



BRITISH EMBASSY,

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20008

TELEPHONE: (202) 462-1340

FROM THE AMBASSADOR

9 October 1979

M O'D B Alexander Esq
10 Downing Street

Dear Michael,

Now that the fuss over Senator Helms' alleged intervention in the Rhodesia conference has died down, I thought it might be useful to give you a little background about him. In talking to members of my staff Carbaugh has made no secret of Helms' access to the Prime Minister, and I imagine that he lets it be known elsewhere. It seems to me important therefore to ensure that the Prime Minister is aware of Helms' reputation here.

He is not an inhumane man. For example, sixteen years ago he and his wife adopted a nine year old boy with cerebral palsy who is now flourishing after extensive medical treatment. But his political reputation in Washington is not good. A successful broadcaster, he was registered as a Democrat until 1970. He was elected Republican Senator for North Carolina in 1972. His campaign was described by this Embassy as thoroughly nasty and racist, in the worst Southern tradition. He has done little since then to get away from this posture. He has influence in one section of the Republican party, but his views enjoy little respect in Congress. His ambition is believed to be to lead an extreme right wing party, either the Republican party once shifted to this position, or one of his creation.

In his re-election last year he spent (according to the official figures) \$7.4 million (more than \$12 a vote), three times the average, most of it raised through a nationwide right wing mailing system whose organiser is paid more than half of the takings. This does not stop him calling for cuts in Federal spending. He also relies on at least four foundations funded and run by three of his staff, including Carbaugh. One had its charter revoked last year for failure to file annual reports.

yours ever,

Nicholas Henderson

Nicholas Henderson

USA

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

F BK



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

29 October 1979

Senator Helms

I have discussed your letter to me of 9 October and John Robinson's related letter of 24 October with the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister was not, I think, altogether surprised by what I had to say. She is well aware of the need to distance herself from some of those with whom she had dealings in times gone by. Senator Helms is certainly among those with whom she will be increasingly cautious in future.

M. O'D. B. ALEXANDER

His Excellency Sir Nicholas Henderson, G.C.M.G.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

9B



BRITISH EMBASSY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

24 October 1979

M O'D B Alexander Esq
10 Downing Street

Dear Michael,

SENATOR HELMS

1. Nicko Henderson wrote to you on 9 October about Senator Helms. Last week we passed on to Senator Helms' office the Prime Minister's letter of 9 October to him about Rhodesia.
2. Yesterday Helms quoted the Prime Minister's letter, interspersed with his own comments, during consideration of the Defence Authorisation Act. The text of the Prime Minister's letter with Helms' comments appear in the Congressional Record: copy enclosed.
3. This illustrates the point made by Nicko Henderson in paragraph 1 of his letter to you.

Yours ever

John

J A Robinson

CC
G G H Walden Esq
PS/S of S

and Britain from a variety of sources, mainly over the land compensation issue.

Leaders of several Commonwealth and African nations criticized Carrington's conduct of the conference and warned him that there could be no acceptable solution without the Patriotic Front.

At the same time, the five "front line" states neighboring Zimbabwe-Rhodesia that support the guerrillas urged a moderate approach by their clients. The "front-line" states are Mozambique, Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana and Angola.

It was noteworthy that today's agreement came just one day after a "front line" summit in Tanzania that supported the Front on the land issue but took a significantly conciliatory approach, urging that the conference "move to the next crucial stage." The guerrillas are under pressure to settle from their supporters, particularly Zambia and Mozambique which have been attacked repeatedly by Zimbabwe-Rhodesian forces.

Last week Carrington made the proposal on the land issue that the guerrillas accepted today. He offered vague promises of financial assistance in a multinational grouping to help an independent Zimbabwe government pay for land expropriated from whites as required under the British-proposed constitution.

About 6,000 white farmers control most of the best land in the country and it is estimated that it could cost more than \$500 million to buy out most of the farmers in order to carry out a land reform program.

When the talks broke off Monday, the Front, citing the overriding importance of the land issue, said it was seeking "clarifications" from various governments about contributions to a land compensation plan.

Today, the guerrillas said in their statement, "We have now obtained assurances that depending on a successful outcome of the conference, Britain, the United States and other countries will participate in a multinational financial donor effort to assist in land, agricultural and economic development programs.

