



Thursday 19th December 1974

SOLIDARITY CULTURAL NIGHT:

Spirited Students show that Student's Struggle does not End with Boycott

The rain failed to dampen the spirit of fellow students who participated in the Solidarity Cultural Night yesterday evening (Wed. 18.12.74).

Instead fellow students on two occasions chose to remain in the Solidarity Square seated on the grass despite heavy downpours. It was only when rain fell a third time at 7 p.m. that we shifted smoothly to Union House Canteen to continue our show.

The show started off in Solidarity Square in the evening with fellow students seated on the grass facing the Solidarity Monument, which was proudly constructed just before the show. The monument is the proof of the strength of our unity for many hands helped in its building (see next report). The sight of the Monument gave new spirit to students during the show.

Participants from various affiliates sparked off the night in the true spirit of solidarity by coming together and singing "You've got to do more than that". This was a historic item - perhaps the first time that affiliates have joined together in such united effort!

In the Union House canteen spirits reached a peak with our own originally composed song, "A Better World Someday" sung after the tune of "Pie in the Sky". Fellow students sang with such enthusiasm and sang it twice over. The song strengthened our belief in our cause:-
"Working people and students unite,
Side by side we for freedom will fight,
And the world shall be better someday,
As we learn from each other the way."

"We shall fight on and on
Until all oppression is gone,
As we fight, we'll unite,
All people ever more than before."

The ballad of Coconut Trees, a dynamic dance, by the Chinese Society carried on the night in the same strong spirit. Fellow students learnt from the dance that in spite of or maybe because of increasing repression (the storm), a

This same theme was continued in the form of the drama "A tableau". We saw in these acts, the stages of the increasing repressive measures against our Union. The drama showed the strategy of the repression, mapped out at a high-powered meeting between top officials named Mr. D, Mr. Y, Mr. L, Dr. T and Mr. ISD, and how the strategy was practised with cold-blooded efficiency on our Students' Union. The repression intensified with our President's arrest, then followed the arrests of our five students and the present persecution of Tsui Hon Kwong. The play succeeded in giving fellow students a clear picture of the stages in the strategy of repression against USSU. But, more important, Cont'd pg. 2.

FELLOW STUDENTS, UNITE!
FIGHT FOR JUSTICE AND FREEDOM
NOW AND FOREVER!

Inside:

- Wah Piow: Ending Boycott is No Indication of our Weakness.....2
- Invasion of Solidarity Square by Suspicious Characters.....3
- Wah Piow Fights in Court.....3,5
- ST Rebutted.....6

it showed the spirit of solidarity and struggle in which USSU members responded despite of ---- and because of! ---- the repression!

Many rousing songs were enjoyed: Traditional Malay songs (including Trek Tek Tek) from the Malay Society, and progressive Malay Songs, Bersatu-lah and the inspiring Bersatu Tentang Akta (Solidarity against Oppression); the DRH group, on the same theme of solidarity, reminded us that "No Man is an Island" and "United we stand, divided we fall." Harmonicas and accordians led and accompanied fellow students in ringing "Oh freedom" and "Bersatu-lah!"

Inspiring poems were read with much feeling, including a group effort praising the greatness of "Hands". We can also say that the Ballad of Coconut Trees was also poetry in itself, in words and in movement! A novel event presented earlier was a magic show, presented by a fellow student from Bizad. His disappearing-reappearing ball especially fooled his audience!

The Cultural Night ended with all fellow students joining hands and dancing the Snake Dance, to lively music. It was a fitting climax to our celebration of Unity!

What the Cultural Night Sought to Show

The Solidarity Cultural Night practised, and not only showed, Students' Solidarity. Many affiliates took part in the organising (led by the Indian Cultural Society) and participated in presenting items. This proved that despite our varying interests and inclinations, we fellow students can come together in a common cause and create a really meaningful production together.

The songs, poems, drama and dance all emphasize on our struggle against oppression and injustice. They tried to show that we students are a capable lot, that we can achieve tremendous things and can build a "Better World Someday" if we unite

into one strong force (Bersatu-lah!). Even where there is great repression, we students, like the coconut trees in the ballad, can rise against the storm, with our united effort. And we must not forget the working people, the "Hands" which are truly responsible for the building of our society. ("Working people and students unite!")

