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ABSTRACT

A SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF TWO TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION TESTIMONIES: TRANSITIVITY AND GENRE

N. Hattingh

MA minithesis, Department of Linguistics, University of the Western Cape.

This thesis examines how two narrators construe their experiences of the same events differently through the linguistic choices that they make, through a systemic functional analysis, as well as a genre analysis of two testimonies. The Human Rights Violations (HRV) hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) allowed testifiers to tell stories of their experiences during apartheid. The selected testimonies refer to the events that led up to the arrest and eventual torture of Faried Muhammad Ferhelst, as told by himself and his mother, Minnie Louisa Ferhelst. The frameworks used to analyse the testimonies are drawn from the transitivity and genre theories of Systemic Functional Linguistics. A clausal analysis of the transitivity patterns is used to compare the ways in which the testifiers construct their identities and roles when recounting their stories. The transitivity analysis of both testimonies shows that both Mrs Ferhelst and Faried Ferhelst construe themselves as the Affected participant through Material, Mental and Verbal clauses, and construe the police as the Causers, mostly through Material clauses. A genre analysis revealed that both testimonies took the form of narratives, in particular the Recount, a typical genre for relating narratives of personal experience. This research project also explores how the original Afrikaans versions of the testimonies differ from the translated English versions, available online on the TRC website. The Afrikaans versions were transcribed by the researcher from audio-visual records. A transitivity analysis reveals that the interpretation of the Afrikaans testimonies is fairly accurate, with a minimum loss of meaning. Thus in the case of these testimonies, the actual online record in English is an accurate reflection of their stories.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION & CONTEXT

1.1. INTRODUCTION

People use language to make sense of the world around them, whether in written form or through speech. Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 29) state that language defines human experience, and experience is expressed through language – how people perceive the world around them both physically and mentally. Narratives come about when people express their experiences or perceptions of events, to make sense of their everyday lives. A speaker uses narrative not only to try and make sense of an event, but also to position him/herself (as well as others) in a particular way and within a particular social situation (Labov, 1972; Grabe, 2002; Eggins, 2004; and others). This thesis explores how speakers construe themselves and their experiences through the linguistic and discursive choices they make. This thesis will also focus on how they construe others, as well as how the same event is construed by different speakers.

This thesis will use testimonies taken from the hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), held in Cape Town in April 1996. The testimonies are those of a mother, Mrs Minnie Ferhelst and her son Faried Muhammad Ferhelst, a student activist who was tortured by the Security police in the mid-1980s. The mother’s testimony was given in Afrikaans, and simultaneously interpreted into English. Ferhelst gave his testimony in English and Afrikaans, which was also interpreted simultaneously into English. The simultaneous English translations of these testimonies are available on the official TRC website.

The object of this research is to reveal how the two narrators construe their experiences (of the same events) differently through the linguistic choices that they make, through a systemic functional analysis, as well as a genre analysis, of the two respective testimonies. Another aim of this study is to reveal how the different narrators position themselves and other participants when recalling the same set of events. Lastly, this thesis explores whether these testimonies were accurately interpreted or captured in English, as they are represented on the official TRC website.
In order to understand the context of the testimonies, it is necessary look at the historical context of the country, i.e. apartheid and the political situation that eventually necessitated the implementation of the TRC. This chapter will look at the following:

- A brief overview of the system of apartheid and its eventual abolishment;
- How and why the TRC was commissioned, as well as its constituent committees;
- A brief discussion of the various hearings, including special hearings for victims and women respectively;
- The importance of making meaning by briefly discussing the interpretation and translation issues at the hearings; and
- What effects the system of apartheid has had on testifiers.

Finally, the chapter will conclude with a summary and a brief outline for the rest of the thesis, by briefly discussing chapters two to six.

1.2. **APARTHEID**

1.2.1. **Background:**

Apartheid was a system of racial segregation implemented in South Africa by the National Party (NP) in 1948. Apartheid means ‘separateness’ in Afrikaans (TRC Report, Vol 1: 29; Marks, 2006). The policy of apartheid expanded on the oppressive and prejudicial government laws that had existed already for nearly 200 years under colonialism. White settlers and black ‘tribal inhabitants’ were already divided, even more so after the discovery of mineral rich lands in the 19th century (TRC Report, Vol 1: 29; 40). With the NP’s election victory in 1948, the government “set out to segregate every aspect of political, economic, cultural, sporting and social life” (TRC Report, Vol 1: 30; Marks, 2006), by amending existing laws or creating new ones that would achieve this separation.
1.2.2. **Laws:**

To achieve complete societal segregation, the government implemented or altered existing forms of segregationist legislation and transformed it systematically into a set of (legally) discriminatory and racist laws. New policing forces were also put into operation to stifle any opposition to the government (TRC Report, Vol 1: 30).

One such law was the Population and Registration Act of 1951, which sought to classify South Africans according to race, as well as control and censor contact between races. Non-whites were restricted in terms of social, economic and political aspects: the government controlled where they could work, what work they could do, and where they could live. Blacks in particular were ostracised from every aspect of the political arena. Races were separated in terms of the Group Areas Act, which determined where particular races could live and work. Non-whites were resigned to often inferior facilities and services, including separate transport systems, hospitals, schools, churches and beaches. Better facilities were marked out for the use of whites only. Blacks’ movement in and out of certain areas were controlled by the Pass Law: all blacks had to carry passes with them at all times (Marks, 2006).

1.2.3. **Opposition:**

Many South Africans (including some white people) were against the government and its oppressive laws. The government branded all opposition as ‘communists’, then set in place stringent laws and policing to inhibit their opposition (Marks, 2006).

This did not prevent people from protesting and forming political parties to oppose the government. The African Nationalist Congress (ANC) was established as early as 1912 as one such opposition party, “to represent African views and fight government policies” (Marks, 2006). Opposition parties were mostly led by coloureds, Indians and blacks.

Protest movements came about in the 1950s, led by the ANC and the Pan African Congress (PAC). Protests were organised to be peaceful. However, in 1960, one such PAC-led protest culminated in the deaths of hundreds of people, and the wounding of
many more as police opened fire (Sharpeville Massacre). Subsequently, all (black) political parties were banned by the government (including the ANC and PAC), their leaders arrested or sent into exile, while millions of blacks were relocated and sent to live in the so-called ‘Bantu homelands’ (Bantustans). Blacks were eventually stripped of their South African citizenship, which meant that they could only work in South Africa, but had to return to their homelands when not working (Marks, 2006).

In 1961, the ANC formed the military wing, Umkhonto we Sizwe (‘spear of the nation’; known as MK), as a means of undermining the apartheid government. MK served as the armed wing of the ANC who were, for the next 30 years, conducting affairs from underground. By 1969, the NP’s political grip on the country was starting to slacken as Steve Biko established the Black Consciousness Movement. He was later murdered, while in custody by the Security police in 1977.

The early 1970s saw black workers take part in strikes and boycotts. One boycott in Soweto in 1976 saw police open fire on students protesting against the forced implementation of Afrikaans-only education. This event sparked worldwide indignation, and led to many countries placing sanctions on South Africa – economically, South Africa was segregated from the rest of the world. The ‘Soweto Uprising’ (as it came to be known) caused resurgence among many resistance fighters across the country. More protests followed in the form of strikes, boycotts and clashes between youths and police in the townships. Eventually the government declared a series of states of emergency (1985 and 1987) in a bid to quell the resistance. With increased resurgence from the blacks in the townships and sustained international boycotting taking its toll on the economy, the government was forced to rethink their apartheid policy. The government was forced to reorganise their apartheid legislation, by abolishing the Pass Law.

By the 1980s, both the government and resistance had failed to secure the country and bring it to stability (the resistance couldn’t overthrow the government and the government could no longer control the public). In 1984, Asians and coloureds were introduced into Parliament, where they still only received separate representation. Blacks, however, were still not allowed representation in Parliament. This was not enough to satisfy the black communities and more violence and protests followed.
In 1989, then President P.W. Botha resigned, ceding to F.W. de Klerk. By February 1990, De Klerk declared that apartheid was formally at an end. The bans on the ANC and PAC were lifted, and Nelson Mandela was released from prison. Talks were held to discuss post-apartheid legislation and preparations for elections were made. In April 1994, South Africa held its first democratic, multiracial elections, with Nelson Mandela elected as president of South Africa.

1.2.4. **Legacy of Apartheid:**

The abolition of apartheid is regarded as one of the most important achievements of the 20th century. Years of “discrimination, exploitation and deprivation” (Marks, 2006) have left deep scars among the majority of South Africans. Many South Africans still face high levels of unemployment, inferior education, squalid housing and poor general living conditions (to name a few). Addressing injustices has proven to be difficult and painful for many. Living in fear was a reality for most people, particularly black people. The discriminating laws of apartheid meant that many were terrorised, harassed and tortured on a daily basis – mainly (but not restricted to) those who opposed the government (TRC Report, Vol 1: 34-35).

1.3. **THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION (TRC)**

1.3.1. **Background:**

The (new) government recognised that there was a need to address the injustices perpetrated during the previous regime. In 1995, Parliament set up the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, No. 34, an act that would serve to investigate the violations of human rights abuses perpetrated during apartheid (TRC Report, Vol 1: 24; 49; Marks, 2006).

The TRC was established to bring about closure, or ‘bridge the gap’ created by apartheid. The Commission set out to inform the nation of the injustices perpetrated during apartheid by both the government and the liberation movements, and “to enable South Africans to come to terms with their past on a morally accepted basis.
and to advance the cause of reconciliation” (TRC Report, Vol 1: 48-49; Marks, 2006). The Commission sought to promote an understanding of the past, and to reinstate people’s dignity. The Commission also provided perpetrators with an opportunity to tell the truth and gain some understanding of their own pasts, and to see the past from a different point of view (TRC Report, Vol 1: 49; Hay, 1999: 44).

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission Report is probably the most important document to come out of South Africa in decades which deals with the gross injustices of the past. The TRC Report (Vol 1: xiii; 24; 29) documented gross violations of human rights that had occurred over a 34-year period in South Africa (1960-1994). The Report is an assemblage of testimonies of victims, perpetrators and witnesses.

1.3.2. **The Organisation of the TRC:**

The Commission was composed of three committees that dealt with different aspects of promoting truth and reconciliation. These were the Amnesty Committee, the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee, and the Gross Violations of Human Rights Committee. All three will be detailed below.

i) **The Amnesty Committee:**

The Amnesty Committee was established in accordance with provisions made by the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act (TRC Report, Vol 1: 267; Vol 5: 108). It was also the only committee of its kind to have been accorded the power to grant amnesty to perpetrators (Sarkin, 2004: 3). The function of the Committee was to invite and hear applications by perpetrators seeking amnesty for past abuses that they had committed. These offences would have occurred during the period set out by the Commission, as well as having been politically motivated to be considered for amnesty. Probably one of the most controversial institutions of the TRC, the Act made provision for those seeking amnesty to be exempted from further criminal or civil prosecution (TRC Report, Vol 1: 267; Vol 5: 108; Sarkin, 2004: 6; Christie, 2000: 149). According to Sarkin (2004: 4), only 1167 applicants have been granted amnesty (145 have received partial amnesty).
ii) The Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee:

The function of the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee was to facilitate healing among survivors or the families of victims who had suffered various immeasurable losses (TRC Report, Vol 5: 170). In South Africa, reparation and rehabilitation was deemed necessary as a measure to counter-balance the “generosity” afforded to perpetrators who received amnesty. As the recipients of amnesty cannot be tried criminally or civilly, it was argued the responsibility for ensuring reparations for victims or their families should lie with the government (TRC Report, Vol 5: 170; Christie, 2000: 149).

The Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee was responsible for the following (TRC Report, Vol 1: 285):

- To consider recommendations for reparation and rehabilitation as placed before them by the other committees and the Commission;
- To investigate all possible avenues with regards to the victim(s), what human rights abuses they suffered, and the extent thereof;
- To provide the government with suggestions that would enable giving victims suitable reparation and rehabilitation in order to give victims back their pride and honour;
- To offer suggestions on how reparation and rehabilitation should be made to victims;
- To offer suggestions about the establishment of institutions that would benefit victims and society as a whole and to suggest steps to prevent human rights abuses from recurring.

iii) The Gross Violations of Human Rights Committee:

Gross violations of human rights are defined by the Act as the “killing, abduction, torture or severe ill-treatment”, and as the “attempt, conspiracy, incitement, instigation, command or procurement to commit” the above-mentioned deeds. Due to
the extent of human rights abuses committed during apartheid, the Commission had to restrict their investigations to those that culminated in severe physical and mental abuse, or deaths, as a result of political violence during the requisitioned period (TRC Report, Vol 1: 29). The Commission tried to represent the worst deeds of political violence perpetrated over this period, but acknowledged that their representations remain incomplete, as human rights abuses had been an occurrence stemming from South Africa’s colonial history (TRC Report, Vol 1: 29; Vol 5: 4).

The Commission invited all those affected by apartheid to share their stories of human rights abuses. Over 21 000 statements were received. The statements were analysed and entered onto a database (TRC Report, Vol 3: 3). The Gross Violations of Human Rights (GVHR) Committee was established with regards to those who saw themselves as victims of GVHRs. It also set out to treat victims with the necessary respect and compassion due to them. The Commission decided that it was important to allow victims to relate their own experiences, thus, the notion of holding public hearings was conceived and put into operation (TRC Report, Vol 5: 1-2).

The Committee chose the testimonies that were heard at the public hearings. The chosen statements would reflect (TRC Report, Vol 5: 5-6):

- Representation(s) of both sides (victims and perpetrators) of the political arena of apartheid;
- Representations of human rights abuses over the entire mandated period;
- Opportunities for men, women, as well as the youth, to share their experiences;
- and
- (Near) accurate and complete representations of conflict within a particular region, so that others may also identify with victims’ experiences.

The TRC came to be known through the public hearings, as it enjoyed extensive coverage by the media, both locally and internationally. The Commission was both commended and criticised: the TRC sought to bring about reconciliation which in turn was needed to facilitate forgiveness. Some people were unable to forgive, and did not submit statements to the Commission (TRC Report, Vol 5: 7).
1.3.3. **Summary:**

The first few volumes of the TRC report appeared in October 1998; the final volume was published in April 2003. The Commission condemned all political organisations (both government and the liberation movements) for their respective involvement with human rights abuses. The Commission described the system of apartheid as in itself having been a “crime against humanity”. Most of its criticism was thus reserved for the former National Party (NP) government (Marks, 2006; TRC Report, Vol 1: 29). However, the TRC was both widely lauded and criticised. These praises and criticisms are summarised below:

For:

- The TRC was implemented in terms of conditions set out for it by Parliament, “for the promotion of reconciliation and national unity” (TRC Report, Vol 1: 49), and to identify the acts of human rights abuses perpetrated during apartheid (Doxtader, 2005: 7). Ultimately, the Act should be seen as a “result of political compromise and bargaining” (Hay, 1999: 47; also Christie, 2000: 162).
- It made sure that no South African would forget the gross violations of human rights perpetrated during apartheid, to ensure that those violations would never be repeated, or denied that it ever took place (TRC Report, Vol 5: 8).
- The TRC of South Africa was different from the previous 30 truth commissions that were held around the world, as it was the first to be able to grant amnesty to perpetrators. (Sarkin, 2004: 3; 6).
- It received a high level of interest and support internationally (Sarkin, 2004: 6; Ross, 2003: 1)
- The TRC has opened the way to new “social possibilities” (Ross, 2003: 1), in that its public hearings allowed for the promotion of understanding through the recounting of narratives, for the therapeutic nature of storytelling (Graybill, 2002: 81-83), and for past abuses to be voiced and acknowledged (Hay, 1999: 44; Henry, 2000: 166). It succeeded in its objective of “restoring the human and civil
dignity” (TRC Report, Vol 5: 8) by giving victims a platform to share their experiences;

- The positive effects of the TRC prevail over the negative effects. The TRC was portrayed as a “healing intervention” (Ross, 2003: 1), and the work of the TRC has helped promote the healing of the nation (Hay, 1999: 44). However, the TRC is only one stepping stone towards the healing of a nation and requires patience and time (Christie, 2000: 146; 153; Sarkin, 2004: 34; Doxtader, 2005: 7-8).

Against:

- The TRC faced a lot of opposition from many spheres of society (Hay, 1999: 44). Perceptions of the TRC and public opinion differed greatly, as many felt angered by the Commission, which was accused of trying to assign blame (Sarkin, 2004: 6-7; 34).

- Some critics of the TRC wondered whether the TRC was probing the right issues. Some have doubts whether the TRC has really established “as complete a picture as possible” (TRC Report, Vol 1: 24). Years later, many gaps still remain, and the TRC archives are still inaccessible to the general public (Doxtader, 2005: 7-8).

- Achieving reconciliation, truth and justice may be in conflict with each other: truth may sometimes come at the expense of justice; also, justice may not always lead to reconciliation (Sarkin, 2004: 6-7; 34; Christie, 2000: 166).

- Addressing the injustices of apartheid still has not improved the standard of living for the majority of people. Many are still unemployed, uneducated, with inadequate housing, lack access to necessary resources, or have only a limited access to these resources (Christie, 2000: 148).

- Controversy surrounded the amnesty committee, not in terms of who should receive amnesty, but the methods, findings and conclusions of the Commission were criticised (Sarkin, 2004: 6-7; 34; Doxtader, 2005: 7-8).

- The healing benefits of testifying were overemphasised by the media and the TRC. Graybill (2002: 83-84) states that the TRC promoted the view that “as long as there was crying”, healing was taking place. The issue of restoring a victim’s dignity in such a public display was sometimes regarded as demeaning to victims more than it was of therapeutic benefit.
The TRC undermined the suffering experienced by testifiers, as it “trivialised lived experiences of oppression and exploitation” (Henry, 2000: 166). The TRC failed to provide adequate follow-up support for victims who testified, and many victims felt that they had to fend for themselves. Reparations made to victims were deemed inadequate by some, and the distribution of reparations has been slow and disappointingly little (Graybill, 2002: 83-84; Henry, 2000: 166).

1.4. **Translation and Interpretation at the TRC**

1.4.1. **Background:**

The TRC believed that all those testifying at its hearings should do so in a language of their choice. They believed that the effects thereof would be beneficial for testifiers if they conversed in their mother tongue or a language that they were comfortable with (TRC Report, Vol 1: 146; Vol 5: 7).

The new constitution of South Africa makes provision for 11 official languages; on this basis discrimination based on a person’s language is prohibited, according to the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, No. 34 of 1995 (Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1997; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006; Lotriet, 1997).

According to Lotriet (in Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006:110), up to 1994 there was little investment in formal interpretation or translation services into the African languages because of the country’s policy of only two official languages (Afrikaans and English). With the changing political situation in the country, the need for interpretation and translation services into all 11 official languages was recognised.

The diverse language needs necessitated the Commission to employ an interpretation service that could cater for a multilingual audience. They contracted the services of the Language Facilitation Programme (LFP) of the Unit for Language Facilitation and Empowerment (ULFE) of the University of the Free State. The LFP suggested that the Commission use a simultaneous interpretation service (TRC Report, Vol 1: 147; Vol 6: 749-750; Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1997: 163; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006:111).
Cilliers (2002: 13; also Howe & Martin, 2007: 140) makes the distinction between interpretation and translation: interpretation is the oral transfer of a message from one language into another; and translation is the written transfer of a message from one language into another.

The Commission had to acquire mobile interpreting equipment, and interpreters had to be recruited and trained. The LFP handled the recruitment and training of interpreters in the space of two months across the country. This took place in the form of short courses and limited in-service training. The candidates who were shortlisted were subjected to further tests, from which the final selection (23) was made. According to Du Plessis & Wiegand (1997: 165), it is better to describe the two-week training session as an orientation course (also, TRC Report, Vol 6: 750; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006: 111).

Although the simultaneous interpretation service was deemed successful, the interpreters were faced with many challenges within and outside the context of the TRC (Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006:113-114; Lotriet, 1997: 170-171). These included:

- Ignorance surrounding the use of interpretation as a means of communication among people;
- A lack of trained interpreters in various spheres of society. These included a lack of training facilities and programmes for interpreters;
- Too little time to train the interpreters;
- Interpreters often had to avail themselves at short notice. They were away from their families for long periods at a time;
- The hearings placed a lot of physical and emotional strain on the interpreters;
- Often they had to interpret from or into English, which was not the first language of the majority of interpreters;
- Lack of resources, and inadequate handling of the mobile equipment created problems.
According to Picard (1988: 25), it is necessary for an interpreter or translator to render a service as accurately as possible, to ensure the closest meaning possible to that which is being interpreted or translated. Picard (1988: 39) states that exact translation or interpretation is not always possible as personal preferences, cultural or world views, narrative styles, and so on, influence the interpretation or translation of texts (Bock et al., 2006; also Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006: 104). Simultaneous interpretation was valuable in terms of the time it saved, and the extensive volumes of terminology it had generated (TRC Report, Vol 6: 750; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006:114).

Researchers have found that the official online versions of testimonies are sometimes misinterpreted, additional information is sometimes added, or vital information has sometimes been omitted. This has implications for researchers because access to TRC testimonies in their original source languages is still fairly inaccessible. Only the online versions of testimonies are freely available (Bock et al., 2006; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006: 104; Doxtader, 2005: 8).

1.5. **VICTIM HEARINGS**

1.5.1. **Background:**

Some victims who gave statements were invited to testify at the public hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). The hearings usually lasted two to five days, with approximately 20–60 people testifying (TRC Report, Vol 1: 145). There were 76 public hearings held across the country between April 1996 and June 1997. These hearings usually consisted of a panel of 3 to 17 Commissioners or Committee members (Ross, 2003: 13).

The public hearings were considered the most central part of the TRC, as they gave victims the opportunity to voice their stories of human rights abuses. They were an opportunity to share their hurt and anguish with the rest of society. The hearings sparked discussion among people, especially on how human rights abuses can be avoided in the future (TRC Report, Vol 1: 147).
Storytelling was a core aspect of the TRC hearings, through which testifiers voiced their experiences of past human rights abuses (Graybill, 2002: 81). Storytelling was seen as important as survivors often felt guilt or shame at what their activism had done to their families and friends. Victims often felt that their identities had been lost: they felt misunderstood, that their sacrifices had gone unnoticed, that people did not understand the pain they had suffered, and that they could fit into society. According to Graybill (2002: 81-82), “survivors often feel misunderstood and ignored, their sacrifice unacknowledged, their pain unrecognized, and their identity lost”. Public storytelling was seen as an important step for victims to reclaim their identities. The TRC recognised that telling one’s story had therapeutic advantages for victims, and that sharing one’s story can lead to healing for both victims and perpetrators (Graybill, 2002: 82-83; 85). The negative side of telling stories of past abuses is that it reopens old wounds, and that people relive the trauma of the past, because, as Ross (2006: 121) states, “remembering and recounting harm is neither a simple nor neutral act”. For some, telling their stories did not heal them, but made them bitter and angrier than before.

1.5.2. **Special Hearings: Youth and Children**

The youth were among those who were not only witnesses, but were subjected to some of the worst violations of human rights suffered during apartheid. The TRC realised the impact political violence had on children and youth, and the role they played in the country’s liberation. The Commission decided to institute special hearings for the youth to communicate their experiences (TRC Report, Vol 4: 248).

The TRC Report (Vol 4: 248) argues that many former youth activists may have suffered irreparable physical and psychological damage due to prolonged exposure to violence. Most of those who gave testimonies (on gross violations of human rights) told of the torment and harassment that youth and children suffered at the hands of the Security Forces. The former youth activists saw themselves as ‘freedom fighters’, liberators or soldiers. Few of the youth who testified referred to their own acts of heroism and tenacity that they displayed in the struggle. The Commission did not prompt those who did (testify) to describe themselves and others as heroes; testifiers
chose the public hearings to share the effect their sacrifices have had on them, such as their loss of educational opportunities. They described how they had sacrificed their lives and livelihood for the country’s liberation (TRC Report, Vol 4: 248-249).

Many children were kept in custody by the Security Forces, the largest number of them (about 80 000) between the two states of emergency in the 1980s. An estimated 48 000 were under the age of 25. Many suffered abuse and torture at the hands of the police while in detention. The abuses included depriving them of essentials such as food, water and proper sanitation; threatening to hurt their families; mental, physical and sexual abuse; and teargas in confined spaces, amongst others. Many young men, aged then between 13 and 24 years, reported being tortured and severely ill-treated. Many chose to run or hide from the police, as they feared detention (TRC Report, Vol 3: 484; Vol 4: 260-280; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 228).

1.5.3. Bonteheuwel Military Wing (BMW):

i) Background:

Some of the worst offences committed during the period of apartheid were carried out against children and youth. The youth had become increasingly agitated with the political situation in the country. The 1980s saw the political tensions in South Africa reach a climax. By 1984, resistance to the unjust apartheid system had increased, particularly among the youth in townships. Many townships became ‘war zones’ with ongoing clashes between youth and police. One such township was Bonteheuwel: a predominantly coloured area on the outskirts of Cape Town. It was created as a result of the Group Areas Act in the 1960s, following the forced removals of coloureds out of Cape Town (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482; Vol 4: 278).

The period between 1985 and 1989 saw the government impose even more stringent measures to curb political opposition, including two states of emergency (1985, 1987) and repression of the media. Increased police presence and power resulted in mass arrests, detentions and killing of activists, mainly youths who were leading the resurgence. Both the state and the resistance saw violence as their only means of gaining control (Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 223).
By the mid-1980s Bonteheuwel was known as a regular site for political violence, mostly student-led. The youth sought to undermine the government by creating general chaos in the townships, rendering the areas ungovernable. They regarded it as their duty to help overthrow the apartheid regime and force political change. School children formed political organisations and held mass meetings to voice their rejection of the current political system and its unjust policies. In 1984, BISCO (Bonteheuwel Inter-Schools Congress) was formed, a combination of various SRCs that spoke out against the government (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482; Vol 4: 278; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 223-224; 228).

