

January 5, 1975
**Telegram from the UK Embassy, Blantyre, to the
Foreign and Commonwealth Office**

Citation:

"Telegram from the UK Embassy, Blantyre, to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office", January 5, 1975, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Rhodesia Part II, PREM 16/634, The National Archives, United Kingdom. Obtained by Jamie Miller.
<https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/134634>

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

IMMEDIATE

ADVANCE COPY X

CYPHER/CAT A

FM BLANTYRE 050915Z

CONFIDENTIAL.

DESKBY 060900Z.

TO IMMEDIATE F C O TELNO 17 OF 5 JANUARY.

FOR WESTON PRIVATE OFFICE FROM DALES.

FOLLOWING IS FULL RECORD OF SECRETARY OF STATE'S MEETING WITH VORSTER IN PORT ELIZABETH WHICH THE SECRETARY OF STATE WOULD LIKE TO BE PASSED TO THE PRIME MINISTER FIRST THING ON MONDAY MORNING. BEGINS.

1. MR VORSTER WELCOMED MR CALLAGHAN AND INVITED HIM TO BEGIN THE DISCUSSION.
2. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE HAD COME FOR A BUSINESSLIKE AND INTIMATE DISCUSSION ABOUT THE PROBLEMS OF SOUTHERN AFRICA. HE WAS GRATEFUL TO MR VORSTER FOR RECEIVING HIM AT SHORT NOTICE, BUT AS HE KNEW, IT WAS ONLY AFTER DR KAUNDA HAD STRONGLY URGED HIM TO MAKE THIS JOURNEY THAT HE HAD FINALLY DECIDED TO COME TO SOUTH AFRICA. DR KAUNDA AND OTHER AFRICAN LEADERS HAD TOLD HIM THAT THEY WERE MOST INTERESTED AND IMPRESSED BY MR VORSTER'S RECENT SPEECHES AND THEY SHARED WHAT THEY UNDERSTOOD TO BE HIS VIEW ABOUT THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE SITUATION NOW DEVELOPING IN SOUTHERN AFRICA. THERE WERE INDEED EXPECTATIONS OF POSSIBLE COOPERATION BETWEEN ALL THE COUNTRIES CONCERNED. BUT IF THESE EXPECTATIONS WERE DISAPPOINTED AND, FOR EXAMPLE, NO SOLUTION WAS REACHED FOR THE PROBLEM OF RHODESIA, THEN THE STABILITY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA AS A WHOLE WOULD BE IN GRAVE JEOPARDY. ONE HAD ONLY TO LOOK AT THE MAP TO SEE THAT THE SITUATION COULD DETERIORATE VERY RAPIDLY AROUND THE BORDERS OF RHODESIA AND INDEED IN THE OTHER COUNTRIES CONCERNED, MOZAMBIQUE, ANGOLA AND SOUTH EAST AFRICA. MR VORSTER INTERJECTED THAT IN SOUTH WEST AFRICA THE WAY FORWARD COULD NOT BE SWAPO'S WAY. MR CALLAGHAN SAID HE WOULD REVERT TO THAT QUESTION LATER. HE FIRST WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ABOUT RHODESIA. DR KAUNDA AND PRESIDENT SERETSE KHAMA HAD PRESSED HIM TO MAKE A FRESH MOVE AND THEY HAD BOTH THOUGHT THAT HE WAS OVER CAUTIOUS BECAUSE HE HAD DELIBERATELY HELD OFF FROM INTERVENING DURING THE LAST TEN MONTHS. THE VIEW WHICH THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT HAD TAKEN WAS THAT AFTER THE CHANGE OF PORTUGUESE POLICY IN APRIL EVENTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO MOVE TOWARD

J.S.

Mr. Wright
No. 10 Downing St.

Prime Minister (H)

This is the full record
found in the Foreign and Commonwealth
Secretary's message to you.

How
1/1

PORTUGUESE POLICY IN APRIL EVENTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO WORK THEIR WAY THROUGH TO CHANGE THE ATTITUDES OF THE EUROPEAN POPULATION IN RHODESIA. BUT NOW, AFTER THE INITIATIVES TAKEN BY THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS, HE WAS BEING PRESSED TO COME INTO THE THE ACT HIMSELF AND WORK FOR A VERY EARLY CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS REGARDED SOUTH AFRICA AS A VERY IMPORTANT FACTOR IN THE SITUATION. THEY BELIEVED THAT ALL THE COUNTRIES IN THE AREA SHOULD USE WHATEVER INFLUENCE THEY HAD TO BRING ABOUT A SETTLEMENT AND THEY CERTAINLY SEEMED TO BE USING THEIR OWN INFLUENCE VERY ACTIVELY AND SINCERELY. THEY FEARED THAT WITHOUT A SETTLEMENT THE SITUATION WOULD DETERIORATE, BUT THEY WERE CONSCIOUS OF THE DESIRABILITY OF GIVING SOME REASSURANCE TO THE EUROPEAN POPULATION WHEN NEGOTIATIONS FOR A SETTLEMENT TOOK PLACE.