The Cultural Night was not a session of mere entertainment. Rather, it was a time for all fellow students to participate in action and in spirit and to renew their convictions in the struggle for justice and freedom.

Wah Piow: Ending Boycott is No Indication of our Weakness.

USSU President Tan Wah Piow declared at the Cultural Night that ending our boycott was not an indication of our weakness, or that we were giving up our strength or that we had forgotten the six deported students.

Wah Piow reminded fellow students that 'We are fighting a rational battle against irrational forces to whom reason has no appeal.' We had tried rational and reasonable means to impress on them, but they stubbornly stuck to their line.

"That does not mean that we stop in our struggle," Wah Piow declared.

The Union may think of other ways especially to deal with Tsui Hon Kwong's problem.

Wah Piow brought out that some boycotting students did not really understand the Significance of the boycott, because they stayed at home. It was true that staying away from classes was a form of protest but "we should make use of time and manpower to do more concrete things!"

We had no tradition of boycott. Perfection will come only through the process of experience. Next time, if the need arose for another boycott, it would be more successful.

Wah Piow said that he did not want to spread the 'disease' of boycotting. "Personally, I dislike not going to classes!" he confessed. But we had no choice but to boycott as a form of struggle and solidarity.

He said that the necessity for a boycott arose when the persecution exc-

cannot impose decisions on students, that USSU cannot give orders. Success would only come if students agreed with the action. In the past few days there was good indication of spontaneous response.

Role of USSU Wah Piow said that USSU's role was to organise this spontaneous response of students and in the present case, to synthesize this response into the boycott action. This shall always be the role

Day 6 of the Trial

TAN WAH PIOW CONTINUES TO CROSS-EXAMINE LAWRENCE KWEEK

The trial reopened at 2.30 p.m., Wah Piow continued with his cross-examination of Kwek.

WP: 'Mr Kwek, will you agree with me that if the glass plane was broken by someone from outside and that you were a few inches away from the glass planes your face and other parts of your body will injured in the process?'

The judge disallowed this question considering it not a question of credibility. When Wah Piow asked Kwek the position of the 5 persons, the judge told him to confine his description as to whether they were standing, stooping etc. only. The judge refused Wah Piow's request for the description of the attack on the grounds that it was already covered. When Wah Piow asked for the length of the 2 sticks, (he and Botak was supposed to be holding) the judge told him to go on to the next question. So Wah Piow continued:

WP: "I put it to you..... if there were to be such an incident, you would have raised your voice to summon for help?"

Judge: "This is a comment. You can submit it to me."

Kwek gave a demonstration of how he was attacked, he also said that Wah Piow and Botak managed to catch hold of both the sticks. When Wah Piow asked:

"Do you mean that during the grabbing of the sticks, the 2 of us froze our actions to allow him to do it?"

Judge: "He didn't mean that."

The judge then continued to explain and interrupted Wah Piow's questions.

WP: "I put it to you that if the incident were to take place, the 3 other persons behind the 2 persons carrying sticks would join in".

Judge: "That is hypothetical."

Ghows protested and the judge disallowed the question.

When Wah Piow asked whether the 2 persons with sticks hit Kwek with their left hands, he answered that they did and when asked which part of his body was hit, he could not remember. The judge then decided to stop that line of cross-examination.

To be continued on page 4.

NG WAH LING IS SELLING HIS MOTORBIKE

Model: Yamaha 100 c.c.
Bought on 26-8-1974 (Brand New)
Registration No: AQ 1731R
Original price: \$1,202
Mileage: 2,000 miles.
Price: negotiable.

Interested persons can contact Wah Ling through USSU Secretariat.

Wah Piow Urges All Students to Follow Closely His Courtcase (Cont'd)

Wah Piow then dealt with his continuing courtcase. He said that developments will reach a peak during the short break and urged all students to follow the trial very closely. Wah Piow made a personal appeal to all students that should he be convicted during the vacation, all students please come back to Union House on the last day before the conviction for a show of unity. The Union may not be able to contact all students to inform them of the conviction; however students can be kept informed by the mass media.

