CONFIDENTIAL

Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

15 February 1980

Dear Michael,

Prime Minister

Call by the Tanzanian High Commissioner
Monday 18 February

Mr Nsekela will be calling on the Prime Minister on the afternoon of 18 February to deliver a message from President Nyerere. We assume that this will be a further message about Rhodesia. I enclose a brief accordingly.

There is an outside chance that the High Commissioner will raise the question of aid to Tanzania. In August of last year the Tanzanian Government issued a general appeal for emergency economic assistance, partly to offset the costs of the war in Uganda. The Tanzanians estimated their total needs at $375 million. They have asked The Netherlands to lobby major aid donors on their behalf: but are aware that the major donors are reluctant to respond to their appeal until Tanzania reaches an understanding with the IMF. For the time being, the Tanzanian Government remains in sharp disagreement with the IMF.

The future level of British bilateral aid to Tanzania is likely to be influenced by the Tanzanian Government's attitude towards the Rhodesian settlement. If the High Commissioner raises the subject of aid, therefore, we would suggest that the Prime Minister simply takes note.

Yours ever

RMJ Lyne

(R M J Lyne)
Private Secretary

M O'D B Alexander Esq
10 Downing Street -

CONFIDENTIAL

① Maybe intimidation evidence overwhelming.

② If continues - other parties may withdraw & refuse to accept results.

② Better talk vaguely one-sided resolution while we do not by that. Mr Mugabe criticise dates.

CALL BY THE TANZANIAN HIGH COMMISSIONER, MR AMON NSEKELA,
18 FEBRUARY 1980

(A) RHODESIA

Points to Make

1. Will study President Nyerere's message carefully and send a reply in due course.

2. We are doing our best to organise fair elections in Rhodesia under very difficult conditions. Against great odds, we have achieved a remarkable transformation. Very serious problems remain, the most difficult of which is that of intimidation by Mr Mugabe's party. The evidence of this is overwhelming. If it continues, it must be doubtful whether fair elections can be held in the areas where it is practised. Indeed there is a risk that other parties will conclude that they no longer have a fair chance and will withdraw from the elections or refuse to accept their results. This would put at risk everything which was achieved at the Lusaka Heads of Government meeting and at the Lancaster House Conference.

3. The problem will not be brought under control while the OAU and African governments individually seem to endorse Mr Mugabe's activities by passing one-sided resolutions which criticise the Governor and the auxiliaries and make no mention of the problem of ZANLA intimidation. Want to leave the High Commissioner in no doubt that our task is being made very much more difficult by Tanzania's activities in the OAU and the United Nations. In particular Mr Mkapa's intemporate criticisms of Lord Soames in the Security Council were completely unacceptable. We do not fear criticism and shall give President Nyerere a detailed reply to points raised in his message. But constant sniping and destructive criticism risks undermining the settlement.

/4.

4. Should like to be convinced that Nyerere remains committed to seeing the Lancaster House agreements fully implemented and that he will recognise the outcome of fair elections irrespective of who wins (as we shall). Hope too that he will use his influence to urge Mr Mugabe to abide by the agreements which he signed.

Essential Facts

5. Since signature of the Lancaster House agreements, President Nyerere has been extremely critical of our administration of Rhodesia. He took the lead in organising meetings of the Front Line states and of the OAU Liberation Committee in January which led on directly to the United Nations Security Council meeting and the OAU meeting in Addis Ababa last week. At all these meetings, the Tanzanians have been in the forefront in sponsoring unbalanced and highly critical resolutions. Mr Mkapa, the Tanzanian Foreign Minister, has been responsible for some particularly venomous speeches. Nyerere's latest initiative is to ask Dr Waldheim to go to Rhodesia. We are discussing with Waldheim the possibility that he might send a personal representative to witness the elections.

6. The only rationale for Nyerere's campaign seems to me to be to prepare the ground for refusing to recognise the outcome of the elections unless the candidate whom he supports, Mr Mugabe, comes to power. In the last week or so there is some evidence that he has begun to realise that the behaviour of ZANLA is a serious threat to the elections and that not all the propaganda put out by Mr Mugabe's party corresponds to the facts. The implication of the growing divergence of interests between Nkomo and Mugabe may also have begun to dawn on him. It would be helpful if the Prime Minister could bring home to the High Commissioner that the highly critical and sometimes offensive remarks made by Mr Mkapa, and the apparent campaign which Nyerere has mounted against us, cannot be without effect on our relations. At the same time the Prime Minister will wish to assure the High Commissioner of our determination not to be deflected from implementing the Lancaster House agreements.

/7.

7. Copies of the recent exchanges of messages between President Nyerere and the Prime Minister are attached together with the remarks by Mr Mkapa in the Security Council.