"These assurances go a long way in allaying the great concern we have over the whole land question arising from the great need our people have for land and our commitment to satisfy that need when in government."

Since the breakoff of the talks, the United States signalled its willingness to participate in an assistance effort. No money figures have been cited.

Britain and the United States are reluctant to give details on what has been offered because of failures of similar past efforts to bail out the whites. British sources said, however, that there had been no contacts with the Front on the issue since last Thursday and "there was nothing to add" to Carrington's statement then on the subject.

The three parties are to meet Friday morning to begin joint discussion of the transition to independence starting with elections.

Analysts are unanimous that the transitional issues will be much harder to settle than the constitution, which took 38 days to resolve.

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1980— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on legislative business for today, we have a conference report on S. 428, the Defense Authorization Act of 1980. I submit that report of the committee of conference

on S. 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 428) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1980 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and for civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, to authorize the military training student loads, to authorize appropriations for civil defense, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the Record of October 17, 1979.)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, that bill has been fully gone over by the conferees and all matters worked out and agreed on.

There has been a matter brought to my attention by the Senator from North Carolina regarding a technical point about one of the amendments. I, therefore, move, Mr. President, that that conference report be sent back to conference for further consideration by the conferees.

I will gladly yield now to the Senator from North Carolina with whom I have repeatedly conferred, and where he was at all times in a spirit of cooperation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Mississippi.

As he has indicated, he and I have discussed a possible point of order that could have been made in connection with this conference report. As always, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is most cooperative.

Mr. President, I had contemplated making a point of order against further consideration of the conference report on grounds that the conferees have exceeded their authority. It was not an action that I relished. The distinguished managers of the bill know of my affection for them, and my intense interest in the future security of our Nation, and my conviction that this bill is a pledge for that security.

But the issue of lifting sanctions against Zimbabwe-Rhodesia is also a matter which is of utmost concern for our national security. When dealing with a bill such as the defense authorization bill, it is difficult to make relative judgments as to which element of the bill is more important to our national secu-

rity. The bill, for example, authorizes the construction of a new aircraft carrier. But then we are faced with the fact that we cannot build this new carrier unless we have an ample supply of strategic materials, such as chrome. And we all know that sanctions prevent us from obtaining chromium from the principal place of origin; namely, Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

Now when the distinguished conferees considered this matter in conference, they took note of the issue; the report addresses the question of access to strategic materials in a general way. Furthermore, at the time the conferees discussed this matter—nearly 4 weeks ago—negotiations at the London Conference on the future of Rhodesia were at a critical stage. There was perhaps some reticence to take an action that might have upset the negotiations.

But now that objection is no longer valid. As we saw in last week's papers, both sides in the Rhodesian talks have accepted the constitution proposed by the British. The substantive issues have been settled, and all that remains is the question of implementation.

This was confirmed in a letter which was hand delivered to me from Prime Minister Thatcher late Thursday afternoon.

I hope the Senators on the floor and those who may be listening by way of the amplifying system in their offices will be attentive to what Mrs. Thatcher had to say in her letter to me. Mrs. Thatcher wrote:

DEAR SENATOR HELMS: I was grateful for your letter of 12 September about Rhodesia.

My letter to her, incidentally, was hand-delivered by my aides in London:

I am sorry not to have replied earlier, but I thought that before doing so it would be best to wait to judge the progress made in the Constitutional Conference.

That, of course, is what we all have been waiting for, what I believe the distinguished conferees were waiting for. But now Mrs. Thatcher feels that it is proper to judge the progress. She continues:

As you know, I want to see sanctions against Rhodesia lifted as soon as possible.

Note that she says, "as soon as possible."

She continues:

I am now confident that the Conference in which we are engaged will help us to achieve this aim. We regard adequate safeguards for the white minority as an essential part of the independence Constitution. We have provided for this in the constitutional proposals we have put forward. (I enclose a copy). As you will know, Bishop Muzorewa has announced his acceptance in principle of our constitutional proposals.

So apparently, Mrs. Thatcher believes that the Conference is going to succeed, and she notes the willingness of Prime Minister Muzorewa to accept the constitutional proposals. I continue to quote:

What Rhodesians need above all is a settlement which will bring them international acceptance. They are looking to the Conference to achieve this: it would provide the strongest encouragement to them to remain in the country.