Wah Piow said that the Govt expected strong response from the students if he was convicted and the present repression will further increase. This is a very realistic thing, Wah Piow emphasized. He had discussed the possibility of deportations with the six students before they were deported, and the banner put up in Union House, 'Don't Let Them Ban The Union', was put up before the deportations. This goes to prove that the Govt measures had been anticipated by the Union.

'Since they (the repressive forces) cannot see daylight, they must work at night', Wah Piow said.

Correction of yesterday's issue of AWAKENING (18.12.74)

The following lines missed out at bottom of page 1:

Note: The CISCO kids said that they

We know that our monument is none of

Ju: "I give you chance now to show me where in my 15 pages of record that you are getting close to the case of credibility."

WP: "I tried very hard to extract evidence that will help me to prove the impossibility of the alleged incident. However, due to persistent interruptions by your Honour and the act of ruling out my questions on several occasions as irrelevant, I have not reached the stage where I can produce a meaningful submission. Due example is the point I raised on the impossibility for the witness to see through the frosted glass, the 5 shadows. My request in this case was turned down. There are many examples of such a nature."

Ghows: "Your Honour has tried to help him... There is no merit in his submission whatsoever..."

Proceeding this, G. Raman began cross-examination for Ng Wah Ling. He said that all witnesses should be submitted and the judge asked for the list of witnesses. Ghows then named Robert, Edwin Neito and Mary Low as those who could be witnesses. The court was then adjourned for 10 minutes at 3.45 p.m.

At 3.55 p.m., after the recess, Wah Piow enquired whether there were anybody in the C Department and Kwek answered that there was nobody.

WP: "Will you still deny it if I produce the 2 girls there? I can have one of them here - her name is Lai Ah Choon."

This witness is called.

Kwek: "She was not in the premises that day."

Wah Piow then applied for subpoena for the safety of this particular witness. Kwek said that only E. Neito, Lee Sang Kee, Robert Ng and Mary Law were present at the time of the incident.

WP: "Am I right to say that the whole incident no one came to your assistance?"

Kwek: "No one came to assist me."

WP: "Did you make any attempt to summon for help?"

Kwek: "I did say 'Catch them, don't let them run away.'"

It is very unfortunate that Mr. Kwek was not assisted and thereby was hurt. He finished his vivid account of this "10-12 minutes" incident remembering almost every particular detail of the incident.

hall(in exhibit P13). Court adjourned.

POLICEMEN AND OTHER SUSPICIOUS PERSONS INVADE SOLIDARITY SQUARE.
WHAT ARE OUR CISCO GUARDS FOR?

Last night, around 10.00 p.m., some students saw a few suspicious characters moving around the campus. They asked for their identities. One man said that he was an estate officer, looking for his key. The students just kept an eye on them.

About 12.30 p.m., more people came, following policemen, they moved around upper quad and science tower, towards solidarity square. Some students went to the square, and others went to union house to inform more students and halls of residence.

When the students reached the square, they saw more than 10 persons going into the estate office. They also discovered that all the banners and posters had disappeared, and some bricks of the monument have been removed. There were 7 or 8 policemen and Cisco kids left in the square. The students came with bare hands, but policemen already took up the batons in their hands.

One Datsun mini lorry was waiting outside Admin. It was driven away when the driver saw more students coming.

When coming students asked the policemen what it was all about they said that they did not know. They were just carrying out their duty. When they saw more students gathered, they also left. More than 50 students remained guarding the monument until about 2.45 a.m.

Who are these people who took down our banners and who tried to break down our Solidarity Monument?

We worked very hard together to express our solidarity and our struggle in our banners and our monument! We put in a lot of ourselves in our banners and our monument!

Why are they interfered with?

WHAT ARE THE CISCO GUARDS FOR IF THEY DO NOT PREVENT SUCH BLATANT INVASION IN THE HEART OF OUR CAMPUS?

