

# Historical Commission of Inquiry: Non-Aligned States in Cold War Context

Report to the Historical Commission of Inquiry: Non-Aligned States in Cold War Context on Commission of Inquiry under resolution 496 (1981) in connection with the Republic of the Seychelles

## Contents

In accordance with Draft resolution S/14793, this Commission of Inquiry was formed to investigate the events surrounding the attempted coup d'etat on the Republic of Seychelles at the Seychelles International Airport on the 25th of November, 1981. The Commission has reached out to various international leaders, representatives of involved parties, and governmental officials to discover the origin, details, motives, and funding of the attempted coup. The Commission has also reported on the estimated cost of the damage suffered by Seychelles. The Commission would like to note the cooperation and hospitality of the governments of Seychelles and South Africa. This report would not have been possible without their contributions. Furthermore, the Commission greatly appreciates the knowledge obtained from all participating individuals, governments, and agencies. USSR, United States of America, and the United Kingdom: The Commission requested information from each of the aforementioned countries due to allegations of connections to the mercenaries who attempted the coup in Seychelles. The United Kingdom responded to the request, and while they affirmed that two of the mercenaries were citizens of their country, they had no involvement in the attempted coup, and the men did not reside in the United Kingdom. The United States affirmed they had no involvement in the attempted coup; however, they didn't agree with the exile of the former President, James Mancham. The USSR also maintained that they had no involvement in the plot, and they supported the Ren Presidency and emphasized Seychelle's right to self-determination. Republic of Seychelles:

#### 1. Seychelles International Airport, Pointe LaRue, Seychelles:

- (a) On the 21st of January 1982, our Commission arrived at the Seychelles International Airport in the Republic of Seychelles. We were greeted by Giovinella Gonthier, the Charge d'Affaires of the Permanent Representative of Seychelles to the UN. While at the airport, our Commission was able to witness the extensive damage suffered by their airport. The Royal Swazi plane, the plane which the mercenaries arrived on, was destroyed; there was a sizable hole in the front windshield, intense shrapnel damage across the exterior of the plane, and the inside was entirely shredded. The nearby control tower's windows were almost completely shattered, and the inside was severely damaged. Almost all of the airport's technological equipment, in particular its meteorological equipment, had been destroyed, and thus flights to Seychelles right now are severely risky. Most of the roofs of the airport buildings were damaged in the gunfight. The damaged roofs exposed the electrical equipment inside to the heavy rains of this time, and thus most electronic devices are now destroyed. Additionally, it must be noted that a large number of tourists were stranded in Seychelles and at the airport during and after the attack. The government of Seychelles had to take rapid action to ensure that the foreign individuals were able to return to their countries of origin after the end of their visit.
- (b) After the attack on the 25th of November, Seychelles has done as much rapid repair work as possible to their airport; the cost incurred is approximately \$17.6 million. The airport staff stressed that the previous figure represented only the quantifiable amount of damage done during the attack, and does not accurately represent all damage suffered by the small island country. An example of the unquantifiable damage caused by the attack is an unwillingness in other countries to invest in Seychelles for business-related purposes due to fear of an attack like this.
- (c) The damage of the airport is particularly devastating to Seychelles, as this airport is their only major place in which they can interact with the outside world. The nation relies heavily on tourism, and the closure of the airport not only prevents people from coming in but also trapped people in Seychelles for a significant amount of time. Many supplies come through the airport as well, such as food, goods, and medicine. Since this is the only international airport on the isolated island, the effects of its closure are felt far and wide across the nation.

## 2. President France Albert Ren:

- (a) On the 22nd of January, 1982, our Commission met with the current President of the Republic of Seychelles, France Albert Ren. He reiterated the country's full support of our mandate and will do everything in his power to assure that we have access to all of the information we need. President Ren emphasized that the damage done to the country's airport was close to 18 million dollars, not including lost future revenue. Seychelles believes that South Africa is responsible due to the nationality of the mercenaries and because of South Africa's history of interfering in the internal affairs of other states.
- 3. List of names and country of origin of mercenaries involved in the attack on November 25th, 1981, as reported by the Republic of Seychelles:

(a) Advance Party:

```
i. Robert Sims (brother-in-law of Michael Hoare), Republic of South Africa (RSA)
53
               ii. Susan Ingle (common-law wife of Robert Sims), United Kingdom (UK)
54
55
               iii. Martin Dolinschek, alias Anton Lubic (Intelligence), RSA
               iv. Bernard Carey (Group Leader), UK
56
               v. Aubrey Brooks, Zimbabwe
57
               vi. Kenneth Dalgleish (Group Leader), Britain
58
              vii. Des Botes, RSA
59
60
             viii. Roger England, Zimbabwe
               ix. Charles Dukes, United States of America (USA)
61
          (b) Main Body:
62
63
                i. Thomas Michael Hoare, alias Thomas Boarel (Commander), Ireland
               ii. Andrew Standish-White, Ireland
64
               iii. Peter Duffy (Second-in-command), UK
65
               iv. Richard Stannard, UK
66
               v. Robert Jones-Davies, UK
67
               vi. Kenneth Barnes, UK
68
              vii. Nicholas Wilson, UK
69
             viii. John Mackay, UK
70
               ix. Donald Kenny, UK
71
               x. Michael Webb (Group Leader), UK
72
               xi. Simon Willar, UK
73
74
              xii. Devet Shyn, RSA
             xiii. Janolot Sydow, RSA
75
             xiv. Patrick Henrick, RSA
76
              xv. Jeremiah Puren, RSA
77
78
             xvi. Johan Fritz (killed), RSA
             xvii. Theodours van Hursteen, RSA
79
            xviii. Trevor Beck, RSA
80
             xix. B. de Vos, RSA
81
              xx. Desmond Walker, RSA
82
83
             xxi. Christo Hillesbran, RSA
             xxii. Louis, Boucher, RSA
84
            xxiii. William Paul, RSA
85
            xxiv. Tulio Moneta, RSA
86
             xxv. Pieter Doorewaaro, RSA
87
            xxvi. Johannes de Beer, RSA
88
            xxvii. Jechemns Dekker, RSA
89
```

xxviii. Frederick Gouws, RSA

90

```
xxix. Patrick Furelle, RSA
91
              xxx. Alan Mann, RSA
 92
 93
             xxxi. Ernest Deetlees, RSA
             xxxii. Keita Maclood, RSA
94
            xxxiii. Alex Deacon, RSA
95
            xxxiv. Peter Hean. RSA
96
             xxxv. Charles Goatley, Zimbabwe
 97
            xxxvi. Vernon Prinsloo, Zimbabwe
98
            xxxvii. Stephen Bibblecomber, Zimbabwe
99
           xxxviii. Jacob Dutoit, Zimbabwe
100
101
            xxxix. David Greenhaugh, Zimbabwe
                xl. Peter Rohwein, Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)
102
               xli. Kunt Priefert, FRG
103
              xlii. Seven Forsell, Austria
104
              xliii. Kenneth Kelly, Australia
105
              xliv. Barry Gribein, USA
106
```

 $126 \\ 127$ 

- (c) Summary: The majority of involved mercenaries are either from South Africa or from the United Kingdom. Those remaining are from Zimbabwe, Germany, Austria, Australia, the USA, and Ireland.
- 4. Summary of the Report of the Police Commissioner of the Republic of Seychelles on the Mercenary aggression of 25 November 1981 against Seychelles:
  - (a) Planning: Seychelles determined that the plan to stage a coup d'etat in Seychelles was originally hatched in the middle of September 1981, approximately 2 months before the attack took place. Mr. Robert Charles Sims, a South African, and his wife, Mrs. Susan Josephine Ingles, traveled to Hilton and Howick, South Africa, respectively. In Hilton, Mr. Sims met with Michael Hoare (his brother-in-law), in which they discussed their action plan. Sims, following Hoare's instruction, worked from a safe house in Mah, Seychelles, where he and Mrs. Ingle would pass out money to Hoare's recruited men. Hoare instructed Sims and Ingle to each open a bank account with \$10,000 at two different banks. Hoare told Sims that they would be joined by Barney Carey and Martin Dolinschek (alias Anton Lubic) in Seychelles.
  - (b) Dolinschek and the National Intelligence Services (NIS) (South Africa connection): Seychelles reported that Dolinschek was a senior intelligence officer from Durban, South Africa. Hoare supposedly had been to see ex-president James Mancham in England, and that Hoare intended to stage a coup d'etat in Seychelles aimed at overthrowing the present Government and installing Mr. Mancham in power. Dolinshek also reported to the Seychelles government that Hoare also reported that a man named Gerard would become Vice-President of the new government, and a Seychelles judge living in Australia would become the Prime Minister. Hoare also allegedly told Dolinshek that the Kenyan government was involved, and they would be flying troops and police to Seychelles to aid in the aftermath of the coup. Hoare described the current regime of Seychelles, that of President Ren, was oppressive, and the Soviet Union, Libya, and the Palestine Liberation Organization all had a presence there.
  - (c) Arms: The mercenaries were provided with 80 total AK-47s, 3 boxes of RPGs, and a few hand grenades, acquired from a Saudi Arabian arms dealer.
- 5. Minister of Foreign Affairs Jacque Hodoul
  - (a) On the 29th of January, 1982, the Commission had the pleasure of talking to the Seychelles Minister of Foreign Affairs, Jacque Hodoul. When asked about how the attempted coup has affected their foreign relations, Minister Hodoul stated that despite everything that has occurred, Seychelles' diplomatic relations have remained strong. When asked why the Republic of Seychelles believes that South Africa may have played a key role in the incident, Hodoul shared similar sentiments with the President, saying that

