

1. Suleman has given evidence in at least 6 cases. These are

- |       |                  |                                    |              |
|-------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| (i)   | 14 August 1963   | State v. J. <del>Guabe</del> Guabe | Regional CRT |
| (ii)  | 6 September 1963 | State v. S. Fadana                 | Regional CRT |
| (iii) | 6 September 1963 | State v. H. Motgothi               | Regional CRT |
| (iv)  |                  | State v. H. Fazzi                  | Jheron. J.   |
| (v)   | 13 December 1963 | State v. K. Makshabe               | Skyn. J.     |
| (vi)  | 20 December 1963 | Rwoma case                         |              |

2. He was arrested in a car on the night when the police intercepted the Kombis. This was the <sup>10<sup>th</sup></sup> 9<sup>th</sup> June 1963. He was detained for 66 days which means that he was released on the <sup>15<sup>th</sup></sup> 14<sup>th</sup> August 1963. This was the day on which ~~the~~ ~~at~~ he gave evidence in the Guabe case, and as far as is known, this is the first occasion on which he <sup>has</sup> given evidence. The ~~former~~ details of his detention and the manner in which his statement was taken appear from the cross-examination in the Makshabe case. His statement was started ten days after his arrest, but was not completed for another 40/50 days.

3. In the Regional Court cases no reference is made to Mbozandi or Malangeni. These <sup>cases all</sup> ~~cases~~ are dealt with a trip made during February 1963. In each case Suleman said that the arrangements were made during February 1963 by Sisulu, and that the recruits were accompanied by Modise and Mbata. The February trip is

not direct with in the Fuzzi case, (as in the Makshabe case and the Ruonia case his evidence referred to 314 trips made during the period January to May 1963. In the Makshabe case he says that the first of these trips was arranged by Malangeni, and that the next two were arranged by Mbata. ~~In the Ruonia case~~ The first trip was paid for by Malangeni and the next two by Mbata. He also mentions that Mbata accompanied Geri on the second two trips. In the Ruonia case he was not asked who arranged the trips, but he said that on each of the three trips he was accompanied by Mbata or Malangeni, and that Mbata or Malangeni paid him for these trips. Prima facie this evidence in the last two cases contradicts the evidence in the Regional Court cases. It is of course possible that the Feb. 63 trip direct with in the Regional Court case, ~~this will be~~ will be explained as the "Fourth" of the three to four trips mentioned by Suliman, and this must be excluded before the contradiction is put. Since <sup>our record is vague ~~as to who arranged~~</sup> ~~he has not said who arranged~~ the 314 trips between Jun / May ~~in the case~~, he can be asked to clarify this at the beginning of his evidence.

- 4. In the Fandana case he says that all the trips which were done during 1962 were arranged by Sisuleu. He mentions ~~the~~ six such trips. This is contrary to his evidence in the Makshabe case and the Ruonia case, where he said (in both cases) that the third trip was arranged by Mokise, the fourth trip by Kakruda and the fifth trip by Nokwe. In the Fandana case he referred to the fifth trip and mentioned that Sisuleu

p. 14  
15.  
16.  
17.  
18.  
22.

~~was present~~ engaged him in Nokwe's presence. He added, however, that Nokwe was merely present and had nothing to do with the arrangements.

5. In the Fardana case (which dealt with recruits who left in Feb 1963), he says that the second trip <sup>(to the just on which he took recruits) (P.14)</sup> was in August 1962. This was before he gave evidence in the Fazzi case (which dealt with recruits who left in June 1962). In the Fazzi case (and the subsequent cases) he says that the second trip was in June 1962, which was obviously necessary for the purposes of that case. In the Matshabe case he says that his statement was completed before he was released from detention and that <sup>it had not been shown to him,</sup> ~~he did not see it again~~ after that date. Presumably, therefore, some discussion must have taken place between the two cases to ensure that his evidence was brought into line with what was required.

6. In the Matshabe case he just mentioned Malangeni's name in connection with trips done <sup>after</sup> ~~between~~ January ~~1963~~ 1963. This was before it had been suggested that Malangeni was not in Johannesburg during 1962. He in fact said "I came to know Malangeni also from last year.... from January to May". In the Roos case he said that he had seen Malangeni during 1962 at Sisulus office, and that he had supervised the loading <sup>and Nokwe,</sup> of the trips which had been arranged by Mathoodan. This evidence was presumably arranged to corroborate the Sherkhalist (It was possible because in the Matshabe case he had NOT been asked who arranged the loading of these two trips).

7. In the Matshabe case he refers to ~~an~~ <sup>one</sup> occasion on which Mbata gave some pass books to Malangeni. He attributes this to the last trip - ~~is~~ The one with 4 vehicles when he was arrested. In the Rivonia case he also refers to an occasion on which Mbata gave pass books to Malangeni, but says that this was on the trip before the last.

8. In the Matshabe case he said that there was an interval of "four to six" weeks between the first occasion on which recruits were taken for training and the second occasion. In the Rivonia case he said that there were two weeks between the first two trips. This ~~was~~ <sup>may have been</sup> ~~presumably~~ necessary to fit in with the herbalists' evidence which was to the effect that there were two weeks between the first two trips on which recruits ~~were~~ left his house { Sed Quare (for recruits fourth trip in cell) } The third trip is said by Suleman to have been in Sept/Oct 1962, which does not fit in with the herbalists' evidence }

It is ~~interesting~~ interesting that in the Fandanga case, the witness Uhlen has recruited van pr

9. In the Regional Court cases he said that he conveyed the recruits for the A.N.C. — This was clearly to assist the prosecution for on cross-examination he said that he assumed that the recruits were for the A.N.C. because Suleman engaged him.

10. In the Fuzzi case he said that he collected the recruits at the Marabi Hotel, which was the place to which Madise took him from the Marabi Garage. In the Matshabe case he says that these recruits were collected from a double story building the name of which he did not know. He was asked to identify a photograph which was presumably SIK Buildings and did so. In the Rwona case he also refers to a double story building in Orlando. This fits in with the herbalists evidence.

Two points are of interest. First, the Fuzzi recruits stayed at the Marabi hotel (but were moved to SIK Bldgs just before they left). Second, the Fuzzi record shows that Suliman did not know whether it was in fact the Marabi hotel, but accepted what Madise told him. This may simply be an honest mistake because the herbalist also gave evidence in the Fuzzi case.

10. In the Maksothi case he says that he did not think he personally was committing any offence by conveying people to the border to enable them to leave the country for military training. If he had been arrested he would have told the police that Suliman engaged her ~~and~~ and that the passengers were going for training. This is prima facie contrary to his evidence about "weddings" & "football matches", though it seems probable that

6.

The evidence given at the Reunion trial was true as far as this is  
concerned.

If you are going to show the ripper  
~~to~~ again the accused that Whata did  
not tell him to lie, you must show  
the same ripper again the State witness.

**Collection Number: AD1844**  
**State vs Nelson Mandela and 9 Others (Rivonia Trial)**

***PUBLISHER:***

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a collection held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.