By October 1985 BISCO was banned from holding meetings and rallies, along with an estimated 101 other organisations. BISCO’s leaders, among them Ashley Kriel and Faried Muhammad Ferhelst, were forced to go into hiding from the authorities. The young activists decided that they needed to protect themselves from the security forces. At a meeting in 1985, the Bonteheuwel Military Wing (BMW) was created as “a militant body to co-ordinate and intensify the revolutionary activities, especially at the Bonteheuwel High Schools”. This new organisation would go against the government and police (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482; Vol 4: 278; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 224; 228). It is estimated that BMW had over 100 members during its short existence. Members were nothing more than ordinary school children, aged between 14 and 18 years old. BMW was welcomed by fellow liberation organisations such as the ANC and the UDF, with whom they formed close ties (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482-483; Vol 4: 278-279).

The BMW was a highly militant group. Some members joined MK cells inside South Africa or those in exile, where they received military training, including the handling of weapons and explosives. These members would then return to BMW to recruit and train more people, using their newfound expertise. They operated in small groups consisting of several different types. In particular, five groups (four members each) were referred to as the “gunmen” of Bonteheuwl: they carried out the more serious activities, such as arson and raids on civilian homes. The remaining units provided them with safety, money and weapons. The BMW acquired weapons from various sources, including comrades who were returning from exile and smuggling weapons.
into the country, stolen police weapons and from MK members operating in the Western Cape (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482; Vol 4: 279; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 228).

By late 1986 and early 1987, Bonteheuwel had become a so-called ‘war zone’, with police unable to enter the area. BMW members launched attacks on police and government institutions, even community members perceived as helping the police and alleged ‘informers’. Vehicles containing food and supplies were hijacked and the produce redistributed among members of BMW and the community. Their various exploits made BMW a target for the security forces (TRC Report, Vol 3: 483; Vol 4: 279).

Police attempted to restore order, and by 1986, they established the special Unrest Investigation Units (UIU). These were charged with clamping down on the unrest and bringing down those responsible for it. The UIU were instructed to gain information as quickly as possible as well as by any means necessary. The UIU succeeded, when, during a raid in Athlone (late 1987), they invaded a BMW stronghold, basically bringing an end to the organisation. More arrests followed: between June 1987 and January 1988, more than 40 BMW members had been detained. By mid-1989, BMW had ceased to exist (TRC Report, Vol 3: 483-484; Vol 4: 279). Many former BMW members who testified before the Commission reported that they were severely tortured by police while in detention (TRC Report, Vol 3: 484; Vol 4: 279-280).

This study will look at the testimony of a former member of BMW, Faried Muhammad Ferhelst.

1.5.4. **Faried Muhammad Ferhelst:**

i) **Background**

Faried Muhammad Ferhelst was one of the founding members of BMW at the age of 14 years. During the 1980s, he was on the run from the police, and often went without shelter or food. His mother occasionally left clothes and food for him at designated ‘safe’ houses (Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 228). In 1987, while staying at a friend’s house, he was arrested and taken into custody by the security police amid a squadron
of armoured cars and armed policemen. He was interrogated by the police, released and re-arrested, the latter resulting in his abduction and subsequent assault and torture.

He was chosen to appear before the Commission to share his experiences at the hands of the security police. During his testimony, he indicated his disappointment with the current government for their lack of support for the children and youth who had helped with the fight for liberation. He highlighted the plight of his fellow comrades. According to Ferhelst, these former activists do not have a proper education and consequently experience high levels of unemployment. Others have turned to crime, gangsterism or substance abuse. They find it difficult to find their place in society, as they do not share the community’s sense of what is ‘normal’; normal for them (growing up) meant running or hiding from the police, taking part in acts of violence and detentions by the security force. They lived with the fear on a daily basis, not only for themselves but for friends and families as well.

ii) Post-apartheid Sentiments:

The youth were an integral part of the country’s racial liberation. Many sacrificed stable home lives and their education to take part in the collective violence, attacking anything or anyone associated with the government.

At the public hearings, many of the young victims told of their ongoing struggle to come to terms with their active participation in political violence, and the tremendous physical and mental scars this has left them with. Some have found it difficult to reintegrate into society, and maintain employment and relationships. In effect, their activism has left them feeling a major sense of loss, both emotional and material (TRC Report, Vol 4: 269-280).

A number of activists at the TRC spoke of how the new South Africa has not lived up to its promises, generating feelings of abandonment, displeasure and bitterness, especially towards the political groups that had supported and endorsed their political activities (TRC Report, Vol 4: 272; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 222). Many still see themselves as freedom fighters, even after the fall of apartheid and the subsequent institution of a democratic government. The new government has turned out to be a
major disappointment to many former activists. They felt excluded from the process of negotiation for democratic change. Some have turned to crime to survive, as they feel that the government has left them to fend for themselves (Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 225; 228).

Others have taken their dire situations and found something positive from it: some have built new lives for themselves, and have learnt to deal with and to overcome their past. They have become resilient, wise and tolerant leaders in their communities. Many have forgiven their perpetrators in their own bid for reconciliation, and have found their peace through the TRC and other organisation such as the Breakthrough Project. Another example is the Bonteheuwel Veteran’s Association (BVA), founded by Faried Muhammed Ferhelst: its aim is to find solutions to unemployment, homelessness, lack of education and general support for struggling ex-members, and to help them reconstruct their lives in a positive way. The BVA is self-reliant, as the government has been slow in their support for these former activists. They regard themselves as liberators, not ‘victims’, who fought for the betterment of the nation; the sacrifices they had made have (in a sense) been worth the effort (TRC Report, Vol 4: 276-277; Marks & McKenzie, 1995:228).

1.5.5. **Special Hearings: Women and the TRC:**

The TRC observed that fewer women than men had testified about violations of human rights committed against them (Ross, 2003). The Commission thus deemed it necessary to hold separate hearings for women.

The TRC created an environment where people’s narratives “would be transformed into truth and history” (Motsemme, 2004: 911). Narrative was employed to show how “everyday identities become (re)formulated in various ways” (Motsemme, 2004: 914). Narratives not only reveal what happened, but also how and why the event happened, placing the emphasis on the meaning of the event in question.

Ross (2003) conducted research into the testimonies of women at the TRC hearings. Her findings revealed that when testifying, men and women’s roles differed: women spoke mostly about males (usually relatives), while men tended to speak about their
own political activities and suffering (TRC Report, Vol 4: 283; Ross, 2003: 17). Ross (2003: 17) found that 79% of women testified about crimes committed against men, and 40% of women testified about violations committed against their sons. 62% of men testified about their own political experiences, which was almost 4 times more than testimonies given by women.

According to Kendall & Tannen (2001: 556; also TRC Report, Vol 4: 289), gender is a cultural construct. Identities and roles are constructed through negotiated social interaction – the way men and women interact reveals their social positioning within a culture (Kendall & Tannen, 2001: 556). These differing roles were revealed through their testimonies at the hearings. Women constructed positions for themselves as mothers, wives, sisters and daughters, mostly in relation to a politically active male relative. Women activists rarely testified about their own experiences and few came forward with their stories (TRC Report, Vol 4: 283; 289; Motsemme, 2004: 919; Ross, 2003: 17).

According to Ross (2003: 46), most women began their testimonies by placing themselves within the sphere of daily life. The home was seen as a safe space in which they had control, and where their identities were created. The home was used to describe the forced intrusion of the state into their lives, causing disruption to what was deemed ‘normal’ or ‘usual’. In their testimonies, women recounted feelings that they had failed to protect their homes and families. They had no ‘breathing space’; the state used this regular imposition to disrupt the family or community’s sense of morality (Feldman 1991, in Motsemme, 2004: 924). The state’s intrusion into their homes resulted in feelings of inadequacy and loss of control over the one space women felt that they did control. Keeping quiet about what was happening around them maintained the illusion of stability of their daily lives (Motsemme, 2004: 909; 920; Ross, 2003: 42-43).

Women spoke of the loss or disappearance of a loved one and the anguish it caused. According to Ross (2003), they were more likely to reflect on the effects violence had on them on a psychological level than men. They described how they searched for their loved ones at police stations, mortuaries and prisons, amongst others. Women testified of the measures they took to protect their loved ones. Some feigned
ignorance about a family member’s political activism; others defiantly stood up to the authorities (TRC Report, Vol 4: 293; Motsemme, 2004: 910; Ross, 2003: 43).

According to Ross (2003: 45), silence was employed as a means to survival – to deal with the loss of agency to corrupt and demeaning forces. Women also used silence as a means of protection. According to Motsemme (2004: 919; 921), silence can be regarded as a “form of recognition” among those in similar positions rather than blatant ignorance about one’s social position (mother, wife or daughter). Many refused to cooperate with the authorities as a means of subverting the increased pressure the apartheid state was putting on them for information about politically active relatives. Some politically active women even hid their own activism from their family and friends.

Most women who testified at the Commission were older than men – between 37 and 60 years, whereas males were aged between 25 and 48 years. The age difference corroborates research that males between the ages of 13 and 24 had been politically active during the 1980s, a period of intense and violent conflict in the country. Women, on the other hand, testified mainly about their children, mostly about their sons (TRC Report, Vol 1: 170-171; Vol 4: 258ff in Ross, 2003: 19).

This research will look at the testimonies of Mrs Minnie Ferhelst and her son, Faried Muhammed Ferhelst, a former activist. The analysis of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony will include comparing her testimony in Afrikaans with the official English translated version, from the TRC website. The analysis will also look at how she construes herself as a mother, wife, as well as her construal of other participants in her testimony. The analysis of Mr Ferhelst’s testimony will reveal how he construed himself as an innocent victim, pursued by the police for no apparent reason.

1.6. **CONCLUSION**

Apartheid was a system that sought to divide a nation according to race, to ensure white supremacy. It has left many wounds on people who were affected by it. For some, social inequalities, like inadequate housing and unemployment continue to exist (Marks, 2006; TRC Vol 4: 269-280).
The TRC was established to address the injustices perpetrated during apartheid, and to give a voice to those who had been silenced under apartheid. It was established to give a platform to victims, perpetrators and witnesses to share their experiences of the past, in a bid to aid healing and reconciliation. The TRC also wanted people to know about the human rights abuses perpetrated during apartheid, and to prevent those from re-occurring (TRC Report, Vol 1: 48-49; Vol 5: 8). The TRC hearings heard testifiers from all spheres of society. Many of the victims of apartheid were children or youth at the time, who now suffer for their activism, through unemployment, for example. Women, too, suffered the brunt of apartheid, many of whom lost loved ones, or were harassed by the security forces (TRC Report, Vol 4: 248-280; Motsemme, 2004; Ross, 2003).

The TRC hearings were made accessible through the Commission’s implementation of an interpretation service, which allowed testifiers to speak in the language of their choice. Though some logistical concerns arose, the simultaneous interpretation service was seen as a success in the time and cost it saved the Commission, as well as the volumes of new terminology that it generated for future interpreters (TRC Report, Vol 1: 147; Vol 6: 749-750; Du Plessis & Wiegand, 1997; Lotriet, 1997; Bock & Mpolweni-Zantsi, 2006).

For many, the effects of apartheid still linger, and the TRC has been criticised for this. Many (Christie, 2000; Henry, 2000; Sarkin, 2004; Doxtader, 2005) believe that the TRC did not succeed in promoting reconciliation and healing. As Yazir Henry (2000: 173) stated, “[t]he TRC has initiated a process. It has not healed a nation. It could never do this.” It has succeeded, though, in terms of exposing the truth as told by the many victims and perpetrators at its hearings. The hearings brought therapeutic healing for some, for others it has only uncovered deeply buried hurts and anger. All recognise that the TRC still has a long way to go to bring about reconciliation and healing. It may take many years to undo the damage wrought by apartheid and healing a nation will require patience. The TRC itself states that it should be seen as a small step towards reconciliation, and it only set the process in motion (TRC Report, Vol 3: 271; Graybill, 2002: 83). According to Henry (2000: 173), who wrote an article about his own testimony and his subsequent post-TRC stance:
“… Painful as it is, the truth should not be suppressed. Apartheid affected everybody. Everyone has a story to tell. People need to be given the opportunity to tell these stories, since there are different perceptions of truth. These different perceptions need to be addressed…”

1.7. **OUTLINE FOR THE THESIS**

This chapter has looked at the context of the TRC and the hearings that produced the testimonies. The rest of the thesis is divided as follows:

- Chapter two will provide the theoretical background to the study that will be used for the analysis of the data. This chapter will look at the theories of Systemic Functional Linguistics, narrative and constructing identity through one’s linguistic choices.
- Chapter three will look at the research methodology that will be used for the study.
- In chapters four and five, the testimonies of Faried Muhammad Ferhelst and his mother, Minnie Ferhelst will be analysed respectively. Their testimonies will be analysed using the theory discussed in chapter two.
- Chapter six will be a summary and discussion of the key findings of the analyses.
2.1. **INTRODUCTION**

People use language to make sense of the world around them, both the physical world and their mental perceptions of it (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 29). Speakers not only position themselves (and others) in relation to a particular event or participant, but place themselves within that particular social situation. This brief description is but an aspect of the theory that underpins this thesis, namely Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This thesis will look at how speakers construe themselves and their experiences through the linguistic and discursive choices they make. This thesis will also focus on how they construe others, as well as how the same event is construed by different speakers. Also in this chapter will be a discussion of genre, attempts to define the term ‘genre’ and its various constituents. Examples of genre are also discussed, in particular the Narrative, as the testimonies used in this thesis take the form of the Recount narrative genre. Lastly, this chapter will end with a brief summary of the all the relevant discussions and theories.

The section that follows will focus on the revised work on Systemic Functional Linguistics by Halliday & Matthiessen (2004), also Eggins (2004), Ravelli (2000), Lock (1996) and others where noted.

2.2. **SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS (SFL)**

People use language every day, through speech or writing. People use language to interact with one another in ways that are meaningful (and informative), and to express their experiences of the world (Eggins, 2004: 11). Language is a “system for creating meaning” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; 511), and is the means through which meaning is expressed (Ravelli, 2000: 29). Language has a semantic purpose in that when we interact, we produce (particular) meanings within particular contexts (Eggins, 2004: 11; Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 1).
Language forms the cornerstone of human experience: it expresses our views of the world (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 3). Linguists have (long since) tried to establish how speakers (users) use language to encode their experiences of the world (Martin, 2004: 73), i.e. to “equate meaning with function” (Thompson, 2004: 28). This theory was developed (and elaborated) by Halliday (and others) and is referred to as Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

SFL is defined in various ways by various linguists and language practitioners. SFL is a “multifunctional theory” (Fairclough, in Martin, 2000: 275) that can be used in the analysis of a variety of different texts, and in relating those texts to their contexts. According to Feez (2002: 44), SFL can be described as the organisation of a language system as a resource for people to construct texts that differ according to different social contexts. SFL is a “contextually sensitive and functional grammar”, which allows movement between language and context in a “mutually predictive way” (Macken-Horarik, 2002: 42); in other words, Systemic Functional linguists look at how language differs from one context to another, thereby establishing a link between language use and context (Feez, 2002: 53; Fairclough, 2004: 5; Macken-Horarik 2002: 19). SFL also explores the relatively invariable organisation of language that makes texts recognisable within a society and culture, which form the underlying theory of genre (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 29). In other words, SFL is used to make sense of everyday interactions (Eggins, 2004: 1).

According to Thompson (2004; 28-30), SFL is not only concerned with individual words, but with all aspects of how those words combine to make meaning, for example, naming things, describing events or expressing ideas. According to Ravelli (2000: 34), meaning can only be interpreted if taken within the context in which it takes place. Meaning is gained by the choices that are made or could have been made (Eggins, 2004: 3). The overall purpose of language is for people to communicate with one another, i.e. “to make meanings with each other” (Eggins, 2004: 11). These meanings are all made simultaneously and can be obtained by looking at the clause. The clause is described by Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 168) as a “multifunctional construct”. The functions of the clause can be separated in terms of three kinds of meaning – Theme, Subject and Actor, each of which carries its own distinctive meaning. Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 48-60) refer to these three elements as
Clause as message (Theme), Clause as exchange (Subject) and Clause as representation (Actor). Collectively these are known as **Metafunctions** – the textual metafunction (clause as message), the interpersonal metafunction (clause as exchange), and the ideational or experiential metafunction (clause as representation). Metafunctions are important in language as they are powerful tools for extracting and analysing meaning in a text and relating that meaning to its immediate social context (Martin, 2000: 296).

In the sections that follow, this thesis will attempt to explain each of the three metafunctions (as they pertain to this thesis).

2.2.1. **The Ideational or Experiential Metafunction**

The ideational or experiential metafunction describes how we perceive the world around us, both the physical (outside) world and the world of our thoughts and feelings. Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 29) state that “there is no facet of human experience that can’t be transformed into meaning”, i.e. language is used to define human experience. Experience represents a constant flux of events, or “goings-on” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 170). These events, or “goings-on” form a representation (a ‘figure’) of our experiences of the world, the people we interact with and the circumstances in which these interactions take place (Martin, 2000: 276). This is referred to as **Transitivity**, which can be defined as an organised or structured system of how we make sense of reality.

A figure can be divided into three components (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 175):

- The **process** itself, which is an activity or event that unfolds temporally – “a way of being”;  
- The process is brought about by the **participants** involved and affected by it; and  
- The **circumstances** surrounding the process, which represent additional information about the event.
The English language construes experience as a semantic configuration: the process, participant and circumstantial components are semantic categories through which experience is construed. Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 170) distinguish between “inner” (i.e. our thoughts, feelings, and so on.) and “outer” experience (i.e. the world around us). Our outer experience includes events, people or things that cause things to happen. Our “inner” experience is a reflection of these “outer” events. Halliday & Matthiessen posit that there is a clear distinction between the two processes, which are represented in the grammar of the clause. These two processes are referred to as Material and Mental processes respectively and will be discussed below.

Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 170-171) distinguish between three main types of process in the English language, namely Material, Mental and Relational. There are also other processes which are considered borderline between the (three) main processes, sharing characteristics of at least two processes. These processes are Behavioural, Verbal and Existential.

i) **Material Process:**

The Material process refers to the actual ‘doing’ or ‘action’ performed by a person or ‘thing’. The process reflects the action taking place through time, which is brought about by the participant, the Actor. The Actor typically occurs in the subject position of a clause, and is usually represented by a nominal group. The Actor is the participant who ‘does’ the action. Sometimes, the process extends to another participant – the one who ‘receives’ the action, known as the Goal. The Goal is realised in the position of the direct object, and is also realised by a nominal group (Lock, 1996: 72, 75). Both Actor and Goal can be animate or inanimate, i.e. it can be human, object or thing. A Material process may or may not have a Goal, depending on whether the clause is a ‘happening’ (intransitive) or a ‘doing’ (transitive).

Material processes need not only represent physical action processes; they can be abstract as well, though they are still regarded as action processes grammatically. However, such abstractions make it more difficult to distinguish between Actor and Goal. According to Ravelli (2000: 38), different processes construe different ‘actions’ in a text. Doing a Transitivity analysis (of Material clauses) can reveal how different
participants construe actions differently, by observing (for example) how a particular clustering of Material processes can reveal important segments of action in a text. Combined with particular participants, this allows for more detailed analysis of texts.

ii) **Mental Process:**

Mental processes refer to what goes on in our consciousness. The Mental process refers simply to what is being thought, felt or seen. The process may have two participants, namely the Senser and the Phenomenon.

The Senser is the participant who does the thinking, feeling, and so on; this participant is always human or “human-like” (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 201). The Senser is represented by a nominal group, but can be referred to pronominally. The Senser can also refer to:

1. a group of people as sharing one thought, feeling, and so on.;
2. it can represent a part of a person as being endowed with the ability to sense;
3. it can be the result of human consciousness; and lastly,
4. it can also be an inanimate object that has been “given life” or personified, i.e. an object or thing that is regarded as a conscious being.

The Phenomenon refers to the person or thing that is being felt, thought, perceived or wanted. It is represented by a nominal group that can be anything conceivable (e.g. human, animal or object). The Phenomenon can also be an act or a fact. It can be represented metaphorically, i.e. through a nominalisation that represents the process as a thing. (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 203; Lock, 1996: 105).

Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 208), Lock (1996: 105) and others have divided Mental processes into four sub-types:

- Perception (e.g. seeing, feeling)
- Affection / Emotion (e.g. liking, hating)
- Cognition (e.g. thinking, remembering)
- Volition / Desideration (e.g. wanting, hoping)
Mental processes have the ability to set up one or more clauses as the result of a person’s thinking. This result is known as the idea clause, and is regarded as separate from the Mental clause. When the idea clause and Mental clause are combined, they form a Projection: the Mental clause ‘projects’ the idea clause as a set of ideas that are the product of (a person’s) consciousness.

iii) **Relational Process:**

This process indicates a relationship or connection between participants. According to Lock (1996: 126), Relational processes are about “what things are, what they are like, and what they possess”. Relational clauses must have two participants which can be either an indefinite nominal group or a prepositional phrase. The reason for this is that “something is said to be something else” in a Relational process, in other words, a relationship is being established between two entities. As with the Phenomenon in Mental clauses, a Relational process can be a thing, act, or a fact.

The Relational process is usually realised by the verb ‘to be’ or ‘to have’, functioning on its own or as the main verb of the clause, (but not as an auxiliary), also through other verbs of a similar nature, like ‘seems’ or ‘represents’ (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004: 211, 214; Ravelli, 2000: 40). Relational processes construe experience as ‘being’ rather than as an action or a thought or feeling. In fact, they are more like Mental processes, in that they describe participants as ‘non-active’ or stagnant. The difference is located in the tense – Relational clauses are distinctly in the simple present or past tense.

English sub-divides into three main Relational processes, intensive, circumstantial and possessive. Each of these three types consists of an attributive and an identifying mode, which makes six types of Relational clauses altogether. In the attributive mode, something is assigned or attributed to another, and is said to have or belong to a class. One of the participants is referred to as the Attribute – the participant to which a description or attribution is being made. The Attribute can normally be found in the position of the Complement / Object of a clause. The Attribute is usually ascribed to some entity, known as the Carrier. The Carrier is typically found in the position of the
subject of the clause. For example in the clause “I was still young”, “I” is the Carrier and “young” represents the Attribute.

The identifying mode involves ascribing an identity to one entity by comparing it with another entity. The participant which is being identified is the Identified. The entity which is used to make the identification, is referred to as the Identifier. Either one can be the subject of the clause, depending on the voice of the clause. If the clause is in the operative (active) voice, then the subject is the Token; if the voice is in the receptive (passive), then the subject is referred to as the Value.

One important difference between the attributive and identifying modes, is that attributive relational clauses cannot be changed into the passive, whereas the identifying relational clauses have passive forms.

iv) **Behavioural Process:**

The Behavioural process refers to processes that are associated with the physiological and psychological workings of a participant. Examples are sleeping, eating or breathing (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 248; Ravelli, 2000: 39; Lock, 1996: 116).

A Behavioural process, or Mental-Action process (Lock, 1996: 116), is characterised by features of both Material and Mental processes. As with the Senser of a Mental process, there must be a participant who is animate, usually human, known as the Behaver. A Behavioural process generally only consists of a Behaver and the Process. Sometimes the behaviour is disguised as a participant, referred to as the Behaviour. A Behavioural process is also coupled with certain circumstantial elements – Matter, Manner and Place, of which circumstance of Place usually occurs as a prepositional phrase (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 250-251).

v) **Verbal Process:**

This process refers to the different ways of ‘saying’. According to Halliday & Matthiessen (2004: 253), Verbal processes are “symbolic relationships” in the human mind which are played out through language, i.e. by saying or telling. Verbal
processes typically appear in the form of “x said, then y said”, followed by a quote. The verb ‘say’ and other related verbs of saying generally make up the verbal group. What makes Verbal processes important is that they set up dialogic relations, which is especially important in narratives (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 252; Ravelli, 2000: 41; Lock, 1996: 116).

Verbal processes are a combination of the Mental and Relational processes and therefore share characteristics of both, most prominently, the capacity to project. The projection, i.e. “what is said”, forms the secondary clause. Therefore, Verbal processes contain two clauses, similar to the idea clause of a Mental process (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 108-114; 129; also 2004: 253; Martin & Rose, 2003: 74-75).

The participant is typically realised by the Sayer, which can be anything represented as saying something. What is said is known as the Saying (Lock, 1996; 116) or the Verbiage (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Verbal processes recognise three different participants, apart from the Sayer. These are:

- The Receiver / Addressee is the entity to whom the Saying is directed; it is represented as a nominal group, which can stand on its own, or may be indicated by a preposition. The nominal group can refer to an animate being, a group or an institution. It may also form the subject in a receptive clause. All of this, though, depends on the verb that realises the Process.
- Verbiage refers to what is said, representing it as a “class of thing”. It may refer to the gist of what is said, or may be in reference to a saying.
- The Target is the participant that is ‘targeted’ by the Saying. A Verbal process that contains a Target does not generally project indirect speech.

vi) Existential Process:

This process relates to something that exists or happens. Like Relational processes, the Existential process is realised by the verb ‘to be’, but also other verbs of a similar nature, (e.g. exist, become). Existential processes do not frequently occur in discourse, but may occur in the Orientation stage of a Narrative, where they may serve to
introduce key participants. The ability to orientate is often presented in the form of circumstantial components of time and place. After the Orientation stage they may serve as an introduction into the main narrative. The only participant is the Existent, which is anything that is said to exist; it can be an event, situation, institution, or person – anything that is construed as a ‘thing’. Existential processes are realised by “there”, which is neither a participant nor a circumstance. It serves no purpose in the structure of Transitivity within the clause, and is simply a ‘feature of existence’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 256-258; Ravelli, 2000: 41; Lock, 1996: 139).

