



15 March 2022

**On 14 March 2022 Barrick Gold issues a [statement](#) in response to RAID public briefing on police violence at its North Mara gold mine in Tanzania. Below is RAID's response.**

Of the upmost concerns to RAID, since Barrick posted its statement, RAID has received credible reports of further serious human rights abuses by police assigned to the mine, including at least one killing and another person injured. We continue to gather information about these latest incidents.

- 1) RAID has not ignored Barrick's response to its publication. We refer to it, have published it in [full](#), and link to it repeatedly so that readers of our [briefing](#) can see what Barrick said in response to the reports of serious human rights abuses by police assigned to its North Mara mine and RAID's questions (which, for the most part, Barrick did not answer).
- 2) Barrick says that the litigation at the High Court of England and Wales concerns "some of the incidents raised in RAID's publication". This is incorrect. The litigation at the High Court concerns killings and assaults when Barrick's UK-listed subsidiary Acacia Mining was operating the mine, (i.e. *prior* to September 2019). The incidents documented in RAID's publication all occurred *after* September 2019, when Barrick took over operational control from Acacia. RAID has previously made clear to Barrick that the new incidents are not subject to the High Court litigation.
- 3) Barrick says that jurisdiction for the current High Court litigation "properly lies in Tanzania", but that it consented to UK jurisdiction "so that RAID cannot complain about the forum." As RAID has reminded Barrick, RAID is not a party to the litigation, which was commenced by the law firm Hugh James on behalf of Tanzanian nationals. In any case, it is for the courts, not Barrick, to determine where jurisdiction "properly lies".
- 4) Barrick takes issue with what it calls "incorrect" and "deliberately misleading" references to the police at the mine. It says that "Mine police" is an incorrect reference, and "Police employed by" and "guarding" the mine are deliberately misleading references. As our briefing makes clear, these are terms used by local residents and leaders. Barrick also says that the term police "assigned to the mine" is deliberately misleading, yet "assigned to" is the exact term Barrick itself uses in its own public [reporting](#). None of our references are deliberately misleading, as Barrick claims.
- 5) Barrick's statement that the abuses RAID documented all occurred outside the mine's perimeter is incorrect. As RAID's publication notes, Barrick has not explained how it defines the mine's perimeter, but regardless, of the four killings, at least two occurred where the mine is actively conducting operations (i.e. where it is dumping waste rock and/or within its walls), and a third by the mine wall where the mine has erected signs stating "Private road". But the overriding point is that the killings and assaults were committed by police assigned to the mine and relate to security operations at the mine. For Barrick to infer that these abuses are "day-to-day" police activities, which it is not expected to monitor, downplays the seriousness of the situation, the direct link to the mine and Barrick's responsibility under human rights instruments it says it endorses.

- 6) We also note that Barrick does not dispute any of the details regarding the mine's relationship with the police, including that the mine pays, feeds, accommodates and equips the police assigned to the mine, nor does it dispute the human rights abuses that RAID documented in its recent publication. If Barrick wishes to clarify its relationship with the police, a starting point would be for it to publish the Memorandum of Understanding it has agreed with the police, as UN experts recommend.
- 7) Barrick says that RAID has not raised human rights concerns with public authorities in Tanzania. This is not true. RAID has written and met with Tanzanian authorities to raise concerns about the human rights violations at the North Mara mine and has informed Barrick about this. Barrick describes its Twiga joint venture with the Tanzanian government (of which North Mara mine is a key asset) as a "triumph of partnership". At a minimum, Barrick is therefore well placed to exert the maximum leverage on its partner over police conduct and impunity, as required by the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which Barrick endorses.
- 8) Barrick makes reference to three so-called "independent" audits which it says found "significant improvements" at the North Mara mine. These audits were commissioned or largely influenced by Barrick, and none of them have been published, despite repeated requests.