3. MR CALLAGHAN WENT ON TO SAY THAT IN THE RHODESIAN QUESTION SOUTH AFRICA HAD A GEOGRAPHICAL INTEREST, WHEREAS THE UNITED KINGDOM HAD A CONSTITUTIONAL INTEREST. FOR US RHODESIA WAS IN ONE SENSE A PERIPHERAL INTEREST AND IN ANOTHER AS A MATTER OF HONOUR. IN VIEW OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES, WE COULD NOT STAND ASIDE FROM THE QUESTION AND WE HAD TO HAVE REGARD FOR THE PRINCIPLES WHICH WE HAD CONSISTENTLY PROCLAIMED. YET, IN FACT, IF NO SOLUTION WERE TO BE FOUND, OUR OWN MAJOR INTERESTS WOULD NOT BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED: THE RHODESIAN QUESTION WOULD CONTINUE AS A IRRITATION TO US, BUT IT WOULD BE THOSE WHO LIVED IN SOUTHERN AFRICA, WHO WOULD REALLY BE HARMED. FOR THIS REASON WE THOUGHT THAT IN PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES IT WAS NO LONGER APPPOSITE FOR US TO TRY TO PRODUCE CONSTITUTIONAL PLANS AS WE HAD IN THE PAST IT WAS BETTER FOR THOSE WHO LIVED IN SOUTHERN AFRICA TO DO SO. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE AGREED STRONGLY. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT OF COURSE WE SHOULD HAVE TO BE SATISFIED THAT, IF AN AGREEMENT WERE TO BE REACHED, IT WOULD SQUARE WITH OUR OWN PRINCIPLES. STILL, HE WOULD NATURALLY ADOPT AS FLEXIBLE AN ATTITUDE AS POSSIBLE IF AN AGREEMENT WERE INDEED TO BE REACHED BY THE PARTIES CONCERNED. MR VORSTER COMMENTED THAT TO TAKE ANY OTHER ATTITUDE WOULD PERHAPS BE SOMEWHAT "COLONIALIST". MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE WAS NOT CLEAR WHAT OUR ROLE MIGHT BE AT A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. PERHAPS WE MIGHT BE A BROKER OR MIDWIFE. WE SHOULD NOT PRODUCE A NEW PLAN OURSELVES, BUT WE MIGHT HELP TO IRON OUT DIFFICULTIES WHICH AROSE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. IN ANY CASE, IT SEEMED IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO SIT BACK AND DO NOTHING SINCE THE AFRICANS WERE PESSING US TO BE ACTIVE.

4. MR CALLAHAN SAID THAT HIS TALKS WITH DR KAUNDA AND PRESIDENT SERETSE KHAMA HAD SHOWN HIM CLEARLY THAT THE TWO PRESIDENTS REGARDED SOUTH AFRICA AS BEING IN AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT CATEGORY FROM RHODESIA. THEY HAD POINTED OUT THAT ALTHOUGH THEY HAD DIFFERENCES WITH SOUTH AFRICA, THEY RECOGNISED SOUTH AFRICA AS A STATE IN ITS

OWN RIGHT. ONCE THE RHODESIA QUESTION WAS SETTLED DR KAUNDA WOULD WISH TO MEET MR VORSTER, BUT NOT BEFORE. HE AND PRESIDENT SERETSE KHAMA HAD EMPHASISED STRONGLY THEIR DISAVOWAL OF VIOLENCE AS A MEANS OF PROMOTING THEIR POLICIES. AND THEY MUCH DEPLORED THE RECENT BREAKING OF THE CEASEFIRE IN RHODESIA. MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THE BREAKING OF THE CEASEFIRE WENT ON LIKE THIS IT WOULD WRECK EVERYTHING. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS WOULD AGREE WITH THIS UP TO A POINT THOUGH THEY ALSO THOUGHT THAT SMITH HAD NOT YET FULLY CARRIED OUT HIS PART OF THE AGREEMENTS. BUT WHILE THEY DISAVOWED AND GENUINELY DEPLORED THE RECENT INCIDENTS THEY HAD PARTICULARLY ASKED HIM TO MAKE THE POINT TO MR VORSTER THAT THE SOONER SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE COULD BE WITHDRAWN FROM THE RHODESIAN BORDERS THE BETTER.

5. MR CALLAGHAN ADDED THAT IN CONSIDERING THIS WHOLE QUESTION HE FELT VERY UNCERTAIN WHAT MR SMITH'S TRUE ATTITUDE WAS ABOUT THE NEXT STEPS AND IN PARTICULAR HOW HE VIEWED THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE.

6. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE WELCOMED THE VERY OPEN MANNER IN WHICH MR CALLAGHAN HAD SPOKEN. HE TOO WOULD SPEAK PLAINLY. IN HIS VIEW THE RHODESIAN QUESTION WAS AT THIS STAGE AN AFRICAN SITUATION DEMANDING AN AFRICAN SOLUTION. IN SPITE OF ALL EFFORTS FROM OUTSIDE IT MUST ULTIMATELY BE FOR RHODESIANS IN RHODESIA TO "FIND EACH OTHER". THE ROLE OF OTHERS WAS TO COUNSEL REASON AND URGE THEM TO FIND AGREEMENT. THE LESS WE INTERFERED THE BETTER BUT WE HAD COUNSELLED SMITH TO FIND SETTLEMENT. HE THOUGHT IT WAS TRUE THAT SOUTH AFRICA HAD PLAYED A KEY ROLE IN PUTTING THE TWO SIDES TOGETHER AND ESPECIALLY IN ARRANGING FOR NKOMO AND SITHOLE TO GET TO LUSAKA. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THIS WAS FULLY RECOGNISED BY DR KAUNDA. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE BADLY WANTED PEACE IN SOUTHERN AFRICA AND THOUGHT THAT WE WERE NOW AT THE CROSS-ROAD. IF WE TOOK THE WRONG TURNING THERE WOULD BE AN ESCALATION OF VIOLENCE WHICH WOULD INVOLVE THE WHOLE REGION. HE WOULD GO ON SEEKING PEACE UNTIL IT WAS CLEAR THAT HE HAD FAILED. IF HE DID FAIL AND VIOLENCE FOLLOWED HE COULD NOT KEEP OUT. AS REGARDS THE NEXT STEP IN RHODESIA IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO SPEAK ABOUT PARITY OR MAJORITY RULE. THERE WAS ALREADY AGREEMENT AMONG ALL THE PARTIES CONCERNED THAT THE WAY FORWARD WAS TO AGREE UPON A QUALIFIED FRANCHISE. ALL THAT REMAINED WAS TO WORK OUT THE QUALIFICATION. DR MULDER SAID THAT ALL THE PARTIES INCLUDING THE ANC KNEW WHERE THEY STOOD AND ALL WERE AGREED THAT QUALIFIED FRANCHISE SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED WHAT THE PROPOSED FRANCHISE WOULD BE BASED ON MR VORSTER SAID THAT IT WOULD BE BASED MAINLY ON EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS BUT THIS WOULD REALLY BE UP TO THE PARTIES. REGISTRATION OF VOTERS WOULD OF COURSE BE IRRESPECTIVE OF COLOUR (IE THERE WOULD BE A

COMMON POLL). THE RHODESIAN SITUATION WAS QUITE DIFFERENT FROM MOZAMBIQUE. RHODESIAN WHITES HAD LIVED IN THE COUNTRY FOR MANY YEARS AND HAD EFFECTIVELY ENJOYED A HIGH DEGREE OF INDEPENDENCE AND SELF-GOVERNMENT SINCE 192 (SIC) OR EVEN BEFORE. EVEN IN PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES IT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE TO GET THESE PEOPLE TO HAND OVER EVERYTHING TOMORROW TO THE BLACKS. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED WHAT THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES WOULD BE OF THE PROPOSED NEW FRANCHISE. HOW LONG WOULD IT TAKE BEFORE THERE WAS MAJORITY RULE? MR VORSTER ASKED WHETHER IT MATTERED PROVIDED THAT RHODESIANS AGREED ON IT. IT WAS TO THE INTEREST OF ALL IN SOUTHERN AFRICA THAT THEY SHOULD AGREE AMONG THEMSELVES. WAS IT NOT ALSO OF BRITISH INTEREST? MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE SHOULD HAVE TO BE SURE THAT ANY PROPOSED SETTLEMENT WAS CONSISTENT WITH OUR OWN PROCLAIMED POSITION. MR VORSTER SAID THAT SURELY WE WOULD NOT QUESTION THE TERMS IF EVERY BODY HAD AGREED? MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT WE WOULD LOOK AT THE SITUATION WITH THE GREATEST SYMPATHY AND FLEXIBILITY BUT WE STILL HAD A CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY. MR VORSTER SAID THAT OF COURSE EVERYBODY REALISED THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE VOTERS WOULD BE BLACK AT THE TIME WHEN THE NEW FRANCHISE COMES INTO EFFECT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE WAS UNEASY ABOUT MR SMITH'S CONTINUING TALK ABOUT KEEPING UP THE STANDARDS AND "NO DRAMATIC CHANGE" ETC. MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THE WHITES DID NOT GET SOME REASSURANCE ABOUT STANDARDS YOU WOULD NEVER GET AGREEMENT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE THOUGHT WE HAD STILL GOT A LONG WAY TO GO BEFORE GETTING AGREEMENT. MR VORSTER AGREED AND SAID THAT IN FACT THEY HAD ONLY JUST STARTED. NOW THEY HAD TO SEAT ROUND A TABLE. IN HIS VIEW BLACK RULE TOMORROW WAS "OUT". BUT BLACK RULE BASED ON AN EDUCATED MAJORITY BASIS WAS "IN". MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT SURELY ALL DEPENDED ON WHAT THE RESULT WOULD BE IN TERMS OF PARLIAMENTARY SEATS. MR VORSTER SAID THAT OF COURSE THAT WAS SO BUT IT WAS AGREED BETWEEN ALL CONCERNED THAT THERE WOULD BE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AND THEN MAJORITY RULE. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED HOW GRADUAL THIS WOULD BE. MR VORSTER SAID THAT SURELY IT DID NOT MATTER IF EVERYBODY CONCERNED WERE TO BE SATISFIED. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THIS WAS ALL VERY WELL BUT IF A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE WERE TO START TOMORROW AND THERE WERE TO BE A DISCUSSION OF A NEW FRANCHISE THE AFRICAN MAXIMUM DEMAND WOULD BE FOR ONE MAN ONE VOTE AND MAJORITY RULE WITHIN ONE YEAR. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THIS WAS SO BUT SMITH'S MAXIMUM DEMAND WOULD BE FOR NO MAJORITY RULE IN HIS LIFETIME. IT SHOULD BE POSSIBLE TO FIND A COMPROMISE. THEY MUST SORT IT OUT FOR THEMSELVES. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT ONE HAD TO BEAR IN MIND PRESSURE FROM THE OAU FOR THE MAXIMUM. WOULD IT REALLY BE POSSIBLE TO BRIDGE THE GAP? MR VORSTER SAID THAT SMITH WAS NOW BEING VERY CO-OPERATIVE AND CLEARLY SAW THE NEED FOR A SETTLEMENT. IN FACT HE COULD NOT