The processes and their participants are summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1</th>
<th>PROCESS TYPES WITH DESCRIPTIONS &amp; PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Physical / abstract action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Perception, Affection / Emotion, Cognition, Volition / Desideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Process of ‘being’ or ‘having’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Physiological and psychological process (e.g. breathing, sleeping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Process of ‘saying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Something that exists or happens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from Halliday & Matthiessen (2004).

2.2.2. **ERGATIVITY**

Agency is a complex aspect of human experience. Agency can be found in all different types of processes. According to Halliday & Matthiessen (1999: 559-560), agency is expressed through language as a “fundamental complementarity”: Transitivity distinguishes between two perspectives of English grammar, i.e. between the ‘doer’ and the ‘done to’ (transitive perspective); or the process may present the action as having occurred by itself, or as having been caused by an outside or external agent or causer (ergative perspective) (Thompson, 2004: 135; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 282-284). These two basic perspectives are explained in this

The transitive perspective refers to processes with regards to “actions” which have two participants – the ‘doer’ or Actor who brings about the action. The second participant (Goal) may or may not be affected by the action.

The concept of Ergativity is closely related to that of causation, which refers to one participant portrayed as “causing a state or event” (Lock, 1996: 125). This represents the system of Ergativity, and it is expressed through a special class of verbs (ergative verbs). The ergative perspective refers to a type of analysis that describes participants in terms of Causer and Affected (Lock, 1996: 89). The grammar of English represents Ergativity in terms of “happenings” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999: 559-560), i.e. Ergativity represents one participant as being affected by the action (Affected), which may or may not be caused by another or external participant (Causer). For example, in “[h]e pulled me up”, “he” is the Causer of the action; “me” is the recipient of that action, i.e. the Affected participant.

In the English language one can express an action as having occurred on its own, or as having been caused by someone or something else. The means through which the process is conveyed is referred to as the Medium, and bears a relation to that of Goal in Material processes. The ‘external causer’ of the process is referred to as the Causer or Agent, and is similar to the Actor-role of Material processes (Lock, 1996: 57; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 284; Thompson, 1993: 93). Ergative clauses may feature with or without a Causer.

In terms of the Transitivity system, Ergativity is important in the composition of the message, i.e. the decision on whether or not to add or leave out agency. Sometimes locating agency can be problematic (Martin, 2003: 73). Breaking the text into its processes and participants can help in assigning agency, and to see how agency is distributed in the text. The system of Ergativity carries great importance with regards to the system of voice. Clauses that are construed without agency are known as middle, i.e. they are neither active nor passive. Clauses that carry agency are referred to as non-middle or effective clauses – they can be either active or passive. Non-
middle clauses are realised explicitly (by naming the Agent) or implicitly (by making it passive and omitting the Agent).

These two models, transitive and ergative, form the basis of the Transitivity system in that they complete each other. Both systems, though, have sparked some controversy among grammarians: some (grammarians) believe a single clause can be analysed for both Transitivity and Ergativity; others believe that only one system is conveyed in the clause at a time (depending on the verb) and not both together (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 285).

2.2.3. **The Interpersonal Metafunction**

The clause expresses three meanings simultaneously. One of these meanings, the ideational metafunction, was discussed in the preceding section, which dealt with how language is used to represent our experiences of the world around us (clause as representation). On another level, the clause expresses how language is used to enact personal relations, or how language is used in terms of information or service exchange(s), i.e. how participants construe themselves in relation to their roles, attitudes and relationships with other participants. This is reflected through the interpersonal metafunction (clause as exchange). As this metafunction is not dealt with in this thesis, a brief description of what it entails follows below.

The interpersonal metafunction refers to an exchange of meaning and the building of relationships between people. This metafunction is realised through speech roles – giving and demanding, information, and goods and services. These four realise the speech functions of offer, command, statement and question. All this is represented in the system of Mood. Mood refers to the level of involvement between speakers and listeners. Mood indicates the mood of the clause, i.e. whether the clause is declarative, interrogative or imperative. Mood also selects for tense, modality and polarity. Modality expresses ‘degrees of uncertainty’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 147; Thompson, 2004: 66); it functions as either Modulization (degrees of probability and usuality) or Modulation (degrees of obligation and inclination). Polarity refers to whether a clause is positive or negative.
2.2.4. **The Textual Metafunction**

In order for a text to make sense, it is important that the components of the text follow in a logical or meaning-making order. So far, this chapter has outlined two ways of expressing meaning in the clause: the experiential and the interpersonal metafunctions. These two metafunctions realise that “messages” or interactions are about something and addressing someone (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 30). The third of Halliday’s metafunctions enables us to do that: the textual metafunction (clause as message) allows for the ideational and interpersonal meanings of a clause to be organised in order for the text to make sense. The textual metafunction relates to how language is used to organise the message of a text in relation to its context. The choice of how to structure the message is made as we speak, and is determined by the situation in which it is produced (Ravelli, 2000: 51; Lock, 1996: 9, 220). As with the interpersonal metafunction, the textual metafunction is not dealt with in this thesis, and is summarised below.

The textual metafunction represents the clause as message – how the clause is organised to convey a message. Theme occurs in the first position of the clause – the “point of departure” of the clause, or simply, what the clause is about. The Theme is selected by the speaker or writer. The Theme extends up to and ends with the experiential function; the rest of the clause is known as the Rheme. The experiential constituent of the clause expresses the topical Theme; other Themes, namely the textual and the interpersonal, occur before the topical Theme. Inherently thematic features serve to orientate the clause, while characteristically thematic elements express the attitude and point of view of the speaker in reference to the content of the message.

2.2.5. **Summary of Section**

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a “contextually sensitive grammar” that is used to make sense of the world around us. SFL looks at the relationship between language and context. Together with genre theory, SFL looks at how people use language to construct texts in different social contexts (Macken-Horarik, 2002: 42).
The clause expresses meaning about the world around us. According to Halliday (1994, 2004) the clause carries with it three distinct meanings or metafunctions – the experiential metafunction (clause as representation), the interpersonal metafunction (clause as exchange), and the textual metafunction (clause as message).

The experiential metafunction expresses how experience is represented – the ‘goings-on’ around us. This is achieved through the system of Transitivity, which allows for the construal of experience. Transitivity consists of six Process types: Material, Mental, Relational, Behavioural, Verbal and Existential. The purpose of a Transitivity analysis is that it allows for the analysis or representation of how people perceive the world around them, and how people make sense of reality (Halliday & Matthiessen, 1999; 2004). Reality is construed through what people do or say, i.e. the different actions, events, and relationships between various participants in particular circumstances (Eggins, 1994: 266). The analysis involves determining the processes, participants and circumstances realised by the clause. Analysis can explain how the field of situation is being construed (‘what’s being talked about’) and how shifts in field can be achieved (Eggins, 1994: 266). Analysis allows for different perspectives of experience or different representations of the world or the same events.

The interpersonal metafunction refers to the exchange of meaning and the level of involvement between speakers and listeners. An interpersonal analysis can reveal the relationships between and the feelings towards other participants in the testimony. Lastly, the textual metafunction refers to how the clause is organised to communicate a message. Textually, an analysis can reveal how the different speakers organised the different meanings of the clause to present certain information.

Concluding this section is the system of Ergativity. The system of Transitivity is complemented by the system of Ergativity. Ergativity is construed as an action that occurs by itself, or is caused by an external agent or causer. The Medium is the means through which the process is conveyed, while the external entity is referred to as the Agent. Both the transitive and ergative models form the basis of the system of Transitivity.
In terms of this thesis: a Transitivity analysis will reveal how testifiers position themselves in relation to their perpetrators, i.e. as “victims” who were Affected by the police (Agents / Causers). An analysis will reveal the different choices speakers made while testifying: through their testimonies, speakers reveal their own perspectives on certain events, also their feelings and their perceptions of other participants, as well as how different participants view the same events.

2.3. GENRE

2.3.1. INTRODUCTION

In SFL, language is used to describe speakers or writers’ choices within particular contexts. The purpose of language is to enable speakers to communicate and make meaning with others. By studying genre, theorists attempt to bring together the aspects of context, content and language that are produced in a particular discourse event (Eggins, 1994: 7; Paltridge, 2001: 2; Johns, 2002: 3).

This research will draw on theories from Eggins (2004), Halliday & Hasan (1989), Cortazzi and Jin (2000), Labov (1972), Johns et al. (2002), and others where noted.

2.3.2. DEFINITIONS OF GENRE

Over the years, genre has been identified in various ways by different practitioners and theorists, such as Halliday & Hasan (1989) and Eggins (2004), to name just two. According to Johns (2002: 3), “genre has become a term that refers to complex oral or written responses by speakers or writers to the demands of a social context”. However, these theorists and practitioners all have different views on how genre should be defined.

What these theorists do agree on, is the fact that genre has not only been widely defined, but that the notion of genre has evolved considerably over the years. Genre is no longer seen as just a definition of written texts; genre encompasses contextual perspectives of genre as well as its formal features. Genre also takes into account that
texts are adaptable, and that users of genre have the ability to mould texts to suit the particular discourse situation, as well as the needs of different audiences and purposes (Johns et al., 2002; Martin & Rose, 2007: 8).

According to Eggins (2004: 74) genres are extensive in their diversity. Genres can be found in many disciplines (including literary studies and films). Genres are also used in and as part of our every day lives, from buying and selling things to recounting an event (Eggins, 2004: 55-56). Genre is characterised as typical responses that arise from situations that are recurring in a specified context (e.g. service encounters). Genres are “complex mental abstractions” that are constantly changing, “socially situated”, and constantly modified to suit the needs of different audiences or purposes (Johns, 2002: 237-238, Coe, 2002: 180; Paltridge, 2001: 3)

One of the most widely cited definitions of genre is that of Martin & Rose (2007: 8): “…a staged, goal-oriented social process; social because we participate in genres with other people; goal-oriented because we use genres to get things done; staged because it usually takes us a few steps to reach our goals.” In other words, genre is a cultural (communal) activity that is aimed towards some goal or purpose in a (generically) patterned way, by members of a culture or community, through the use of language.

Another definition, posited by Swales (1990: 39, 45, 58), is that genre is a “class of communicative events”, in which language plays an important part. In SFL, “social systems” are expressed through language; language, in turn, defines, is defined by, and (can) redefine a society (Martin, 2000: 279). Genre arises wherever language is used in a meaningful way by a particular culture. Membership into a (particular) genre involves sharing in a set of communicative purposes. These communicative purposes are employed by members of a discourse community to achieve their community’s goals. This allows members to create and draw meaning(s) from the text (Eggins, 2004: 55). Analysing particular genres can also reveal (critically) the cultural work or aspect genre is trying to achieve and who will benefit from it (Eggins, 2004: 82).

Meanings that are conveyed through particular texts can reflect certain cultural values that dominate and thus benefit certain sectors. Meaning is derived by identifying the purpose of the text, which tells the reader how to interpret the text. A text therefore
has to be coherent (and cohesive) for it to be understood, or “unproblematic” (Eggins, 2004: 54). Cohesion also depends on the relationship between the text and its context for the text to be understood within a particular culture or community (ibid; also Hasan, 1989: 113). This can only be achieved through a continual sharing of genre knowledge within the given culture. Eggins (2004: 84) states that “genres are about expectation, not about determination”. Genres can be shaped to readers’ needs as well as be accessible and conscious of the needs of readers. According to Hasan (1989: 114), meanings are encoded either implicitly or explicitly, depending on the context of situation.

2.3.3. **THE IMPORTANCE OF GENRE ANALYSIS**

Genre analysis plays an important part in realising the cultural and social aspects of the language that is being used. According to Eggins (2004: 70), the following points are applications in the systemic analysis of genre:

1. To find out why some texts work and why others are deemed unsuccessful;
2. To differentiate between various genres and their different realisation patterns in service encounters as well as interpersonal situations;
3. To understand similarities or diversities between fiction and non-fiction genres;
4. To perform critical analyses of texts.

It is important for the analysis of texts to distinguish between text types. By looking at the generic identity of a text, we are identifying in what ways particular texts are “similar to, reminiscent of other texts circulating in the culture” (Eggins, 2004: 55). The text is considered problematic if the generic identity is unclear. According to SFL, the generic identity of a text can be found by focusing on: register configuration, schematic structure and realisation patterns. (Eggins, 2004: 56).

**Register configuration** relates categories of linguistic features with situational features in which they regularly occur, i.e. the “co-occurrence of a particular contextual cluster” (Eggins, 2004: 56).
The theory of register includes three dimensions which constitute the context of situation. These patterns can be found in situations where the interaction is said to recur or is predictable in its use of language (Eggins, 2004: 58; Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004 and others). The context of situation refers to the environment of the text, which includes the situation in which the text was articulated. The context of situation expresses certain variables that are specific to the situation. Together these values construct the register of a text (i.e. the meaning patterns that are associated with the text). These variables have an effect on the language of a text (see also, Swales (1990); Halliday & Hasan (1989) and Paltridge (2001). These variables are:

i) **Field** refers to a specified social action, event or circumstance in which discourse is produced in terms of content or ideas based on the language or lexical choices people make. Field refers to “what is going on” (Macken–Horarik, 2002: 19; 24), or what the text is about; the content of discourse comprises one aspect of field.

ii) **Tenor** refers to “who” is taking part in a communicative event: it refers to the relationships, attitudes and feelings between participants in a particular situation (Macken–Horarik, 2002: 19; 24).

iii) **Mode** refers to “how” the message is represented – how language is used to represent the message, i.e. whether written or spoken. Mode can also be reflected as operating along a scale – from most “spoken” to most “written” (Macken–Horarik, 2002: 19; 24-25). Mode is influenced by two types of semiotic distances: the distance of the speaker / writer from the events being described; and the distance between the participants themselves, i.e. an interaction with plenty of feedback to little or no feedback (Eggins, 2004: 58; Swales, 1990: 40, amongst others).

According to Halliday (1978: 122-123), Hasan (1989: 102) and Swales (1990: 40), these three variables “act as determinants of the text through their specification of the register; at the same time they are systematically associated with the linguistic system through the functional components of the semantics”. What this means is that field, tenor and mode are also related to the semantic components of a text, i.e. ideational, interpersonal and textual. Thus, field is also related to managing ideas; tenor is associated with organising personal relations, and mode is linked with managing discourse itself. These three variables offer a descriptive framework for analysis; they
are not to be seen as types of language use. According to Swales (1990: 40; also Hasan, 1989: 62), the connection between genre and register cannot always be differentiated and should not be confused: genre refers to completed texts, whereas register refers to choices with regard to stylistics. Genre, according to Macken–Horarik (2002: 20) is (just) “another layer of context of situation”.

Genres come about when the values for field, tenor and mode “regularly co-occur” (Eggins, 2004: 58; Hasan, 1989: 70) in specific situations in a culture. This means that interactions within particular contexts become standard or set, and can lead to institutional genres. In other words, when values for field, tenor and mode become standard or set in particular contexts, interactions (in these situations) are seen as “conventionalised”; these conventionalised interactions then become the preferred type of interaction within these recurring situations. Thus, the concept of register is related to the environment in which the text is produced, i.e. the context of situation (Halliday, 1985: 6) and genre relates to the social purpose and distinguishing schematic structure of a text.

Genres are made up of a number of predictable elements or stages that occur in sequence. A stage can only really ‘exist’ if it is ascribed a functional label. The label must describe what the stage is doing or what the stage is about (i.e. its function) in relation to the text as a whole, as well as being as specific as it can be to the particular genre (Eggins, 2004: 64). Genres are staged because one cannot make all the meanings one wants to make at the same time. The meaning of the text as a whole is furthered by each stage, therefore ensuring successful interpretation of the genre. These functional stages, referred to as the **schematic structure** of a genre, are developed through our constant mediation with others within particular situations. Schematic structure refers to the “staged, step-by-step organisation of genre” (Eggins, 2004: 59). The schematic structure is a way of moving from one point to another in a way that is culturally specific as well as accomplishing its culturally specific functions.

A schematic structure of a genre can have defining or obligatory elements. These can be determined by asking which stages can be left out and still perform a complete function within the specific genre. The obligatory elements of a genre help the sender
or audience determine whether or not a text is complete or incomplete (Hasan, 1989: 109). Optional stages only occur if it is necessary for the comprehension of a text; a text can therefore function without the optional stages (Hasan, 1989: 111). One definition of genre can thus be found by looking at its obligatory structure, as well as its optional elements (Eggins, 2004: 64; also Hasan, 1989: 62).

There are two important notions that come about when describing the schematic structure of a genre: constituency and functional labelling. **Constituency** refers to the constituent stages that make up a genre. When describing its schematic structure, we are describing its constituent stages, i.e. the layers that the genre is made up of. **Functional labelling** refers to formal criteria, which refers to breaking the text into units of the same type according to the form of each constituent part (e.g. text into paragraphs, paragraphs into sentences, and sentences into words); and functional criteria, which refers to how each constituent connects to the text as a whole on a functional level; the text is broken into the different functions of each constituent stage (Eggins, 2004: 60).

Important to the functional approach to language is the relation between context and the types of meaning in language. This means that “each dimension of social context is related in predictable and systematic ways to each type of meaning” (Eggins, 2004: 65-66). According to functional analysis, language is an integral and naturally occurring part in social life.

Although identifying the schematic structure of a text is important to the generic analysis of a text, this analysis cannot be performed without an analysis of the realisation patterns of each constituent element of the schematic structure (Eggins, 2004: 65). Realisation is the “way a meaning becomes encoded or expressed in a semiotic system” (Eggins, 2004: 65).

Eggins (2004: 66) explores two consequences of the relation between language and social life. Firstly, different genres have differing realisation patterns. This would mean that speakers employ different choices in grammar for each genre that they participate in to achieve their desired goals. Secondly, each genre’s schematic stages will differ in their realisation patterns. According to Eggins (2004: 66), if each stage is
comprised of different elements, then each stage will employ different lexico-grammatical choices.

To ascertain how many stages should be present, one has to look closely at the language that the text uses. Language will reveal that each schematic structure is connected to particular kinds of lexico-grammatical features, and, through determining the grammatical formations of each schematic structure, both the number of stages required and the boundaries between stages can be determined. This also applies to the connection between stages and realisation patterns of any text that one wishes to analyse (Eggins, 2004: 68-69).

Some stages have a fixed set of realisation patterns while others are constrained by linguistic structures and groupings of specific linguistic options. Some stages can also be realised through non-verbal actions.

Grabe (2002: 250-251) states that the evolution of the notion of genre has overlooked two important concepts that need to be included within the (new) changing theories of genre. Basically, Grabe defines macro-genres as including two text types, narratives and expository texts.

Martin (2002: 269) argues that genre refers to clustering texts together; for Grabe, macro-genre refers to grouping genres together. Martin contests this view of Grabe’s – that there are only two macro-genres. Examples of macro-genres then, according to Martin (2002: 270-274), include service encounters and interviews, amongst others. Examples of narrative genres include personal recounts, observations and Western news stories. Narrative is regarded as the most fundamental genre within a context of culture (Rothery & Stenglin, 1997: 239). Bhatia (2002: 280) suggests that what Grabe refers to as macro-genres are best termed Genre colonies, which are “firmly grounded in specific, though to some extent, flexible, rhetorical contexts”. Genre colonies include various members, roughly brought together in terms of their communicative purpose, “rhetorical standards” and contexts they seem to share, as well as in terms of their lexico-grammatical and discoursal features.
Grabe’s so-called macro-genres all share some characteristics with regard to their intended communicative purpose, how they go about communicating and the degree to which they are associated with relating rhetorical contexts and traditions.

The factor that determines whether a genre belongs to a narrative family is not the order in which the events follow, but how they convey or evaluate the speaker’s experience (Martin, 2002: 270).

To summarise: genre has been identified and defined in various ways by various theorists. It is a complex term that refers to oral as well as written structures by speakers or writers, according to the social context they find themselves in. Genre can be identified by looking at its generic structure, register configuration and schematic structure and realisation patterns.

2.3.4. **STORYTELLING GENRES**

SFL theories of genre draw heavily on Labov & Waletzky’s (1967) theory of Narrative, in particular Systemic Functional linguists such as Martin & Plum (1997). Martin & Plum state that Labov & Waletzky’s work has provided the foundation for much genre research on Narrative: their work enables researchers to analyse how people use language in their everyday lives in their communities and with people around them.

Labov & Waletzky’s (1967) main premise was that simple narrative structures can be found in the stories people tell. They believed that all forms of narratives have a combination of simple or basic narrative structures; they wanted to relate these simple structures to the functional features of language by looking at a range of stories told by ordinary speakers. To do this, they looked at the most basic unit of language that could realise those functions, i.e. the clause (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 13), by relating a series of sequential clauses to the sequence of events as they unfold in the narrative (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 20).
As mentioned above (Rothery & Stenglin, 1997), Narratives are regarded as a fundamental genre within a culture. The following section will look at and discuss the Narrative genre, as well as its stages and other examples of genre.

As mentioned previously, genres are defined by their obligatory stages (as well as their optional stages). Martin & Plum (1997) state that narratives fall under the heading of story genres, as do Recounts, Observations, Anecdotes and Exemplums. These are all examples of (story) genres in that they foreground stages through which a story goes to achieve a social purpose. Each of these story genres are described below.

2.3.4.1. **Narrative:**

People use language to tell their stories and make sense of the world around them. According to Abbott (2002: 17; Middleton & Edwards, 1994: 36), stories are “always mediated” and “something that we construct”. Narratives are produced when these stories are used to express people's experiences and feelings (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: 29). Many ‘victims’ were encouraged to tell their stories at the public hearings of the TRC. Many of these testimonies can be seen as storytelling genres, according to their generic structure.

The testimonies of the TRC took the form of informal storytelling, so that the testifiers could express their experiences to the best of their knowledge and capabilities. Many testimonies were told in the form of a narrative (Graybill, 2002: 81). Narratives are a way of describing events that occurred in the past and “involve people accounting for their decisions retrospectively” (Garfinkel (1967), in Watson, 1996: 260). According to Billig (1994: 62), narratives are “jointly reconstructed through discourse”, and therefore take the past as its subject. Narratives have to do with ‘protagonists’ or characters who have to resolve a problematic situation (Labov, 1972: 359). Narratives brings together “human agency and activity” (Watson, 1996: 260) and have to do with human “action”, “intention” and “potential” (Grabe, 2002: 253).
The SFL theory of Narrative genre is based on Labov & Waletzky (1967) and Labov’s (1972) six-part structure. This section will also refer to work done in this field by Toolan (1991), Eggins & Slade (1997), Martin & Plum (1997), and others where noted.

**The Stages of a Narrative:**

One approach to describing past experience is to match the sequence of events to the sequence of clauses, in the order that the events actually occurred. Labov & Waletzky (1967) and Labov’s (1972) work on narrative revealed that Narrative can be looked at in terms of six distinct, functional stages: Abstract, Orientation, Complicating Action, Evaluation, Resolution, and Coda. These stages are detailed below.

**Abstract:**

The Abstract is found at the beginning of the narrative, indicating that a story is about to be told, and why the story is worth telling. The Abstract usually comprises one or two clauses (Labov, 1972: 370). According to Toolan (1991: 152-154) the Abstract is an optional stage, and may give a shortened account of the narrative itself. Abstracts are requests for longer talking turns, by summarising the story in an ‘inflated’ way.

**Orientation:**

The Orientation section indicates the setting of a story, by revealing the participants, time, place and the activities that participants find themselves in. The Orientation section is usually located at the beginning of a narrative – between the Abstract and Complicating Action; it is (usually) characterised as a set of free clauses (before the first narrative clause of the Complicating Action). Free clauses are defined as free-moving clauses in a narrative and are “not confined by any temporal juncture” (Labov, 1972; 361). These clauses have the potential to be moved around freely in the text, without distorting the meaning thereof (Toolan, 1991: 150). A narrative clause refers to clauses that are ordered according to the sequence of events as it happened. Unlike free clauses, narrative clauses cannot be shifted around without distorting the meaning potential of the text. They must occur in sequence; it is impossible to tell the
same story if the clauses of the text are reordered (Labov, 1972: 361; Toolan, 1991: 148-149). In theory, all free clauses can be placed at the beginning of the narrative. Free clauses may be found at many significant points throughout the narrative. There they serve a different role in the narrative – by deferring the action, i.e. evaluating the story. (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 32)

**Complicating Action:**

The Complicating Action of a narrative is where the problem or crisis that had been described in the Abstract or Orientation sections is told. Clauses are arranged in sequence of how the event unfolds. The problem usually escalates into a crisis that needs to be resolved. A narrative can comprise of several Complicating Action sections (Eggins & Slade, 1997: 239-240).

**Evaluation:**

Narratives are usually a response to some “outside stimulus”, and create a “point of personal interest” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 34). The structure of a narrative is influenced by what the narrative is set out to achieve.

According to Labov (1972: 366) Evaluation is perhaps the most important stage of a narrative. According the Cortazzi & Jin (2000: 105), evaluation “marks the part of the narrative, giving it prominence in any way that shows a departure from the local norm of the text”. In other words, Evaluation makes a text noteworthy, worth telling, and is conventional for narratives of personal experience.