South Africa has had past aggressions with those who have different/independent governing styles from themselves. Hodoul considers the relations between the two countries to be relatively hostile and states that past restrictions on trade and tourism have caused an upset between both the Republic of Seychelles and South Africa. When asked about Seychelles' current relationship with Kenya, Hodoul declared that the two countries hold a cordial relationship and that the Republic of Seychelles does not believe that Kenya played any role in the attempted coup.

## Republic of South Africa:

#### 1. Mike Hoare

137

138

139 140

141

142

143

144145

 $146 \\ 147$ 

148

149

150

151

152

153

154 155

156

157

158

159

160 161

162

163

164 165

166

167

168

169

 $170 \\ 171$ 

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182 183

184

185

186

187

188

- (a) The Commission was interested in meeting with Mike Hoare as he is stated in multiple reports to be the leader of the operation. His testimony is necessary to ensure this report is fully accurate regarding the coup in Seychelles. But, the South African government stated we are not allowed to speak or interview him, therefore we are missing crucial information.
- 2. Interview with Mr. Roelof F. Botha, Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa
  - (a) On February 4th, 1982, our Commission met with Mr. Botha in Capetown, South Africa. During this interview, Mr. Botha reiterated that the Prime Minister of South Africa had stated that his government did not know of, nor had they ever, in any capacity, supported the mercenaries in their attempted coup. Mr. Botha directed our questions regarding the prosecution of the mercenaries to the Office of the Attorney General. While the South African government admits to having been approached by several dissident groups in the country asking for support with whatever goals they had, South Africa categorically told each group that supporting them ran contrary to the policies and belief of the South African government, who would never involve themselves with dissident groups. Mr. Botha could not state if South Africa had been approached by the dissident group involved with the mercenary aggression in Seychelles, but rather clarified that all he meant was that in the past South Africa had been approached by dissident groups as all governments have. He further clarified that South Africa responded, in the same way, each time. South Africa hopes to restore ties with Seychelles because it is important to have access to travel through the region. Finally, Mr. Botha stated that there are a large number of individuals living in South Africa, whose actions the government cannot be held responsible for.
- 3. Letter from the Attorney-General of Natal for South Africa, Mr. Cecil Rees:
  - (a) Mr. Rees reported to our Commission that South Africa originally only charged specific members of the group with kidnapping; their officers have reassessed the situation and since charged all 45 of the mercenaries with hijacking, under Civil Aviation Offence Act No. 10 of 1972. In response to our inquiry as to why South Africa chose to prosecute the mercenaries in their country while disregarding the pleas of the Seychelles government to return them for them to stand trial in front of an international tribunal overseen by the UN, he responded that the reason was due to specifics of the South African legal system. Jurisdiction of the courts is based on territoriality, and consequently, concerning offenses that involve civil aircraft, the jurisdiction has been enlarged to acknowledge the pertinent international conventions. Thus, as Attorney General, Mr. Rees was within his jurisdiction, concomitant with that of the Supreme Burt of Natal, in their process prosecuting the hijacked Air India aircraft. In his prosecution, he is primarily concerned with proving the elements he is required to meet under the Civil Aviation Offence Act. He has to first prove that the 45 accused mercenaries were the individuals who hijacked the plane and that they pursued this action intentionally and unlawfully. The 45 mercenaries charged are subject to the accusatorial system, ensuring them a fair trial, and requiring the prosecution to act within the law. He told us that the weapons used in the coup were from different sources, some from the security forces of Seychelles. The weapons are in the possession of the South African police, and they include 38 AR-47 assault rifles, 2.435 rounds of live ammunition, and three active stick hand grenades, but they have been destroyed due to the danger they present. Mr. Rees, as of yet, did not have any information regarding the possible finances of the coup. He hopes to interview the crew members of the Air India aircraft in person; to attain their testimony for his case.
- 4. Letter from General P. van der Westhuizen, Head of Military Intelligence for South Africa
  - (a) Our Commission received a letter from Mr. Westhuizen on March 1st, 1982. In this letter, he reported that unfortunately Mr. Constand Viljoen, the Head of the South African Defense Forces, was not able to meet with our Commission, but this letter contained his testimony in response to our lines of investigation.

