this, about this escape story?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I am not very sure, perhaps a day or some days later Brigadier Visser might have told me that these people contacted him to determine whether everything had worked out fine but I did not know anything about the escape story.

DR ALLY: You didn't read the newspapers, you didn't see anything about - all the media attention around this issue? Nothing, you were - it just passed by you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It simply went passed me as an escape which occurred. I did not bring these matters together.

DR ALLY: Even though the same names were involved? People who you said you knew, van Niekerk's name came up in connection with the escape. He was questioned in connection with the escape. Mostert was another person who was present at the time of the - when the body was delivered to you, these were names of people who were part and parcel of this escape story, and you say that this was never of any interest to you? You didn't in any way make any connection?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I only knew van Niekerk, Mostert I only met a couple of days ago during the consultation. I

have said that I drew no link between van Niekerk and the escape in the news media. I did take note of it. I would have read about it but I did not draw any obvious links or conclusions.

MR SWART: Captain at that time the security branches were linked to one another by means of telex machines?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct.

MR SWART: All incidents with regard to the activities of the security branches were dealt with in a lecture or a meeting through the course of the day as it came through.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not in a lecture context.

MR SWART: But the members were informed?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: If there was any personal involvement, yes.

MR SWART: The escape of Stanza was mentioned by telex to your office was it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It might have been.

MR SWART: So you should have known of it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I might have read about it or heard about but I did not draw any connection.

MR STEENKAMP: The members involved in fabrication of the so-called escape of this person these names were involved or mentioned in those telex messages?

ADV PRINSLOO: A moment, I don't understand the question. Is it stated as a fact that these names were included in the telex message.

MR STEENKAMP: This is a fact.

ADV PRINSLOO: I just want to note it down.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot tell you whether I have read that telex or whether I was informed of it. It might have been read to me but the procedure at the security branch

where Brigadier Visser was in command was that there weren't lectures where the facts, messages were dealt with. You can enquire if you want to. Brigadier Visser's mail he dealt with on his own. When there was an investigation where a fax or a telex at that time came through which had to do with my work then he would have booked this out to me for my information.

MR SWART: About eight o'clock or what time in the evening did he phone you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes about eight o'clock at night.

MR SWART: What did he tell you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: He said to me that he had received an information or phone call from Pretoria that he had to meet people from the Johannesburg security branch with regard to a sensitive problem.

MR SWART: So you drove through with two vehicles?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: The Brigadier arrived in his own vehicle and I went with my own vehicle. I filled up at the police station, met him along the road and went along together.

MR SWART: Apart from filling up at the police station with petrol did you do anything else before arriving to this arranged meeting place?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No except for changing into other clothes.

MR SWART: How were you dressed that evening?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: In a jean and a shirt I believe, probably a warm jacket which I had in the car.

MR SWART: When you got rid of the body as you say in your application at the Komati River in the process of handling the deceased did any blood attach to your clothes?



MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: So there was no blood whatsoever?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No none whatsoever.

MR SWART: Before driving off, the arsenal in the boot of all security police did you remove it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I did not have such an arsenal.

MR SWART: You were not one of those people with the AKs and the things in the boot?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I didn't have any such objects.

MR SWART: What did Visser say to you what exactly were you supposed to do when you had this sensitive package?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: He told me that I should get rid of it.

MR SWART: He did not tell you how to dispose of it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR SWART: At which stage did you then decide that you were going to dispose of it in this fashion?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: At the time when I drove in the direction of Witbank and in the region, the vicinity of Witbank Freeway, through Nelspruit, towards Nelspruit, I drove along that road and as I said earlier I was nervous, I did not know exactly what to do and I decided to go to the border area to Komatipoort where I could throw him into the crocodile area.

DR ALLY: Is this not a bit difficult to believe, that here is something that involves senior policemen, that after the death of Stanza Bopape the commanding officer there, van Niekerk, contacts his commanding officer, his commanding officer contacts the commanding officer in Pretoria. The commanding officer in Pretoria then contacts your commanding officer in Bronkhorstspuit. Very, very senior people

involved. We hear all the time of how sensitive this issue was, this was a politically sensitive issue, that is why it had to be covered up. Under no circumstances could we have another death in detention. Yet when it comes to the disposal of a body there is this laissez faire attitude. You don't even know what you are going to do with the body and you are driving with this body in a car, all these senior policemen are involved, right up to the Commissioner of Police who authorised this cover-up. That's in an amnesty application. And you are told, you are given no specific instructions, you yourself don't even know what you are going to do, now how credible a story is that, given how sensitive this issue is, that you just ride with this body on your own. You are not accompanied by anybody, no assistance.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: As I have already said to you, I decided on my way to Witbank that I was going to go to Komatipoort. I did not drive around with the corpse, I drove and I took the decision where to go.