Labov & Waletzky (1967: 40) define Evaluation as groups of free clauses, multi–coordinated or restricted clauses. Evaluation “suspends” or delays the action, by interrupting the narrative’s flow of events at a critical stage. Although Evaluation is usually found between the Complicating Action and Resolution stages, Evaluative comments can be found throughout a narrative; therefore, a narrative can have more than one Evaluation section. Evaluation often reveals the attitude of the narrator towards what is being retold, and how the narrator expects the story to be interpreted (Labov, 1972: 374). In order to recognise the Evaluation section of a narrative, it is
important to know why the events were told in the first place, i.e. why the events were worth telling.

Cortazzi & Jin (2000: 107) state that there is often more than one level of Evaluation. To them, Evaluation is an ambiguous term. Firstly, what they term the “primary” or structural element of Evaluation is its position between the Complicating Action and the Resolution. Here, Evaluation delays the action sequence, preventing the story from going forward (temporarily). It also reveals the “point” of the story – why it was told in the first place. Secondly, Evaluation can be found at almost any point in the narrative, and can coincide with other stages of the narrative (e.g. Evaluation can also merge with the Resolution stage). This secondary Evaluation device is a “rhetorical underlining”: it indicates the part that was evaluated semantically, prosodically or grammatically. Almost any element in the narrative can be signalled in this way by the narrator. These two points are important because without it, the narrative will not make sense, in other words, it will lack “structural definition” (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 39; Eggins & Slade, 1997: 240).

The problem of classifying Evaluation as a secondary structure, argue Cortazzi & Jin (2000: 107) is that Evaluation does not have a readily identifiable position in a text, and therefore can appear almost anywhere in a text, and may be accomplished through any linguistic means, i.e. phonologically or grammatically, for example. Interpretation of Evaluation is also derived from the listener’s acquired cultural and contextual knowledge.

Labov (1972) distinguished between two types of Evaluation: those that occur inside (internal) the text, and those that occur outside the text (i.e. external). These devices are briefly listed below (Labov, 1972: 371-380; Toolan, 1991; Labov & Waletzky, 1967).

Internal Evaluation typically takes the form of:

- intensifiers (quantifiers, repetition),
- comparators (negatives, questions, imperatives),
- correlatives (progressives) and
- explicatives, which are clauses that usually begin with “while” or “although” (qualification), or “since” / “because” (causal).

Toolan (1991: 156) and Labov (1972: 370-374) disclose five ways of supplying External or Embedded Evaluation, which do not disrupt the succession of narrative clauses. These range from:

1. The wholly external Evaluation, where the narrator interrupts the flow of the narrative to address the audience directly to evaluate his or her own thoughts or feelings on the events being retold.
2. The narrator quotes himself or something he may have said, thought or felt at the time of the event retold, rather than addressing it (directly) to the audience;
3. The narrator quotes himself as speaking to another participant;
4. The narrator quotes a third person’s direct words;
5. The narrator describes what participants did, rather than what they said. This is referred to as Evaluative Action.

**Resolution or Result:**

The Evaluation is typically followed by the Resolution, in which the crisis (which was suspended through the Evaluation) is resolved. The narrative generally returns to sequentially ordered clauses in the past tense (Eggins & Slade, 1997: 240). The Resolution may coincide with the Evaluation section, if the Evaluation forms the last element of the narrative (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 39).

**Coda:**

The Coda is a set of free clauses that indicate the end of the narrative. The audience is brought back to the present, as the narrator reiterates what was expressed at the beginning of the narrative, i.e. “the point at which they entered the narrative” (Labov, 1972: 365; Eggins & Slade, 1997: 243). Its main function is to return the narrative to
the present. This is accomplished through a number of ways (Toolan, 1991: 161-162; Labov, 1972: 365):

- By stating explicitly that the narrative is over;
- Through the use of deixis; linguistically, codas frequently make use of demonstratives such as ‘that’, ‘there’ or ‘those’ to refer to someone or something, instead of mentioning the thing or person explicitly. This is typical of narratives of personal experience. By using “the” or “that”, the narrator indicates a switch to the present tense, and the end of the narrative;
- By following the actions of the main character of the story up to the present.

According to (Labov & Waletzky, 1967: 40), a narrative may end with the Resolution; therefore the Coda is an optional stage. Codas also function as an Evaluation of the events that were told in the Complicating Action, and indicate how those events have subsequently (or consequently) impacted on the narrator’s life.

The Complicating Action is the only stage necessary in recognising a text as a narrative though (Labov, 1972: 370; Toolan, 1991: 147). The Abstract, Orientation and Resolution stages form the referential function of a narrative, while the Evaluation section is functional in nature, answering the question: “why was story told in the first place?”

SFL theorists have identified four other storytelling genres. These are the Recount, Observation, Anecdote and Exemplum, all of which are discussed below.

2.3.4.2. **The Recount:**

The Recount has two obligatory stages, namely the Orientation stage, which orients the listener to the time, place, circumstances and participants of the event in question; and the Record of Events stage, in which the main events unfold relatively unproblematically. This stage is similar to the Complicating Action of a narrative – it deals with a sequence of events that culminates in a crisis. The Record of Events is typically realised by Material processes. The Reorientation stage of the Recount is
optional; it serves the same function as the Coda in a narrative, and brings the reader/listener back to the present.

2.3.4.3. **The Observation:**

The (obligatory) stages for Observation are the Orientation, Event Description and the Comment as middle and end stages respectively. The latter two stages can come about discretely and can be spread throughout the text. What makes the Observation different from the other genres is that the Events Description stage does not follow according to a temporally ordered sequence of events, as with the Recount and Narrative. It is a description of a (single) moment in time. It realises the experiential meaning of the text. The Comment stage gives the Events Description stage importance as it realises interpersonal meanings. According to Rothery & Stenglin (1997: 240-242), the Comment stage “focuses on significance and interest in local events for its own sake”.

2.3.4.4. **The Anecdote:**

The Anecdote evokes reaction or emotion from the listener, by relating unusual or noteworthy events. The Reaction stage is where the narrator draws on the listener’s shared experience, and is also where it affects an emotional response through repetition of the extraordinary event of the previous stage, the Remarkable Event.

2.3.4.5. **The Exemplum:**

In the Exemplum, the narrator expresses a “judgment” of the extraordinary event being told, though it is not used to evoke an emotional response. It is similar to the Narrative in that both describe a disruption to people’s lives. It invites listeners to agree or disagree with story participants.

The table below summarises the schematic structure of the above-mentioned story genres. The optional stages are presented in brackets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2</th>
<th><strong>SCHEMATIC STRUCTURES OF STORY GENRES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Complicating Action ^ Evaluation ^ Resolution ^ (Coda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recount</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Record of Events ^ (Reoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Events Description ^ Comment ^ (Coda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdote</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ (Orientation) ^ Remarkable Event ^ Reaction ^ (Coda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplum</td>
<td>(Abstract) ^ (Orientation) ^ Incident ^ Interpretation ^ (Coda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from Eggins & Slade (1997), Martin & Rose (2007).

2.4. **SUMMARY OF SECTION**

Genre has a wide range of definitions, but the most commonly held view is that it is staged and goal-oriented with a social purpose. A genre can be distinguished by looking at its generic features, by focusing on its register configuration, schematic structure and realisation patterns. Register constitutes the three aspects of the context of situation – field, tenor and mode. Register can also be described as referring to the stylistics of a text (Swales, 1990: 40; Hasan, 1989: 62). Schematic structure refers to the predictable stages of a genre. These determine whether a genre is complete or incomplete. It describes a genre’s obligatory and optional stages.

There exists a highly disputed view on macro-genres. Martin (2002) defines macro-genres as grouping genres; Grabe (2002) defines it as grouping texts. Bhatia (2002) states that macro-genres should be referred to as genre colonies. There are more than two macro-genres, examples are service encounters and interviews.

This chapter also looked at storytelling genres, in particular narratives and other storytelling genres. Narrative is the most fundamental of the genres. It is a description of past events, by relating and resolving the protagonist’s problem. It is described as dealing with human interaction.

Other examples of genres that were discussed include the Recount, Observation, Anecdote and Exemplum. The Recount is particularly important for the analysis of the TRC testimonies, as discussed in chapters four and five. However, before turning to the analyses, the next chapter presents the research methodology followed in this thesis.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss the research methodology used for this thesis. This chapter will look at the subjects and data drawn on for this research, including how the data was collected and prepared for analysis.

3.2. PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

This thesis aims to explore how different narrators construe themselves, other participants, as well as their beliefs, attitudes and feelings in the stories they tell. This study will also look at how the two narrators construe their experiences, and how they represent and organise information.

Researchers rely on prior knowledge when doing research. Researchers need to use this prior knowledge or “pre-understanding” when they want to distinguish between what Terre Blanche et al. (2006: 378) refer to as the speaker’s intended meaning and the receiver’s interpreted meaning. Researchers can only offer interpretations of the speaker’s intended meaning, as it is difficult to know exactly what it is that the speaker meant to convey. Speaker’s meaning here refers to what was ‘lost’ during the interpretation process. It is therefore necessary to look at what meanings were lost or affected during the interpretation process when the narrators testified in Afrikaans, and their testimonies were transcribed into English.

Receiver’s interpretation refers to knowledge or understanding of the context which they bring to bear on the interpretation process. Context influences the linguistic choices that speakers make. In terms of this research, it is essential to know and take into account the context in which the events in question took place and to offer, as far as is possible, accurate interpretations.

According to Watson (1996: 261):
“…Whenever we wish to understand ‘what actually happened’ in the lives of people we are studying (or of people we know socially), we have little to go on other than the words that are spoken to us by these people themselves or by people who know them. To reach our own interpretation of ‘what happened’, it is therefore vital to recognize the importance of interpretive work which the individuals themselves have engaged in when constructing their accounts. Part of what each of us is, as a unique individual with a distinctive self-identity, is the outcome of the stories which we construct to make sense of ourselves and others of who we are and where we have come from. These stories emerge out of culturally constructed meanings but they also help us to reconstruct and change these meanings.”

3.3. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

This study aims to reveal how the two narrators construe their experiences (of the same events) differently through the linguistic choices that they make. The theoretical basis for this research will be Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Transitivity and genre, in particular the storytelling genres, Narrative and Recount. The aim is the reveal how the different narrators position themselves and other participants when recalling the same set of events. This thesis will also explore the differences and similarities between the original (Afrikaans) texts and the transcribed online English texts, in an attempt to identify what meanings were lost or affected during the interpretation process.

The objectives of this study are thus:

- How testifiers construe themselves and their experiences in their testimonies, as well as other participants;
- whether these testimonies were accurately interpreted or captured in the official (online) translation.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

3.4.1. Research Procedure

The texts used for this research are the testimonies of Faried Muhammad Ferhelst and his mother, Minnie Louisa Ferhelst. Both Ferhelst and his mother’s testimonies were
transcribed from the SABC video recordings of the TRC, with both the original language used by the testifier and the English voice over. The testimonies were translated simultaneously from Afrikaans into English during the hearing. Minnie Ferhelst’s testimony was given only in Afrikaans, while only a section of Muhammad Ferhelst’s testimony was in Afrikaans, the rest in English.

3.4.2. Analysis of the Data

The respective testimonies were (both) broken up into clauses for the analyses. A Transitivity analysis was done using SFL, and the processes and participants for each clause were identified. The participants were identified and counted. The processes that occurred more frequently were identified and also the participants who occurred mainly within those particular clauses and processes. All the processes were counted up and tabulated to give a complete transitive analysis of both testimonies. This was complemented by an ergative analysis which explored the extent to which the main participants were in the roles of Causer or Affected.

A genre analysis was done according to the theories posited by analysts such as Eggins & Slade (1997), and Martin & Plum (1997). The genre analysis revealed that both testimonies took the form of a Recount, with its constituent stages of Orientation, Record of Events, Reorientation and Coda. The Record of Events was further divided into segments and labelled for an easier and in depth analysis of both testimonies. The Transitivity and generic patterns are then discussed to ascertain how Mrs Ferhelst and her son construe their experiences and position themselves and their audiences in relation to these patterns.

One of the research aims already mentioned is to see if there are any similarities or differences between the testimony in the original language and the English interpreted versions. This thesis will attempt to show that very little meaning was lost during the interpretation of the Afrikaans into English, with exceptions, which will be discussed in the respective chapters (four and five).
3.5. **CONCLUSION**

This chapter has attempted to outline the research methodology of this thesis. The methods discussed were that of Transitivity and genre analysis, as well as brief descriptions of the participants of the study, and the methods used for the preparation and analyses of the respective testimonies.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF TESTIMONY: FARIED MUHAMMAD FERHELST

4.1. **INTRODUCTION**

Muhammad Ferhelst was a member of the Bonteheuwel Military Wing (BMW) during the 1980s when he was an adolescent. As a member of BMW, he sought to oppose the government by actively resisting them, which resulted in his eventual arrest in the late 1980s. Ferhelst gave his account at the TRC hearings, held at the University of the Western Cape in 1996. In his testimony, Ferhelst revealed how he and other members of BMW were harrassed, detained and tortured by the Security police, and the consequent effects his political activism has had on him personally. He also appealed for the plight of his former BMW comrades, who are struggling to adjust to life outside of the military organisation.

In this chapter, I will argue that the Transitivity, Ergativity and genre analysis reveals the following:

- Ferhelst’s testimony takes the form of a Recount, with stages Orientation, Record of Events and Reorientation. The analysis is presented stage by stage, with each stage appearing as a sub-section in this chapter. The text is broken into separate clauses and numbered. The overall clause structuring is based on Halliday & Matthiessen (2004).

- A Transitivity analysis of the Record of Events reveals how Ferhelst positions himself in terms of other participants, which follows a Causer and Affected pattern. Ferhelst thus ascribes the identity of ‘innocent victim’ (Affected) to himself, and that of aggressor (Causer) to the Security Branch (SB). This is most evident in the number of MAT clauses in which the SB’s appear as the Causers, while Ferhelst is the main participant in MEN and VERB clauses.

- Throughout the rest of the testimony, Ferhelst details the current situation of his fellow BMW comrades. He uses mostly MEN and REL processes to describe their inner and real world conflicts, as well as his own.
Both the English (online) and the Afrikaans are similar in content, with a few exceptions, which will be discussed.

This chapter ends with a summary and a table containing the overall process counts for both the English and the Afrikaans versions of the testimony.

4.2. **ORIENTATION** [1–38]

In the orientation, Ferhelst orientates the audience as to the time, place, participants and circumstances of his involvement in the liberation struggle; he uses REL clauses to illustrate his and BMW’s innocence and youth, giving the impression they were harassed for no apparent reason. This is thus typical of an Orientation section (see Chapter two). Ferhelst starts by giving an account of the political situation in the country from 1984 to 1986, expressed through mostly MAT (22) and REL processes (10).

The table below shows the participant count for the orientation section. The participants listed are the Causers of the action, and the numbers in the respective columns show how many times these participants occurred within a particular process. The participant count for the Orientation section can thus be broken up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* imperative use

Table adapted from: Rothery & Stenglin (1997), Martin & Rose (2003), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004)

He describes himself as being “young” at that time, and refers to himself and the other activists as “children” (clauses 7–9) – implying innocence, vulnerability and helplessness through a series of REL clauses (16–19). Ferhelst presents this background as if it was usual, even customary for “children” of his age to be
politically active. (Note: the words that are in square brackets are not in the original testimony but have been re-inserted to aid the analysis.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.1</th>
<th>‘Orientation’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I came home from school one day</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. and the cops were looking for me</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. why… up till today I don’t know.</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uh 1985 in the beginning… I joined like SRC’s on the schools [2] uh BISCO</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. and like we were on the run.</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was still young</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. and I [was] like… any child</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. who was afraid</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. what this people was gonna do</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. an’… the information [that] we got from other children</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. [who] were caught</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. is [that]</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. they gonna kill us [2] like</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. we didn’t know what to do [3]</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. um [2] in 1985… where [we?] like basically had nowhere to go,</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. [we had] nobody to turn to in fact [2].</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. At night we don’t – didn’t have places to sleep,</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ‘cause we [were] afraid… [3]</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sometimes we went without food for days 3, 4 days.</td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ferhelst creates distance early on between himself and the Security police. In clause 3, he refers to them as “the cops”, an informal reference to the police. After that initial introduction, he refers to them as “they”, ascribing the SBs a group identity. In effect, Ferhelst establishes early on that it was “us” (those fighting against apartheid) against “them” (those upholding apartheid):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.2</th>
<th>‘Orientation’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. and we thought.</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. well… what can we do to protect us against these people…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most notably throughout the orientation is Ferhelst’s switch from first person (“I”) to the plural form “we”. The pronoun “we” occurs in seven MAT clauses. This creates a group identity with BMW. “We” also occurs in five REL clauses, which express shared group sentiments – as a group they all stood for the same things, and all underwent the same treatment at the hands of the Security police. “I” occurs three
times in clauses 1–5 (two MAT; one MEN), and once as an evaluation in clauses 7 and 8.

4.3. **Record of Events Stage** [39–251]

After setting the background in the Orientation section, Ferhelst starts his main narrative in the Record of Events. In this section, Ferhelst details how he was pursued and eventually arrested by the Security Branch, who then tortured him to gain information. This section has been broken up into sub-sections or phases and labelled for ease of reference, which are:

- ‘First Arrest’ [39–118];
- ‘First Arrest and Interrogation’ [119–164];
- ‘First Court Appearance’ [165–185];
- ‘Second Detainment and Second Interrogation’ [186–208]; and
- ‘Torture’ [209–251].

4.3.1. **First Arrest’ [39–118]

Ferhelst appears (as Actor) in 11 MAT process clauses, but he is not acting against the police (e.g. clause 44 below). This is in contrast to the police (eight MAT) and Van Brakel (nine MAT), who do act against him (e.g. pulling him up or bursting into the room). Although these numbers are quite similar, Ferhelst represents the police as having physically acted against him as Causers, resulting in him receiving that action, i.e. being the Affected participant.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Clauses</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>BMW</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Ferhelst, however, relies on describing his thoughts as he was not able to act physically: he appears in seven MEN process clauses, most notably clauses 45–50 (below), where MEN clause 45 signals an evaluation sequence. A feature of Ferhelst’s testimony was that he created distance between himself and the police, as well as his own emotions, mostly through the use of the impersonal pronoun “you”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.3</th>
<th>‘First Arrest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. but I got back into bed.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I heard the cars pull up.</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Your – at that time your senses are so developed,</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. you can hear a car a mile for uh</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. when it brakes,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. like your senses – everything becomes –</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. you become suspicious of everything and everybody…</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ferhelst uses the pronoun as a form of detachment. Also, “you” and “everything and everybody” (50) are used in a very generic sense: it describes his state of vigilance, of constantly having to be alert or aware of “everything and everybody”. This state of alertness is also a feeling that he shared with the other activists.

Another MEN clause signals external evaluation when Ferhelst contemplates the reasons why the police would pursue him. This extract is also indicative of how Ferhelst viewed the police. He takes himself out of the action (so to speak) – he is the implied Affected, as the police were there for him:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.4</th>
<th>‘First Arrest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. I thought,</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. is all this people just coming for me?</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. What did I do wrong?</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. What did I do SO badly</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. that this people want me so?</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Um I then realise that,</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. well, all the threats we got…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. from uh all the information we got from other children</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. who were caught,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. well this people are going to kill me,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. that’s</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. what they said</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. an’… um I got back into bed</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. and [I] laid. [2]</td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these clauses (62–75), Ferhelst steps away from the story to evaluate what he had thought (at that time). According to Tannen (2007: 117) the “casting their thoughts as dialogue allows a dramatization based on the state of their understanding of events at the time, rather than on the clarity of hindsight” (also in Watson, 1996: 260; Wetherall, 1996: 305). He expresses confusion, fear and perplexity as to why the police wanted him through two MEN clauses and three MAT clauses (64, 65 and 71). Ferhelst had already summarised the situation as inevitable (clause 56: “but it was too late”) – he could not run because the house was surrounded by armed policemen.

Ferhelst introduces change through two EXIST clauses (78–79): the police enter the house. Ferhelst mentions Van Brakel for the first time in clause 80, but only implicitly – his name is only mentioned in clause 90. Ferhelst refers to Van Brakel very seldom by name – throughout the Record of Events, the name “Van Brakel” occurs only three times (see, for example, clauses 90, 137 and 201). From introducing Van Brakel as “this captain” (in clause 80), until the end of the main narrative (i.e. clause 377), Ferhelst regularly refers to him by using the pronoun “he” (21 times), as well as “This captain” (80, 173), “that man” (87), “die kaptein” (335). These references act as strategies to distance him from Van Brakel. Ferhelst’s anger and hatred comes to the fore in clauses 85–89, where he disrupts the flow of activity sequence to express the direct words Van Brakel told him that day he was arrested. He addresses the audience directly, signalled through three VERB processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.5</th>
<th>‘First Arrest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78. and there was this… uh commotion in the dining room.</td>
<td>EXIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Um there was approximately… 20 to 30 cops in the dining room,</td>
<td>EXIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. and this captain burst into the room</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. that I was laying.</td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. I was still in a shorts [2].</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. He pulled me up</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. he said uh…</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. can I use the exact words</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. because like it’s hard for me to forget</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. what that man said that day</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. and like I tried to forget</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. but it’s always there.</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Uh this captain his name is Van Brakel uh</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. he he came into that room, he and about four, five other SB’s.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. He said to me.</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pronoun “ons” (“we”) is used when Ferhelst recalls more of Van Brakel’s exact words in clauses 92–94. This is one example of how Van Brakel, according to Ferhelst, never referred to himself in the singular – throughout the Record of Events, Van Brakel is quoted as using the plural pronoun to show off his superiority and that he never acted alone. This use of external evaluation and the use of quotation reveal Ferhelst’s impressions of Van Brakel. Quotations, according to Koven (2001: 514), can be used to assign particular types of identities to specific individuals. Koven (2001: 518) states that “speakers make their quoted characters use particular languages to inhabit, position themselves relative to, or even juxtapose linguistically embodied social identities”. Speakers also do this when quoting themselves. Therefore, by quoting Van Brakel’s direct words, Ferhelst positions him as a specific identity type, i.e. as a smug and rude individual.

4.3.2. ‘First Detainment & Interrogation’ [119–164]

In this part of the Record of Events, Ferhelst is interrogated by the police for the first time. This is evident from the number of VERB processes (11) in this section, as Ferhelst refused to answer Van Brakel’s questions. Once again, references to the police dominate: they are mentioned in 17 of the 22 MAT process clauses. Ferhelst does not appear in any MAT clauses (he cannot act, he is in police custody); he is the Senser in four MEN and the Sayer in four VERB clauses, therefore confined to his thoughts and words.
Another example of how Ferhelst used dialogue to construe Van Brakel is contained in clauses 125-126:

His words are in the imperative, but can be interpreted as being more dismissive of Ferhelst’s pleas than as a direct order to keep quiet. The interjection “ag” achieves this (dismissiveness), relegating the imperative to a statement. The meaning of “ag”, though, is not carried over into the English translation (it could be roughly translated as “oh”). In the English, the imperative directly orders Ferhelst to shut up, therefore, the meaning of this expression is lost.

4.3.3. ‘First Court Appearance’ [165–185]

Clauses 165–185 are dominated by MAT processes, with Ferhelst the Actor (but not Causer) – “I” comes across in eight of the 13 MAT processes. Ferhelst briefly switches from the first person to the plural form “we” in clauses 170–171. Ferhelst establishes a group identity, by using words such as “we”, and “our [Section 29 papers]”. In clause 173–174, however, he reverts to the singular after he is confronted by Van Brakel (presumably), as his focus of his testimony shifts from references to a shared activist experience to his own personal narrative.
I was like interrogated for say about seven days. [2] Then I got bail. Uh before we got bail – the day before we got bail, our Section 29 papers were there uh this captain reckons to me [that] he’s gonna detain me under Section 29 so I said, “well you must do whatever you want to.” because I know what what were on their minds. Luckily I got away but… and I got a date to appear later – when I – at a later date I came to court the charges were dropped against me,

Ferhelst also appears as the Affected participant in clause 185: Agency demonstrates the ‘done to’ versus the ‘doers’: Ferhelst does not explicitly state who did or gave him what – he is the Affected, but omits the Causer(s). All can be inferred from the text, though.

4.3.4. ‘Second Detainment & Interrogation’ [186–208]

In this section, the story takes a twist – a policeman that Ferhelst knew points him out and he is rearrested. The police (Causers) take him from one police station to another, i.e. Ferhelst is still in the role of Affected. When Van Brakel enters the room, he becomes the sole aggressor (clause 201–208) and the narrative focuses on the contest between Ferhelst and Van Brakel. (In this sense, Ferhelst’s testimony is similar to that of other young activists, who frequently depicted themselves as heroes pitted against the police adversaries. See, for example, the analysis of Colin de Souza in Bock & Duncan, 2006, and Bock, 2010).

| 168. | I was like interrogated for say about seven days. [2] | VERB |
| 169. | Then I got bail. | MAT |
| 170. | Uh before we got bail – | MAT |
| 171. | the day before we got bail, | MAT |
| 172. | our Section 29 papers were there uh | REL |
| 173. | this captain reckons to me | VERB |
| 174. | [that] he’s gonna detain me under Section 29 | MAT |
| 175. | so I said, | VERB |
| 176. | “well you must do | MAT |
| 177. | whatever you want to.” | MEN |
| 178. | but as soon as I walk out of the court | MAT |
| 179. | I started running | MAT |
| 180. | because I know | MEN |
| 181. | what what were on their minds. [2] | REL |
| 182. | Luckily I got away | MAT |
| 183. | but… and I got a date to appear later – | MAT |
| 184. | when I – at a later date I came to court | MAT |
| 185. | the charges were dropped against me, | MAT |

Extract 4.8

| 201. | uh at about 7 or 8 Van Brakel came. | MAT |
| 202. | He started asking me questions | VERB |
| 203. | [he started] smacking me around what | MAT |
| 204. | and then left again, | MAT |
Van Brakel does all the talking (two VERB – 201, 205) and the hitting (one MAT – 203). Ferhelst represents this rather nonchalantly, as if being smacked around by the police was a common thing. In clause 206, Ferhelst quotes Van Brakel’s direct Afrikaans words; he uses the pronoun “ons” to intimidate, scare Ferhelst, as well as to display his power. The English translation, however, is in indirect reported speech and tones down the original meaning (Bock et al., 2006), and “voor jy uit die tronk uit” (own translation – “before you leave prison / jail”) is omitted.