I5 February I980
Rhodesia Department
Foreign and Commonwealth Office

UN Security Council Record. 31 January 1980.



The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The next speaker is Mr. Benjamin Mkapa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MKAPA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, I wish to express gratitude to you and to the other members of the Security Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate on the situation in Southern Rhodesia.

The signing of the Lancaster House Agreement on Southern Rhodesia constituted a solemn undertaking by the British Government to ensure true majority rule through free and fair elections. It was also a pledge to the international community by the British Government that it was ready to assume its role as the Administering colonial Power over that Territory, which had defied its authority for many years. Tanzania took that commitment very seriously and expected the British Government and the transitional authority in Southern Rhodesia to observe the letter and the spirit of the Agreement. For we believed then, as we still believe now, that whether the Lancaster House Agreement could hold depended largely upon the scrupulous and impartial compliance with it by the colonial Power.

My Government and those of other front-line States worked diligently towards the realization of this Agreement, which we believed would minimize bloodshed and suffering in Zimbabwe. For the same reason, Africa, the Commonwealth of Nations and the United Nations lent their support to the accord.

The 15 weeks of negotiation were punctuated by a series of crises. On several contentious issues the Conference came to the brink of collapse. But with the interest and counsel of several members of this Council, of the Organization of African Unity, of the non-aligned countries and of the United Nations, failure was averted and compromise provisions were agreed to by all the parties.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

It has therefore been with great shock and dismay that we have followed fundamental breaches of the Lancaster House Agreement on these very contentious issues by the Administering Power since the Governor was installed in the colony in mid-December. We were astonished to see that the British authorities that had chaired the negotiations leading to this delicate and sensitive Agreement were the first to dishonour it.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

They have set the Agreement off to a bad start, because even before the conclusion of the Lancaster House Conference the British Government precipitately sent a governor to Salisbury; and, before the ink on the agreement was dry, Her Majesty's Government took an illegal, unilateral action to lift sanctions which had been collectively imposed by the United Nations. In spite of that bad omen, we remained hopeful that that over-zealousness on the part of the British authorities would be corrected.

Unfortunately, no such self-restraint has been evinced by the Goverror and his Administration. Rather, we have witnessed calculated and more bold actions by him in breach of the most important and sensitive provisions of the Agreement. With arrogance, the Governor is embarked upon a dismantling of the transitional arrangements, imperilling the cease-fire and, by inviting South African troops and condoning their presence, sanctioning external intervention in the transitional and electoral process.

Given those ominous developments, Africa was left no choice but to come before the Security Council to protest in the strongest possible terms against the breach of the Lancaster House Agreement. Because this body has been seized of the Rhodesian question from the time of the 1965 rebellion, we feel that the Council should consider the grave and far-reaching implications of the gross violations of the Agreement for Zimbabwe's independence and for peace in that region.

I have heard the assurances of the representative of the British Government that South African troops have now been withdrawn from Rhodesia and his opinion that this difficult point is now behind us. I must say that in my view it is not behind us and I shall therefore still refer to it, because as I said it explains the character and thinking of the transitional administration in Rhodesia which must affect the course of events during the next four decisive weeks.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

The troops of the apartheid régime have been in Rhodesia at the sufferance - indeed, at the invitation - of the British Governor. That is contrary to the letter of the Agreement and assurances given in London by the British authorities. But most disturbing is the fact that Governor Soames has spoken approvingly of and hence sanctioned that presence. First, he told us that they would not interfere with the electoral process; but now we are told that those troops are withdrawing from Rhodesia. How are we expected to believe that? In London we were assured that they would leave the minute the Governor arrived. Today we are being assured that they have left. What will we be assured two weeks from now?

Those troops constituted a big threat and were intended to intimidate Zimbabweans, especially the supporters of the Patriotic Front. It must be clear that their aim was to serve notice that the South Africans would prepare a coup against a duly elected Zimbabwe Government and then set up a puppet régime in the territory as a buffer.

The continued presence of South African and other mercenary troops nearly broke up the Conference in London. It was only when the British Government gave an undertaking that that presence would not be countenanced upon the Governor's assuming office that it was possible to proceed to other issues. Lest there be any doubt about this point, I shall quote from the official record of the crucial session where the issue was settled. Mr. Mugabe of the Patriotic Front said:

> "As you know, we remain concerned about the disposition of the forces, the grounding of the Rhodesian Air Force and the presence of the South African forces."

Lord Carrington, the British Secretary of State and Chairman of the Conference, replied:

> "In relation to your concerns, I can assure you again that there will be no external involvement in Rhodesia under the British Governor. The position has been made clear to all Governments concerned, including South Africa."