... SETTLEMENT. IN FACT...
FAULT HIM IN ANY WAY. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE WAS STILL NOT
ENTIRELY SATISFIED THAT SMITH WOULD BE PREPARED TO GIVE WAY ENOUGH
TO SATISFY THE AFRICANS. IT SEEMED TO HIM THAT ALL DEPENDED ON
THE QUESTION OF WHEN QUALIFIED FRANCHISE WOULD ACHIEVE MAJORITY
RULE. MR VORSTER SAID THAT ALL THIS HAD ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED
AT GREAT LENGTH WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS AND
IT WAS AFTER THESE DISCUSSIONS THAT THE LUSAKA AGREEMENT HAD BEEN
REACHED. THIS HAD PROVIDED FOR THE CEASEFIRE, THE RELEASE OF
DETAINEES IN FOR QUALIFIED FRANCHISE THE BASIS OF WHICH WAS TO BE
WORKED OUT BY WHITE AND BLACK RHODESIANS ALL THESE THINGS HAD
BEEN CLEARLY AND DEFINITELY AGREED BY ALL CONCERNED.

7. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED WHETHER THERE HAD BEEN ANY DISCUSSION OF WHEN
THIS WOULD LEAD TO MAJORITY RULE. MR VORSTER REPLIED THAT THERE
HAD NOT BECAUSE IT WAS RECOGNISED THAT TIMETABLES WERE DANGEROUS.
MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT ONE MUST BEAR IN MIND THAT SMITH HAD FOR MANY
YEARS BEEN PLAYING ABOUT WITH FANCY FRANCHISES OF A KIND WHICH WERE
MOST UNSATISFACTORY FOR THE AFRICANS. MR VOSTER SAID THAT ON THIS
OCCASION IT WOULD BE DIFFERENT. THIS WOULD BE AN AGREED QUALIFIED
FRANCHISE. AND IF THEY ALL AGREED UPON IT WELL AND GOOD. MR
CALLAGHAN SAID THAT EXTREMISTS IN THE ANC SHOULD NOT BE UNDERRATED.
REVEREND SITHOLE WAS PROBABLY STILL URGING THE NEED FOR FIGHTING.
IF THE PERIOD BEFORE MAJORITY RULE IS MADE TOO LONG SITHOLE'S
ARGUMENTS WOULD WIN THE DAY. MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THIS WAS SO
IT WOULD BE TOO BAD. HE WOULD HAVE DONE HIS BEST. MR FOURIE SAID THAT
THE AFRICAN RESIDENTS SEEMED CONFIDENT THAT THEY COULD HANDLE THE
EXTREMISTS. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT WAS CERTAINLY HIS IMPRESSION
THAT THE PRESIDENTS WOULD DO ALL THEY COULD. HOWEVER THEIR EXPECTATIO
WAS MAJORITY RULE WITHIN, AT THE VERY MOST, THREE YEARS. IF THEIR
EXPECTATIONS WERE DISAPPOINTED BY NEGOTIATIONS WITH SMITH THEIR
ATTITUDE WOULD CHANGE AND IN THAT EVENT THEY WOULD GO FOR 10, 20
30 OR 40 YEARS OF STRUGGLE. HE WAS STILL NOT CONVINCED THAT SMITH
WAS THINKING REALISTICALLY ABOUT THE SITUATION. MR MCNALLY SAID
THAT THE MISSING PIECE IN THE PUZZLE WAS IN FACT MR SMITH'S
VIEW. UNLESS WE KNEW MORE ABOUT THIS, THERE MUST BE A DANGER OF A
CONFERENCE FAILING. THE ZAMBIANS TENDED TO BE UNREASONABLY
OPTIMISTIC ABOUT MR SMITH'S ATTITUDE. MR VORSTER SAID THAT MR SMITH
WOULD ACCEPT A FAIR AND REASONABLE AGREEMENT. IF SUCH AN AGREEMENT
WERE REACHED HE (MR VORSTER) WOULD HOLD HIMSELF RESPONSIBLE
FOR SEEING THAT IT WAS CARRIED OUT. BUT IF THE ANC WERE UNREASONABLE
AND THEY TOLD THE WHITES THAT THEY INSISTED ON HAVING MAJORITY
RULE TOMORROW, THERE WAS NO CHANCE OF REACHING AN AGREEMENT. MR
CALLAGHAN SAID THAT BEFORE HE PLUNGED INTO A CONFERENCE, HE WOULD
NEED TO KNOW MORE OF WHAT WAS IN MR SMITH'S MIND. MR VORSTER SAID
THAT MR SMITH WOULD WANT THE BEST POSSIBLE TERMS FOR THE WHITES,
... CONFIDENCE THAT HE COULD REACH AGREEMENT WITH THE BLACKS