4.3.5. ‘Torture’ [209–251]

In clauses 209–251, Ferhelst’s story comes to a climax. As with the beginning of the Record of Events, he orientates the audience to the time and place of his incarceration, and the physical state that he was in before the police entered the cell. The SBs were the only Causers of the situation, as is evident from the high number of MAT clauses with the SBs as Subject. Of the 27 MAT clauses in this section, they appear in 21 of them. Ferhelst appears in two MAT clauses, but once again only as the Affected. He does not explicitly state who the Causers are (although this is inferred from the context). Ferhelst’s responses are confined to four MEN clauses and one REL clause, as he was obviously unable to defend himself against the very physical nature of the torture.

| Table 4.4 | RECORD OF EVENTS Torture [209 – 251] |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. of Clauses | Ferhelst | Police | You | Other |
| MAT | 27 | 2 | 21 | / | 4 |
| MEN | 5 | 4 | / | 1 | / |
| REL | 7 | 1 | / | / | 6 |
| VERB | 1 | 1 | / | / | / |
| BEH | 2 | 1 | / | 1 | / |
| EXIST | 1 | / | / | / | 1 |
| TOTAL | 43 | 9 | 21 | 2 | 11 |
In clauses 237–251, Ferhelst evaluates the situation by describing the physical and mental torture he went through, by using the pronoun “you”. In the context, Ferhelst detaches himself from the mental and physical pain by generalising it. The use of the non-referential “you” downplays the event emotionally by making it less personal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.9</th>
<th>‘Torture’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237. Um like, the majority of the time when they hit you</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238. your didn’t – you didn’t even feel the pain</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239. because you passed out or something.</td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240. It went uh…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241. as I can say</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242. that went on for [2] for that period.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243. After that night it was every night, half past 2, 3 o’clock every night.</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244. They came to fetch me.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245. Um [3] I can’t remember for how long</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246. that went on.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247. but to me… it felt like…</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248. it … went on for…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249. it felt like a – almost a couple of years, just that short period</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250. because what – of what people – the way they handle you,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251. the way they hit you.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. **Reorientation** [252–255] & **Coda** [256–257]

In the Reorientation, Ferhelst brings the audience back to a time after the torture. He does not mention exactly how long was held and tortured (even though it was only for a “short period” (249)). He mentions his fellow comrades in clauses 254–255 (explicitly), who were detained and released with him. He is still the Affected, and the Agent of his release (i.e. the police, law) are omitted and treated as if these events had occurred by themselves.

In the Coda, Ferhelst signals the end of his account with a REL clause (256–257), indicating that he has finished his story.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.10</th>
<th>Reorientation &amp; Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reorientation</strong> [252–255]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252. Um after that, they took me to uh Victor Verster [2]</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253. where I was [2] originally detained.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254. Uh later on I was released on [2] bail with the other fellow comrades</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255. who was with me…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his testimony, Ferhelst gives his account of his harassment and torture endured at the hands of the Security police. He describes what happened in the Record of Events, which is structured in a chronological sequence of events. The participants are mainly Ferhelst, Van Brakel and the Security police. In the Orientation stage, mostly REL processes are attributed to BMW, through which Ferhelst establishes his activist identity. In the Record of Events stage, most of the MEN clauses are attributed to Ferhelst, on the one hand, and most of the MAT clauses are attributed to the police and Van Brakel. Ferhelst has an almost equal number of MEN and MAT processes, an indication of how his ‘agency’ is increasingly limited to his thoughts and feelings.

This table is a summary of the participant distribution of the main testimony according to section and process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.5</th>
<th>PROCESS &amp; PARTICIPANT TALLY FOR FERHELST’S MAIN TESTIMONY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferhelst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of Events</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorientation</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section demonstrates clearly how Ferhelst construes Van Brakel in relation to himself (i.e. how Ferhelst assigns identity roles). Ferhelst construes himself in the role of Affected – he is always being ‘done to’. The principal Causers are always either Van Brakel or the SBs. Almost the entire testimony is construed in this way. Ferhelst’s portrayal also serves to demonstrate his innocence, youth and lack of understanding of how dangerous it was to be politically active during that time.


After his main narrative, Ferhelst proceeded to respond to the questions asked by the panel of Commissioners.

4.6.1. **Introduction & ‘Personal Effect (1)’** [258–274]

This section of Ferhelst’s testimony is significant because he switches to Afrikaans to answer some of the Commissioners’ questions (his main testimony was entirely in English). The shift is triggered by the interlocutor (Potgieter) and the acoustics. This section aims to show whether there are any discrepancies between the online translated version and the original transcribed testimonies.

Ferhelst explains the effect the events had on him then and how they still affect him in the present. After his release from prison, he quickly realised that the political situation in the country had changed, and that there was no longer a need for the extreme means of self-defence that they as a group had trained for. They had suffered mentally and physically for their cause, and now they were left to fend for themselves. He feels he and his comrades were abandoned and forgotten after their release from prison. For many of them, integrating back into society was difficult, as they were highly “militarised” as a result of their struggle involvement (Marks & McKenzie, 1995).

At some point during his torture, Ferhelst was taken to a doctor to see to his injuries. Ferhelst is prompted by the Commissioner to describe his physical and mental abuse inflicted by the Security police in clauses 275–285. The direct words of the doctor in clause 284–285 below, do not appear in the translated version on the official website. This could be translated as either “There is nothing (fuck-all) wrong with the bastard” or “The bastard is fine”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.11</th>
<th>‘Doctor’s Visit’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283.</td>
<td>and he reckons to the SB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284.</td>
<td>“die donner makeer fok all.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td>Vat hom hier weg”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ferhelst switches to Afrikaans from clauses 286–323. As with the main story, the MAT processes in this section reflect the actions of the SBs. Van Brakel does not have a physically active role even though he appears in two MAT clauses, as he is the one who interrogates Ferhelst (three VERB processes in Afrikaans). The only actions available to Ferhelst were through his thoughts and words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6</th>
<th>Asking About Ashley Kriel [286–323]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>Ferhelst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clauses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In clause 291A, the interpreter opts for a less aggressive-sounding translation, “in my gesig gedruk”, which is interpreted as the SB “giving” the gun to him. The meaning is lost in the translation, as one can interpret the English as the SB giving the gun to Ferhelst willingly, instead of forcefully persuading him to take his own life before they do it.

In clause 297 of the Afrikaans, Ferhelst relates that he was “opgetel” (“picked up”). The Afrikaans translates roughly to “when I was picked up” (i.e. jailed). No mention
is made of this in the English (online) version, which only refers to his initial days of interrogation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.12</th>
<th>‘Asking about Ashley Kriel’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286. Um, like uh in die eerste – die eerste en tweede aand, was dit oor my kop gewees.</td>
<td>REL Like - in the first and second evenings the bag was over my head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287. Like die derde aand toe hulle die sak [gebruik].</td>
<td>MAT but on the third night one of the policeman took off the bag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288. uh het een van die polisiemanne die sak afgehaal...</td>
<td>MAT I was virtually unconscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289. Ek was like, half… unconscious um.</td>
<td>REL I was virtually unconscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290. Hy’t toe die haelgeweer gevat,</td>
<td>MAT and he then took the rifle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291. in my gesig gedruk</td>
<td>MAT and gave it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292. en gesê</td>
<td>VERB and said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293. “boekom trek jy nie self die trigger nie?”</td>
<td>MAT “why don’t you pull the trigger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294. Want ons gaan jou tog vrek maak”</td>
<td>MAT because we going to kill you anyway.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295. Um en ook um… toe hulle – toe hulle vir my interrogate…</td>
<td>VERB And when they interrogated me –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296. dis um vir die eerste tien dae</td>
<td>REL I am talking now of the first ten day period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297. wat ek… opgetel was,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Van Brakel made a statement that – | VERB |

In the Afrikaans, clauses 301–302 are transcribed as Ferhelst using Van Brakel’s direct words, whereas the English (online) uses reported speech, which results in a loss of narrative immediacy (Schiffrin, 1981).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.13</th>
<th>‘Asking about Ashley Kriel’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301.</td>
<td>VERB He] also said that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302. “Ons weet</td>
<td>MEN they knew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303. waar hy is,</td>
<td>REL where Ashley was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL and that they would find him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304. en ons gaan hom vrek skiet”.</td>
<td>MAT and kill him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal evaluation comes in the form of repetition in clauses 313–314. These MAT clauses serve to strengthen the specific action (i.e. the shooting of Ashley Kriel) and also delay the action. In the English (online) version, Ashley Kriel’s shooting is only mentioned once. Once again, this leads to some loss of evaluative meanings (Bock et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.14</th>
<th>‘Asking about Ashley Kriel’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313. toe skiet hy vir Ashley.</td>
<td>MAT They shot Ashley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314. Toe toe SKIET hulle vir Ashley.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Jy” (319–323) is used in the same way as “you” in English in the previous section (the Record of Events); it appears as a means of distancing himself from the physical
and mental effects of his torture and political involvement by making the situation more general. He also creates a ‘picture’ in the minds of the audience of the police, by describing the police as “mense van daad” (316) (men of action) – as people who carried out their threats and therefore dangerous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.15</th>
<th>‘Asking about Ashley Kriel’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>319. Uh in… in die interrogation, maak jy so peace met jouself</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320. dat… wat gebeur,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321. moet gebeur. [2]</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322. Um, om dit so te stel</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323. dat… jy prepare jouself… vir die ergste.</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarise: this section focused on some of the translation issues of the testimony. The interpretation and translation of the Afrikaans testimony into the English is more or less verbatim, with a few exceptions, e.g. the English online version tended to avoid repetition, and some information was not always interpreted from the Afrikaans to the English. This resulted in small losses of ‘emotional meanings’ which do not significantly alter the meanings.

4.6.3. ‘Laying Charges’ [324-334]

What is significant in this section is what was omitted by the interpreter in the English (online) version. Clause 328 (“Hulle wat ek by daai tyd was?…” is not in the translated version, but is replaced with a statement, “the police could do whatever they wanted to” (MAT). Also, the Afrikaans is a description of the way the police were in those days, hence the question and REL process. Clause 334 is a repetition of clause 324, and is not mentioned in the English. Again the English is translated as a statement, whereas the Afrikaans is stated as a rhetorical question: the issue was not whether he was able to lay charges against his perpetrators, but rather to whom. The rhetorical question expresses more his subjective feelings of powerlessness or helplessness as opposed to the English ‘statement of fact’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 4.16</th>
<th>‘Laying Charges’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>324. Het ek klagtes gelê? Um… nie einlik nie.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325. Like, daai tyd as ons kan kyk…</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326. wat kon wie doen?…</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
327. Niemand kon niks doen nie. MAT nobody could really do anything. MAT
The police could do MAT whatever they wanted to. MEN
328. Hulle wat ek by daai tyd was?… REL Who who would I make the charge to, to MAT the police?
329. Aan wie lê ek – MAT
330. aan wie sé ek VERB Who could I tell VERB
331. wat met my gebeur, MAT what was happening to me? MAT
332. môre doen hulle dieselfde ding MAT The same thing would happen the day – MAT they very next day.
Nothing would happen. MAT
333. niemand gaan niks doen daaraan nie. MAT There was nobody to investigate my EXIST complaint.
334. Waarom moet ek ’n klag maak? BEH

4.6.4. ‘The Way Forward’ [335–365]

In this section, he expresses the effects that the struggle has had on all of those affiliated with BMW, mostly through REL (11) and MEN (10) processes. They feel betrayed, ignored and rejected, not just by the government but by society as well. In these (REL) clauses, Ferhelst expresses his sense of responsibility towards those he had recruited. He does not name his comrades. He refers them as “mense” (341) (“people”), which is quite general. The English translates to “our people”, which is more specific. “Ons” is used to create a group identity (343–344). Here, “hulle” (345) is a reference to BMW members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hierso’s mense buitekant… um REL is that our people outside – REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ek was nie alleen nie REL I was not alone. REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ons was… ’n military wing, REL We were a military wing. A whole group of us. REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ons was ’n klomp. [3] REL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As ek na hulle kyk MEN If I look at them – MEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afrikaans has slightly more MAT processes (8) than English (6), but these clauses do not necessarily describe physical action. Verbs such as ‘kon kry’ (could get), ‘ge-recruit’ (recruited), ‘gewen’ (won), ‘opgeoffer’ (sacrificed), ‘kan doen’ (can do), and ‘omkyk’ (look after) – do not all refer to actual physical action, but can be interpreted both ways. For example, the verb ‘opgeoffer’ (sacrificed) could mean the act of having pledged themselves to their cause, or as having given up their lives for their cause. This is significant if compared with MAT processes associated with the police throughout his testimony, which described (more) overtly physical actions (e.g. hitting, taking, cuffing, pulling).
To summarise: Ferhelst uses this platform (i.e. the Commissioner’s question) to highlight the plight of his fellow comrades, whom he feels have been forgotten. He does this through a series of REL (11) and MEN clauses (13 / 7). He expressed his feelings of discontent for them and not so much for himself. He re-establishes a group identity, but only briefly (341-345). He does not assign blame or responsibility (other than to himself) – he does not say who is supposed to take care of his comrades. He simply appeals for help.

4.6.5. Summary & ‘Personal Effect (2)’ [336–377]

Lastly, in the last 12 clauses, Ferhelst reverts to speaking English. Ferhelst is the only participant (in ten of the 12 clauses). The three REL clauses describe his current situation (of employment) and also his emotional situation. The Commissioner then concludes proceedings.

4.7. CONCLUSION

Ferhelst was a founding member of the Bonteheuwel Military Wing (BMW) in the 1980s. They fought against the injustices of the apartheid government. Many were in their early teenage years. They received military training and recruited members in the community. In 1985, Ferhelst was arrested by the Security police, interrogated and tortured (TRC Report, Vol 3: 482; Vol 4: 278; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 224; 225).

Ferhelst’s story takes the form of a Recount. In the Record of Events stage, Ferhelst takes us through his arrest, interrogation, re-arrests and subsequent torture and release. His story takes the form of ‘us’ against ‘them’, with the Security police as the aggressors and Ferhelst as the affected party; therefore the police, and references to them, are mostly MAT processes. The majority of Ferhelst’s responses to them are MEN and VERB, as these were the only actions available to him in a situation of extremely unequal physical power.

The Transitivity analysis of this testimony can be summarised as follows:
### Table 4.7: Overall Count-up of Participant & Process for Ferhelst’s Testimony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Count-up</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>BMW</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>You / Jy</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record of Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reorientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rest of The Testimony</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What follows the main narrative, is a series of questions asked by the panel of Commissioners. Here, Ferhelst pleads for the plight of his fellow comrades, whose roles in the struggle have been forgotten and ignored. This is seen in the high number of MEN and REL clauses, which reflects the emotional, mental and physical consequences of their political involvement and consequent struggle to reintegrate into society.

Another important point is Ferhelst’s switch from English to Afrikaans. Even though the interpretation of his testimony into English does not greatly differ from that of the Afrikaans, some exceptions do occur where the meaning is lost in the translation. At times, these result in small losses to the emotional meanings expressed in his testimony.
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS OF TESTIMONY: MINNIE LOUISA FERHELST

5.1. INTRODUCTION

Minnie Louisa Ferhelst is the mother of Muhammad Ferhelst, a political activist and member of the anti-apartheid group BMW. She was not politically active, but was aware of her son’s activities. She testified with him at the Tygerberg TRC hearings, and detailed her own harassment at the hands of the police. Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony starts at a point before Ferhelst’s, and continues until his re-arrest (after his second court appearance). Mrs Ferhelst testified before Ferhelst, but as Ferhelst was the political activist and ‘victim’, his testimony was analysed first (Chapter four). Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony is about Ferhelst, and her description of the police, and her emotional and psychological struggles to see her son. In this sense, her testimony is typical of the majority of other women who testified at the TRC in that her testimony was about a male member of her family (Ross, 2003).

Mrs Ferhelst’s original testimony was in Afrikaans, which was simultaneously translated into English during the TRC hearing. In terms of this analysis, Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony (also) takes the form of a Recount, with the relevant constituent stages. Each stage has been further labelled for ease of analysis. Each testimony has been broken up into clauses and each clause has been numbered. Each process has been analysed in terms of Transitivity. Because this thesis deals with both the original Afrikaans and English (online) testimonies, this thesis will distinguish between the Afrikaans and English clauses, by putting either “A” (Afrikaans) or “E” (English) after the relevant clause number (e.g. 1A / 2E). It is important to distinguish between the two testimonies, as not all clauses correspond, e.g. a clause that appears in the Afrikaans testimony may not necessarily have been translated into the English (and vice versa).

In this chapter, I will argue that the Transitivity, Ergativity and genre analysis reveal the following:
• How Mrs Ferhelst positions herself, Ferhelst, as well as the police, i.e. as with Ferhelst, she is the Affected; this should be reflected through the high number of MEN, REL, VERB and BEH clauses; the police are the Causers, reflected through the high number of MAT clauses that they appear in; and

• Both the Afrikaans testimony and the English (online) testimonies are similar in content and translation, the exceptions will be discussed.

This chapter will end with a summary of the major processes.

5.2. **ORIENTATION** [1–27A; 1–23E]

In the Orientation section, Mrs Ferhelst orientates the audience to the time in question and her roles as mother and housewife. The Afrikaans testimony has 27 clauses, with 12 MAT clauses and 12 REL clauses. The high number of REL clauses is not uncommon for an Orientation section, as Mrs Ferhelst is giving background information to the testimony. This is also true for the English testimony, which has 23 clauses of which ten are MAT and nine REL clauses. Mrs Ferhelst shifts the story in clause 3 (both testimonies) to introduce the police who were looking for Ferhelst:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.1</th>
<th>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</th>
<th>ORIENTATION</th>
<th>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ek was eintlik by die huis, altyd maar</td>
<td>REL 1.</td>
<td>I was at home, REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>en Donavan was Standard 9 gewees by Spes Bona Hoërskool.</td>
<td>REL 2.</td>
<td>Donovan was in Standard 9 at Spes Bona High School REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>En um… dit het so gebeur</td>
<td>REL 3.</td>
<td>and it so happened MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>dat die polisie vir hom gesoek het</td>
<td>MAT 4.</td>
<td>that the police were looking for him. MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>en um huilte het</td>
<td>REL 5.</td>
<td>And they would come every week at least once a week. MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>elke week het huilte gekom, omtrent twee keer per week.</td>
<td>REL 6.</td>
<td>My children were still very small at the time. REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Um my kinders was baie klein gewees</td>
<td>REL 7.</td>
<td>I had one daughter REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>en um en uh ek het een dogter gehad</td>
<td>REL 8.</td>
<td>who was working REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>wat gewerk het</td>
<td>MAT 9.</td>
<td>and the others were still at school. REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>en die anders was nog klein gewees</td>
<td>REL 10.</td>
<td>And they would come MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>hulle’t skool gegaan</td>
<td>MAT 11.</td>
<td>and knock in the early morning hours. MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>en dan het huilte oggend ure kom klop daar</td>
<td>MAT 12.</td>
<td>The policeman that came MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>en dan moet ek die deur oopmaak.</td>
<td>MAT 13.</td>
<td>were mostly Captain Van Brakel and others, REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Die polisie wat gekom het</td>
<td>MAT 14.</td>
<td>and they would search my house, MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REL clauses serve to describe her anguish as a mother. From clauses 5–11A / 5–9E, Mrs Ferhelst describes her everyday life, and her children through REL clauses (four each). Clause 9 of the English testimony deviates from the Afrikaans (clauses 10–11)
– the Afrikaans repeats how young her children were at the time, while the English testimony avoids this repetition.

For both the Afrikaans and English testimonies, the majority of the MAT clauses have the police as main participant (‘doer’ of the action). These eight MAT clauses for both testimonies describe how the police harassed her family with constant nightly raids and their general disregard for her and her family. She presents these raids as having been part of their everyday lives. The MAT clauses describe clearly how the police were the Causes of the action, while Mrs Ferhelst and family merely received that action.

In clause 15A / 13E, Captain Van Brakel is introduced (both REL clauses). This information is inferred, as testifiers gave statements before the hearings, therefore the Commissioners would know and follow the testimonies without interruption. Mrs Ferhelst merely mentions that he was the one policeman who took part in most of the searches the police performed on her home. The English testimony refers to “Van Brakel and others”, while the Afrikaans only refers to Van Brakel.

In summary: in this section Mrs Ferhelst orientates the audience to the background of her testimony. She mostly uses REL clauses (three in Afrikaans, four in English) to describe how powerless she was against them. The REL clauses here serve to uphold the definition of the Orientation section. She also represented the police as ‘doers’ of the action, and herself and her family as receiving that action, through MAT clauses (eight for both Afrikaans and English). The table below shows that the pattern for both the English and Afrikaans testimonies is similar in their distribution of MAT and REL clauses that have Mrs Ferhelst and the police as participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1</th>
<th>ORIENTATION: PROCESS &amp; PARTICIPANT TALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>2   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>8   12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>/   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>2   2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>0   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>23 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. **Record of Events** [28–365A; 24–329E]

The Record of Events is the main part of the Recount, i.e. where the action unfolds. The Record of Events for this testimony has been analysed according to phases for ease of analysis, which are:

- ‘Ferhelst’s Arrest’ [28–73A; 24–70E];
- ‘At the Police Station’ [73–236A; 71–219E];
- ‘House Search’ [239–276A; 221–253E] and ‘Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’ [277–319A; 254–289E]; and
- ‘Ferhelst’s Torture’ [320–365A; 290–329E].

5.3.1. ‘Ferhelst’s Arrest’ [28–73A; 24–70E]

In this section, Mrs Ferhelst describes what Motsemme (2004: 920) refers to as “illusions of stability”. Mrs Ferhelst presents a normal family situation, with Ferhelst at home (28–30A; 24–26E). This “illusion” is quickly shattered when the police come and arrest Ferhelst and he has to flee again. The Afrikaans section contains 46 clauses of which 18 are MAT, and 13 are VERB. The English testimony has 19 MAT, and 13 VERB out of 47 clauses. Both sections are signalled by an EXIST clause, indicating a change of direction from the previous (Orientation) section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2</th>
<th>RECORD OF EVENTS Ferhelst’s Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>E  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>19 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>13 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>47 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Afrikaans testimony, clause 33 signals the first of 13 VERB clauses. This is a typical feature of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony, where VERB clauses (whether direct or indirect) are second only to MAT clauses. This reflects her role as a concerned parent who was continuously questioned by the police as well as constantly asking about her
son and his whereabouts. The first VERB clause is signalled by clause 32 in English when Mrs Ferhelst reports what the police had said.

Mrs Ferhelst is the Sayer (“ek”) in five VERB clauses, the police in four VERB clauses, in the Afrikaans testimony. In English, Mrs Ferhelst is the Sayer (“I”) in nine VERB clauses, with the police in one VERB clause. Another feature of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony is that she used a lot of direct speech, which was then interpreted as reported speech. The shift from direct into indirect speech is one of the ways in which some of the emotional intensity of her story is lost (Schiffrin, 1981; Bock, 2010). Again, the police are described as the aggressors (e.g. 32A; 28E above), Mrs Ferhelst or Ferhelst those affected by the action. Mrs Ferhelst’s fear is expressed through MEN clauses (four in Afrikaans; three in English). Basically the only ‘action’ available to Mrs Ferhelst is through VERB clauses, as the majority of the VERB clauses (throughout her testimony) are attributed to her.

The police are introduced in clause 32A and 28E; thereafter they are referred to as “hulle” / “they” (as with Ferhelst). In this case, the pronoun is used as an impersonal tool to create distance between her and the police. Again, as with Ferhelst in Chapter four, it is “us vs. them”. The police are Causers in nine of 18 MAT clauses in the Afrikaans testimony, and seven (of 21) MAT clauses in English. They are always referred to in the plural or as a unit, except where individuals are mentioned (Van Brakel, Strydom, certain police officers), in contrast with herself and Ferhelst as individuals. In this way, they are positioned as the ‘other’ in her testimony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.2</th>
<th>‘Ferhelst’ Arrest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. En daar was ‘n tyd</td>
<td>24. There was a stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. toe Donavan by die huis gewees het</td>
<td>25. where Donovan was at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. toe’t ek hom winkel toe gestuur saam met my tweeling dogters</td>
<td>26. and I sent him to the shop with my twin daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. en toe hulle terug kom</td>
<td>27. and when he came back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. en toe het die polisie vir hom gevat</td>
<td>28. the police arrested him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. En en toe vra ek vir hulle</td>
<td>29. And I wanted to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. hoe kom vat hulle hom</td>
<td>30. why they were arresting him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Hy’t niks gedoen nie</td>
<td>31. he hadn’t done anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Toe sê hulle</td>
<td>32. and they said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. hulle vat hom vir ondervraging</td>
<td>33. they were taking him for questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. en daar’t hulle hom gehou</td>
<td>34. They kept him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs Ferhelst is the Sayer (“ek”) in five VERB clauses, the police in four VERB clauses, in the Afrikaans testimony. In English, Mrs Ferhelst is the Sayer (“I”) in nine VERB clauses, with the police in one VERB clause. Another feature of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony is that she used a lot of direct speech, which was then interpreted as reported speech. The shift from direct into indirect speech is one of the ways in which some of the emotional intensity of her story is lost (Schiffrin, 1981; Bock, 2010). Again, the police are described as the aggressors (e.g. 32A; 28E above), Mrs Ferhelst or Ferhelst those affected by the action. Mrs Ferhelst’s fear is expressed through MEN clauses (four in Afrikaans; three in English). Basically the only ‘action’ available to Mrs Ferhelst is through VERB clauses, as the majority of the VERB clauses (throughout her testimony) are attributed to her.