DR ALLY: These officers sit down together after Stanza Bopape had been killed to think up a story of how we can cover up this death, they consult amongst each other. They all put bits and pieces together, this is what the escape is going to look like. One of them even puts on the shoes of Stanza Bopape to run into the bush to make this look as if this was a real escape. There's forensic evidence that they concoct. They fire shots. An elaborate plan to cover up a killing, yet the most important part of this killing is the disposal of the body, that's critical. Because if the body is not disposed of properly the cover-up falls flat. Yet with regard to the disposal there's this casual thing about

it. They give it to you. You decide while you are driving I am going to throw this body into the Komati. You don't weight it down with any bricks and that. You don't even know who this is. Now how do you expect us to believe a story like that? Would you believe a story like that?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It may be difficult for the Commission to believe but I did not know anything about the finer details of the plan to - about the staged escape itself.

DR ALLY: We believe you don't have knowledge of it, but the five had knowledge of it and yet when it comes to the disposal of the body it is done in this almost casual way, that it's done in this almost casual way that it's left to your discretion yet they plan together the escape, but they don't seem to have the same interest. Van Niekerk doesn't say to you look this is an important issue, you know make sure that there's no trace of this body. Visser doesn't - Schalk Visser doesn't say to you look this is a critical matter, if this thing is discovered politically we are all in trouble. They don't communicate with you. I mean I find that impossible to believe that they wouldn't communicate to you the seriousness of what is going on, and therefore for you to know that you have got to make every effort to ensure that this body is never, ever found. That's what they say in their amnesty application, they want us to believe that this was a politically serious matter, yet they don't impress this upon you, and they give you the most important part to do. What is going on here?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: They did tell me it was a serious matter so as anyone would assume it was a sensitive matter, I was dealing with the body myself and one could believe

that everything had to go well.

CHAIRPERSON: Describe how you picked up the parcel.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Are you referring to Bronkhorstspruit?

CHAIRPERSON: From Bronkhorstspruit on.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: At Bronkhorstspruit the two vehicles, my vehicle and the vehicle of Zeelie drew close to each other with their boots towards each other. The boots were opened. He leaned over and we transferred it to my vehicle.

CHAIRPERSON: The two of you picked up the body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: When you dropped the body in the Komati River how did you manage to pick up the body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: As I explained to Superintendent Swart on the day when I went to identify the scene to him I put my arms under the body, it was in a foetal position, so I put my arms underneath him and rested it on the edge of the vehicle and then I got between the vehicle and the body and then rolled it into the river.

CHAIRPERSON: Was the body stiff?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: In what position was the body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot tell you in which position it was but I would say that it was sort of curled up. I did not open it. It was wrapped, but it wasn't a long straight body. In some way or another if I were to conclude I would say it was curled up.

CHAIRPERSON: At no stage were you curious? Did you open the packet to look at the body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I was nervous. I already told you that it was due to my nervous state and also I was in a

hurry to get away from there so I didn't have time to open it up and look at it. I could feel that it was a human body.

DR ALLY: Now isn't this even more peculiar and more strange that such a high profile political case that they give it to somebody, as you said, totally inexperienced, you've never ever done this before, this is the first time, not so, that you've been asked to do something like this, is that true? Was this the first time that such a request had been made to you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It is the first time and I cannot explain why this instruction was given to me.

DR ALLY: And you are nervous and you are all on your own.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct.

DR ALLY: And no one ever comes back to you afterwards and says have you done this job properly?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: ~~CHIV~~ No it was told to Brigadier Visser the Monday morning when I got to the office that everything went well.

DR ALLY: That's all, you didn't give him any details. You didn't tell him where and how you did it? Did you tell him that you took the body to Komatipoort?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes if I remember correctly I did tell him that I threw it in the crocodile hole in the Komati River. I did not identify the spot to him but the Komatipoort crocodile hole, so he had an idea where it should have been more-or-less.

DR ALLY: You say there was plastic, was this plastic tied onto the body with any ropes, string, cellotape?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Definitely not strings or ropes, possibly - I would not have been able to identify cellotape

if it was black tape but possibly clear or white cellotape I would have been able to there.

DR ALLY: This plastic did it tear or shift or anything like that?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It could have shifted or torn I am not sure. I did not look at it specifically.

DR ALLY: So you never, ever got sight of this, of any part of this body, you didn't see anything of this body? Not a hand, not a foot, nothing, it was completely covered in this plastic. This plastic didn't tear it didn't shift, so throughout this operation all you dealt with was a plastic bag with a body inside, is that what you are saying to us?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot say whether the plastic tore or it did not tear or move or any part of the body was protruding or not, but the transfer at Bronkhorstspruit happened very fast and at the dam I worked alone and very fast and it could have torn when I was picking it up and putting it on the ground and rolling it along the ground. It could have torn. I cannot tell you with certainty that it remained whole, but what I can tell you is that I did not see the body.

