

mistrust his email had caused and assured me of the value that the NPA attached to my testimony as a witness.

None of this is reflected in your report, even though it was published prominently in the Daily Maverick apology to me last year: <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2021-05-27-daily-maverick-apologises-to-aristeidis-danikas-affords-him-right-of-reply/>

2. On page 26, your report states:

According to the de Kock report, Maema made another vital admission in an email dated 24 April 2019: a statement in English from Danikas had never been lawfully obtained. Instead, Danikas' signature had been 'superimposed' on the English version. In his email, Maema noted that the Greek national had refused to sign the English translation because it contained errors, according to the report.

This is factually incorrect and misleading.

Firstly, as far as I am aware, nowhere in the De Kock report does it state that my statement in English was “unlawfully obtained”.

Let me say categorically that all the legal processes were followed in obtaining and translating my statement. I have all the paperwork to show the proper steps of the Mutual Legal Assistance process was followed. This process included the involvement of a magistrate in Greece and a court in South Africa appointing an official translator.

Secondly, it is factually incorrect to say my signature was “superimposed” on the English version of my translated statement because I supposedly refused to sign it. I can provide emails proving that I was never asked to sign any translation neither I refused to do so.

In saying this, the Open Secret report is repeating false claims made in the De Kock report about my interaction with the NPA officials, without checking with me first for verification of the facts.

It is important to mention that *after* the De Kock report came out, Blueprint called for an independent international inquiry into the killings and cover up that is not tainted by South African politics.

This is what Blueprint wrote:

Blueprint does not imply the guilt of any party at this time. The allegations brought against the squad should be dealt with in a transparent manner. Danikas' evidence will be critical in an investigation of members of the squad. The allegations of continued violence, sustained over time, against low-income black South Africans is serious enough to need an impartial judicial review led by a panel of eminent jurists, such as retired judges from an international court, who are completely independent of the complex party politics of South Africa.

3. On page 17, your report says that the Satchwell Inquiry had found that the Sunday Times newspaper had “invented” the stories it wrote about the Cato Manor unit.

This is not true. Nowhere in the Satchwell report does it say the stories were “invented”. This is what the Satchwell report said about the Cato Manor stories:

Paragraph 8.206

The sources upon which the reporters relied in the Cato Manor stories have not been discredited and one of the prime sources, Mary de Haas, has publicly confirmed her information. More than 40 people

are dead and the Hawks and the NPA all conducted their own investigations resulting in prosecutions. These were not figments of the imagination of the journalists involved.

Paragraph 8.138

... the Panel would add that the opprobrium the stories attracted may have ensured the issue is not now revisited by any media, despite the compelling testimony of community members and human rights activists unconnected with the Sunday Times.

Cover up

It is regrettable for me as well as the South African public, that your researchers have either not seen or ignored a different version of the actions of the Cato Manor police unit, including those that I myself have witnessed.

For example, the highly respected political violence researcher, Mary de Haas, has written extensively on the subject. I have attached her latest piece, "The myth that black lives matter in South Africa: the triumph of apartheid policing and justice."

Here is some information about the credentials of Ms De Haas:

<https://www.ru.ac.za/latestnews/rhodesuniversitytohonourpoliticalviolenceresearcherandsocialjusticeadv.html>

I believe there has been a massive cover up of gross human rights abuses in South Africa regarding the Cato Manor unit. I previously dedicated nearly eight years of my life providing the authorities with a lot of evidence. For example:

- Spent cartridges, removed at a crime scene to cover up the use of excessive force.
- Bodies moved and crime scenes staged as well as tampered with.
- Racist profiling and torture of suspects at the office of the Cato Manor unit (video footage taken by me in secrecy).
- Video footage of Johan Booysen graphically narrating to me and my wife of how he and other members of the Cato Manor unit targeted and shot black pedestrians while on duty for their amusement.
- Graphic video footage of the Cato Manor unit's officer's casualty making fun of a dying suspect, while waiting for him to die, including Booysen himself.

None of this evidence has ever been tested in court because of politics and incompetence in the NPA, and their peculiar decision to limit their indictment to a time period that excluded my evidence.

I am concerned that the truth of what happened is being suppressed, and this is a great injustice to the underprivileged African people who were tortured and killed unlawfully, and I would like to see that made right.

I will be happy to make myself available to your researchers to go through my evidence of human rights abuses that have never been tested in court, so that they can make up their own minds, and hopefully contribute to the perpetrators being held to account and the families of people tortured and murdered finding justice.

Best Regards

Aris Danikas