The police are introduced in clause 32A and 28E; thereafter they are referred to as “hulle” / “they” (as with Ferhelst). In this case, the pronoun is used as an impersonal tool to create distance between her and the police. Again, as with Ferhelst in Chapter four, it is “us vs. them”. The police are Causers in nine of 18 MAT clauses in the Afrikaans testimony, and seven (of 21) MAT clauses in English. They are always referred to in the plural or as a unit, except where individuals are mentioned (Van Brakel, Strydom, certain police officers), in contrast with herself and Ferhelst as individuals. In this way, they are positioned as the ‘other’ in her testimony.
Mrs Ferhelst refers to Ferhelst in three MAT clauses in Afrikaans and six MAT clauses in English. He is not an Actor though, as actions are being done to him, for example, the police arrest him and charge him. Throughout her testimony, Ferhelst is never an active participant, for example, clauses 30A / 26E, and 32A / 28E in Extract 5.2 above. Ferhelst is described through REL clauses (five for Afrikaans, six for English). He is always described in terms of his youth, innocence or his whereabouts.

In summary: this section details how uncooperative the police were at that time, as well as the lack of resources available to Mrs Ferhelst, and how normal family life was just an “illusion” (Motsemme, 2004: 920) to those who were politically active. This section shows how similar the English and Afrikaans testimonies are in terms of their Transitivity patterns (see Table 5.2 above). Mrs Ferhelst also features in nine Afrikaans and five English VERB clauses, as her words (and thoughts) were the only ‘actions’ she could perform. The police are described through mostly MAT clauses, while Mrs Ferhelst and Ferhelst are affected by their actions.

5.3.2. ‘At The Police Station’ [73–236A; 71–219E]

This section of the Record of Events is the main section of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony and therefore the focus of her testimony. This section details Mrs Ferhelst’s interrogation at the hands of Van Brakel and Strydom; how they tried to coerce her into implicating Ferhelst and other members of BMW by threatening her, particularly using her child as leverage to obtain information (Ross, in TRC Report, Vol 4, 291). Mrs Ferhelst shows “displays of defiance” (Motsemme, 2004: 919) as she refused to comply with the police. This section contains a total of 165 clauses in Afrikaans, and 150 in English, with the dominant participants being Mrs Ferhelst, Van Brakel and the police, as reflected in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3</th>
<th>RECORD OF EVENTS At the Police Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>E A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>56 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>21 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>18 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>43 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>150 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high number of MAT clauses for Mrs Ferhelst (22 Afrikaans; 18 English) does not, however, indicate that she had any control of the situation – merely her attempts at locating her son. She (and Ferhelst) are receiving the action from the police or Van Brakel, hence the high number of MAT clauses that the police occur in as Actor (see Table 5.3). She is resigned thus to her thoughts and feelings, represented by MEN clauses (14 Afrikaans; 15 English) – the most compared to the police (one Afrikaans; two English) and Van Brakel (one English).

Mrs Ferhelst’s uses a high percentage of VERB clauses in this section – dialogue forms an integral part of her testimony, as this section of the Record of Events will show. Mrs Ferhelst is the “Sayer” in 16 clauses in Afrikaans and 19 in English – more or less the same as Van Brakel (20 Afrikaans; 11 English) but more than the police (eight Afrikaans; seven English). These VERB clauses come in the form of reported speech (direct and indirect).

There are various reasons why a speaker would incorporate reported speech into a story. According to Tannen (2007: 39), reported speech creates a sense of involvement with the listener, used to invoke the listener’s imagination – to place them in time and space of the events being told; in this way, the message being conveyed by the speaker comes across more effectively (Tannen, 2007). Reported speech is also used as a means to evaluate or express the speaker’s thoughts or feelings towards the participant whose speech they are recreating. Kuo’s research (2001, in Tannen, 2007: 18) has found that reported speech is used to create a sense of “… credibility as they present positive images of themselves and negative images of their opponents, as well as to evade responsibility and distance themselves from the purported source of the information they thus impart”. This is (what I believe) Ferhelst and Mrs Ferhelst are doing in their testimonies, i.e. by representing what the police said (and did) in a particular way, they are establishing a negative picture of the police.

This section contains the most clauses of direct and indirect speech of the testimony. In Afrikaans, Mrs Ferhelst quotes directly in 11 clauses, and indirectly reports in six clauses. In English, the interpreter interpreted this as direct quotes in seven clauses,
and reports in 13 clauses. There is a discrepancy between Afrikaans and English: the interpreter did not always interpret direct speech Mrs Ferhelst used as direct speech. This explains the higher number of reported speech clauses in the English online version. The resultant effect is a loss of immediacy in the narrative (Schiffrin, 1981).

This extract below shows a series of “he said, she said” type of responses. Mrs Ferhelst employs various forms of External Evaluation (Labov, 1972) as she recalls exactly what she said, as well as the direct words of Van Brakel, Strydom and other members of the police (e.g. 80–83A; 76–80E). External Evaluation refers to evaluation that occurs ‘outside’ the text, and do not disrupt the flow of the narrative (Toolan, 1991; Labov, 1972). The extract below serves as an example of how Mrs Ferhelst used reported speech to relay the type of things Van Brakel would have said.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.3</th>
<th>'At The Police Station'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Ek het gekom by Bishop Lavis se polisiestasie</td>
<td>And when I got to Bishop Lavis police station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. en ek het gevra by die polisiékantoor</td>
<td>I asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. of ek vir hom die skoon klere kan gee,</td>
<td>if I could give him clean clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. en um hulle het vir my gesê</td>
<td>saying that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. nee, hulle kan dit nie vat nie.</td>
<td>they couldn’t take it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Um ek het toe gevra</td>
<td>I asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. of ek met die kapein [kan] praat.</td>
<td>if I could speak to the captain,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Hulle het vir my gesê</td>
<td>and I was sent to captain Van Brakel's office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. “gaan na Kapein Van Brakel.”</td>
<td>and I was sent to captain Van Brakel's office,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Hulle het my gestuur na kamer nommer.</td>
<td>I was given the office number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Ek het gegaan</td>
<td>I was told to come inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. en ek het sy – uh Donavan se klein broertjie saamgehad</td>
<td>and Donovan’s younger brother was with me,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. en um toe ek klop daar aan die deur</td>
<td>When I knocked on the door,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. toe sé hy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. ek moet inkom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. en toe was Kapein Van Brakel en ‘n Mnr Strydom daar.</td>
<td>and Captain Van Brakel and a Mr Strydom were there,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. En toe sé Kapein Van Brakel, um</td>
<td>Captain Van Brakel then said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. “mevrou, ons wag al so lankal vir jou.</td>
<td>&quot;ma'am we have been waiting for you for a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Um ek’s bly</td>
<td>I am happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. jy’t gekom.”</td>
<td>that you have come.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Ek sé toe vir hom.</td>
<td>I then told him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. “ek wil net die skoon klere vir my kind gee.</td>
<td>that I just want to give my child these clean clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. want die kind moet voor die hof verskyn.”</td>
<td>because he is due to appear in Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. En uh hy sé toe vir my</td>
<td>He then said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. “nee, nee kom in.”</td>
<td>“please come inside”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. En um toe het ek daar gesit</td>
<td>and I sat there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. en toe het hy vir my gesê</td>
<td>and he said to me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the above extract Mrs Ferhelst is adding (creating) suspense or a “sense of drama” (Tannen, 2007: 106) by attempting to recreate a scene through dialogue. According to Koven (2001: 514), dialogue is a means through which the speaker attempts to convey or establish “particular kinds of local, quotable identities” – of themselves and those being quoted (Koven, 2001: 513). Also, dialogue is “an important source of emotion in discourse” (Tannen, 2007: 39).

The words that are quoted as someone’s direct speech may not necessarily be what was said by the person being quoted, but these words may resemble “credible utterances” (Koven, 2001: 514) attributed to actual people to construe them as “linguistically stereotypable kinds of people” (Koven, 2001: 517). In other words, the quoted person is made to speak in a certain way so as to convey how the speaker remembered or perceived the quoted person. By conveying the direct words of the police, for example, Mrs Ferhelst is describing the type of people the police were, as representatives of the apartheid state; how they tried to coerce her into implicating her son and other BMW members, with the type of things they would have said (but might not necessarily have said) – i.e. by positioning them and herself as positive and negative people (Kuo (2001), in Tannen, 2007: 18; also Koven 2001: 518).

Below is another example of Mrs Ferhelst quoting someone’s direct words, this time, Strydom, the other policeman who was with Van Brakel in his office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.4</th>
<th>'At The Police Station'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</td>
<td>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. en uh Strydom sé toe vir my – die ander polisieman um</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. &quot;mevrou kyk hier,</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. jy moet ophou um speel saam met ons</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. en dan sal ons jou seun laat uitkom (inaudible)</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. maar as jy nie saam met ons speel nie</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. dan gaan ons hom hier hou vir 6 maande.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. Ons sal hom nooit weer terug laat kom</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strydom tries to coerce her into implicating her son and the other members of BMW. Coercion and threats against loved ones were a common means by police to obtain information from people at the time, women in particular (Ross, TRC Vol 4: 291). He does this through a number of MAT clauses (five for both English and Afrikaans), implying that her refusal to cooperate was not “playing the game” (144A; 133E).

Clauses 191–192A are not translated into English, and represent one of the few omissions in the interpreted English version. Note that the gist of 190–192A is captured by the indirect quote in English “that you are still going to cry much more”. The direct speech and more elaborated Afrikaans utterance has more emotional appeal, and thus these meanings are lost in the interpreted (official) version. Also, Mrs Ferhelst “was told” (174E; also 176E) that she was going to cry – the agent who said those words is inferred from the context.

Van Brakel continued his verbal harassment, this time attacking the lawyer. She recalls Van Brakel’s direct words, “hy sal hom kry” (MAT, 196A). This clause is not in the English version, and roughly translates into he will “get” him. Van Brakel
attempts to discredit the lawyer, by describing him through REL clauses (three in Afrikaans; two in English) as a “skelm” or “crook” (194–198A; 177–181E).

Also worth mentioning is the high number of BEH clauses with Mrs Ferhelst as the Behaver – of the ten BEH clauses in the Afrikaans section, eight BEH clauses belong to Mrs Ferhelst. She cries (188A / 175E) and sits (181A / 167E), i.e. roles that are not associated with ‘agency’.

In summary: this section is the main section of the Record of Events. Mrs Ferhelst was interrogated by Van Brakel and Strydom, who tried to coerce her into implicating Ferhelst and his fellow comrades. Even though Mrs Ferhelst appears in 22 of the 62 MAT clauses in the Afrikaans testimony, and 18 in the English, she is by no means the ‘doer’ of the actions: she is giving clothes, being sent, sitting and so on, which is reflected in 16 MAT clauses in Afrikaans and 14 MAT clauses in English that she appears as the Affected. As she is giving a near verbatim account of the events, VERB processes also tend to dominate this section of her testimony, in both the Afrikaans and English versions (see Table 5.3).

5.3.3. ‘House Search’ [239–276A; 221–253E] & ‘Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’ [277–319A; 254–289E]

The section labelled ‘House Arrest’ is a description of what happened after Mrs Ferhelst’s initial confrontation with Van Brakel and Strydom. This section shows how the police were the Causers of the action, and Mrs Ferhelst the Affected and unable to act against them, even though she appears in seven MAT clauses. This is reflected in the type of verbs Mrs Ferhelst used here: Van Brakel “let” her go (i.e. ‘allowed’ her to go), or she “had to” get back into the car.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.6</th>
<th>‘House Search’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255. En um en toe het Van Brakel –</td>
<td>REL 235. They eventually let me - let me go MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256. ek het uitgeklim toe hy –</td>
<td>MAT 236. but I couldn’t go too far MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257. hy het my toe laat loop,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258. en uh maar ek mag nie ver gaan nie.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the section marked ‘Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’, Ferhelst and Mrs Ferhelst’s testimonies overlap. Mrs Ferhelst describes a time after one of Ferhelst’s court appearances, and his consequent re-arrest. Two more participants are introduced, the magistrate and Gary Harris. It is important to remember (here) that Ferhelst testified after his mother, but because their stories coincide at this point, it can be assumed that it is the same policeman that Ferhelst mentioned, i.e. Gary Harris. This section does not show any significant differences, except that clauses 280–282A are in indirect speech which was translated as direct speech in the English. Ferhelst appears as the Affected in four MAT clauses (Afrikaans and English):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.7</th>
<th>‘Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maar… die die – ‘n tyd daarna het Donavan toe – het hy nou voorgekom,</td>
<td>MAT 254. But a while later Donovan appeared again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>het HY – Donavan vooruit geloop.</td>
<td>MAT 260. Donovan was walking in front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy’t nou net uitgekom.”</td>
<td>MAT 277. he has just been released.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy was opgesluit by uh Brackenfell se polisiestasie.</td>
<td>MAT 284. he was locked up at Brackenfell police station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His ‘actions’ are described from Mrs Ferhelst’s point of view, with the police doing all the physical actions (e.g. taking him, or locking him up).

To summarise this section: the processes that dominate are MAT and VERB, though the role of the participants differ: the police are physically doing the action to Mrs Ferhelst and Ferhelst, e.g. ‘taking’ him, ‘locking him up. Mrs Ferhelst has the most VERB clauses – she is speaking or pleading with the police or shouting or screaming as her son is re-arrested. A summary of these patterns follows in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4</th>
<th>RECORD OF EVENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ferhelst’s Second Arrest</strong></td>
<td>No. of Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.4. ‘Ferhelst’s Torture’ [320–365A; 290–329E]

In this final section of the Record of Events, Mrs Ferhelst discovers that her son is being tortured. This section consists of 46 clauses for the Afrikaans testimony, and 40 clauses for the English. Mrs Ferhelst appears in nine of the 21 MAT clauses for the Afrikaans, and in eight of the 20 MAT clauses in the English. She is resigned to actions, such as going, giving or opening his clothes. She is also the main participant in most of the VERB clauses of this section – in the Afrikaans, she appears in four of the eight VERB clauses, as well as four clauses of the nine VERB clauses in the English translation. The roles of the participants (in this section) are thus very similar.

### Table 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Clauses</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mrs Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ref: Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ref: Police</th>
<th>Ref: Lawyer</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In clauses 347–354A / 312–318E, she describes how she discovered that Ferhelst was being tortured. The construction of these clauses allows for the agent of the torture to be omitted, even though this information is inferred from the context of the testimony (not just the agent, but also, in a sense, the Affected). It is only in the last clause (365A / 329E) that she mentions explicitly that her child is being tortured – “[dat] my kind ge-torture word” (“[that] my child was being tortured”).

### Extract 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</th>
<th>‘Ferhelst’s Torture’</th>
<th>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>347. By die huis gekom um…</td>
<td>MAT 312. and when I got home,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348. toe ek die klere oopmaak,</td>
<td>MAT 313. when I opened up the clothes,</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349. toe sien ek</td>
<td>MEN 314. I saw</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350. daar’s bloed…</td>
<td>EXIST 315. that there were –</td>
<td>EXIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351. maar dit was uitgewas</td>
<td>MAT 316. the clothes were bloodstained</td>
<td>REL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352. maar die stains is nog daar.</td>
<td>REL 317. although it had been rinsed.</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353. Ooe [en dit was seker die dag</td>
<td>REL 318. I cried that day,</td>
<td>BEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354. wat] ek vreeslik gehuil het.</td>
<td>BEH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary: in this section, Mrs Ferhelst describes how she discovered that Ferhelst was being tortured. Although MAT clauses are in the majority, neither Mrs Ferhelst nor the police are actually acting upon the other, therefore their roles (here) are fairly similar. Once again MEN clauses describe her inner anguish, and VERB clauses show the contrast between the two policemen who tried to help her, and other policemen (Van Brakel, Strydom) mentioned previously in her testimony.


In this section, Mrs Ferhelst primarily quotes what the lawyer said to her the day she went to take Ferhelst’s bloodstained clothes to him. She construes him as very helpful and kind, as well as determined to get some answers for her. Here he is referred to as “hy” / “he” (366A; 330E). In clause 336E in the English translation there is a reference to “they” – in this context it can only be assumed that this refers to the Security police.

The Coda concludes her testimony, by stating how she was eventually allowed to see her son after her ordeal. The Afrikaans only has one clause whereas the English has two clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract 5.9</th>
<th>REORIENTATION &amp; CODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRIKAANS TESTIMONY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH ONLINE TRANSLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REORIENTATION [366–372]</strong></td>
<td><strong>REORIENTATION: [330–336]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366. En uh hy’t gesé</td>
<td>VERB 330. And he said to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367. “gaan nie hier weg nie”</td>
<td>MAT 331. “you are not going to leave here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368. al moet ons uh uh “n [hoisank?] kry</td>
<td>BEH 332. even if it means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369. dan moet ons uh uh “n [hoisank?] kry</td>
<td>MAT 333. you have to sit here all day,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370. en na die en (inaudible) supreme court toe gaan.</td>
<td>MAT 334. we are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371. maar vandag moet hulle [na die kind] gaan kyk.”</td>
<td>MEN 335. and we have to go to the Supreme Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CODA [372]</strong></td>
<td><strong>CODA: [337–338]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372. So het ek daai dag tot ons nou vir hom gaan kyk het.</td>
<td>MEN 337. And I spent the whole day there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372. So het ek daai dag tot ons nou vir hom gaan kyk het.</td>
<td>MEN 338. until we got to see him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5. **CONCLUSION**

Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony is a typical example of the types of information that was conveyed by women during the TRC testimonies (Ross, 2003; Motsemme, 2004). As was characteristic of women’s testimonies, she spoke of the political involvement and mistreatment of a family member (and herself) at the hands of the Security police, and the psychological effects this had on her as a mother and caregiver.

Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony was given in Afrikaans, and translated into English simultaneously during the hearing. This chapter attempted to show the differences between the (original) Afrikaans testimony and the English version that is available on the TRC website. Though the loss of meaning was minimal, the emotional meanings of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony were at times not carried over into the English online version.

In terms of the Transitivity analysis, this chapter has attempted to show how the police were (mostly) the Causers of the actions, with Mrs Ferhelst and her family the Affected. Although Mrs Ferhelst (and Ferhelst) appears in a number of MAT clauses, their actions are not those associated with people who are in the more powerful position. Mrs Ferhelst is also the main participant in the majority of VERB clauses, which means that her ‘actions’ were mainly restricted to her words and thoughts as she could not physically act against the police. Rather, her role was defined by her verbal interactions with the police and her anxieties and fears as mother of an activist on the run.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mrs Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Attorney</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>E 0</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>E 1</td>
<td>A 0</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>8 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB Tot</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>23 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record of Events</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mrs Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Attorney</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>45 51</td>
<td>12 13</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>45 47</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>17 21</td>
<td>133 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>29 27</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td>36 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>13 11</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>39 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>38 34</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>12 23</td>
<td>18 22</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>77 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>9 10</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>13 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>8 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB Tot</td>
<td>130 131</td>
<td>28 26</td>
<td>24 36</td>
<td>73 83</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>40 53</td>
<td>306 339</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reorientation</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mrs Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Attorney</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB Tot</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coda</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mrs Ferhelst</th>
<th>Ferhelst</th>
<th>Van Brakel</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Attorney</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB Tot</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>136 139</td>
<td>31 29</td>
<td>24 36</td>
<td>84 94</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>49 61</td>
<td>338 372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 | OVERALL COUNT-UP OF PARTICIPANT AND PROCESSES AS PER THE STAGES OF THE RECOUNT
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

6.1. INTRODUCTION

The TRC set out to give “as complete a picture as possible” (TRC Report, Vol 3: 24) with its hearings, giving a voice to those who were previously silenced. During these hearings, South Africans were able to hear of and experience the atrocities that were done to those who actively sought to oppose the apartheid government. The TRC permitted testifiers to speak freely of their experiences, allowing for their stories to be heard. According to Graybill (2002: 81-82), victims felt ignored and abandoned. Public storytelling was an important aspect of the TRC, as it allowed victims to tell their own stories, or tell of those who were otherwise affected by apartheid. Narratives are a way of retelling past events, and refer to a succession of events (Labov, 1972: 359; Abbott, 2002). The main storytelling genre that was used in this thesis was that of the Recount, which can be seen as a typical genre for this kind of extended narrative of personal experience.

This thesis has attempted to explore how people position themselves and represented their individual experiences, by looking at the testimonies of two ‘victims’ of the apartheid regime. A Transitivity analysis allowed for the comparison of the testimonies by revealing how narrators presented their experiences of the same event differently or similarly, according to the linguistic choices they made during their testimonies. A genre analysis of the testimonies attempted to bring together aspects of context, content and language within the particular discourse event. A genre analysis also revealed that texts are adaptable and suited to a specific context to attend to the needs of particular audiences and purposes (Johns et al., 2002). (In this case, from the point of view of the ‘victims’ of apartheid and to reveal the brutality of the police and state). Also explored in this thesis was how the original Afrikaans testimonies differed from the English version available online on the TRC website. This chapter will attempt to discuss and compare the findings of the analyses done throughout this thesis.
6.2. **Discussion of Findings:**

Mrs Ferhelst testified first, and recounted for the most part, her emotional state during a time when her son was arrested and tortured, as well as her harassment at the hands of the Security police. This was common for family members (mothers) of politically active youth (Ross, 2003: 17). Her testimony is indicative of how apartheid "insinuated itself" into people's everyday lives, and how violence and disruption was a normal everyday occurrence for most people (Motsemme, 2004: 910). Her emotions and feelings are reflected through Transitivity mostly through MAT, MEN and VERB processes (as shown in Table 6.1 below). She, as with Ferhelst, is for the most part the Affected participant, with the police obviously the Causers of her distress. Their 'agency' is reflected in the high number of MAT (and VERB) processes attributed to them, with Van Brakel more often taking the role of the 'Sayer' and leaving the 'doings' of physical torture to the other nameless SBs. Thus Mrs Ferhelst positions herself as a mother, caregiver, also as a victim, in that she could not act against the police to help her son; but also as defiant in resisting them and not being coerced. She positions the police as rude, crass, and threatening, uncaring people. Ferhelst is positioned as a young and innocent "child". The fact that she makes a number of comments describing him is reflected in the relatively high number of REL processes attributed to him.

![Table 6.1](image.png)

Mrs Ferhelst appears as Senser in 30 MEN clauses in the English testimony, as Sayer in 38 English and 34 Afrikaans VERB clauses, and Behaver in 10 English and 11 Afrikaans BEH clauses. What this reflects is merely that her 'actions' were confined to her thoughts, words and even physiological behaviour (e.g. sitting or crying), as she could not physically act against the police as the law at the time did not allow this
(Motsemme, 2004: 919; Ross, 2003: 43). She did however attempt to defy the police, by for example, refusing to answer their questions, not giving them the information that they wanted. She helped her son in this way, as she may have been aware of his political activities. Mrs Ferhelst testified in such a way that she never mentioned her awareness of her son’s political involvement (Ross, 2003: 45; Motsemme, 2004: 919; Marks & McKenzie, 1995: 228).

Ferhelst’s testimony relates to his ordeal at the hands of the Security police. Ferhelst’s testimony is typical of that of an activist. His testimony is more physical and action-oriented, hence the high number of MAT clauses present (in his testimony). Ferhelst describes himself (and other members of the BMW) as innocent victims, and having no choice but to defend themselves against the police, who were typically described as the aggressors, perpetrators of the action against them. Ferhelst is the Senser in 33 MEN clauses, and detaches himself emotionally from the activities described in his testimony with the pronoun “you”. (He uses pronouns to detach himself from the police (even himself) at times – see Table 6.2) He also appears in 15 VERB clauses, and just as with Mrs Ferhelst, could only respond through his thoughts and words, as he feared retribution if he acted physically. REL clauses (19) are also prevalent, particularly after the main narrative, where he describes the plight of his BMW comrades who are struggling to adapt to life after apartheid. Ferhelst is generally the Affected participant throughout his testimony. The police are described as the Causers of the action against them and appear in 69 MAT clauses in his testimony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2</th>
<th>FERHELST: OVERALL PARTICIPANT COUNT-UP (As Causer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferhelst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEH</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including Gary Harris  * Including the doctor

Ferhelst’s testimony takes the form of “us” (BMW) against “them” (the police), and he assigns group identities to the police and Van Brakel, as well as himself and BMW.
At times, Ferhelst does not reveal ‘agency’ – the Causer of the action is omitted and treated as if it happened by itself (e.g. when he used the pronoun “you”) in both the English and Afrikaans sections of his testimony.

One important feature of Mrs Ferhelst’s testimony is her use of dialogue, compared to Ferhelst, who used it far less. According to Tannen (2007: 39) the “casting of ideas as speech of others is an important source of emotion in discourse”. This explains the high number of VERB clauses that have Mrs Ferhelst as Sayer, as she attempted to add credibility to her testimony by attempting to recreate the types of responses that the police would have given her during that time. It must be taken into account that dialogue in a retelling of an event cannot be taken as the actual words that the quoted person, but rather as “icons of credible utterances from culturally specific types of personas” (Koven, 2001: 517-518). Mrs Ferhelst is thus attempting to attach a particular kind of identity to the police, by quoting them in a certain way (e.g. as rude, uncooperative, threatening).