DR ALLY: You never saw any part of the body at any stage?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: As I already said it is possible that small parts of the body were visible but I did not see any parts of the body. As I said the body was covered in plastic and if one had time you would probably have observed parts of the body.

CHAIRPERSON: I find it hard to believe - I want you to tell me exactly what kind of packet was this, what kind of plastic? How was he tied or closed in such a way that you couldn't see what was in it?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I cannot tell you exactly what kind of plastic it was. I did not pay that much attention to it. It could have been a hard plastic bag or a soft plastic bag, I did not pay attention to it.

CHAIRPERSON: The most important episode that I would think took place in your life, and to me I think the memory would be absolutely vivid, but you don't remember.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I am not saying that I cannot remember. I can remember that it was wrapped in plastic.

CHAIRPERSON: Wrapped in what?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: In plastic.

CHAIRPERSON: I accept that, but the plastic surely also had to have been closed with something, what was it closed with?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: The plastic was not closed.

CHAIRPERSON: So we assume it's open you don't look inside, nothing peeps out, was the body covered with a blanket?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No, it was just covered in plastic, wrapped in plastic, but it appeared as if he was wrapped in plastic.

CHAIRPERSON: And you didn't see anything?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No I did not see anything.

CHAIRPERSON: If it was covered in plastic you said just now that maybe the legs were pushed over, so at which end was the head, was it on the open end or on the closed end, tell me?

ADV PRINSLOO: We don't understand the question Chairperson, he did not say at any stage that any side of the plastic bag was open.

CHAIRPERSON: He says he can't remember that it was closed, so if it wasn't closed it must be open.

ADV PRINSLOO: He did not say that. One cannot make that inference when he says that he cannot remember that it was closed, but assuming that it was open.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I said that the body was wrapped in plastic and if it would have torn, or if there was a tear in the plastic I cannot tell you whether any part of the body or piece of clothing was protruding. You must realise that I was very nervous and very much in a hurry to get rid of it.

CHAIRPERSON: Why did Brigadier Visser not accompany you?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: He did not accompany me, if I remember correctly his explanation was that he had to be at the office ... (tape ends)

CHAIRPERSON: ...what would happen to this one or didn't it concern you at all?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It did concern me to a certain extent. I depended more on the fact that the body would have been devoured or would have been devoured by the crocodiles and if it did rinse up it would have rinsed up on the Mozambique side. I cannot comment on whether they eat plastic or not. I was hoping that the crocodiles would devour the body.

MR STEENKAMP: Another few questions. Why mention this specific place where the body was thrown in as the crocodile hole?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: To me it is known as the crocodile hole. From the first time I visited it, it was called Hippopotamus hole or crocodile hole.

MR STEENKAMP: Did you ever see any crocodiles there?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes I did.

MR STEENKAMP: Several times or rarely?



MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I did not braai there very often but on most occasions when a braai was held there crocodiles and hippopotamus were seen there.

MR STEENKAMP: So it was approximately 2 a.m. in the morning and you were standing at the boot of your vehicle closest to the water?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes that is correct.

MR STEENKAMP: There was no lighting?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No as I said in the identification, when I got there the lights of the vehicle were on the place where I was to stop to ensure that it was clear. Then I reversed and stopped with the boot towards the river.

MR STEENKAMP: And then it was dark, is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Yes.....

MR STEENKAMP: You were in a hurry to get away and to get rid of this and it was dark and you rolled this body down into the water?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct.

MR STEENKAMP: How could you see that this body was becoming totally submerged in the water?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It appeared to me as if this happened.

MR STEENKAMP: So you were not entirely sure?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I was partly sure, but not 100%, no.

MR STEENKAMP: In view of the sensitivity of this body which was not ever supposed to have been discovered you nonetheless take the risk not to ensure for yourself that he was entirely covered in water, is that correct?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is correct, and it was a considerable risk which I took which worried me a great deal.

MR STEENKAMP: In addition you report to Brigadier Visser that you got rid of the body entirely and that there would not be any chance of it being found again?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: That is what I said to Brigadier Visser.

MR STEENKAMP: Did you believe it at the time?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not deeply in my heart, no.

MR STEENKAMP: Whose body did you throw in the water?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I don't know.

MR STEENKAMP: Did you not know at that time?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I know now who it was.

MR STEENKAMP: Did you know how this person was killed that you put into the water?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Not at all.

