



AN USSU PUBLICATION

FOR INTERNAL CIRCULATION

1975 Issue 6

Friday 10 January 1975

19TH DAY OF TRIAL (9th January 1975)

WAH PIOW'S FIRST DEFENCE WITNESS STILL IN WITNESS STAND

GOH : I DID NOT SAY I COULD NOT SPEAK MALAY, I SAID 'SUPPOSE I DO NOT SPEAK MALAY'.

During the cross-examination, the S-G tried to prove that Goh is not an honest person. He said that Goh testified the day before that he could not speak Malay which was untrue. What Goh said was "Suppose I don't speak Malay." He said this in an attempt to show the court why it is better sometimes to go with some worker friends to look for jobs together. He quoted the example that if say he could not speak Malay and one of his friends could speak, it might be easier for them to go through the Malay guard, if that is the case.

SG: To prove what a liar you are, I want you to recall whether or not you said yesterday that you could not speak Malay.

G: I said "Suppose I do not speak Malay". I was giving you an example.

J: Will you answer the question? Did you say yesterday that you did not speak Malay?

G: I did not say it, I know some simple words but I cannot form these into long sentences. I can form simple sentences like 'Pergi mana?' I can speak simple sentences.

J: So we end up in you knowing simple sentences.

SG: If you speak Malay, why do you need a Malay speaking worker to accompany you to talk to the Malay guard at the entrance to allow you to enter the factory?

WP: Objection. In his evidence yesterday....

J: This witness understands perfect English.

(Witness asked to go to witness room)

WP: In his evidence yesterday, he said, maybe, for instance I don't speak Malay myself. If I have a friend who can speak Malay, I can go to the factory... Earlier he did say he knows a bit of Malay, so the court cannot presuppose he did not know Malay.

J: I allow the question.

(Witness called back.)

Goh: What I said yesterday was an example. I can speak simple Malay but I might not be able to put across what I wanted to say to the Malay guard. So if I go with a person who spoke Malay fluently, it would be easier.

AWAKENING GOING BANKRUPT!

Fellow students, we may not be able to produce the next issue of AWAKENING.

So far we have produced 31 issues of 3500 copies each, at about \$150.00 per issue. This means we have already spent about \$4600.00.

Until today the Polytechnic students have contributed \$1445.0 while our UNIVERSITY STUDENTS HAVE ONLY CONTRIBUTED ABOUT \$750.00. The public and other students have also contributed another few hundred DOLLARS WOULD MAKE IT ALL THIS PAGE!

SG: It was a hot afternoon, isn't it?

G: Not very hot.

J: Ist accused said that it was a hot afternoon.

G: It depends on how the individual feels.

J: I agree but generally there is not much of a doubt whether it is hot or not very hot.

GOH: EVEN IF I HAD GONE TO THE POLICE, WOULD THE POLICE DROP THE CHARGE?

During the examination-in-chief, Goh had given evidence that throughout the whole alleged riot, Wah Piow and Wah Ling were never in the PIEU premises. The SG questioned Goh on why he did not make a report to the police on what he himself saw on the 30th Oct.

SG: When you read the newspapers on the 10th Nov., and knowing the charge of rioting at PIEU on the 30th Oct, why did you go to the police?

G: When the incident took place, the police did not make any arrest nor did they disperse the crowd. Also, when I came to know about it, he had already been charged. Added to that, I did not know that a person could go and see the police if any person had been wrongly arrested. I did not know such a law exist.

J: Why did not you go forward to tell the police that you at the scene on that day and had seen the 1st accused at the hawkers' Centre, and that he was not in the premises when you heard the breaking of glass and knocking of furniture.

G: EVEN IF I HAD GONE TO THE POLICE, WOULD THE POLICE DROP THE CHARGE?

I was thinking I would come forward as witness if the case comes up in court.

G: I told my friend who was typing this out for me that I studied up to Sec. 2 in Seh Chun School. After that I studied on my own. I also told him that in 1964, I did not take part in the examination. There appear to be some misunderstanding over this.

J: Would you therefore agree that there is a false statement in the application form.

G: I agree.

Letters of warning.

In an attempt to show the court what sort of person Goh is, SG produced copies of letter of warning from Jurong plywood.