Mr. President, I believe that the time has come to provide Rhodesians with at least a modicum of international acceptance for having made so many difficult concessions at this point. It is important to reward them. Furthermore, Mrs. Thatcher is determined not to allow the Patriotic Front to have a veto over a fair settlement. She says:

"But we are determined to bring about a solution which will bring Rhodesia to legal independence and enable us and others to lift sanctions with the widest possible international acceptance. I am confident that we are making progress in that direction.

Warm regards,
Yours sincerely,
MARGARET THATCHER.

Mr. President, the letter from Mrs. Thatcher has arrived at a crucial time in our deliberations. I think that she is telling us that the Conference is going to succeed. Now I am aware that the Byrd amendment, as originally passed by the Senate, covered all trade with Rhodesia. It may be that the conferees might want to reconsider their action on the Byrd amendment. It may be that they do not want to go quite as far as the Byrd amendment goes. It may be that the Byrd amendment could be restricted to the question of strategic materials only, not all trade. That would be a reasonable compromise, since it would provide international reassurances to the Rhodesians, while at the same time protecting U.S. national security. It might even enable us to build that carrier once the bill becomes law.

Mr. President, although the State Department has been downgrading the importance of chromium to our developed economy, a recent study by the National Research Council, which has studied the matter solely from a scientific point of view, has come to quite opposite conclusions, and I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with Mrs. Thatcher's letter.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRIME MINISTER,
10 Downing Street.

Senator JESSE HELMS,
DEAR SENATOR HELMS: I was grateful for your letter of 12 September about Rhodesia. I am sorry not to have replied earlier, but I thought that before doing so it would be best to wait to judge the progress made in the Constitutional Conference.

As you know, I want to see sanctions against Rhodesia lifted as soon as possible. I am now confident that the Conference in which we are engaged will help us to achieve this aim. We regard adequate safeguards for the white minority as an essential part of the independence Constitution. We have provided for this in the constitutional proposals we have put forward. (I enclose a copy.) As you well know, Bishop Muzorewa has announced his acceptance in principle of our constitutional proposals.

What Rhodesians need above all is a settlement which will bring them international acceptance. They are looking to the Conference to achieve this: it would provide the strongest encouragement to them to remain in the country. We shall not allow anyone to exercise a veto over a settlement we believe to be fair and reasonable. But we are deter-

mined to bring about a solution which will bring Rhodesia to legal independence and enable us and others to lift sanctions with the widest possible international acceptance. I am confident that we are making progress in that direction.

Warm regards,
Yours sincerely,
MARGARET THATCHER.

CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR CHROMIUM UTILIZATION

CHAPTER 1: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chromium is an element that imparts unique properties to the material to which it is added. While it is an important ingredient in many commodities, it is irreplaceable in stainless steels and high-temperature-resisting superalloys, two classes of materials that are vital to the technological well-being of the nation. Currently, there are no chromium-free substitutes that can be used in these critical applications nor are any such substitutes likely to be developed in the foreseeable future.

The United States is completely dependent on imported chromium and known commercial deposits are located in only a few countries. The Committee could not identify any technological responses that would eliminate completely U.S. vulnerability to a long-term disruption of chromium imports. Accordingly, contingency plans for chromium utilization are assessed, assuming the worst possible supply situation, that is, a total embargo on all foreign sources of chromium ore and ferrochromium. These contingency plans stem from a technical perspective and the study does not propose measures for coping with chromium contingencies by legal, political, or financial means.

1.1 General conclusions and recommendations:

1.1.1 Conclusions.—These general conclusions and recommendations present the Committee's findings regarding the degree to which the United States can reduce its dependence on imported chromium and recommended programs that might lead to reduction of that dependency.

1. Although important segments of U.S. industry are vitally dependent on chromium, insufficient effort has been made to develop substitutes for or to conserve, reclaim, or recycle chromium-containing materials. Consequently, a drastic curtailment of chromium supply would have serious short- and long-term effects.

2. Known chromium reserves are estimated at about 5 billion short tons and are expected to last for several centuries. On the basis of the currently known information, the quantity and location of proven and potential reserves are such that, at the current rate of consumption, the geographic concentration of chromium deposits will increase: within 25 to 75 years, the world will depend completely upon South African and Rhodesian deposits.