MR STEENKAMP: You say you now know who this was, but this is also only hearsay?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It is hearsay from my advocates and I trust them. I don't have any doubt in their abilities, no.

MR STEENKAMP: Were you not present at the scene when the body was handed over by two entirely strange persons in this group and you did not know how and when this person was killed, would you not be anxious to take part in such an expedition?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: In the event of a sensitive operation I do not believe that they would have brought along any other strange people. I thought that it would be security branch persons involved.

MR STEENKAMP: But you did not know how the person died? You don't know whether the person was shot in front of witnesses or anything?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No.

MR STEENKAMP: Nonetheless you are still willing to take a risk to be involved in this act.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I took this risk yes.

MR STEENKAMP: Why are you so loyal to Visser?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I was loyal also to my colleagues and my country and my people.

MR STEENKAMP: This is what moved you to take part in this excursion?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: This was everything - my only reason.

MR STEENKAMP: So your loyalty would be such that you would incriminate yourself to this extent?

ADV PRINSLOO: My apologies Chair, he said towards his country, his people ... (intervention)

MR STEENKAMP: He could add the country and the people to the colleagues I am sure.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I will also say this.

MR STEENKAMP: Thank you.

MR SWART: A last question. Did Brigadier Visser at any time discuss any possibility with you that there might have been an escape staged in the Eastern Transvaal with regard to this package?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No this was not discussed with me at all.

MR FIGOU: Just a couple of clarifications please Captain van Loggerenberg, if you remember when we went on the pointing out at the Komati River and we asked, I think more than one time, about the issue of what the body was covered in, you indicated at that stage that it was a blanket and/or cloth, now you are reverting back to the version that it was black plastic bags. Could you perhaps try and explain that

contradiction to me because it's a significant difference?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: If I recall correctly I said to you that I do not believe that it was in a blanket or a canvas. Canvas is what I mentioned, I said that I did not believe that it was wrapped in canvas. I thought that it would have been wrapped in plastic. I would still say that it was not a rag or a bag or a canvas or that he was in a canvas bag.

MR SWART: If I recall correctly you said that it would have been in a plastic bag or some canvas bag or something.

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: What I mean by canvas is it's a kind of plastic, it's probably a PVC bag that this person is referring to.

MR SWART: Do you know the body bag which was provided to the police, the plastic body bag. could it have been something like that?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: No it wasn't something like that.

MR PIGOU: Well just for clarification, and we will check and we will make a transcript obviously of the video recording so we can establish clearly on that, the body - and you've indicated to us that it was in the foetal position, that indicates to me that whatever it was wrapped in it was tightly wrapped so the outline and the shape of the body there was nothing - is that correct, there was nothing loose in terms of the way the body was wrapped?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I don't understand what you mean by loose? Did you mean additional things wrapped around the body?

MR PIGOU: No what I am trying to establish is that the body that you put into the river when it was wrapped was something wrapped around all parts of the body or was it just generally wrapped? I mean did you - you were quite

clear obviously that you knew it was a body but was that because it looked like a body or felt like a body?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: It felt like a body but it did not look like a body. If I think back clearly once you opened the boot and you looked it would not have looked like a body, but it felt like a body. If I understand your question the plastic in which it was wrapped was loosely wrapped around it, it wasn't tautly wrapped next to the body.

MR PIGOU: Just a couple of other further points of clarification, when we were at Komatipoort you indicated that the water level that we found at Komatipoort at that time was similar to the water level at the time. You couldn't be absolutely sure but you indicated that it was similar. Would you retain that story?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: Correct yes, I cannot tell you exactly what the water level was that day but I would stay with it that it was roughly at the same level. It was dark, it was night time so I cannot tell you exactly.

MR PIGOU: Do you also maintain that the weir that is built upstream where the bridge crosses the main road from Komatipoort town towards the Mozambican border that at that time in 1988 that that weir was not constructed, it was not there?

MR VAN LOGGERENBERG: I don't exactly know what weir you are talking about, is it the weir where the tarred road crosses or lower down in the river? I am not exactly sure which weir you are referring to.

MR PIGOU: Well my understanding is the gauging weir which is next to the tarred road. I wasn't aware that there was another weir on that section of the river.

MR. VAN LOGGERENBERG: That weir had not been built yet in those years. It was only built very recently to my knowledge but there might have been a smaller weir, but the present weir was built very recently.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Loggerenberg at this stage is there anything more that you would like to add before we finish today?

MR. VAN LOGGERENBERG: No there is nothing I would like to add.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. I would like to warn you that you are not to communicate any of what you have discussed here today with any other person, except of course your legal representatives. I would also want to advise you that we may at some stage recall you to another hearing.

Thank you for coming today.

MR. VAN LOGGERENBERG: Thank you.

ARCHIVE FOR JUSTICE