BUT HE WAS CONFIDENT THAT HE COULD REACH AGREEMENT WITH THE BLACKS IF THEY WERE LEFT ALONE TO NEGOTIATE. OF COURSE THE BRITISH POSITION AT THE MOMENT WAS ONE OF A TRUSTEE, BUT SURELY IF A TRUSTEE WERE TO BE TOLD BY HIS WARDS THAT THEY NO LONGER NEEDED A TRUSTEE, THAT WOULD BE THAT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT WAS NOT CLEAR TO HIM HOW THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE ORGANISED. WOULD THERE BE PHASES OF NEGOTIATION LEADING TO A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE? WHAT WOULD BE THE BRITISH ROLE IF ANY? AND AT WHAT STAGE SHOULD WE COME INTO THE PICTURE? MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THE BRITISH WERE TO COME IN AT THIS MOMENT, THEY WOULD WRECK THE WHOLE THING. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED WHETHER ANYTHING WAS ACTUALLY HAPPENING IN RHODESIA AT THE MOMENT. HE WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO SEE THEM GET DOWN TO TALKS BUT SO FAR AS HE KNEW THEY HAD NOT YET DONE SO. MR VORSTER SAID THAT DELAY WAS ON THE ANC SIDE AS A RESULT OF THEIR NEW ORGANISATION. THERE WERE DIFFICULTIES OVER THE LEADERSHIP.

8. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IN THIS CONNECTION HE WANTED TO EXPLAIN WHAT HAD HAPPENED IN LUSAKA ABOUT HIS PROPOSED MEETING WITH THE ANC. IT WAS NOT HE WHO HAD ASKED FOR THIS MEETING. IT HAD BEEN SUGGESTED TO HIM BY THE ZAMBIANS AND HE HAD AGREED TO IT AND THE ZAMBIANS HAD THEREUPON TRIED TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS. SOMETHING HAD GONE WRONG IN RHODESIA AND IT SEEMED AS IF THE ORIGINAL ADMINISTRATIVE MUDDLE HAD NOW BEEN TURNED INTO A DEFINITE CONSIDERED REFUSAL BY MR SMITH OF PERMISSION FOR SOME OF THE ANC LEADERS TO LEAVE THE COUNTRY. HOWEVER, THE POINT HE WANTED TO EXPLAIN WAS THAT IT WAS NOT WE WHO WERE TAKING THE INITIATIVE IN SEEING THE ANC WE HAD SIMPLY BEEN RESPONDING TO THE ANC REQUEST TO SEE HIM WHICH HAD BEEN BACKED UP BY THE ZAMBIANS. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE QUESTION HAD NOT BEEN PROPERLY HANDLED AND IF THE REQUEST HAD BEEN MADE BY MR CALLAGHAN IT WOULD HAVE BEEN AGREED TO. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT WAS NOT REALLY HIS BUSINESS TO MAKE THE REQUEST AND HE WOULD NOT HAVE DONE SO. HE HAD LEFT IT TO THE ZAMBIANS. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THEY WOULD SEE WHETHER THERE WAS SOMETHING THEY COULD DO ABOUT THIS. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE STILL THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE USEFUL FOR HIM TO SEE THE ANC. IN THIS CONNECTION HE WANTED TO TELL MR VORSTER THAT MR CHIKEEMA OF FOLII(SIC) HAD TOLD A MEMBER OF HIS STAFF THAT THE POST CEASEFIRE KILLING OF SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE WAS A MISTAKE MUCH REGRETTED BY THE ANC AND CONTRARY TO THEIR POLICY. IT HAD BEEN DUE TO CONFUSION IN THE FIELD WHICH HE BLAMED ON THE REGIME'S ATTEMPTS TO TRANSMIT INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CEASE FIRE THEMSELVES (DROPPING OF LEAFLETS ETC) INSTEAD OF ALLOWING THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT TO DO THE JOB. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE NOTED THIS, BUT UNFORTUNATELY IT WAS NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT NEVERTHELESS IT LOOKED AS IF THE ANC WANTED THE VIOLENCE TO STOP. WHAT ABOUT THE