Let us guard our monument ourselves tonight and every night to express how valuable it is in expressing

Day 7 of the trial :

WAH PIOW ORDERED TO STOP CROSS-EXAMINATION OF LAWRENCE KWEEK

Most of us have seen or read how the judge often ruled WP's important questions as irrelevant. But yesterday the judge went to the extent of disallowing him to question the witness, Lawrence Kwek. As if that is not enough, the judge informed WP that all those questions Wp put forth after the 11.15 - 11.30 a.m. recess would be ruled out and hence would not be recorded.

WP was questioning Kwek on the riot scene. He was just going to bring out what he saw that day for Kwek to testify when the judge put a stop to his questioning. What is a court for if one is not even given the right to question a witness, WHEN ONE IS ORDERED TO SIT DOWN.

Cross-examination of Lawrence Kwek continues.

As soon as the court hearing began, WP lodged a complaint against a P.I.E.U. member for taking the photo of one of his witness, Miss Lai. He wished to have his complaint recorded. The judge just ignored his complaint and told him, "Never mind, go on."

According to Kwek, WP was carrying a stick upright when Kwek gave him a kick in the stomach. WP moved backwards and appeared to be trying to attack him again. At that moment, Botak was at his left and Kwek pulled Botak by his right hand towards his right to block the 1st accused. Both of them ran along the corridor towards the hall. During all these struggle he did not notice the rest of the alleged rioters. He said he heard noise of leather shoes kicking against the plywood panel.

WP: Who did the kicking?

Ju: He demonstrated what happened. That is sufficient. Go on.

WP: Botak moved forward as alleged, trying to hit you. How many feet did Botak move forward in wanting to hit you?

Ju: (Kwek indicated) About 4 feet apart with interpreter acting as Botak.

WP: My question is not how far apart they were but how many feet he moved forward?

Ju: In a way he did not answer your question. But he demonstrated and in doing so, he gave you more than you want. You can work your answer out.

WP tried to explain what he wanted but the judge said that it was too trivial and that the answer was self evident from Kwek's answer.

Two questions were raised to the position of Botak when Kwek was having a 'struggle' with WP. But Kwek could not give any definite answer.

WP: From your glorious kind of struggle...

Ju: Put question, don't comment.

WP: Do you agree that you are the sort of person who will not submit to violence?

Kwek: Yes.

WP: I put it to you that you have the

cated incident is concerned?

Ju: There are two questions here. You must break that up into two.

WP: I see this as one.

Ju: No, either you rephrase question or I will disallow it.

WP: I put it to you that you sell your soul

Ju: Disallowed.

WP: I put it to you that you have the courage to mislead the public.

Ju: Disallowed. I am concerned with the trial

WP: I put it to you that you've the courage to mislead the court and the public.

Ju: Disallowed.

WP: I put it to you that you have courage to mislead the court into believing that there was a riot in P.I.E.U. premises.

Kwek: I disagree with you. I have not mislead the court. There was a riot that day at the P.I.E.U. premises.

When WP asked him what he did when the alleged rioters ran out of the rear door, Kwek replied that he locked the rear door.

WP: You made an attempt to grab one of the rioters. What was your intention then?

Ju: You know the answer. It is damaging to you if you continue to ask. I want to finish with you as soon as possible. Two days already.

WP: Two days is not long.

Kwek: I wanted to catch hold of him to hit him back.

WP: You said you locked the rear door, why did you not chase after the rioters outside?

Kwek: There should be a lot of people outside at that time. I was afraid that if I ran out, they would hit me so I locked the rear door.

WP: Isn't it contradictory ...

Ju: You are wasting time.

According to Kwek, before he closed the rear door, he saw Botak running to the left and WP and 4 or 5 others running to the right.

WP: Before you closed the door, did you pause for a moment?

Ju: You are re-emphasizing points that

STRAITS TIMES, WE REJECT YOUR VALUES!

(Continued from yesterday's AWAKENING: a critical examination of the Straits Times editorial yesterday 18.12.74)

Quote: 'Student activists are generally of two kinds. Some are honestly, although often misguided, exercised over relevant issues; others are motivated by political impulses which have nothing to do with the issues.'