That was an unconditional undertaking which has been unilaterally and clandestinely abrogated.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

The Governor was expected to head an impartial interim administration, but by his acts of commission and omission Governor Soames has spiritedly come out in favour of the Smith-Muzorewa group and relentlessly against the Patriotic Front. Ironically it was the Patriotic Front, through armed struggle, that made it possible for the Lancaster House negotiations to take place and the Agreement to emerge. It was the Patriotic Front, through immense sacrifice, that enabled the British to resume authority in Rhodesia. The achievements for which Governor Soames now claims credit - and which have been enumerated here this evening - have been brought about by Zimbabweans who have shed their blood under the banner of the Patriotic Front. However, the fighters of the Patriotic Front are now pejoratively referred to as the "rebels", while the Smith-Muzorewa forces are glorified as the "government forces" and the "security forces". And it could not have escaped representatives this evening that the representative of Her Majesty's Government continues to refer to the forces of the former rebel régime as the "security forces", while they are the forces of insecurity.

Under the terms of the Lancaster House Agreement, Patriotic Front forces were to report to and be confined at 16 designated assembly points, while the forces of the former rebel régime of Smith and Muzorewa were to be confined to 40 designated bases. The Patriotic Front forces have assembled but Governor Soames has, by his own repeated affirmations, permitted the forces of the former rebel régime to remain at large. He and his Administration refer to them as "government forces", casting an unacceptable aspersion upon the legitimacy of the Patriotic Front forces.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

The deployment of the forces of the former rebel régime is contrary to the letter of the Agreement and constitutes a grave provocation of the assembled Patriotic Front forces. The forces of the former rebel régime should be confined to the 40 designated bases. That is what the Lancaster House Agreement stipulates.

I am glad that the representative of Her Majesty's Government has confirmed this evening that those forces have been deployed and are assisting in the maintenance of law and order. That is contrary to the provisions of the Lancaster House Agreement. In that Agreement it is stipulated that the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order is that of the Rhodesian police, and it was with extreme reluctance that that concession was made by the Patriotic Front because even the police were an instrument of the former rebel régime. And so it is adding insult to injury now to deploy the armed forces in addition to the police for the purpose of maintaining law and order.

The attachment to the cease-fire agreement stipulates the provision of additional assembly places should the number of men of the Patriotic Front forces assembled exceed the 16,000 envisaged by the British Government. Some 22,000 men of the Patriotic Front forces are now assembled. To date Governor Soames has not given additional sites.

Under the Lancaster House Agreement the forces of the Patriotic Front and those of the former rebel régime are given equal treatment by the Governor and his Administration. This equality of treatment is written into the Agreement; it had to be in order to destroy any notion in the minds of the international community and, specifically, of the Governor that the Rhodesian army would be the legal army during the interim. It was an issue so vital that, again, it almost caused the Conference to break up. But Governor Soames has elected to ignore it. Not only has he deployed the Smith-Muzorewa forces, he has also employed them to harass and intimidate Patriotic Front leaders and supporters. Those troops have killed, in cold blood, Patriotic Front forces on their way to assembly points in two incidents. The Governor has attempted to justify those murders by claiming that the Patriotic Front forces in those incidents refused to surrender their arms. They had every right to refuse to surrender those arms. Nowhere in the Lancaster House Agreement is it provided that the Patriotic Front

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

is to surrender to the rebel army. In a statement on 11 December 1979 Lord Carrington, the Chairman of the Lancaster House Conference, affirmed the following:

"There can be no question of surrender by either side. All the forces which comply with the Agreement, which accept the Governor's authority and comply with his directions will retain their arms and equipment, will be treated honourably and will be lawful."

But Governor Soames, in using rebel forces to kill freedom fighters, has nullified this understanding of his Secretary of State.

I am sure that it has not escaped the Council's notice that it has not been told this evening that the Patriotic Front, which is equal, under the Governor, to the Rhodesian forces, has been asked to enforce law and order anywhere. It has not. Repeatedly, the Rhodesian forces have. That is the kind of equality that is being enforced.

In addition to deploying the Smith-Muzorewa troops, the British Governor has further deployed the so-called auxiliaries, which are nothing but a band of ill-trained armed political thugs of Muzorewa and Sithole. Under the Agreement they too were expected to be confined to base. The representative of Her Majesty's Government has confirmed to the Council this evening that they are in the Tribal Trust Lands. They are not confined to base; they are supposed to be enforcing law and order - ill-trained armed political thugs of one group. Those private armies have now been a major factor in Governor Soames' breach of the cease-fire agreement. He has said: "They are doing a lot of work that needs doing." That work is to take over positions vacated by the Patriotic Front forces and to surround them. Once again the statement of 11 December 1979 by the Chairman of the Conference has been violated with impunity. The assurance that there would be no question of any patriotic Front forces being encircled is being rendered meaningless. Instead of confining the Smith-Muzorewa forces and Muzorewa's auxiliaries to base as the Lancaster House Agreement envisages, the Governor has used them to terrorize Patriotic Front forces and the general population.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