3. U.S. chromium deposits are small and virtually no prospects exist for the discovery of any significant new U.S. deposits. There is little evidence to suggest the existence of significant chromium deposits outside of those geographic areas presently known. The discovery of additional deposits in producing regions with limited known reserves (e.g., the USSR and Turkey or elsewhere) would be beneficial in maintaining the few alternate sources of supply that currently exist, even if the new deposits were not developed initially.

4. No substitutes exist or are likely to be developed for chromium in the high-strength steels, high-temperature metals, and corrosion-resisting alloys that are essential in the manufacture of jet engines, petrochemical

and power plant equipment, and various other critical products. It is highly unlikely that corrosion-resisting or high-strength alloy steels without chromium will be developed for such critical applications, although chromium-free substitutes could be used in decorative stainless steels, automotive flatware, refractories, and some chemicals.

5. Current U.S. chromium consumption could be reduced potentially up to one-third within about five years without creating major economic dislocations by using available technology to substitute alternative materials or processes, to recover and recycle waste chromium, and to design for greater chromium efficiency.

6. A major chromium-conserving research program has the potential of reducing chromium consumption an additional one-third within 10 years but could involve economic penalties (or disruptions) in some areas.

7. Even if the above measures are taken, however, essential or unsubstitutable chromium consumption is expected to be at least 180,000 short tons per year (approximately 6 percent of 1975 world chromium production), on the average, in the foreseeable future.

8. Sudden mandatory chromium conservation programs would result in severe economic dislocations even if all needed development work were completed in advance.

9. Chromium conservation is an ineffective response to short-term (about five year) shortages. Moreover, unilateral changes in U.S. consumption will have very little impact on long-term world conditions but will create severe economic penalties for the nation.

10. Conventional stockpiling can provide short-term protection (five years) against chromium shortages; however, the continued use of chromium in easily collected final products (e.g., hub caps, flatware, coins) may provide a more cost-effective stockpile for the types of shortages the United States is likely to encounter during the remainder of this century.

11. The criticality of chromium to industry generally is not appreciated, this lack of awareness works against the development of long lead-time technology stockpiles, or international agreements necessary to avoid supply interruptions.

12. The optimum response to the nation's increasing vulnerability to a disruption of the chromium supply probably would involve a combination of three approaches: some form of stockpiling to provide short-term (about five years) protection, conservation measures to produce medium-term (five to ten years) protection by reducing consumption rate and thereby extending life of the stockpile, and exploration for deposits to provide long-term (more than ten years) protection against a total disruption of supply from existing sources.

1.1.2 Recommendations.—

1. The criticality of U.S. dependence on foreign chromium should be publicized widely in conjunction with the intention to institute a program to decrease U.S. vulnerability to chromium requirements.

2. A basic research program aimed at developing substitutes for chromium in stainless steels and high-temperature, oxidation-resisting alloys should be initiated. Although this is a long-term program with little chance for early success, it is the only technical possibility for eliminating U.S. vulnerability to a long-term chromium embargo.

3. The search for new chromium deposits outside of current producing areas should be supported with adequate incentives, particularly on the North American continent.

4. Research into chromium conservation and recycling technology should be pursued vigorously, but only price and the market should be used to control consumption.

tion. Detailed examination of this interaction will require further study.

5. A study should be initiated to develop innovative methods for stockpiling chromium to provide up to five years protection against a cessation of supply and improved methods for ensuring that the content of the stockpile is matched properly to changing U.S. needs.

6. The combination of approaches—stockpiling, conservation, and exploration—should be explored as a strategy in addressing the chromium problem.

7. A thorough technoeconomic follow-on study (including cost-benefit analyses) should be undertaken to assess the substitution potential of chromium-containing alloys.

1.2 Specific conclusions and recommendations:

These specific conclusions and recommendations represent the Committee's most attractive approaches for reducing U.S. chromium consumption. However, as indicated earlier, these recommendations will not eliminate U.S. dependence on imported chromium but could reduce by two thirds the quantity of chromium that otherwise would have been consumed. It should be noted that implementing the recommendations would involve considerable time, money, and effort from development of the alloys through various aspects of metallurgical processing such as heat treatment, fabrication, and testing.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, just as a matter of suggestion—and, of course, it has no effect beyond whatever extent that the conferees may want to consider it—I am going to hand to my friend from Mississippi copies of suggested compromise amendments which I have drafted. I ask unanimous consent that the text of each of these amendments be printed in the Record at this point.

