



Response to Business & Human Rights request:

---

Barrick has the following response to your request for comments on the three articles noted below:

The first article, “Tanzanian Police Shoot Dead Intruder at Barrick Gold Mine,” by Sarah McGregor of Bloomberg.com, is short but factual. Ms. McGregor is a professional journalist with a worldwide news service.

On the other hand, the next two “articles” are not written by journalists. They are written by anti-mining and anti-Barrick activists. These writings appear in a monthly on-line magazine called the “Dominion” and an anti-Barrick website. The Dominion believes that “where mainstream media makes false claims of ‘balanced’ and ‘unbiased’ coverage, the Dominion is explicit about its bias: we are biased towards the perspectives of those most affected by events, government policy and corporate activity.” To Barrick’s knowledge there is no effort by Dominion editors to ascertain whether any submissions to the Dominion are *factually* correct. The two submissions in question certainly are not.

The first item is written by Sakura Saunders. For the benefit of the readers of the Business and Human Rights website, Ms Saunders is a principal and activist behind an anti-Barrick website. In her article she extensively quotes three other individuals, Allan Cedillo Lissner, Evans Rubara and Tundu Lissu – all of whom conveniently also are principals in “protestbarrick.” The Saunders submission should not be confused with journalism – it is advocacy by the four dedicated anti-Barrick activists. While Barrick respects the rights of these individuals to protest Barrick’s every movement, the various statements of Saunders and her colleagues should not be mistaken for the truth.

Consider these facts. Ms Saunders and her colleagues assert that there was a spontaneous “civilian uprising” at Barrick’s North Mara mine in response to the shooting of a young man engaged in an argument with Barrick security. This story is factually incorrect in virtually every respect -- other than the tragic fact that a man was fatally shot. In fact, there was no argument between the deceased and Barrick security. A shooting did not precipitate a “civilian uprising.” The man that was fatally injured was part of a large group of people – many of them armed - who illegally invaded Barrick’s open pit mining operation where Barrick’s operations had exposed an area of relatively high grade gold ore. The invasion occurred *before* the shooting. It was not an “uprising” in *response* to the shooting, as Ms Saunders would have you believe. That fact should have been self-evident to any objective observer inasmuch as the shooting occurred *in the Barrick open pit*. The deceased was one of the invaders. The invaders were confronted in the Barrick open pit by Tanzanian police, who had been summoned by Barrick. The female

Tanzanian police officer who shot the man stated that she did so in self-defense. The matter was investigated by the Tanzanian police and Barrick, both of whom confirmed the basic facts described above.

The article also wrongly asserts that this was “the *seventh* person killed at the hands of ‘mine security’ since July 2005.” Again, the facts are otherwise. *Two* people – not seven – have died in confrontations with Barrick’s mine security at or near the mine. The first incident occurred on April 15, 2006. The deceased was part of a group of approximately 25 armed intruders who attacked a security officer. The security officer fired his weapon in self defense after being chased by the armed group and falling into a creek. He fired his weapon to protect his life. The attacker was struck in the leg but subsequently died. The second event occurred on June 2, 2006. The deceased was once again part of a group of approximately 15 armed intruders who had illegally invaded the mining operation, in that case to steal fuel. The group of intruders, armed with machetes, attacked a Barrick security guard on Barrick property. One of the attackers was shot by a guard whose life was clearly in jeopardy. The deceased was shot once, not five times.

The reference to seven shootings by “Barrick security” is also misleading because Barrick only came to own and operate this mine in early 2006. Since it began to operate the mine Barrick is aware of a total of five fatal shootings in the vicinity of the mine, including the two mentioned above. Four of those shootings have been associated with armed groups of people seeking to steal gold, fuel or other property. The fifth shooting occurred when an armed group entered the mine and fatally shot a Barrick security officer (who was not armed). It is worthy of mention that in 2008 a further Barrick employee was also fatally stabbed by a trespasser. Except for the two events in 2006 mentioned above, all of the shooting incidents involved Tanzanian police – not Barrick security – and occurred in the normal course of law enforcement activities responding to these illegal armed intrusions. The authors’ agenda to demonize Barrick security personnel and foment conflict - and to cast their lot with armed intruders who have entered Barrick’s mine for the purpose of stealing gold ore and/or Barrick property and equipment - and chasing and murdering security officers - appears seriously misguided.

Lastly, Ms Saunders also relies upon Mr. Lissu’s provocative story about Barrick importing hand grenades, which allegedly were temporarily seized by customs officials. In fact, Barrick has never acquired or used hand grenades at any of its facilities nor has it ever attempted to import hand grenades into Tanzania. In contrast, the use of tear gas is a well accepted non-lethal law enforcement tool utilized all over the world – including the United States and Canada - in connection with the dispersal of armed intruders or mob violence – both of which remain a continuing threat in the North Mara area.

The second item is a letter dated January 22, 2009 and written by Tundu Lissu, who, as noted above, is also a principal with “protestbarrick.” It should be noted that for the last ten years Mr. Lissu has been a highly paid anti-mining and anti-Barrick advocate who has been repeatedly discredited for making unsubstantiated accusations against Barrick and/or the Tanzanian government that he knows to be exaggerated or entirely incorrect.

For example, Mr. Lissu and the Lawyers Environmental Action Team (LEAT) requested that the Ombudsman's office (CAO) of the World Bank conduct an independent review of allegations relating to the Bulyanhulu mine. The investigation concluded that "To repeat an allegation that one knows not to be true, especially an allegation of murder, has consequences. It has consequences on the business reputation and trading ability of a private enterprise and on the individuals concerned. There may be legal consequences to such actions. The CAO is distressed that some NGOs have felt that they may act with impunity in this case. In fact the CAO believes there is no impunity. The consequence is a backlash against the "non-accountability" of NGOs."

With respect to the mine, the Ombudsman further commented that "the mine was more than aware of its role and responsibility [for community development, stopping the spread of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases etc.] ...The mine is performing to environmental and social standards that are in line with those expected of an investment by the World Bank Group." The full report is available at <http://www.cao-ombudsman.org/html-english/documents/bulyfinal.Englishpdf.pdf>

In Barrick's experience, Mr. Lissu's inflammatory accusations at North Mara and other near-mine communities in Tanzania have had the practical effect of contributing to the continuing instability of those communities, often while serving his own personal, political and economic ends. The destabilizing impact of his campaigning in local communities was well documented by the office of the Ombudsman of the World Bank in the Assessment Report referenced above. In the current circumstances we understand that his most recent accusations involving North Mara are intended to be a centerpiece of his upcoming campaign for political office. We choose not to be a prop in his political campaign and would prefer to focus on the facts – not rhetoric, misleading characterizations and unsubstantiated allegations.

In spite of the security challenges and regular interference from non-residents, Barrick continues to build collaborative relationships with the local community and a range of other stakeholders at North Mara. Constructive engagement and dialogue is the cornerstone of our approach to working with communities around North Mara, as it is wherever we operate.