The Judge read out one of the letters: 'You have not shown any improvement after 2 warnings. This is the last warning.'

G: I remember that I had seen this.

But I also remember that in one of the letters, it was written that I was a hardworking guy, serious in my job. That warning that you have read was not because of my job but because of absence from work.

The judge was shown the letters Goh referred to.

Application Form to Jurong Flywood.

The witness was then shown an application form he had filled in his application to join Jurong Plywood.

SG: You said that the highest standard you attained was Sec. 2 in Seh Chun Chinese Middle School.

C: Yes.

SG: Do you agree that you declared in this form that the highest standard you passes at Seh Chun School was

23RD Incident

Goh testified that after talking to some of the workers on the 23rd, he found that some were Singaporean and others not.

J: Let's see how true this is. How many said they are not?

G: I can't remember clearly how many said they were not Singapore citizens because I talked to 20-30 of them and we did not talked on citizenship alone.

Chows then asked him a few questions on his career as a NS man in the Vigilante Corps.

SG: During your service, you had some course in law. It is not that you did not know. You were afraid of going to the Police Station to give a statement on what you know about the alleged riot.

G: We had only a few hours on law and I was not taught that if I saw a police arresting a person wrongly, I could go to the Police Station. Now I have very hazy ideas regarding self defence law.

NATIONAL SEMICONDUCTOR: AFTER RETRENCHING WORKERS IN SINGAPORE, WITHIN A FEW DAYS ADVERTISE FOR NEW WORKERS FOR THEIR NEWLY

SG: You were invited by the 1st accused to give a talk on retrenchment in the University. What do you know about the problem of retrenchment?

G: I know that it is unfair for the management to retrench workers who have more than 2 years service and keep the services of those workers who have put in more than 1 year's service. I also know that workers are not well protected, for eg, good workers were retrenched with a 24-hour notice plus 2 weeks wages in lieu of the 24-hour notice.

Sometime last year, after some of the workers of the NS electronics firm were retrenched, the firm expanded in Malaysia and advertised for the recruitment of workers.

SG: What else do you know about retrenchment in Singapore?

G: What I know, I cannot give the details.

J: I'm prepared to record it, so why care about details.

G: As far as the Jurong Plywood Co. is concerned, there was a discrimination on the part of the management. If I'm not mistaken, out of 88 workers retrenched, 52 of them were non-members. I'm not very sure of the figures.

"WORKERS WERE COMPELLED TO BUY THINGS FROM THE SUPERMARKET."

SG went on to question the witness on his knowledge on coupons issued by the management to the AM workers.

G: The workers told me that the coupons were given to them by the management for them to make purchase from the supermarket.

SG: Did your enquiries reveal that they had the option of returning the coupons to the management if they did not want the coupons and get their pay in cash?

G: I did not.

SG: In what way was the Union involved in this issue of coupons by the management?

G: The workers told me that the coupons could only be used to make purchases in the supermarket set up by the Union. I also found out that some of the workers were there on that day to negotiate with the Union on the coupon problem.

SG: What obligations did the Union have to the workers in relation to the coupons issued by the management?

G: THE WORKERS WERE COMPELLED TO BUY THINGS FROM THE SUPERMARKET.

Goh also testified that apart from the workers, there were also students at the PIEU. He said he could also recognise workers who were from the Union branch of the Jurong Plywood factory.

When the court resumed at 2.30pm the SG once again tried to assess the credibility of the Defence witness, Goh Seng Soon.

Goh was first questioned on his ability to comprehend English. Reference

was made on his application form sent in to Jurong Plywood when he was applying for a job. Based on the fact that most of the first page of the form was in Goh's handwriting, the Judge

concluded that Goh's handwriting was

jutting out at the sides of the premises.

G: You said that you went there because you were concerned for the workers. Why then were you at the sides and not in front of PIEU where the workers were?

To that, Goh replied that he moved around the place randomly when he was not engaged in talking but he did not go there solely to look for air-conditioners.

When asked why he did not go to the back of the PIEU, he said that as there was a building under construction, it might be dangerous to go there.

30th Oct.