Furthermore, and in spite of what has been said here this evening, we believe that the British Governor has ignored the machinery established by the Lancaster House Agreement, where it is provided that, if there are breaches of the cease-fire, it will be for the commanders to deal with them through the machinery of the Cease-Fire Commission and with the assistance of the monitoring force. As far as we know, to this day the Governor has not invoked or spoken of this machinery. There has not been one occasion on which the Governor has said that he acted on the advice of the Cease-Fire Commission - or, indeed, against its advice.

Another grave breach of the Lancaster House understanding is the recent renewal of the state of emergency and martial law for another six months. Whereas the Agreement says the necessity of martial law will disappear in the event of an effective cease-fire, the Governor, in his wisdom, deemed it fit to extend the emergency unnecessarily. We have been told that the cease-fire is holding reasonably well. So we wonder, if the machinery is working well, what is the reason for renewing this state of emergency? It is precisely because the interim Administration has not respected the machinery established by the Agreement that it has had to resort to martial law. And it is in the midst of this martial law that the parties are expected to campaign in the elections and to exercise freedom of speech. That is an unusual setting, to say the least, in which "free and fair elections" are to be held. This travesty becomes even more offensive when it is remembered that the Lancaster House Agreement gave the British authorities the mandate to end martial law. Instead, they have decided to renew it.

My delegation could cite more violations and instances of biased action on the part of the Administering Authority. But I believe that we have said enough to underscore the persistent disposition of the colonial Power to place the Smith-Muzorewa group at political and military advantage relative to other groups and, in particular, the Patriotic Front.

We deplore the barrage of calumny emanating from Governor Soames' office aimed at the Patriotic Front as the violator of the Agreement and the cease-fire.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

How can we believe that the forces of the rebel army have overnight turned into angels? How can we believe that none of the more than 100,000 armed white civilians has caused breaches of law and order? Indeed, why is it that, in the violations allegedly committed by the Patriotic Front forces, it is members of the Patriotic Front forces only that get killed? Why is it?

We deplore the lies uttered from Governor Soames' office against the neighbouring front-line States to the effect that they have allowed the infiltration of freedom fighters since the Agreement was signed. We commend the Patriotic Front for exercising restraint and sticking to the Agreement despite Governor Soames' provocations and vilifications of them. The Patriotic Front is the injured party in all this campaign of lies, but it has so far conducted itself magnanimously and with great restraint. We pay a tribute to the front-line States of Mozambique and Zambia for resisting the vicious propaganda campaign of Governor Soames and his collaborators. We salute them for the immense sacrifices they have made in material and human terms for the freedom of Zimbabwe.

(Mr. Mkapa, United Republic of Tanzania)

For our part, we have said that we shall accept any government that is elected through free and fair elections. But those elections do have to be free and fair. This is an unqualified condition which we attach to our acceptance of the election results.

We and many other countries support the Patriotic Front, and we are proud of that support. It was well that someone supported the Patriotic Front through the years, otherwise Governor Soames would not today be in Government House in Salisbury, and this Council would be seized of the issue of Southern Rhodesia in very different terms.

But our support for the Patriotic Front does not disqualify us from an impartial observation of the decolonization process. In addition, we are not the decolonizing Power. Nor does our sympathy for the Patriotic Front entitle the Administering Authority to change the provisions of the Lancaster House Agreement. In spite of our sympathy for the Patriotic Front, we are not asking the Governor to aid and abet its election. Nor are we asking him to aid any other party to the election. It is not his role to decide who should win. His cardinal role is to see to it that free and fair elections are held.

It is obvious that if the colonial Power persists in implementing the Lancaster House Agreement only partially, free and fair elections cannot take place. The situation is precarious. The South African presence, invited and condoned by the colonial authority, is a dangerous precedent of external intervention. The cease-fire is extremely fragile and will not hold, so long as the monitoring force monitors only one group of forces, namely, the Patriotic Front forces. The deployment of the so-called auxiliaries is an endorsement of political thuggery.

These are genuine and legitimate concerns of Africa, of my country and of the international community about which the Security Council has to take action to save this last chance of a peaceful process to Rhodesian independence. We call upon this Council to safeguard the inalienable rights of the people of Zimbabwe by taking appropriate action to ensure that Britain enforces impartially the letter and the spirit of the Lancaster House Agreement. Otherwise, the opportunity for peaceful transition in southern Africa will be lost, with imponderable ghastly consequences.