Mr. TSONGAS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

Sec. 103. In order to insure the unimpeded procurement of weapons and efficient conduct of national defense research and development with the funds authorized herein to be appropriated, taking into account the expense, availability, and quality of strategic and critical materials used in such weapons and research and development, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596; 50 U.S.C. 98-92h-1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 11. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after November 15, 1979, the President shall facilitate the importation into the United States of materials determined to be strategic and critical pursuant to the provisions of this Act by permitting trade in lawful goods between the United States and Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

Sec. 103. In order to insure the unimpeded procurement of weapons and efficient conduct of national defense research and development with the funds authorized herein to be appropriated, taking into account the expense, availability, and quality of strategic and critical materials used in such weapons and research and development, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596; 50 U.S.C. 98-92h-1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 11. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after November 15, 1979, the President shall facilitate the importation into the United States of materials determined to be strategic and critical pursuant to the provisions of this Act by per-

mitting the importation of such goods into the United States from Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.

Mr. HELMS. I would say again to my friend from Mississippi that I deeply appreciate his cooperation in this matter and his patience with me. I think he knows that the Senator from North Carolina has always vigorously supported a strong national defense, and I will never want to do anything to impede the progress of this legislation. I thank the distinguished Senator for his patience and cooperation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from North Carolina, and certainly I will pursue the matters he has spoken of, the matters he has put in the Record, and the suggestions that he has, and I know the great good faith in which they are presented.

It is an important matter. Now we are in the last days of the legislative session for this year, and the appropriation bill is right around the corner. I notice the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is here. He is behind me to get that authorization bill out, and we will do the very best we can. I appreciate very much the sentiment and the cooperation of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas (Mr. Tower) has arrived on the floor. He is the ranking minority member of our committee, and I would beg him to take the floor, and I hope he does, to make a motion that this matter be taken back to conference. The Senator from North Carolina has stated his position for the Record.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield—

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has to interrupt the Senator from Texas for just a moment, with my apology. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Mississippi has moved to recommit the measure to the conference; is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct, yes; and I was recognized in my own right, as I understood.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the thrust of this motion is to recommit the conference report to deal only with the matter of the Rhodesian-Zimbabwe sanction provision in the bill, which was dropped in conference, and there was substituted therefor language of generic nature which simply expressed the sense of the Congress that there should be no impediment to the importation of strategic material.

Understanding that that is the matter that the conference would deal with, that all other matters that have been agreed to in conference will stand and we will not reopen those, I would like to say that I support the motion of the distinguished chairman of the commit-

tee wholeheartedly, and hope the Senate will act in an expeditious manner. I believe we can go to conference very soon, and have a conference report back to the Senate shortly. I would not like to see us delay the vital business of authorization of the defense appropriations any longer than is absolutely necessary to deal with this matter.

So with that understanding, I offer my support to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator, and I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, if I may, Mr. President; I believe he has a point or two.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TSONGAS. I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi fully realizes how important the role he has played is in the whole issue of Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. It is somewhat ironic that it would be his committee, in dealing with the situation, that should have been the instrument that would have provided the opportunity for a peaceful settlement of the Zimbabwe-Rhodesia issue.

Although Mrs. Thatcher, Lord Carrington, and others will be recorded as the ones who brought peace if it happens, I think the Senate should know it was the action of this committee that really would have determined that this action was possible. I commend the distinguished chairman and the entire conference committee for giving this opportunity for peace a chance. Although certainly one does not expect the chairman to follow the issues in Africa as much as some of the rest of us, I would like to say to the Senator from Mississippi that we are indebted to him for his willingness to listen to the arguments made, and for having responded accordingly. I commend him for that action.

Just two other points, Mr. President. I do not want the Record to reflect an impression that Mrs. Thatcher is arguing that sanctions be lifted today against Rhodesia, and I am sure that is not what the Senator from North Carolina was suggesting.

Second, I would like to submit to the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Texas language that they might consider in terms of the reconvening of the conference, which I think would achieve the same result as what they came up with before, but would be specific enough to avoid the point of order which was raised earlier.

Again I commend the Senator from Mississippi for the role that he has played in helping all the thousands of people that may hereafter live in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia and not be consumed in the conflict. They owe him a great deal of gratitude.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we really thank the Senator very much for his kind words and the real help the Senator has given in his consideration of all phases of this matter.

Mr. President, that completes my pres-