LOOKED AS IF THE ANC WANTED THE VIOLENCE TO STOP. WHAT ABOUT THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE WOULD BE WITHDRAWN AS SOON AS TERROR CEASED. ONCE HE GOT A REASONABLE ASSURANCE THAT TERRORISM WAS OVER THE POLICE WOULD BE WITHDRAWN.

9. MR CALLAGHAN SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO REVERT TO THE QUESTION OF A POSSIBLE CONFERENCE. SHOULD WE COME IN AT ALL? MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THE PARTIES REACHED AGREEMENT, THEY WOULD THEN REPORT TO THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT. MR CALLAGHAN ASKED WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF THEY BROKE DOWN. MR VORSTER SAID THAT IF THEY LOOKED LIKE BREAKING DOWN, HE WOULD HAVE TO DISCUSS THE QUESTION AGAIN WITH THOSE CONCERNED. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE HAD NO WISH TO PLUNGE INTO A CONFERENCE WHICH THEN FAILED THROUGH LACK OF PREPARATION MR VORSTER AGREED THAT A FAILED CONFERENCE WOULD DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD. MR MCNALLY SAID THAT THE CURIOUS THING WAS THAT THE AFRICANS HAD BEEN PRESSING ON US THE NEED FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. HAD THEY NOT PRESSED THIS ON THE SOUTH AFRICANS? MR VORSTER SAID NO. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THE THE AFRICAN PRESIDENTS HAD TOLD US THAT WE WERE BEING OVER CAUTIOUS AND IT WAS HIGH TIME THAT WE TOOK AN INITIATIVE AND CALLED A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THIS IDEA HAD BEEN RULED OUT AT THE FIRST TALKS HELD WITH THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AFRICAL PRESIDENTS. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IN THAT CASE THEY MUST HAVE CHANGED THEIR ATTITUDE, SINCE BOTH DR KAUNDA AND PRESIDENT SERETSE KHAMA HAD PRESSED HIM STRONGLY IN THIS SENSE, ONE OF THEM IN PUBLIC. HE WONDERED WHETHER THE CONFERENCE MIGHT BE A TWO-STAGE AFFAIR. DR MULLER SAID THAT PERHAPS MR CALLAGHAN COULD TAKE THE LINE THAT IT WAS UP THE PARTIES CONCERNED IN RHODESIA ST START NEGOTIATIONS AT THIS STAGE BUT AT A LATER STAGE, WHEN THEY HAD REACHED AGREEMENT, OR ALMOST REACHED AGREEMENT, THE BRITISH WOULD COME IN. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THAT WOULD BE CORRECT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE WANTED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT IT WAS NOT HE WHO WANTED TO GET INTO THIS ACT PREMATURELY. IT WAS THE AFRICANS WHO WERE PRESSING HIM TO DO SO. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THAT WAS CERTAINLY NOT THEIR ATTITUDE IN THE PAST. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THE AFRICANS OBVIOUSLY ENVISAGED A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE TAKING PLACE VERY SOON. HE FORESAW THAT THEY WOULD THEN DEMAND ONE MAN, ONE VOTE, TOMORROW. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THIS WOULD BE QUITE CONTRARY TO THE AGREEMENTS WHICH THEY HAD REACHED. THIS INDEED WAS THE POINT OF THE LAST MINUTE BREAKDOWN OVER THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENTS IN LUSAKA WHICH HAD TAKEN A FEW DAYS TO PUT RIGHT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT WHAT THE AFRICANS WERE ASKING US TO DO WAS TO CONVENE A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WITH BRITAIN IN THE CHAIR, THE VENUE BEING PREFERABLY LONDON BUT, IN ANY CASE NOT SALISBURY. DR MULLER SAID THAT PERHAPS THEY WERE THINKING OF THE FINAL CONFERENCE BEFORE CONSTITUTIONAL INDEPENDENCE AND HAD IN MIND ENDORSEMENT OF THE