We would like to ask how did the S.T. ever become an authority on so-called "Student activities"? Being a puppet mouthpiece itself can never have raised any courageous voice to motivate people to constructive action!

If by "student activists" the ST means students who are concerned about and who act to increase the social awakening of other students, then the ST has patched up a description that is at best completely misguided and at worst extremely mischievous. Our student leaders are neither "Misguided" or motivated by self-seeking political interests. They are persons of integrity who dare to speak out and to act when they feel it is just and right to do so.

Quote: "Those in the latter category should not be allowed to confuse or dominate university Affairs. The other kind sometimes turn out to be the best student -- and the best type of citizen --- provided their interests and energies are intelligently used. If such students engage in quiet self-questioning, away from the plemical din, they would realise that university is the place at which they should think about national issues in preparation for constructive action when they eventually graduate to the exacting school of life." (Cont'd on pg. 5).

The Trial

WP: Since you insist on disallowing, I'll go on to the next point.

WP questioned him on the part when tables and chairs were overturned. Kwek said he did not see anything because the door leading to hall was closed. But he alleged that he could see the back of the first accused's head through the glass panes. At that moment, he was 15 feet away from the door.

WP: You were 15 feet away from the door. Was that the position before or after...

Ju: It is trivial. Go on.

WP: It is not trivial. I wish to seek your (permission) so that I can convince you that it is not trivial.

Ju: I rule it so. Go on.

WP tried to explain but the judge said "You can submit to me. I will rule on that."

WP: At that time when you claimed to be about 15 feet away from the door, was it before or after you chased them?

Ju: For a no. of reasons, this question is disallowed.

WP: What are the reasons?

Ju: I am not obliged to give them to

ter the two alleged rioters left the hall. To these Kwek would not give any satisfactory answer.

Kwek: I remember at that time, I could hardly take 3 steps before they run back.

He demonstrated the manner he took the 3 steps. WP requested the demonstration to be done in slow motion but to this the judge disallowed.

WP: Your honour, will you read to me your notes.

Ju: No question? Sit down. No impertinence from you.

WP: At point when you stopped the 2 alleged rioters ran past you...

Ju: Witness has answered the question. I have made a ruling. You accept it.

WP: Mr. Kwek, do you agree that you have answered the question?

Ju: It is sheer impertinence. I will charge you with contempt of court if you go on like this.

WP: Before rioters ran into the hall while they were still running along the passage way, did you see any third person along the passage way? Other than rioters in A department?

Ju: What do you mean by that? (WP

The Trial (Cont'd)

Kwek said that the 3rd person was near the door and that he did not pay any attention to him. He could not say whether there was any contact between this 3rd person and the rioters. This 3rd person is Edwin Neito. When WP enquired about the size and height of E. Neito the judge cut him short.

According to Kwek, while the alleged rioting was taking place, some of the staff were in the hall and some in the conference room. The judge agreed with WP that the door separating the hall from the passageway was not sound proof. When asked whether people in the hall would be able to hear if a commotion occurred in the passageway, Kwek was not certain. Kwek testified that the alleged rioters were about to enter the hall when he raised his voice to say "catch them...."

WP: When you heard commotion in the hall, was this before, during, or after you shouted?

J: I disallow. It's trivial.

WP: Can I explain? It is over the detail time factor that I can prove his credibility.

J: No. I rule it out officially.
(This was requested by WP)

WP: May I know what you recorded?

J: I disallow the question.

WP made another attempt to question the sequence of events but the judge forbade him that. The court was adjourned from 11.15-11.30 am.

AFTER RECESS 11.30 am.

WP: You shouted, "Catch them. Don't let them run away." Did you repeat these words?

K: I can't remember.

WP: When you shouted these words, was it loud enough for E. Neito to hear?

J: Disallowed. Change the topic.

WP: At the time the alleged rioters ran along passageway towards the hall, did they encounter any resistance?

J: Disallowed. Change the topic.

WP: At the time when the alleged rioters ran along passageway towards the hall, was there any obstruction put up....

J: Disallowed.

WP: I object because my question is not finished.... by receptionist Mary Loo?