Goh testified that he reached PIEU at about 10.15am that day. Several questions were raised on what he had for breakfast. Questions asked include the following:

"What kind of breakfast?"

"Hokkien mee."

"Soup or fried?"

"Soup."

"With prawns or fish-balls?", "Mee-hoon or kueh-taow?", "Tea with or without milk?" and so on and so forth.

After this round of questions on his breakfast, the Judge wanted to know whether Goh saw Juliet Chin on the 30th. Goh could not recall whether he did see her there. Goh then asked him whether

A CRITIQUE OF CHRISTIANITY

--- COND FROM HON KIVONG'S 4TH OPEN LETTER

SPREAD THE TRUTH, DON'T RELY ON OTHERS (STRAITS TIMES ETC.)

Wah Piow, a Christian, together with one and a few others, were at a certain after-class-meeting with a social work class, where we explained recent events and the possibility of the Union being banned. Wah Piow was asked whether he was a Christian. He told them, and said that Jesus teaches a lot of good things. He cited the example of Jesus telling the paralyzed chaps to "pick up your sticks and walk", as an encouragement on self-reliance.

Yes, the dirty, shabby, undernourished folks should rely on themselves for their own betterment. How different is this attitude from that of lying back in the stretcher and wait for charity, or "change of government" from above! Swee Lan, have you been taking up responsibilities in the Union, e.g. my social and cultural activities? Don't underestimate your own abilities. As obvious in our Pulau Tekong show, confidence comes from doing it. Now that the 6 of us are no longer around, you and all other students should all the more "pick up your sticks and walk!"----- towards a stronger Union and a more humane society.

Jesus also held mass meetings. Remember the day when he gave a big treat from 5 cakes and 2 fish to a mass meeting beside Lake Galilee? Learn from him. Truth must be spread to the masses. The majority of the Singapore population, I gather, is still very confused with what is happening to USSU. They thought only 200 out of 7500 boycotted. They thought we did break our students' pass promise by struggling with a political machine, because of Chua Sian Chin's long letter. They cannot get the essence of the trials from the legalistic press reports. Therefore they still do not know whether Wah Piow rioted, and whether he was unreasonable so that the Judge always hammered him. Many of them still think Kum Shee and Meng Ker did take drugs! They may also be disappointed that students "planted bombs in the library" and "threatened fellow students who did not boycott classes"! My God!

We must let the public know the truth--- they are so inaccessible to them, while exposed to all those biased information. Everyone of us must become conscious spreader of the truth! Will you please get students to be aware of the seriousness of this problem and put up big posters urging them to take every opportunity to start conversations with everybody contactable to explain the truth of what USSU is doing and is being treated? Talk with lecturers. Talk with the sarabat stall hawkers. Talk with the poor boring CISCO kids. Talk with the bus conductor in your morning bus to campus. Talk with all your brothers, sisters, uncles, aunties, parents, granies and anyone who happen to come around to your house, including the girl who try to sell you a new brand of soap tomorrow. Not only you, Swee Lan, everybody must do it. One more member of the public is not ignorant of the truth, one more day we are nearer a society of justice and democracy.

I actually intended to talk about our ideology. I didn't expect the Christmas greeting to last the entire letter. I have a lot more of Bible stories to tell, but I'll tell you next time I meet you, maybe in the 48 hours before I leave, or when you visit Hong Kong one day, or when I come back for my exams.

Anyway, this letter do reflect part of our ideology. Since many of your close friends are also Christians, in this Christmas tiding, I hope you all enjoy discussing Christianity as a way of life (ie. not just a matter of prayers) with an atheist who admires Jesus as a great teacher --- and rebel.

I know next to nothing about Islam. But I hope my points are interesting to your Muslim friends as well. Merry Christmas, and let's look forward to 1975 as a more splendid year of our Union ---- a democratic force in Singapore!

Yours in Jesus' love
HK Tsui (signed)

P.S.

1. I hope to whip up discussion, debate or polemic with students in AWAKENING or other campus publications. Can you please help me by encouraging those who are likely to argue with my views to start writing?
2. Goody-goodness may mean "make no enemy". This was obviously not what Jesus taught because he said, "Love your enemy". If we make no enemy, how can you