SAID NO, WHAT THEY HAD IN MIND WAS THE BRITISH BEING ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS. MR DE ET(SIC) ASKED WHETHER THEY EXPECTED MR SMITH TO GO TO LONDON FOR THE CONFERENCE? MR CALLAGHAN SAID YES. THEY WERE AWARE OF THE LEGAL DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM MR SMITH'S REBELLION AGAINST THE CROWN BUT THIS COULD PROBABLY BE HANDLED. MR FOURIE SAID THAT MR SMITH'S ATTITUDE SO FAR AS HE KNEW WAS THAT THE CONFERENCE MUST BE IN RHODESIA. SOME PRELIMINARY TALKS WERE GOING ON NOW. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT WITHIN A MONTH FROM NOW THERE WOULD BE GREAT PRESSURE ON HIM TO TAKE SOME NEW INITIATIVE SUCH AS CALLING A CONFERENCE. MR MCNALLY SAID THAT THE LINE THE ZAMBIANS WERE TAKING WAS THAT WE WERE LETTING AN OPPORTUNITY SLIP IN NOT TAKING AN INITIATIVE NOW. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE WAS SURPRISED AT THIS TURN OF EVENTS. THE AFRICANS SEEMED TO HAVE CHANGED THEIR ATTITUDE ABOUT A CONFERENCE. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT MAYBE THE ANSWER WOULD BE A STAGED CONFERENCE. IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO ANNOUNCE SOON THAT THERE WOULD BE A CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE, BUT THAT THIS WOULD BE PRECEDED BY PREPARATORY TALKS BETWEEN THE PARTIES CONCERNED IN RHODESIA. THE DIFFICULTY WAS THE TIMING. THE AFRICANS WERE GETTING IMPATIENT FOR SOME ACTION ON THE BRITISH PART.

10. MR CAMPBELL SAID THAT IF THERE WERE SOME MOVEMENT IN RHODESIA SUCH AS TALKS GOING ON BETWEEN MR SMITH AND THE ANC THIS WOULD OF COURSE EASE THE PRESSURE ON US FOR AN EARLY INITIATIVE. BUT IF FOR THE NEXT THREE WEEKS NO TALKS TOOK PLACE, THE CEASE FIRE STILL DID NOT SEEM TO BE STICKING AND A GOOD MANY DETAINEES STILL REMAINED TO BE RELEASED, THEY IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO AVOID TAKING SOME FURTHER INITIATIVE. MR FOURIE SAID THAT THERE HAD BEEN SOME PROGRESS BUT NOTHING MUCH COULD BE EXPECTED IN A FEW WEEKS. IT TOOK TIME FOR CEASE FIRES TO BE MADE TO STICK. IT WAS CLEAR THAT AFRICAN GOVERNMENTS WERE STILL ACTING IN MANY WAYS AS IF THEY HAD NOT AGREED TO THE CEASE FIRE AND THEY WERE FOR EXAMPLE ALLOWING RADIO PROGRAMMES CALLING FOR CONTINUED ARMED STRUGGLE. MR SMITH FOR HIS PART THOUGHT THAT HE HAD CARRIED OUT HIS UNDERTAKING. LAST MONDAY HE HAD SAID THAT HE WAS AVAILABLE ANY DAY NEXT WEEK TO TALK TO THE ANC. THE ANC HOWEVER WERE IN A LEADERSHIP CRISIS AND THERE WAS GREAT DIFFICULTY OVER THE ATTITUDE OF ZANU. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT SEEMED ALL THE MORE NECESSARY FOR HIM IF POSSIBLE TO TALK TO THE ANC LEADERS WHILE HE WAS STILL IN SOUTHERN AFRICA. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THEY WOULD DO ALL IN THEIR POWER TO GET THIS ARRANGED. DR MULLER SAID THAT IT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL IF THE ANC LEADERS COULD BE INFLUENCED NOT TO SAY TOO MUCH PUBLICLY AT THIS DELICATE STAGE. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE AGREED. IF HE SAW THE ANC LEADERS HE WOULD USE PRIVATE CONVERSATION.

11. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE WANTED TO REPEAT THAT MR SMITH IN HIS OPINION HAD FAITHFULLY CARRIED OUT EVERY AGREEMENT HE HAD MADE

CARRIED OUT EVERY AGREEMENT. SO FAR, MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE HAD NOT MET MR SMITH AND MAYBE HE HAS (BYPD MSG) MISJUDGING HIM, BUT OTHERS WHO KNEW AND HAD NEGOTIATED WITH MR SMITH HAD WARNED HIM TO BEWARE OF HIM SINCE HE WAS NOT TO BE TRUSTED. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THIS WAS NOT HIS EXPERIENCE. MR SMITH HAD SHOWN COURAGE OVER THE RELEASE OF NKOMO AND SITHOLE. HE HAD DONE THIS WITHOUT CONSULTING HIS OWN CABINET. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT OTHERS HAD ALSO TAKEN RISKS. MR VORSTER, DR KAUNDA AND HE HIMSELF HAD ALL BEEN WILLING TO TAKE RISKS AND OBVIOUSLY THIS HAD TO BE DONE IF WE WERE EVER TO GET A SETTLEMENT. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE WAS SURE THAT MR SMITH WOULD GO A LONG WAY TO GET A SETTLEMENT AND WOULD STICK TO IT ONCE IT WAS REACHED. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE WOULD GLADLY ACCEPT AND ACT ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT MR VORSTER'S VIEW WAS CORRECT. WE FOR OUR PART WOULD DO OUR BEST. (SUBSEQUENTLY, ON THE WAY TO THE AIRPORT, MULLER TOLD THE SECRETARY OF STATE THAT THE SOUTH AFRICANS WERE CONVINCED THAT MR SMITH REALISED THAT TIME WAS RUNNING OUT FOR HIM AND THAT HE MUST BE PREPARED TO MAKE THE NECESSARY CONCESSIONS QUICKLY).