Any more attempts by WP to question this topic were ruled out by

J: Don't address me. Go on to next topic.

WP: Was Lee Seng Ke ...

J: Lee has nothing to do with witness.

WP: Can I seek your assistance?

J: No assistance either. Next question.

WP: Is door leading from the passageway lockable from the passage way?

J: Next question. I disallow. Can refer to photo.

WP: Is it possible for E. Netto to lock the door from where he stood if he wanted to?

J: Question disallowed.

WP: Did you after the struggle and before alleged rioters entered the hall at any time directed R. Ng to do anything?

J: Change topic. Subject matter covered. Disallowed.

Ghows: WP's purpose is to confuse the witness.

J: He is not confusing the witness. He has exhausted the cross-examination. Coming to point when he will be asked to sit down. I have disallowed you 7 occasions in last 5 mins. If I disallow 2 more, you must sit down.

Mr Tan, you are unrepresented. I've allowed you to raise a number of questions regarding to your defence of alibi. You've gone beyond your line of defence.

WP: I put it to you that you were the person who started the alleged commotion inside the premises of PIEU on 30th Oct 1974 at around 11.15am.

Ju: Question disallowed.

WP: I've switched the topic.

Ju: Question disallowed.

WP: I put it to you that you stood in the hall near to the door leading towards the passageway at about 11.15am and that you broke the glass on the door leading to the passageway and subsequently you directed the staff of PIEU to overturn the tables and chairs in the hall with intention to create a scene.

Ju: This is impertinent. I have already got gist of question .. Keep quiet. You have put a very long question and is not

OUR SOLIDARITY MONUMENT COMES UP AFTER THE UNITED WORK OF MANY HANDS

Our solidarity monument is the work of many hands. It was set up by the practice of cooperation and united work. The symbol is a solid testimony to our practice of solidarity!

The cooperation and solidarity in building the monument began when Cisco kids blocked our lorryload of bricks from entering the varsity. But that did not stop us! United in a human chain fellow students transported the bricks up by manual labour to be stacked up in the Union House.

Later in the afternoon, at about 3.30 p.m., fellow students formed again our chain of human hands to carry up the bricks to Solidarity Square. The chain branched off into 2 chains as more and more students joined in to help. It was a very dramatic and moving sight indeed! We formed human lines of cooperation clearly up the winding road above Union House, up the steps and across the grass and there, in front of the flower pots, we stacked up brick, by brick, to form our solid monument.

When the bricks were integrated into one monument fellow students crowded round to paint red the symbol "S" and paint white the platform surrounding the "S". Then we sat around for the Rally to begin.

For us, solidarity is no longer a mere slogan! For us, solidarity means the work of many hands, our hands, in united effort.

For us, the symbol "S" on our monument represents Solidarity, Struggle and freedom of Speech. The monument serves also as speaking platform for any member of the University - student and staff alike - to express his mind and emotions.

Straits Times, We Reject Your Values (Cont'd)

Our students are not out to "confuse" or "dominate" the campus, as the ST would have us believe; they work hard to represent the just and legitimate interests of the students and of the people.

One can assume that the ST concept of the "best type of citizen" is very similar to the ST concept of itself being the "best type of newspaper for the nation" i.e. stereo-type, submissive conformist, conformable in his prestigious position in society and completely forgetful of the exploitation of the people. If such is the definition, as we believe the ST means it to be, we would certainly never "aspire" to be the "best type of citizen!"

Neither is the University the place to "think" about national issues; the meaning attached to "think" in this context is an insult to all reasonable men! The ST concept of "think" means adopting a neutral, non-committal attitude, but at the same time putting on the air that you know very much. We reject such a cowardly attitude! In the University, we study, we think, yes, in constructive, inquiring methods, and we think to act constructively now to build a better society for our people. Life is exacting now because of the many complex social problems which it is our responsibility now to help to solve and we condemn any newspaper like the Straits Times which adopts a snobbish, neutral, non-committed and basically cowardly attitude to the problems of the people in our society.

Controlled papers come out everyday
Try to drown you with frat's big-shots say
If you dare to criticize in any way
Somehow or other they'll put you away.

Chorus: