



AWAKENING

ISSUE DUPLICATION

FOR INTERNAL CIRCULATION

1974/16

Friday 20th December 1974

8th Day of the Trial:

JUDGE DISALLOWS WAH PIOW FROM ASKING KWOK MORE QUESTIONS

Thursday 19.12.74. - The court case started at 9.30 am with Mr. G. Raman counsel for Ng Wah Ling cross-examining Lawrence Kwek, Asst. Gen. Sec. of FIBU. This was followed by cross-examination of Kwek by Mr. Francis Khoo, counsel for Yap Kim Hong. Wah Piow had already cross-examined Kwek the day before.

After Mr. Khoo finished his cross-examination, the Solicitor-General, Mr. Ghows, re-examined Kwek briefly. After this the Judge, Mr. Sinnathuray, asked whether counsels for the defence had any more questions to ask Kwek.

Wah Piow stood up and said he wanted to ask some more questions. The Judge would not allow him to do so.

WP : May I explain why I need to re-examine ?

J : I rule that is not allowed.

WP : Can I seek your assistance?
I remember that during the 1st few days (3rd or 4th day) you mentioned on 3 occasions that I brought out irrelevant matters and I could only bring out in the appeal. This morning I re-apply for re-examination but was rejected. You take no heed to my objection to being not allowed to cross examine again.

J : Don't say anything more.

WP : Are you preventing me from explaining myself?

J : Yes

WP : Can you put it in record, your Honour?

J : Yes, sit down, put down your hand.

(Wah Piow was raising his hand to speak)

Do not speak to me now.

WP : When can I speak to you?

J : After prosecution had presented its case.

WP : Can I explain?

J : No.

WE CONDEMN REMOVAL OF OUR SOLIDARITY MONUMENT!
OUR STRUGGLE WILL CONTINUE!

At about 6.45 a.m. this morning (20.12.74), 4 students who were sleeping on the Solidarity Square, guarding the solidarity monument, were awakened by more than 20 Cisco kids and 15-20 Estate Office workers. Led by a high-ranking official, a plainclothesman and a uniformed officer, they charged into the Square and told the half-awakened students that they are here to remove the monument of Student Solidarity. Before the students could say anything, the Estate Office workers started to dismantle the monument and loaded the bricks into a University lorry.

This cowardly act of removing our solidarity monument was carried out when only a few students were present. Armed Cisco kids with walkie-talkies were stationed around the Solidarity Square and at the porch.

FELLOW STUDENTS; THEIR COWARDLY ACT WILL NOT DAMPEN OUR SPIRIT TO FIGHT ON!

WE WILL NEVER

HOW MANY BOYCOTTED?

A review of the boycott was carried out at the affiliates meeting last night. Percentages were presented by the affiliates present.

(The figures are confined to lectures and tutorials)

Engineering	100%	Law 3	70%
Physics	93%	Law 4	50%
Maths	50%	Medicine 1	87%
Chemistry	20%	Archi 1	100%
Law 1	80%	Archi 2	100%
Law 2	60%	Archi 3	70%

Data from other faculties are still coming in. Students and exCos of affiliated bodies are requested to give information to the Secretariat.

BOYCOTT, - SUCCESS

The increasing pressure of social injustice has aroused the awareness of many of us. We are beginning to take concern in the society and the life of the people. Like many others, the six students entered the university hoping to learn something of use. However, under a crippled educational system, even this very basic expectation cannot be met with. In the Students' Union, they worked zealously for the welfare of the student body. In such an era of drastic changes it is sufficiently clear that any cause which benefits the majority will be favoured with further development. It is thus that the Students' Union commenced to change, displaying signs of the birth of a new life. The six students had worked to guide the union along the right path and to ensure the rights of the students. Now that they are departed, is it not our duty to act for their reinstatement?

In the past few days, in spite of painstaking attempts to seek for news of the students, in spite of rallies with an overwhelming attendance, our urgent appeals received dissatisfactory and irresponsible response from the authorities. At the same time, the newspapers (whether internationally or otherwise) portrayed a distorted image and story of the students' struggle for justice. Meanwhile, students are living in fear in an environment of terror. All these go to show that the authorities are unwilling to settle our problems. As our appeals are cast aside by them, we are left with no alternative but to stage a boycott, symbolic of students' solidarity against injustice.

The move to boycott was approved by thousands of students in the decision Rally, and by the Union together with more than twenty affiliate societies. Therefore, the boycott represents the decision of the majority of the students. In fact, some exCos of the few societies which did not support the cause proved themselves to be retrograde. They were forced to resign, some were even voted a motion of non-confidence by the members. Success is inevitable when full support comes from the majority. The unified struggle to fight injustice is reflected in the proportion of over 60% of the student body which boycotted lessons. The boycott was carried out in spite of restrictive conditions such as intentional marking of attendance on the very day of the boycott, and continuing regression of the students.

In the whole, the boycott was a successful attempt. Besides the achievements that can be physically sensed, the successful boycott holds deeper meaning. Firstly, it is a concrete example of student solidarity which has never been stronger in this varsity in memory. Secondly, many students who have never been shown interest in the Students' Union now display their concern and have responded to the Union's appeal. The representative student union is now moulding in form, and its growth is optimistic. Thirdly, this move effectively disproves the saying that the Students' Union can do nothing. It offers the student a better idea as to what a students' union can do to protect students' interests. Fourthly, through the boycott, the students can observe and see more clearly who are those who truly dedicate themselves for the students' well-being. They are brought to realise the necessity of students' commitment to society in the course of student movement. In future, those who speak in the name of the Students' Union for personal interests, will no longer be able to sneak into the Students' Union with a great boogie. The student body has seen their strength in

Kwek cross-examined by Raman

In the process of cross-examination, Raman was interrupted several times by the Judge.

R : When you heard knocking did you rise from your chair and go to the door immediately?

J : He said that already. Immediately.

R : Where was your left foot at the time? Your left foot was never at any time against the door?

J : He said his right foot was against the door how can he stand?

R : Both the assailants (referring to Wah Fioo and Botak) YOU said had punched you. Can you tell us how many times they punched you?

K : The punching took place before reaching B Dept. I did not feel the punching.

R : Are you saying that none of the punches landed on your body?

K : I did not feel.

J : You did not feel the impact.

K : I did not feel the punches touched me.

J : There are 2 explanations: 1. the men had punched but you did not feel. (2) the punches did not land on your body.

K : I did not feel the pain.

R : When you ran out into the hall, which part of the passageway you were?

J : Let me explain. Your evidence is that you pushed them (Wah Fioo and Botak) as far as A Dept. The first accused tried to hit you. They retreated to the hall. At that time, where in the passageway were you?

Kwek indicated on the exhibit.

Kwek said that when he was in the centre of A dept. he saw Kim Hong at the rear door. She opened the rear door for Wah Fioo and Botak to leave. After that he went to the office to telephone the police and then looked through the photographs taken on the 23rd Oct. Police arrived at 12.20 (after 1 hour and 2 mins). The crowd was still outside.

R : Did you make any attempt to find out whether your assailants could have merged with the crowd outside?

J : He was inside, he did not see.

K : No, I was busy looking at the photos

J : When did you next see the crowd?

K : I next saw the crowd after I had put away the photos.

R : After the police arrived were any arrests made?

K : I did not.

R : What happened around 11.15 was actually this:

The front door and the louvres windows were closed from within. You then were seen breaking the glass panels of the inside door of the hall. You then ordered your staff to overturn tables and chairs. You yourself kicked chairs and tables. And there were 2 female workers in the premises at that time. When all this was taking place, and these were the 2 female workers inside the premises.

Raman produced photos of 2 female workers taken immediately after the incident.

Kwek denied all this.

J : (looking at the photo) You cannot say that it's male or female on the photo. Look more like male to me. He had denied there were female workers inside the premises. It means nothing to me in this case.

Courtcase was adjourned for 10 mins.

FRANCIS KHOO CROSS-EXAMINES KWEK

The hearing continued at 11.50 am. Francis Khoo asked Kwek to look at Photographs P10 and P11. Kwek denied the statement put forward by Khoo that the position of the glass pieces on P10, P11 could be explained only by the fact that the point of impact come from the inside of the Gen. Sec.'s room.

Kh : Mr. Kwek, you said that you heard noises of chairs and tables being overturned while the 2 assailants were in the hall. You also said that you heard the sound of glass breaking. I take it therefore that the overturning of tables and breaking of glass took place in the hall.

Kwek agreed. Then Khoo pointed out that on P15, P16 there were no glass pieces in the hall. The Judge said that there were glasses in P13 but Khoo corrected him, saying that the photo. was not of the hall.

J : Isn't P13 the hall?

Kh: This is not the hall. It's the passageway.

Kh: What is the glass object on the hall?

VEHEMENTLY CONDEMN THE UNJUSTIFIED UNCIVILISED DETENTIONS OF OUR DEPORTED STUDENT LEADERS!

Four of our Deported Students were Jailed in Johore Bahru.
Choo, Chia and Chuah Released Yesterday.

JULIET CHIN IS STILL DETAINED!

WE DEMAND HER IMMEDIATE UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE!

From investigations made by trusted people, USSU had come to know that four of our deported students - Juliet, Chia, Choo and Chuah - were put in jail in the Johore Bahru police station when they arrived in Malaysia.

Yesterday at 2.45 p.m. we received a phone-call at the Secretariat from Choo Foo Yoong in J.B. saying that three of them - Choo, Chia Yong Tai and Chuah Chong Lai - had just been released from prison. Their release was unconditional. However, Juliet was still in jail. Many USSU members at the Secretariat talked to Choo and told him that the three of them must try to secure Juliet's release.

Chuah Chong Lai also spoke over the phone for a short time.

The news of the release and Juliet's continued detention was confirmed by Chia Yong Tai, who rang up Secretariat at 12.50 this morning from his house. Chia also said that all 3 of them were very concerned for our Union.

Although we might feel relief that Choo, Chia and Chuah are now free, we must never forget that their deportations were unjustified and uncivilised. Juliet Chin is still in prison - on no charge whatsoever. This is blatant oppression, and WE CONDEMN SUCH VIOLENT REPRESSION. We give Juliet our wholehearted support and WE DEMAND THAT SHE BE RELEASED IMMEDIATELY AND UNCONDITIONALLY.

Let Us Support Bong's Efforts to Return

Bong Hon Min has sent a letter to the Immigration Department, 17th Dec., appealing that he be allowed to come back to Singapore to take his 3rd Year B.Sc. exams and also to sit for his G.R.E. exam, which will enable him to go to the U.S. for a post-graduate course.

Let us support Bong in his efforts to return.

Tsui Hon Kwong Sends Open Letter

Tsui Hon Kwong kept the promise he made in his tape-recording and sent USSU his open letter, which was received yesterday morning. The open letter has been stencilled and drawn up for all USSU members to read.

ExCo's Stand

Meanwhile the ExCo has come to a consensus that before Hon Kwong makes an appearance, a proper and written guarantee must be given by the government that no criminal charge will be levied on him or any persons who have sheltered him.

The ExCo's stand is that Hon Kwong must be allowed to complete his academic work. The ExCo also points out that Hon Kwong need not pay back his \$10,038 scholarship money until the Court passes judgement.

The ExCo also favours Hon Kwong to speak in a rally provided that proper arrangements are made with the authorities as to ensure that order is kept.

Affiliates' Stand

The affiliates, in a meeting last night, agreed with the ExCo that if Hon Kwong were to make his appearance, an assurance must be got from the authorities that no criminal charge be levied on him. However there is a general consensus among the affiliates that Hon Kwong should not speak at the rally.

We Fight On For Our Deported Students

ARE WE FIGHTING A LOSING BATTLE?

Since the deportations of the 5 students last Wednesday (11.12.74) several rallies have been held, many meetings have been called and we have boycotted classes for 2 days but the 5 students have still not been reinstated, the administration has not given a definite reply to our demands. IS USSU FIGHTING A LOSING BATTLE?

Has USSU achieve anything? Yes, we have! USSU has achieved what the 5 students leaders have always been fighting for ---- students' awareness, students' solidarity. The rallies whose objectives were to inform fellow students of the high-handed manner in which students were treated, to make students understand the cause the 5 student leaders are fighting for and to appeal to the administration, have attracted hundreds and thousands of fellow students. In the past, when USSU tried to hold mass meetings so as to have dialogue with the students, only a handful turned up. And now we fellow students came in the thousands to listen and discuss for hours during rallies. Out of those attended, some of us are truly disgusted at the deportations and feel that something must be done, some of us are anxious to know -- no matter what their motives of attending, we all came to show concern for the 5 deported students. It is a great sign! It shows that we students have feelings, it indicates that we students are beginning to come together!

In this society, we are always obstructed when we want to help the poor and oppressed and strive for a better and more equal society. Nevertheless we must not give up. We should be courageous, firm in belief, always heading towards our goal.

FELLOW STUDENTS, TOGETHER WE SHALL OVERCOME!!!!

From pg 5.

Negotiations will also be carried out within the next two days with the Ministry of Home Affairs, the British High Commission and the means of the various faculties to ensure the safety of Don Kwong and also to enable all the six students to finish their academic work.

USSU NEWS CORNER STARTS TODAY

The purpose of the set up of the News Corner is to inform USSU members of the immediate happenings in USSU.

News-readers are needed. Those volunteer to help please give your

Unity is strength. Fellow students united with a common purpose can make great achievements. We have pulled the DVC and the VC down from their bureaucratic air-conditioned offices to speak to us in person - a very rare thing. This is proof of our strength in solidarity. This is our achievement.

Students' concern and unity have forced the government to speak the truth ultimately---- the truth that Tsui Hon Kwong is still in S'pore and has not been deported as it was earlier said. The government will hesitate before releasing any more misleading statements. Their misrepresentations are exposed. This is yet another achievement of our solidarity.

Within our campus the affiliated societies and halls are coming to work closer with the Student Union; they are no longer as before alienated from the union. Isn't this an achievement too?

It is a fact that we have achieved much but we have much more yet to be achieved. IT DEPENDS ON US The process of fighting for the cause for which the 6 student leaders have fully committed themselves is along one.

Trial (cont'd)

J: Were there any glass object in the hall?
 Kw: No.
 Kh: So how could the glass break?

 Kh: You have stated in evidence that you had seen on 2 occasions my client (Yap Kim Hong) at 11.15. On both moments, did she say anything?
 Kw: I did not pay attention.
 Kh: What was she wearing?
 Kw: I did not pay attention.
 Kh: Was she wearing a dress or a slack?
 Kw: I did not pay attention.
 Kh: What made you recognise her?
 Kw: She was shorter than all those persons who came in. She was the only girl wearing spectacles.
 Kh: You say how soon after the incident did you see the photos?
 Kw: Soon after.
 Kh: You have marked down 6 people in the photos. Were you not curious to see whether the other 2 people would be in the crowd in the photo?
 J: Not relevant.
 Khoo then asked Kwek whether he could see Kim Hong on P33, P38, P40, P43. Kwek admitted that he could see now (in Court) but was unable to identify her before.
 Kh: May I put it to you that the 3rd. accused was never at any time that day in the premises?
 Kw: No.
 Kh: I finally put to you that the 3rd. accused was outside the field when the alleged incident took place.
 Kw: No.

ROBERT NG, IRO, GIVES HIS EVIDENCE

At the court hearing, Robert Ng tells of what happened at the PIEU premises on the 30th Oct. 1974.

"On the 30th Oct., I arrived at PIEU at 9.30 am. I put up notices in front of the office. There were then 30-40 people in the field in front of the PIEU.

At about 10 am there were roughly 100 people assembled in the field. At 10.35, Kwek instructed me to close and lock the front door if the crowd should rush in. At 10.55am. the group of people surged in. I asked them to produce their membership card which they refused to do. I slammed the door and locked it. They banged and kicked the door. At that time, I was in the hall with some other staff members. Kwek came out and asked me what happened I told him, and he went back.

ing " Stop them! Catch! Don't let them run." I went in but before reaching the swing-dppr, 2 persons (identified as Wah Piow and Botak) ran into the hall. Each of them was carrying a stick. My colleagues and I tried to block their way. The 2 assailants ran back to the passage inside the office. Wah Piow knocked the small glass on the swing door. It broke. They ran through, passing Kwek, out of the premises through the back door."

Ng said that he had seen both the alleged rioters before in PIEU on the 23rd October. At that time Wah Piow was making some sort of a speech in the conference room to some 30-40 workers there. Yap Kim Hong was also there. At 4a.m. on that day, he told the workers inside that he wanted to use the conference room was refused to do so by Wah Piow. On 2nd Nov. Ng went to the Central Police Station at 7:40 a.m. to identify the persons who entered the premises. There, he identified Wah Piow.

CROSS- EXAMINATION OF ROBERT NG BY WAH PIOW

Robert Ng, an IRO of PIEU, was branch secretary of SILO before joining PIEU. When WP questioned him on his involvement in labour disputes as an IRO of PIEU, the judge warned him that he would lose his right to cross-examination if he continued like that.

WP: Have you come across any trade dispute like that of the American Marine dispute.
 Ng: Yes, one lay off.

WP cross-examined Robert Ng on the 25rd incident.

WP: Would you consider the occupation of PIEU premises on the 23rd as illegal?
 Ju: Disallowed. Irrelevant.

WP: You alleged that you told the people that you want to use the conference room. They took no heed. Why did you not call the police?
 Ng: It did occur to me.

Ng said that he used another room and did not complain to anybody about it.

WP: So I take it that you do not feel particularly offended when they refused.
 NG: No.

Ng testified that he felt that those people were workers from American Marine. He came to this conclusion