Ferhelst used fewer reported speech or dialogue than Mrs Ferhelst: he quoted directly in 12 clauses and indirectly in four clauses; Mrs Ferhelst used direct speech in 11 Afrikaans and seven English clauses; she also reported a participant’s words in six Afrikaans and 13 English clauses. Ferhelst quoted Van Brakel a similar number of times (13 direct) throughout his testimony. The same goes for indirect speech (five clauses). Ferhelst’s testimony however, was more about the physical actions against him by the police, and he used quotes mainly to describe the kinds of people the police were by quoting the types of things they would have said to him. His quoted responses showed him to have been typically nonchalant and defiant.

In terms of the translating and interpreting issues, this thesis has shown that not a lot of meaning was lost during the interpreting processes for both Mrs Ferhelst and Ferhelst’s testimonies. Minor discrepancies did occur, e.g. with (some) direct quotes that were translated as reported speech (Chapters four and five); the English interpretation tended to avoid repetition that occurred in the Afrikaans testimony; the English reported speech may have the agent of the action omitted (e.g. Mrs Ferhelst, clauses 87–88A / 83–84E; 93A / 87E – see Chapter five). The translation of the testimonies was thus fairly accurate and close to the original testimonies.
Even though they testified about the same events, they perceived the same events differently by focusing on different areas. Ferhelst construed himself as an activist, fighting for his country’s freedom, but also as an innocent victim harassed for no reason; Ferhelst does not mention his mother in his testimony. Mrs Ferhelst does not construe him in this way, but rather as a child and a victim of police brutality. Ferhelst’s perspective was shaped by his role as an activist, whereas Mrs Ferhelst’s role was that of a family member. However, their construal of the police is the same. They both construe the police as brutal, dangerous and intrusive.

6.3. **LIMITATIONS OF STUDY**

Due to the brevity of this thesis, research was limited to only two testimonies for analysis. Focus was thus restricted to aspects of the Ideational metafunction, as this thesis in part attempted to establish how participants construed their experiences of the world around them (by positioning themselves in particular ways). Focusing on segments or chunks of testimony allowed for the analyses to be as in depth as was possible, as well as for the sake of clarity and facilitating understanding.

Future research may, for example, undertake an even more in-depth look and cross-examination of similar testimonies, by including analyses of the interpersonal and textual aspects of the text, and how these contribute to and elaborate the meanings within particular texts.

6.4. **CONCLUSION**

This thesis has attempted to explore how people position themselves and others in the stories that they tell. A genre analysis of the testimonies revealed that both took the form of a Recount, with its constituent stages. A Transitivity analysis revealed how participants positioned themselves and others, and how they construed their experiences of the same events. What this revealed was that both Mrs Ferhelst and Ferhelst construed themselves as the Affected participant (through MAT, MEN, VERB clauses) and construed the police as the Causers (mostly through MAT clauses). This thesis has also looked at what was lost during the interpretation of the
Afrikaans testimonies into the English online versions of both testimonies. The conclusion (with regards to the two testimonies analysed) is that not a lot of information or meaning was lost, except for a few discrepancies. It is the opinion expressed in this thesis that the translation of both testimonies into English was fairly accurate.

Lastly, it is not the position of this thesis to establish ‘truth’, but merely to represent versions of it from the points of view of the participants. Middleton & Edwards (1994: 36) suggest that people’s description of events should not just be seen as attempts to recount past events, but should be seen within the “social, conversational context” in which they take place. Therefore language is an essential tool for doing this, as it “mediates” understanding of the past and relates those past events to the present. According to Watson (1996: 260) “people do not necessarily ‘know’ and reveal ‘real’ reasons for their choices and actions” – they merely attempt to give reasons as to why they are the way they are in the present. By establishing their identities, they are trying to establish a link between their current lives and their past lives, to make sense of who they are, and how they have come to be that way (Wetherall, 1996: 302; 305).

Through my analysis of these testimonies, I have attempted to understand how these testifiers tried to make sense of their experiences on the occasion of this TRC hearing.
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APPENDIX

TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION
UWC HEARING - DAY 1 - MONDAY 5 AUGUST 1996

CASE NO: CT/00666
VICTIM: Faried Muhammad Ferhelst [son]
NATURE OF VIOLENCE: Severe Assault
TESTIMONIES FROM: Faried Muhammad Ferhelst
                      Minnie Louisa Ferhelst

MR FERHELST: Ja.

CHAIRPERSON: You are both you and your mother.

MS FERHELST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much indeed.

MR FERHELST: Ja.

MS FERHELST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Ms Burton is going to lead you in a moment and she'll discuss with you
who should speak first. But before I ask her to take over from me, would you both please
stand for the taking of the oath.

FARIED MUHAMMAD FERHELST Duly sworn states
MINNIE LOUISA FERHELST Duly sworn states

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, will you please be seated. Now you are going to tell us about
detention and torture. It's not an easy thing to talk about, it's sometimes difficult to relive
those moments. But I am very grateful to you for coming and doing that because it's very
important. If we are going to have any kind of future in this country, that we understand what
has happened so that we can built a better future. Thank you, and I'll hand over to Ms Burton.

MS BURTON: Thank you Chairperson, good morning again Ms Ferhelst. Ms Ferhelst are
you going to speak first.
TESTIMONY OF MINNIE LOUISA FERHELST:
Process count: Afrikaans

Mrs Ferhelst:

ORIENTATION [1 – 27]

1. Ek was eintlik by die huis, altyd maar REL
2. en Donavan was Standerd 9 gewees by Spes Bona Hoërskool. REL
3. En um… dit het so gebeur REL
4. dat die polisie vir hom gesoek het MAT
5. en um hulle het REL
6. elke week het hulle gekom, omtrent twee keer per week. MAT
7. Um my kinders was baie klein gewees REL
8. en um en uh ek het een dogter gehad REL
9. wat gewerk het MAT
10. en die anders was nog klein gewees REL
11. hulle’t skool gegaan MAT
12. en dan het hulle oggend ure kom klop daar MAT
13. en dan moet ek die deur oopmaak. MAT
14. Die polisie wat gekom het MAT
15. was meeste um Kaptein van Brakel REL
16. en dan het hulle my huis deursoek. MAT
17. Hulle’t my kinders oopgetrek MAT
18. en torches geskyn in hulle gesigte [in] van kamer tot kamer. MAT
19. My hele yard was vol polisie gewees. REL
20. En uh ons kon nooit eintlik rus nie. BEH
21. want dit was elke week REL
22. Ek is – REL
23. ek het nie geweet wat om te gedoen het nie. MEN
24. Um toe het Donavan nooit by die huis gebly nie, MAT
25. want hy was maar altyd buite geslaap het. BEH
26. Ek is omtrent ge-worried gewees oor hom. REL

RECORD OF EVENTS [28 – 365]

‘Ferhelst’s Arrest’ [28 – 73]

28. En daar was ‘n tyd EXIST
29. toe Donavan by die huis gewee het REL
30. toe’t ek hom winkel toe gestuur saam met my tweeling dogters MAT
31. en toe hulle terug kom MAT
32. en toe het die polisie vir hom gevat. MAT
33. En en toe vra ek vir hulle VERB
34. hoekom vat hulle hom. MAT
35. Hy’t niks gedoen nie. MAT
36. Toe sê hulle VERB
37. hulle vat hom vir ondervraging MAT
38. en daar’t hulle hom gehou. MAT
En ons het opgegaan en toe die aand klere geneem het en um hulle het hom laat los die next dag en uh toe het Donavan maar weer so in die ronde geslaap en het hulle hom gevat en toe om het die mense vir my gesê dat hy opgesluit is. Um ek het nie geweet wat om te doen nie. Ek het ‘n prokureur toe in kontak met hom gekom. Ek was by al die polisiestasies en hy’s nie daar nie. Hy was so om trent 10 uur uh die oggend gevat en by 3 uur toe weet ek nog nie waar hy was nie. Um ek was so desperate ek was by al die polisiestasies gebel – Athlone, Mowbray, enige polisiestasie maar hulle sê hy’s nie daar nie en Bishop Lavis [sê] “nee, ons het hom gevat,” maar nie een van die polisiestasies weet waar hy is nie. Hy was so om trent en by 3 uur toe weet ek nog nie waar hy was nie. Um ek was so desperate ek weet nie wat om te doen nie en um … Toe’t ek die prokureur gebel en hy’t vir my gesê ek moet Kaap toe bel na ‘n Mnr Smit toe of Swart en hy’t gesê ek moet weer Lavis bel en op daai manier het uh by 4 uur die middag kon ons eers ‘n ‘n verduideliking kry dat hy in Bishop Lavis was. Kaptein van Brakel het eintlik self met my gepraat. Um ek het gaan uitvind hoekom het hulle hom gevat en toe sê hulle public violence.

‘At the Police Station’ [74 – 238]

Um [2] Hy was toe toegesluit gewees en um die oggend toe hy moet verskyn in die hof um het ek die oggend 7 uur gegaan om vir hom skoon klere te neem by die polisiestasie sodat, hy kan ordentlik kan wees, want hy was omtrent 2 dae al toegesluit. Ek het gekom by Bishop Lavis se polisiestasie en ek het gevra of ek vir hom die skoon klere kan gee, en um hulle het vir my gesê nêe, hulle kan dit nie vat nie. Um ek het toe gevra
of ek met die kaptein [kan] praat.
Hulle het vir my gesê
“gaan na Kapttein van Brakel.”
Hulle het my gestuur na kamer nommer.
Ek het die kaptein met die kaptein [kan] praat.
Hulle het vir my gesê —gaan na Kaptein van Brakel.”
Hulle het my gestuur na kamer nommer.
Ek het gegaan en ek het sy – uh Donavan se klein broertjie saamgehad.
En die braë se gesig is die braë se gesig.
En ek se gesig is die braë se gesig.
“mevrou, ons wag al so lankal vir jou.
Um ek’s bly
“ja, ja, kom in.”
En en toe het ek daar gesit
en toe het ek daar gesit
“jy gaan nie huis toe nie.
Ons gaan jou toesluit.”
Maar ek wou toe weet
wat het ek gedoen
en hy sê
“ek sê jy gaan nie huis toe nie.”
En uh [2] um hy’ t leërs uitgehaal
waar hy vir my seuns se gesigte gewys het
en gevra het
of ek ken
en ek het gesê
“nee ek ken nie vir hulle nie.”
Um hy het later begin te skree op my
en gesê
“jy lieg,”
“ja, hoekom lieg jy so?”
En hy vra toe vir my dat um
En hy vra toe vir my dat um
“ja, hoekom lieg jy so?”
Jou seun en daar’s nog ‘n ander seun –
hulle twee is die twee um gunmans van Bonteheuwel.”
En ek sê
“Mnr van Brakel, jy’t my huis al honderde kere en yard deursoek,
UM
hoekom het julle dan nooit ‘n gun – wapen gekry nie?’

“maar ek sê vir jou” –

hy sê vir my, –

soos ek met hom praat

het hy geskrywe…

en soos hy geskrywe het, –

het ek gesien

en uh Strydom sê toe vir my – die ander polisieman um

“mevrou kyk hier,”

y moet ophou om speel saam met ons

en dan sal ons jou seun laat uitkom (inaudible)

maar as jy nie saam met ons speel nie
dan gaan ons hom hier hou vir 6 maande.

Ons sal hom nooit weer terug laat kom nie."

En um, ek was toe baie hartseer,

want Donavan was ‘n skoolkind

die ander polisieman um

en hy was nog nooit in die gevangenis nie.

En ek weet toe nou nie wat om te maak nie,

maar ek vra toe vir hulle,

“seblief, my kind ken nie die gevangenis nie,”

en hulle sê toe vir my

“kyk hieros,

um vertel die waarheid”

en so meer ek gesê het

ek weet niks

waarvan hulle vra nie,

so meer het hulle my verskree.

Dit was van 7 uur af die oggend tot na omtrent amper 11 uur.

En um [2] hy sê toe vir my – um

hulle het my so lelik gesê

hy sê

“mevrou, jy lyk so mooi en en skoon van buite

maar binne-in is jy so vrot en so sleg soos jou seun.”

En um ek het gevra

“mag ek ‘n sigaret rook?”

Want, toe kan my senuwees dit nie meer hou nie.

En hy’t gekap op die tafel

en geskree

“jy rook nie in my kantoor nie!

Ons sluit jou toe vanoggend!”

Ooe dit was –

ek kan net sê

ek het deur hel daai oggend gegaan.

En hulle het my uitgeneem uit daai kamer

en in nog ‘n kamer gaan sit

waar ‘n ander polisieman moet dan nou kyk na my.

En daar het ek gesit

maar voor daai het hulle gesê
183. hulle stop my kind se bail  
184. en daar het ek begin te huil.  
185. En um ek sit voor hom  
186. en hy sê  
187. hy’s (inaudible) vir Donavan Ferhelst nie.  
188. En op daai moment het ek gehuil  
189. en hy sê  
190. “jy sal nog sommer huil, mevrou.  
191. Dis nog trane  
192. wat jy gaan stort!”  
193. En hy’t ook gesê  
194. “daai prokureur wat jy het,  
195. hy’s ‘n ou skelm,  
196. maar ek sal hom kry.  
197. Uh hy’s ‘n ou skelm  
198. wat die arme mense so beroof.”  
199. En um hulle het my in ‘n ander kamer gesit  
200. en daar het hulle gesê  
201. die polisie moet op [dophou?] na my.  
202. Gelukkig het ek eintlik die polisieman geken,  
203. en hy was so jammer vir my.  
204. Um hy’t gesê  
205. ek kan maar rook in sy kamer,  
206. hy’t by my gesit  
207. hy’t vir my ook ‘n papier gegee  
208. waar hulle wou ook gehad het  
209. ek moet teken.  
211. daar was ‘n opening gelos  
212. dan moet ek onder daai opening teken.  
213. Ek het geweet  
214. as ek sou teken  
215. dan sou hulle ingeskrywe het.  
216. En ek wou nie teken nie,  
217. dis hoekom  
218. hulle my wou opgesluit het.  
219. En ek het in die kamer gesit met die papier –  
220. ek wou nie teken nie.  
221. Hulle het my weer kom uithaal daar  
222. en hulle het my gevra  
223. “het jy al geteken?”  
224. En ek sê “nee”  
225. en hulle het GESKREE  
226. en hy sê  
227. “vat haar  
228. en sluit haar toe!” (inaudible)  
229. Ek weet  
230. ek het so kwaad geword.  
231. Ek het gesê
“ek is nie bang vir julle nie! (inaudible)

Vat my

en sluit my sommer op!”

Ek kan [kon] dit nie vat nie.

En um hy het my geneem na die selle se kant toe,

En by die deur van die selle het hulle my weer teruggevat.

En um hulle het my toe uitgeneem.

‘House Search’ [239 – 276]

Um daar het ek buitekant gekom
dit was baie warm daai oggend,
en um van Brakel se kar het daar gestaan,
hy’t ‘n nog ‘n poliseman ge-bevel om my dop te hou.
Ek moet in daai kar klim
daar moes ek [sit] buitekant daai polisiestasie,
dis SO warm.
En uh… ek het toe met die polisieman gepraat.
Ek het vir hom gevra “jinne hoekom is die mense so?"
Ek sê “waarom moet hulle so aangaan?
Kan ek nie maar loop nie?”

Hy sê “nee mevrou. Ek moet jou in die kar hou (inaudible)
Ek kan jou nie laat loop nie.”

En en toe het van Brakel –
ek het uitgeklim toe hy –
hy het my toe laat loop,
en uh maar ek mag nie ver gaan nie.
En weer in die polisiestasie ek het net gevoel
hulle moet my vanoggend net opsuit.
[En toe kom] van Brakel en Strydom uit
en hulle sê
ek moet mos weer in die kar klim
dan [vat hulle ons] – ry.
En uh by die hof gestop
en ek vra “jinne my kind kom voor
kan ek nie maar… ingaan nie?”

En [hulle / hy] sê
“nee nee – gaan!”
En Strydom moes vir my huis toe ry.
Toe ons by die huis kom
het Strydom my huis weer van voor af geskud
hulle soek eintlik ‘n matchjie boksie
wat ‘n telefoon nommer op het.
'Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’ [277 – 319]

277. Maar… die die – ‘n tyd daarna het Donavan toe – het hy nou voorgekom,        MAT
278. en buitekant die hof um het polisiemannè gesit.              BEH
279. En uh uh die magistraat het gesê           VERB
280. hulle is vry om te loop               REL
281. daar is nie ‘n saak –                EXIST
282. dis terugtrek teen hulle.         MAT
283. En toe ons buite kom,           MAT
284. het HY – Donavan vooruit geloop.         MAT
285. En uh… ek het baie stadig aangekom.         MAT
286. Ek het opgekyk,            MEN
287. die magistraat gesien so loop…       MEN
288. en dit het vir my so snaaks gevoel:       MEN
289. hoekom sal die magistraat dan DAAR loop? MAT
290. En hy kyk so na ons toe.          MEN
291. En uh die polisie het eenkant gesit    BEH
292. daar was ‘n polisieman daar       EXIST
293. wat ek geken het.             MEN
294. En ek sien           MEN
295. hy wys na my seun.         MAT
296. En op daai oomblik en toe vat hulle vir hom     MAT
297. en ek roep my seun          VERB
298. en ek sê “Donavan”       VERB
299. en hulle vat hom          MAT
300. ek skree            VERB
301. en ek sê           VERB
302. “nee maar julle gaan hom nie vat nie!” MAT
303. Hy’s dan nou vry.         REL
304. Hy’t nou net uitgekom.”        MAT
305. En hulle sê “mevrou nee”     VERB
306. en ek sê          VERB
307. “ek gaan SAAM met my seun” MAT
308. en hulle sê          VERB
309. “nee mevrou, jy kan nie saam met hom nie.                MAT
310. Dis ‘n State of Emergency.”        REL
311. En daar het hulle hom toe gevat.                  MAT
312. Hy was opgesluit by uh Brackenfell se polisiestasie.       MAT
313. Um ek het gepro[beer] –        MAT
314. ek – ons um kon toe nie na hom kom nie.                MAT
315. Ek het na die prokureur gegaan        MAT
316. en uh hulle het gesê         VERB
317. hulle sal als in hulle ver-vermoë doen om vir hom te gaan (inaudible)     MAT
318. maar ons kon nie [gaan nie]           MAT
319. want dit was State of Emergency.          REL

‘Ferhelst’s Torture’ [320 – 365]

320. En toe op ‘n sekere [dag] daar het ek gegaan na die polisiestasie van Brackenfell. MAT
321. Ek het skoon klere vir Donavan geneem               MAT
en uh toe ek die oggend daar kom  M A T
het ek so gepleit, om net vir hom te sien en sy klere af te gee.  V E R B
Daar was eintlik ‘n Kleurling um…  E X I S T
ek weet nie uh uh um  R E L
of hy die komandant of wat hy was nie, maar anyway.  V E R B
Ek het by hom gepleit  V E R B
of ek nie uh skoon klere vir my kind kan gee nie en nog goed  M A T
en uh hy wou dit nie vat nie.  M A T
En twee blanke polisiemanne het die klere gesien  R E L
en gesê  V E R B
die Kleurling um…”  E X I S T
of hy die komandant of wat hy was nie, maar anyway.  R E L
"mevrou gee hier”  M A T
en die twee blanke[s] het die klere gevat en cigarettes  M A T
een toe vir Donavan gegee.  M A T
En ek was so bly  R E L
en ek sê  V E R B
gie sy vuil klere vir my,‖  M A T
en hulle gee sy vuil klere (inaudible)  M A T
Hulle’t so mooi gevra  V E R B
“laat die vrou maar na haar seun toe gaan  M A T
is maar net hier  R E L
is maar net ‘n paar minute, vir die klere” vir die Kleurling.  R E L
Hy wou nie hê nie –  M E N
hulle was blankes.  R E L
Maar anyway, ek het so hartseer daar weggaan.  M A T
Ek het huis toe gekom.  M A T
By die huis gekom um…  M A T
toe ek die klere oopmaak,  M A T
toe sien ek  M E N
daar’s bloed…  E X I S T
maar dit was uitgewas  M A T
maar die stains is nog daar.  R E L
Ooe [en dit was seker die dag  R E L
wat] ek vreeslik gehuil het.  B E H
En ek het die prokureur gebel.  V E R B
Ek kon dit nie meer vat nie  M E N
en hy sê  V E R B
eek moet dadelik inkom.  M A T
Ek het die volgende oggend ingegaan, MET die klere.  M A T
En uh eintlik vir hom gewys het.  M A T
Al die prokureurs het nader gekom [om] te kom kyk  M A T
en gesê  V E R B
nee dit IS bloed.  R E L
En… toe weet ek  M E N
dat my kind ge-torture word.  M A T

R E O R I E N T AT I O N  [366 – 371]

En uh hy’t gesê  V E R B
gaan nie hier weg nie  M A T
al moet jy heeldag vandag hier sit  B E H
369. dan moet ons uh uh ‘n [hofsak?] kry  
370. en na die en (inaudible) supreme court toe gaan,  
371. maar vandag moet hulle [na die kind] gaan kyk.”

**CODA [372]**

372. So het ek daai dag tot ons nou vir hom gaan kyk het.
Ms Ferhelst:

**ORIENTATION: [1 – 23]**

1. I was at home, REL
2. Donovan was in standard 9 at Spes Bona High School REL
3. and it so happened MAT
4. that the police were looking for him. MEN
5. And they would come every week at least once a week. MAT
6. My children were still very small at the time. REL
7. I had one daughter REL
8. who was working REL
9. and the others were still at school. REL
10. And they would come MAT
11. and knock in the early morning hours. MAT
12. The policeman that came MAT
13. were mostly Captain Van Brakel and others, REL
14. and they would search my house, MAT
15. uncover the children MAT
16. who were sleeping BEH
17. and look through my house and my property with torches. MAT
18. We never had any peace, REL
19. because they would come every week. MAT
20. I didn't know what to do, MEN
21. Donovan never stayed at home, MAT
22. he always had to sleep outside, elsewhere BEH
23. and I was always worried about him. REL

**RECORD OF EVENTS: [24–329]**

‘Ferhelst’s Arrest’ [24 – 70]

24. There was a stage EXIST
25. where Donovan was at home REL
26. and I sent him to the shop with my twin daughters MAT
27. and when he came back MAT
28. the police arrested him. MAT
29. And I wanted to know MEN
30. why they were arresting him, MAT
31. he hadn't done anything MAT
32. and they said VERB
33. they were taking him for questioning him. MAT
34. They kept him MAT
35. and we went there the evening to take him a change of clothes. MAT
36. And the next day he was released. MAT
37. Donovan had to sleep around at other people's homes once again BEH
38. and they discovered him at somebody’s home at some stage MAT
and charged him with public violence.  
But then the people came to tell me  
that he had been arrested.  
I did not know what to do,  
I contacted an attorney  
and I had been to all the police stations, Athlone, Mowbray  
and was told  
that he wasn't there.  
And I was told  
that Bishop Lavis policeman had arrested him,  
but none of the policeman knew  
where he was.  
He was arrested at about ten o'clock the morning  
and by three o'clock I had still no idea  
where he was.  
I was extremely desperate  
and I didn't know what to do.  
I contacted the attorney  
and he told me  
that I should phone Cape Town  
and speak to a Mr Smit or Swart  
and he said  
that I should again contact Bishop Lavis  
and by four o'clock the afternoon we got an explanation that  
and established  
he was in Bishop Lavis.  
I spoke to Captain Van Brakel,  
I went to try and establish  
why he had been arrested  
and was told  
that he was being charged with public violence  
and he was custody.  

‘At The Police Station’ [71 – 220]

The morning on which he was suppose to appear in court,  
I went there at seven o'clock to take him a change of clothes to the police station  
so that he could look decent  
because he had been in custody for two days.  
And when I got to Bishop Lavis police station,  
I asked  
if I could give him clean clothes  
and they refused  
saying that  
they couldn't take it.  
I asked  
if I could speak to the captain,  
and I was sent to captain Van Brakel's office,  
I was given the office number.
And Donovan’s younger brother was with me.  

When I knocked on the door,  

I was told to come inside  

and Captain Van Brakel and a Mr Strydom were there.  

Captain Van Brakel then said  

“ma’am we have been waiting for you for a long time  

I am happy  

that you have come.”  

I then told him  

that I just want to give my child these clean clothes  

because he is due to appear in Court.  

He then said  

“please come inside”  

and I sat there  

and he said to me  

“I told you, you are not going home,”  

He took out some files  

and showed me some photo’s  

asking me to identify some of the children.  

I said  

that I don't know anybody,  

he then said to me  

“you are lying  

you know them,  

they are use to coming to your house,  

we have taken pictures of them near your yard.”  

And I then said  

“I don't know them.”  

And then asked me  

“why are you lying like this,  

your son and another boy are the two gunmen of Bonteheuwel.”  

I then said to him  

“Mr Van Brakel you have been to my house  

and you've searched my yard hundreds of times,  

how come you haven't come any weapons there.”  

And he then said to me,  

while I was talking to him,  

he was writing.  