- (b) Mr. Viljoen wrote that though some members of the group of mercenaries involved in the attack on Seychelles had military connections to South Africa, nearly every South African will have military connections due to their national service requirements. None of the involved mercenaries are serving in the Permanent Defense Force. Because of this, the investigation is being handled by the civilian judiciary authorities, as the individuals involved are considered civilians as they are not in service at this time.
- (c) They could provide no further explanations for why the mercenary attack occurred nor why the mercenaries chose to commandeer the Air India flight and reroute it to Durban, South Africa.

Mercenaries: In our continuing investigation of the events that transpired in Seychelles, we received interviews of a few of the captured mercenaries. The mercenaries interviewed were Jeremiah Cornelius Puren, Martin Dolinschek, Robert Charles Sims, Susan Josephine Ingle, Roger England, Aubrey Frank Vincent Brooks, and Bernard Stanley Carey. These interviews brought forth new information and questions needed to continue our investigation. Information presented led to the discovery that at least three groups were involved in the failed coup. These groups were the mercenaries under Mike Hoare, a group of South African men, and another group of Ex-Rhodesians. Mercenaries have noted that the potential coup was originally planned to be violence-free and bloodless. Many have stated that Mr. James Mancham funded the potential coup and played a large role in its proceeding, even though he was not present in Seychelles at the time. Furthermore, many mercenaries mentioned that forces from the Republic of Kenya had the potential to be called upon if this mission went well, or from the view of other mercenaries, not well. It is important to mention that many of the mercenaries were forthcoming with information, but the personal testimonies are up for interpretation and may not be completely accurate or trustworthy. There remain discrepancies between the information presented in the interviews on topics such as who was involved in the coup attempt and monetary transactions. Former President Mancham: According to the Mercenary Reports, Mancham is claimed to have financially supported the group. The Commission deemed it necessary to talk to Mancham since he was seemingly implicated in the plot. Unfortunately, the Commission was unable to meet with President Mancham in person and therefore he has provided a statement. In this, he mentions how he has had people reach out to him in exile seeking financial assistance for a coup. He said that he is not willing to support any action that would result in bloodshed like what happened during the attempted coup. One person who he did not name, met with Mancham in the Churchill Hotel in London. The plan cost an estimated \$3.5 million. But he said he did not support the group financially due to their plans. He recorded a taped message by telephone, however, which he believes was used as a way to show his support for a new government in Seychelles, even though he stated he was not interested in violence. Unfortunately, he had little information about the tape. He also claims no other government has been involved in this plot. The only government he is in contact with is that of the United Kingdom since they are allowing him to live a non-political life there. Conclusion and Suggestions: After reviewing the evidence collected during our two-month investigation, the Commission has decided that at this time, we are unable to determine if any Member State, outside organization, or outside person was responsible for the coup attempt in the Republic of Seychelles on the 25th of November, 1981. However, the Commission believes that there is vast potential for further evidence to be uncovered that may indicate a guilty party. We have several lines of inquiry that we wish to pursue further; these are outlined in detail in the following section. Our Commission refrains from declaring involvement by another Member State, due to the severe effects such an implication would have and lack of applicable evidence. Any future Commission must recognize the severity of falsely accusing a state and implores them to gather as much information as possible before concluding their investigation. The Republic of Seychelles is, without question, facing economic difficulties currently that will likely continue due to the damage as a result of the attempted coup. The economy has suffered due to the large decrease in investments and the decline in tourism. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following actions to the Security Council:

### 1. Suggestion for restitution

189

190

191 192

193 194

195

196 197

198

199

 $200 \\ 201$ 

202 203

204

 $205 \\ 206$ 

207

208

209

210

211

212

213 214

215

216

217

218

 $\frac{219}{220}$ 

221

222

223

224

 $\frac{225}{226}$ 

 $\frac{227}{228}$ 

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237 238

239

240

241

242

(a) The Commission has determined that the Seychellois Government requires financial assistance to rebuild their international airport, their main point of interaction with the global community. As noted in the UN's Secretary General's Report on Assistance to Seychelles to the General Assembly at its 33rd session, it reports on Seychelles' intense dependence on tourism and imports for their economy, and thus it is of utmost importance to repair the Seychelles International Airport as quickly as possible. The Secretary General's report already outlines a list of projects to strengthen the social and economic infrastructure of the country, with an expected total cost of \$13,646,000. This Commission recommends to the Security Council to add the reconstruction of the Seychelles International Airport to the current list of 27 projects requiring UN aid. As reported to our Commission by Seychelles representatives during our tour of the airport, the expected cost of this project is approximately \$18 million.

(b) If further investigations reveal a Member State to have been responsible for the planning or implementation of the attempted coup, the Commission recommends that the guilty party be required to pay reparations to the State of Sevchelles as well as a reimbursement of funds allotted for the damage that incurred.

#### 2. Further lines of investigation

243

244

245246

247

 $\frac{248}{249}$ 

 $250 \\ 251$ 

252

253254

255

256

257258

259

260

261

262263

264

265

266

267268

269

270

271

272 273

274275

276

277278

279 280

281

282

283 284

285

 $286 \\ 287$ 

- (a) The Commission has found brief mentions of the possible involvement of the government of Kenya. The Commission recommends that this possible connection is investigated as the Commission was unable to do so.
- (b) Mike Hoare has been identified as a vital player in the attempted coup. The Commission is sure that much information can be gathered from an interview with Hoare. The Commission was unable to make contact with Hoare due to the regulations of the Republic of South Africa and therefore recommends that the Security Council delegates a task force to obtain information from Hoare.
  - i. The Commission drafted initial questions to ask of Hoare. This list is not complete.
    - A. How involved were you in the planning of the attempted coup?
    - B. What form of payment were you and the other participants offered?
    - C. Do you know the amounts promised and how it was to be arranged?
    - D. Do you have any information on the tapes the group was instructed to play after the successful coup?
    - E. Do you know anyone under the name of Tom Boarel?
    - F. Have you faced deportation or any other formal repercussions from the government of South Africa?
    - G. An individual involved in the attempted coup claimed you made a statement that if South Africa became knowledgeable about your involvement you would be deported. Can you confirm or deny that allegation?
    - H. If that statement is true, why do you think that they would have deported you?
    - I. Why do you think you have not been deported?
    - J. Did you have any contact with Mr. James Mancham?
- (c) Air India Flight Crew:
  - i. The Commission believes that the crew of the hijacked Air India flight holds pertinent information about the hijacking. Due to the time constraints, the Commission is not able to meet with the crew and recommends a future Commission of Inquiry meet and gather information about what happened that day.
- (d) Other airport staff/civilians:
  - i. It would be helpful to interview many other people who were present at the airport at the time of the attempted coup, to get a more thorough understanding of the event.
- 1. Weaknesses in investigation
  - (a) Financial Source
    - i. The Commission was unable to determine if there was financial backing from any foreign governments or organizations due to the Commission not being allowed to interview key members involved in the coup attempt.
  - (b) Mercenary Testimony
    - i. The Commission was unable to verify statements made by mercenaries and were not allowed access to in-person interviews with those involved.
    - ii. Issues that were noted by the Commission were the possible involvement of the Republic of Kenya and the source of weaponry. The testimonies also provided doubt as to the involvement or role of James Mancham in the attempted coup.