

CONFIDENTIAL

115/23/37

Your file: 161/1/1, 42/6/1

Our file:

18:52 (5831)	700/MEA/00000/00000	\$286.93
--------------	---------------------	----------

FROM: WELLINGTON	C25628/WN1	12-Jul-1994
TO: NEW YORK		Priority
CC: WASHINGTON		Priority
BEIJING	BONN	Routine
BRUSSELS	CANBERRA	Routine
GENEVA	HARARE	Routine
LONDON	MADRID	Routine
MOSCOW	OTTAWA	Routine
PARIS	SANTIAGO	Routine
TOKYO	WGTN UNSC	Routine
DEFENCE		Routine

MFAT (MEA, UNC, LGL, ISAC, EAB, AMER, DSP3, DSP1)

P/S MFA
 DEFENCE HQNZDF (DSIA, OPS, DDI)
 DEFENCE MOD (GENTLES)

Subject

U53755: SECURITY COUNCIL : RWANDA

Summary

US is considering de-recognising Rwandan interim government and is inclined to challenge, or support a challenge to, Rwanda's credentials in both the Security Council and the General Assembly, according to US Embassy.

Action Required

2 For information. Grateful your continued reporting on consultations among Council members.

Report

3 Washington's C03131. On instructions US Embassy (Counsellor, McCormick) came in this morning, as part of a US approach to Council members (only) in capitals and New York. He said the US was considering de-recognising the Rwandan interim government. This did not mean the US assumed the RPF could organise itself to take a seat in the UN, let alone assume the Council Presidency in September. While best outcome would be for Rwanda to withdraw from the Council, the US judged, after speaking with the Nigerians, that withdrawal was not likely. Accordingly US inclination was to challenge or support a challenge to Rwanda's credentials in both the UNSC and UNGA. It was beginning a process of consultation with this in view. US had abandoned idea of trying to suspend

CONFIDENTIAL

Rwanda under Article V (which would require nine affirmative votes and no vetoes). McCormick emphasized that it would be important not to do anything that could jeopardise the safety of French forces on the ground. US had consulted the French who shared US view of the problem but were concerned about not setting a precedent that would later be regretted. The French were also hoping that the situation on the ground would change for the better.

4 In response we agreed it seemed politically inconceivable that the Rwandan interim government should hold the Council Presidency in September. We had looked at various options under discussion but events in Rwanda had continued to evolve rapidly. Further developments, including a declaration by the RPF of a broad-based government of national unity working within the framework of the Arusha Accords, could change the situation. Continuing consultations would be needed. Our own preliminary thinking was that we should not give up on regional diplomatic efforts aimed at securing a voluntary withdrawal by the interim government. An African consensus, and in particular Tanzania's views as chief broker of the Arusha Agreements, would be crucial in arriving at an agreed course of action. (McCormick concurred and said the US had been consulting with both Nigeria and Djibouti.) We would welcome staying in touch with US thinking as the situation was readdressed.

5 Comment: We are glad that the US is beginning a process of consultation, but with the prospect of the RPF forming a new government and events on the ground unfolding and still having some way to go, we would not expect precipitate action on the Rwanda credentials question. We noted to McCormick that we anticipated the bulk of the consultations would take place in New York.

=

End Message