And when he was writing  

I saw –  

Strydom the other policeman said to me  

“ma’me you must remember  

play the game with us
and we will release your son,
but if you do not play the game,
we will keep him here for six months
and will not let him come out again.”
My heart was very sore
because Donovan was a school child
who had never been in jail.
And I didn't know what to do,
so I asked them
“please tell me
my child is not familiar with this - with this kind of thing.”
And they said to me
“tell us the truth”
and the more I said
that I do not know anything,
the more they yelled at me
and this is from seven o'clock the morning until about eleven o'clock.
He then said to me –
“you know
you look so nice and clean on the outside,
but on the inside you are as dirty and rotten as your son.”
I asked them
if I could please smoke a cigarette
because my nerves were shattered.
And he banged on the table
and shouted
“you are not going to smoke in my office
and we will lock you up until tomorrow.”
And I must say
that I went through hell that morning.
They took me out of that room into another room
where there was another policeman
who was suppose to watch over me.
I then sat there
and they told me
that they were not going to grant my son bail
and I then burst into tears.
And they said
that there was nothing of Donovan.
I was then crying
and I was told
that you are still going to cry much more
and I was told
that the attorney – “the attorney you have is a crook,
but we will –
who robs poor people,
he is a crook
he robs poor people.”
And I was put in this room,
and the police were told to watch me.

Fortunately I knew this policeman

and he felt very sorry for me

and he said

that I could smoke

and I could sit there.

And they gave me a piece of paper

which they wanted me to sign.

The words he had written there –

there was an opening below

what he had written

and he wanted me to sign below that opening

and I knew

that if I signed

that they would fill something in there.

And I refused to sign

and they wanted to lock –

they threatened to lock me up.

I refused to sign

and they then took me out of this room

and wanted to know

if I had signed,

I said no

and they shouted at me

and said

“take her,

lock her up”

and I cried

and I got so angry

and I said

“I am not afraid of you,

take me,

lock me up

I am not afraid to go to jail.”

And I couldn't stand it anymore.

And they took me towards the cells

and at the cell door they took me back

and took me out.

‘House Search’ [221 – 253]

It was very hot that morning

and Van Brakel's car was outside

and he ordered another policeman to watch over me

and that I should get into that car

and sit outside that police station

and it was so hot.

I spoke to this policeman

and asked him
“why are these people like this, why do they have to go on like this, can't I just go?”

and he said “no ma'me I have to keep you in this car as prisoner, I cannot let you go.”

They eventually let me - let me go but I couldn't go too far and I went back into the police station.

I just felt and from there we left.

At Court they stopped and I wanted to know “please my child is appearing can't I go in?”

and they said “no - no go.”

And Strydom had to take me home and when I got home, Strydom searched my house looking for a match box with a telephone number.

From there on I didn't hear from them again.

‘Ferhelst’s Second Arrest’ [254 – 289]

But a while later Donovan appeared again and outside Court there were policemen sitting there.

and the Magistrate said “you are free to go, the case against you is withdrawn.” And when we got outside, Donovan was walking in front and I was walking very slowly and I looked back and I saw the Magistrate walking in a certain direction and it seems strange to me that the Magistrate should walk in that direction and he still turned around to look at us. The policeman was sitting one side and there was a policeman sitting there.

who I knew and I saw him pointing to my son and then took my son and I shouted “Donovan”. They took him and I screamed,
I said "you are not going to take him—he has just been released."

I said "I am going with my son" and they said "no ma’am you may not go with him, it is a State of Emergency."

And they took him, he was locked up at Brackenfell police station. We couldn't get to him. I went to the attorney and they assured me that they would do all that they could to see him, but we couldn’t due to the State of Emergency.

And on a certain day I went to the police station at Brackenfell taking a change of clothes for Donovan. And when I got there the morning I pleaded with them to please just let me see him and give him these clean clothes. There was a coloured person there I am not sure if he was the Commander or whatever but I pleaded with him to please allow me to give my son these clean clothes and he wouldn't take it. Two white policemen then said to me "ma’am give the clothes here" and they then took the clothes and cigarettes and gave them to Donovan. I was very happy and I said "please give me his dirty clothes" and they then gave me the - his dirty clothes and said to him, "allow her to see her child just for a few minutes" and they - this - they were saying to this coloured policeman, but he wouldn't.

I left there very heartbroken and when I got home, when I opened up the clothes, I saw that there were – the clothes were bloodstained although it had been rinsed. I cried that day, I phoned the attorney, I just couldn't stand it anymore

‘Ferhelst’s Torture’ [290 – 329]

And on a certain day I went to the police station at Brackenfell taking a change of clothes for Donovan. And when I got there the morning I pleaded with them to please just let me see him and give him these clean clothes. There was a coloured person there I am not sure if he was the Commander or whatever but I pleaded with him to please allow me to give my son these clean clothes and he wouldn't take it. Two white policemen then said to me "ma’am give the clothes here" and they then took the clothes and cigarettes and gave them to Donovan. I was very happy and I said "please give me his dirty clothes" and they then gave me the - his dirty clothes and said to him, "allow her to see her child just for a few minutes" and they - this - they were saying to this coloured policeman, but he wouldn't.

I left there very heartbroken and when I got home, when I opened up the clothes, I saw that there were – the clothes were bloodstained although it had been rinsed. I cried that day, I phoned the attorney, I just couldn't stand it anymore
and he said to me
“come in immediately.”
The following morning I went in with the clothes
and showed it to him
and all the attorneys came closer
and confirmed that
it was blood
and I knew
that my child was being tortured.

And he said to me
“you are not going to leave here
even if it means
you have to sit here all day,
we are –
and we have to go to the Supreme Court,
but today they must allow us to see this child.”

And I spent the whole day there
until we got to see him.
Mrs Burton: Thank you [Mr Pieterson]. You told – have told us – told our statement takers about your years as a student activist and your involvement then you were recruited with MK… and about the number of times that you were arrested and questioned so please tell us about you experiences.

**ORIENTATION [1 – 38]**

**Mr Ferhelst: [moves chair forward]**

2. I came home from school one day
3. and the cops were looking for me
4. why… up till today I don’t know.
5. Uh 1985 in the beginning… I joined like SRC’s on the schools [2] uh BISCO
6. and like we were on the run.
7. I was still young
8. and I [was] like… any child
9. who was afraid
10. what this people was gonna do
11. an’… the information [that] we got from other children
12. [who] were caught
13. is [that]
15. we didn’t know what to do [3]
16. um [2] in 1985… where [we?] like basically had nowhere to go,
17. [we had] nobody to turn to in fact [2].
18. At night we don’t – didn’t have places to sleep,
19. ‘cause we [were] afraid. [3]
20. Sometimes we went without food for days 3, 4 days.
21. Uh… and then a climax uh the struggle started to climax um…
22. we formed a a group –
23. a group of us came together uh
24. and started forming organisation to protect ourselves from the cops
25. because uh for some of us – some of us it was like
26. they were shooting on sight,
27. whenever they saw you in in Bonteheuwel
28. they started shooting,
29. and we thought,
30. well… what can we do to protect us against these people…
31. uh then we formed uh BMW, uh Bonteheuwel Military Wing uh [2]
32. Um … from there just went on, on a day to day basis like…
33. we met with uh MK (inaudible – *cadres*)¹
34. who trained us
35. [we] went out of the areas

¹From the online transcription.
36. came back in the areas
37. and then you could recruit other people to HELP with this defence unit structure
38. [that] we built. [2]

**RECORD OF EVENTS:** [39 – 251]

**‘First Arrest’** [39 – 118]

39. It went on for ’85, ‘86…
40. till 1987 the cops caught me [2] on a Friday morning.
41. That was [4] about 10 o’clock.
42. I was like still sleeping –
43. actually I wasn’t sleeping,
44. but I got back into bed.
45. I heard the cars pull up.
46. Your – at that time your senses are so developed,
47. you can hear a car a mile for uh
48. when it brakes,
49. like your senses – everything becomes –
50. you become suspicious of everything and everybody…
51. Uh on a Friday morning yes [2] when I heard the brakes of a car uh
52. I stood up
53. I went to the uh back window… see
54. what was going on
55. what car it was whatsoever
56. but it was too late
57. the whole house was surrounded by cops
58. sitting on the wall with guns… uh
59. in the yard was about… something like 25 to 30 cops in the yard…
60. uh two sharpshooters were sitting on the roof. [3]
61. Um… Casspirs and stuff were parked say… three or four blocks away…
62. I thought,
63. is all this people just coming for me?
64. What did I do wrong?
65. What did I do SO badly
66. that this people want me so?
67. Um I then realise that,
68. well, all the threats we got…
69. from uh all the information we got from other children
70. who were caught,
71. well this people are going to kill me,
72. that’s
73. what they said
74. an’… um I got back into bed
75. and [I] laid. [2]
76. I heard a a knock on the door like …
77. I heard a BANG on the door
78. and there was this… uh commotion in the dining room. [2]
79. Um there was approximately… 20 to 30 cops in the dining room,
and this captain burst into the room
that I was laying.
I was still in a shorts [2].
He pulled me up
he said uh…
can I use the exact words
because like it’s hard for me to forget
what that man said that day
and like I tried to forget
but it’s always there.
Uh this captain his name is van Brakel uh
he he came into that room, he and about four, five other SB’s.
He said to me, “you - jou slym etter gemors. Ons het jou. (you piece of trash, we have you now.)”
Ons gaan jou nou vrek maak.” (Now we going to kill you.)
And like… there was uh one of the other guys was with me in the room.
His name is Mymoona Begg
but he doesn’t know –
he wasn’t politically active or anything like that.
They took him out of the room
and then they started to hit me
[they] smack me around…
They closed the door
and like he reckons to me, “why don’t you run?” …
So I said, “why must I run?”
I did nothing wrong.”
Um what he then did was = =

Mrs Burton: Can I just stop you one moment. You were staying in the house of Mymoona Begg. Is that right?
Mr Ferhelst: Excuse me?
Mrs Burton: You were staying in the HOUSE of Mymoona?
Mr Ferhelst: Ja.
Mrs Burton: That’s why he was there with you.

Mr Ferhelst:
Ja. Uh [2] uh he then cuffed me
[he] didn’t want me to put on clothes or anything
he just cuffed me there.
I asked him
if I can put on my clothes
he says,
“no you can put it on at the police station.”

Uh he then put me in a van

[he] took me to the police station

and [he] threw me in a cell.

‘First Detainment & Interrogation’ [119 – 164]

Uh that Friday afternoon at – they also took Mymoona like

I protested

I said “he doesn’t – he doesn’t know anything about me

I’m just sleeping here

why are you taking him?”…

He said, “ag, hou hou jou bek donner” (shut up, bastard)

and he pushed me into the van whatsoever.

[He] took me up to the police station.

Uh at about – if I can judge

it was about two hours later

they threw in… uh

somebody I knew uh Christopher Routledge he’s…

and say about 4 o’clock, they started calling us out one at a time,

[they started] taking us into the cell, for interrogation. [2]

Umm when it was my turn…

two SB’s – I can’t remember the names

but van Brakel was in that room

and two of the SB’s stood next to me on each side.

He started asking me questions

well, I denied everything

[that] he asked

and I said, “I don’t know what – anything what –

how can I tell you these things.”

Uh he went out of the room.

The two SB’s tied my hands with a belt behind my back

and … then then a a third one he came into that room.

He also took off his belt

[he] put it round my neck

and started –

whenever one of the others asked a question

he started to pull the belt,

like choking me,

pulling it (inaudible - stiffer) every time like…

when they saw uh [2]

he couldn’t get any information out of me,

[they] took me back to the cell…

Um [2] later on they came to fetch me again.

It was about 7 or 8 o’clock…

[they] started hitting me,
161. [they started] asking questions again. [2] VERB
162. Well they took me back to the cell uh. MAT
163. The next day, same thing happened. MAT
164. The day after, same thing – same thing happened. MAT

‘First Court Appearance’ [165 – 185]

165. Then I went to court [2] uh MAT
166. I was denied bail. MAT
167. For that ten days I can say VERB
168. I was like interrogated for say about seven days. [2] VERB
169. Then I got bail. MAT
170. Uh before we got bail – MAT
171. the day before we got bail, MAT
172. our Section 29 papers were there uh REL
173. this captain reckons to me VERB
174. [that] he’s gonna detain me under Section 29 MAT
175. so I said, VERB
176. “well you must do MAT
177. whatever you want to,” MEN
178. but as soon as I walk out of the court MAT
179. I started running MAT
180. because I know MEN
181. what what were on their minds. [2] REL
182. Luckily I got away MAT
183. but… and I got a date to appear later – MAT
184. when I – at a later date I came to court MAT
185. the charges were dropped against me. MAT

‘Second Detainment & Interrogation’ [186 – 208]

186. but… uh a cop which I know MEN
187. his name is Ga– uh I know this cop REL
188. his name is Gary Harris. REL
189. He stood in front of the hall – the court. BEH
190. As soon as I left the court, MAT
191. he said, VERB
192. “here’s he.” REL
193. I was detained, MAT
194. [I was] taken to Goodwood police station, MAT
195. where they just put me in a cell MAT
196. an’, about half past 4, 5 o’clock, if I can judge… MEN
197. two SB’s came to fetch me. MAT
198. From there they took me to Brackenfell police station. MAT
199. They booked me in, MAT
200. [they] threw me in a cell… MAT
201. uh at about 7 or 8 van Brakel came. MAT
202. He started asking me questions VERB
203. [he started] smacking me around what MAT
and then left again, and he said uh, “ons maak jou nog vrek, voor jy uit die tronk uit.” [They told me they would kill me.]²

Um [2] I thought [that] everything was okay for the night.

‘Torture’ [209 – 251]

Half past 2 at night, I think [that] it was about 2 o’clock half past two the first night in Brackenfell, I heard all the doors opening, while I was laying in a shorts…

Uh there was about seven SB’s. [2] Uh they rushed into the cell, [they] pulled a … black bag around my neck, [they] tighten it, [they] cuffed my hands behind my back and [they] took me out out to the car. In the car they started hitting me.

They drove um I don’t know where they drove, past Spier … but they drove for about a half an hour or so. When they came to a place they took me out again. It it sounded like it was in a shack… There I was put in a shower, [I was] cuffed to a shower.

They started hitting me continuously until I was [un]conscious then I – they threw water on me to regain my consciousness and like [2] they gassed – teargassed the shower, [they] put me in some uh bin, and they teargassed this bin and [they] start to wet you all over again. The majority of the time when they hit you your didn’t – you didn’t even feel the pain because you passed out or something.

It went uh… as I can say that went on for [2] for that period.

After that night it was every night, half past 2, 3 o’clock every night. They came to fetch me. Um [3] I can’t remember for how long that went on, but to me… it felt like… it … went on for…
it felt like a – almost a couple of years, just that short period
because what – of what people – the way they handle you,
the way they hit you.

**REORIENTATION [252 – 255]**

Um after that, they took me to uh Victor Verster [2]
where I was [2] originally detained.
Uh later on I was released on [2] bail with the other fellow comrades
who was with me…

**CODA [256 – 257]**

I think
that’s about it.

Mrs Burton: Thank you very much. So you were several times detained under Section 29?

Mr Ferhelst: Excuse me?

Mrs Burton: You were detained 2 or 3 times under Section 29.

Mr Ferhelst: No, just that one time when I – when I left the court I was detained.

Mrs Burton: And that that time when you left the court, you were charged with arson = =

Mr Ferhelst: = = [inaudible]

Mrs Burton: = = and then they – and then they found you not guilty. Is that right?

Mr Ferhelst: Ja, they charged me for bombing up a a … post office, and then he said [then again] I’m not guilty.

Mrs Burton: And it was while you were going out the court, that they detained you.

Mr Ferhelst: Excuse me?

Mrs Burton: It was while you were going out of the court.

Mr Ferhelst: Ja.

Mrs Burton: That they detained you.

Mr Ferhelst: Ja that’s when they detained me.

‘**Personal Effect (1)**’ [258 –274]

Mrs Burton: Thank you very much for for um telling us all about um your experience. Can you tell us what EFFECT this had on you?
Mr Ferhelst:

258. [2] Basically, um when I came out of prison MAT
259. I was withdrawn from everything, everybody REL
260. I know. REL
261. Uh… like, I had no friends. [3] REL
262. I was my own friend. REL
263. Um… then you come out. [2] MAT
264. Uh, the other guys, who I recruited like… MAT
265. they were all with me, REL
266. but when it – when we all come out of prison MAT
267. it was a total different game here outside, REL
268. like [2] we were thrown away. [2] REL
269. Nobody… like nobody stood up for us. MEN
270. We were called gangsters and that kind of stuff. VERB
271. Um like we had no support. REL
272. That’s why… REL
273. I can say… VERB
274. [that] my life was never the same. REL

[Pause – 4 secs]

Mrs Burton: Thank you very much… I have no further questions at the moment.

Alex Boraine: Thank you, Mrs Burton. Uh… Dr Orr?

‘Doctor’s Visit’ [275 –285]

Wendy Orr: [clears throat] During the time that you were detained under Section 29 and being interrogated and tortured almost every day, did you see a doctor?

Mr Ferhelst: [laughs]

275. Ja they took me to a doctor once. MAT
276. Uh I can still remember MEN
277. that doctor was somewhere in Bellville. [2] REL
278. My whole body was bruised. REL
279. I had marks on my face. REL
280. When I came to the doctor, MAT
281. the doctor he just took out a stethoscope, MAT
282. put it against my heart MAT
283. and he reckons to the SB, VERB
284. “die donner makeer fok all. REL
285. Vat hom hier weg”. MAT

[Pause – 5 secs]

Alex Boraine: Could I just um continue where Dr Orr left off… this one doctor you saw, can you recall his name?
Mr Ferhelst: [shakes head] No, I’m sorry. I can’t recall his name.

Alex Boraine: Thank you.

Mr Ferhelst: But if I’m – if I’m not mistaken I think it was a district doctor from Bellville whatsoever.

Alex Boraine: Okay. Thank you very much we’ll try and follow that up thank you… Mr Potgieter?


Mr Ferhelst: [puts on headset]

Denzil Potgieter: All right.

Mr Ferhelst: Okay.

‘Asking about Ashley Kriel (1)’ [286 – 323]

Denzil Potgieter: With that bag over your head that you spoke about. You were taken and you were handcuffed… in a um shower… That that incident that you spoke about… um, did you have that BAG over your head the whole time? [3] Whilst you were tortured?

Mr Ferhelst: [switches to Afrikaans]
309. van Brakel sê
310. hy gaan vir Ashley doodskiet
311. en ek dink
312. dit was 3 weke na daai
313. toe skiet hy vir Ashley.
314. Toe toe SKIET hulle vir Ashley.
315. Like, ek het besef
316. dat… dié mense, is mense van… daad.
317. As hulle iets sê
318. dan doen hulle dit. [2]
319. Uh in… in die interrogation, maak jy so peace met jouself
320. dat… wat gebeur,
321. moet gebeur. [2]
322. Um, om dit so te stel
323. dat… jy prepare jouself… vir die ergste.

[Pause – 5 secs]

Denzil Potgieter: Ek probeer net uitvind, daardie [tyd]… toe jy – toe jy in die stort is, geboei, kon jy van die stemme uitiken?

Mr Ferhelst: Ja. Van Brakel – ek kon… die… een persoon wie se stem ek ek kon erken was van Brakel. ‘Cause like [2] sy language wat hy gebruik het is – “kommunistiese etter” is is like altyd – is net… baie ongeskikte woorde wat hy gebruik… en like, ek kon hom [h]erken. Maar die anders… kon ek uh… kon ek nie eintlik sê nie.

Denzil Potgieter: So jy – so jy sê dat van Brakel teenwoordig was die meeste van die tyd? Toe jy ondervra was, behandel was wat jy getuig het?

Mr Ferhelst: Nee, nie die meeste van die tyd nie. Ek sal sê sê die EERSTE week, die eerste paar dae van die interrogation was hy teenwoordig.

Denzil Potgieter: Was jy… ondervra oor Ashley Kriel?

Mr Ferhelst: Oor?

Denzil Potgieter: Ashley Kriel.

Mr Ferhelst: Um, ja. [2] Like, die vrae wat hulle gevra het oor Ashley is like, waar is hy… waar was hy, nie waar is hy nie because like, dis ná die tyd wat hulle hom geskiet het. Waar was hy, watter konneksie het ek met Ashley en [4] wie van sy familie is nog terrorist en en daai klas van [goed].

Denzil Potgieter: So hulle hulle het baie belang gestel in Ashley Kriel.

Mr Ferhelst: Verskoon my?

Denzil Potgieter: Hulle het baie belang gestel in Ashley Kriel.

Mr Ferhelst: Hulle het baie belanggestel. Waar hy was, wat hy gedoen het, [inaudible].

Denzil Potgieter: Kan jy nog onthou watter polisiebeampte die meeste vrae gevra het [oor] Ashley Kriel?
**Mr Ferhelst:** [thinking, whispering to his mother] Sorry, ek kan nie.

*‘Laying Charges’ [324 – 334]*

**Denzil Potgieter:** Kan jy nie [inaudible] Dis all right. [2] Dis okay. Sê net vir my laastens, het het hy enige klagtes gelê… oor die polisie wat jou uh so aangerand het?

**Mr Ferhelst:**

| 324. | Het ek klagtes gelê? Um… nie eintlik nie. | MAT |
| 325. | Like, daai tyd as ons kan kyk… | MEN |
| 326. | wat kon wie doen?… | MAT |
| 327. | Niemand kon niks doen nie. | MAT |
| 328. | Hulle wat ek by daai tyd was?… | REL |
| 329. | Aan wie lê ek – | MAT |
| 330. | aan wie sê ek | VERB |
| 331. | wat met my gebeur, | MAT |
| 332. | more doen hulle dieselfde ding | MAT |
| 333. | niemand gaan niks doen daaraan nie. | MAT |
| 334. | Waarom moet ek ‘n klag maak? | BEH |

**Denzil Potgieter:** En op hierdie stadium?

**Mr Ferhelst:** Op hierdie stadium = =

**Denzil Potgieter:** = = Hoe voel jy?

*‘The Way Forward’ [335 – 365]*

**Mr Ferhelst:**

| 336. | wat hy daaruit gekry het om te [inaud.] te torture, te slaan, | MEN |
| 337. | like hy kon nie informasie uit my kry, | MAT |
| 338. | wat wat… wat het vir hom… gedryf om my so te slaan en so aan. | MEN |
| 339. | En, tweedens, is dat [2] um… | REL |
| 340. | dat ek kan sê | VERB |
| 341. | hierso’s mense buitekant… um | REL |
| 342. | ek was nie alleen nie. | REL |
| 343. | Ons was… ‘n military wing, | REL |
| 344. | ons was ‘n klomp. [3] | REL |
| 345. | As ek na hulle kyk | MEN |
| 346. | ek het klomp van hulle ge-recruit in die sense hoe om hulleself te kan verdedig, en so aan, maar… | MAT |
| 347. | en nou wat ons die struggle… gewen het, | MAT |
| 348. | kyk niemand na hulle nie. | MEN |
| 349. | Hulle word gangsters | REL |
| 350. | daai… daai is wat vir my seermaak. | MEN |
| 351. | Nie die feit so much dat die interrogation so [baie gevat het nie] en daai – | MEN |
maar die feit dat niemand omsien na die ander MEN
wat saam met my was daar buitekant, REL
NIEMAND kyk na hulle nie, MEN
daai is wat vir my seermaak. MEN
Like, ek vat dit, MEN
dat ek het klomp van hulle ge-recruït MAT
ek is responsible [2] vir hulle… REL
hoe hulle hulle lewens opgeoffer het vir die struggle MAT
en nou kan ek niks doen daaraan nie. MAT
Dis hoekom REL
ek dink MEN
as ek vandag miskien kan praat, VERB
dat iemand SAL luister MEN
en omkyk na hulle. MAT

Denzil Potgieter: Ek verstaan dit baie goed. Mnr Ferhelst, ek dink ook die feit dat u sê dat u sê dat um baie van u… kamerade [inaudible] word, gangsters… as gevolg van die omstandighede ons… ons weet byvoorbeeld wat… in die vroeë oggend ure gebeur het in uh [inaudible] vandag. So, dankie vir u getuienis… en ons het kennis geneem van wat u sê… Baie dankie.

Chairperson: Thank you before I - I express the appreciation of the Commission just one final question Mr Ferhelst, what are you doing now, are you employed. Do you have a job, what do you do?

Mr Ferhelst:
I've got a job, REL
but like I don't know MEN
how long I am going to keep that job. MAT

Chairperson: Order please, can you be as quiet as possible please.

Mr Ferhelst:
I've got a job REL
but as I say, VERB
I don't know MEN
how I am going - how long I am going to keep the job, MAT
because it's this hatred REL
I got inside for this people. REL
If I explode MAT
who knows MEN
what I am going to do in the factory. MAT
Alex Boraine: Thank you very much. Uh first of all, may I say to Mrs Ferhelst we really appreciate your being alongside your son. Um this is very important, uh that he has uh support, in the same way as I’m sure it’s important that he… supports you, uh both morally and in every other way. I want to thank you both for coming, and uh Mr Ferhelst, I want to thank YOU for… speaking up on behalf of your comrades. You didn’t talk about yourself you talked about them. But, really and truly it’s about all of you. And I think that the… TERRIBLE cost of … what took place for so long, is what we are paying for now. Not only then, but now. I’m not sure what the Commission can do, um but the very fact that your voice will be heard uh I hope will stir those in charge and in authority and responsibility, that we cannot forget, people who were trained to defend themselves and then in many instances were just left on their own, and therefore started to use the very defence in order to attack. Uh the struggle is not over. The work is not over. There’s a huge amount to do and you’ve reminded us of that and we’re grateful to you. We’re grateful to you for your courage um to undergo the torture that you’ve undergone uh is is a very very heavy thing to do. And I’m quite sure you carry that with you – I hope you won’t explode. I hope that you will use the courage that you have demonstrated today, uh as creative force, to build and try to reach out to the very people you’ve been talking about and perhaps together, as from today, there can be a new start. Thank you very very much indeed both of you for coming. Thank you.

[Both Mrs Ferhelst and Muhammad Ferhelst get up, leaving the stage; Alex Boraine adjourns for a break.]
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