12. MR CALLAGHAN DISCUSSED AND AGREED WITH MR VORSTER THE GENERAL LINE TO BE TAKEN IN TALKING TO THE PRESS.
SIMONSTOWN.

13. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT SINCE HE HAPPENED TO HAVE HAD THIS OPPORTUNITY TO MEET MR VORSTER, HE WOULD LIKE TO RAISE TWO OR THREE OTHER MATTERS OF MUTUAL INTEREST OF WHICH THE FIRST WAS SIMONSTOWN. WE WOULD NOW PROPOSE TO ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT WITH A VIEW TO BRINGING THE AGREEMENT TO AN END. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE ACCEPTED THIS. HE WOULD AWAIT OUR APPROACH MEANWHILE HE HOPED THERE WAS NO QUESTION OF ALLOWING THE AGREEMENT TO 'WITHER ON THE LINE'? MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT WAS HE WHO HAD USED THIS PHRASE. HE THOUGHT IN FACT THAT THE AGREEMENT WAS VERY RIPE AND WOULD WITHER IF NOT BROUGHT TO AN END AS WE INTENDED. OUR IDEA WAS TO ASK FOR FACILITIES ON A CUSTOMER BASIS. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE WOULD NOT PREJUDGE THE ISSUE BY MAKING ANY COMMENT AT THIS STAGE. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THE AMBASSADOR WOULD BE IN TOUCH IN DUE COURSE.

NAMIBIA.

14. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT HE HAD RECENTLY ANNOUNCED OUR NEW POLICY IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND MR VORSTER WOULD HAVE SEEN OUR STATEMENT. SINCE THEN THERE HAD BEEN A RESOLUTION IN THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL FOR WHICH WE HAD VOTED. WE HAD DONE OUR BEST TO GET THIS RESOLUTION IN CONSTRUCTIVE FORM AND WE HAD VOTED FOR IT. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT WERE GRATEFUL TO HIM OVER THE VETO OF THE EXPULSION RESOLUTION IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL. MR CALLAGHAN SAID WE DID NOT WANT THANKS. AS MR VORSTER KNEW WE HAD VOTED ON THE BASIS OF PRINCIPLE. SINCE, IN OUR VIEW, IT WAS

WE HAD VOTED ON THE BASIS OF PRINCIPLE SINCE IN OUR VIEW IT WAS IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN THE UNIVERSAL CHARACTER OF THE UN AND NOT TO DRIVE COUNTRIES OUT OF THE ORGANISATION BECAUSE OF THEIR POLICIES. DR MULLER EXPRESSED APPRECIATION OF THE COOPERATION AT THE UN OF MR IVOR RICHAR. OF COURSE THERE WERE POLICY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US BUT THERE WERE CERTAIN THINGS ON WHICH WE COULD COOPERATE. WE BOTH NEEDED TO TRY TO CURB HARRASSMENT POLICIES OF THE MAJORITY AT THE UN. SOUTH AFRICA WERE VERY DISAPPOINTED AT THE GENERAL TREND IN THE UN AND THEY WERE STILL UNCLEAR WHETHER THEY WOULD STAY IN THE ORGANISATION. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THIS WAS OF COURSE A DECISION FOR THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT. AS TO SOUTH WEST AFRICA, WOULD IT NOT BE POSSIBLE TO GIVE SOME KIND OF SOLEMN DECLARATION TO THE UN ABOUT RESPECTING THE WISHES OF THE INHABITANTS AND NOT SPLITTING UP THE TERRITORY? MR VORSTER SAID THAT HE COULD GIVE NO UNDERTAKING ABOUT KEEPING THE TERRITORY AS A WHOLE. IT WAS FOR THE PEOPLES OF THE TERRITORY TO DECIDE WHETHER THEY WISHED TO REMAIN AS ONE COUNTRY OR NOT AND WHETHER TO FEDERATE OR NOT. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IT WOULD SURELY BE POSSIBLE TO EXPRESS AN OPINION ON THE SUBJECT MR VORSTER SAID HE WAS NOT PREPARED TO EXPRESS SUCH AN OPINION. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT IN THAT EVENT THERE WAS BOUND TO BE A SUSPICION THAT SOUTH AFRICA WAS TRYING TO BREAK THE COUNTRY UP. MR VORSTER REPLIED THAT THE PEOPLES HAD THEIR ELECTED LEADERS. HE HAD ALREADY ARRANGED FOR REGULAR MEETINGS OF THESE ELECTED LEADERS. THERE WAS TO BE AN ELECTION THIS VERY MONTH. HIS ATTITUDE WAS THAT THE PEOPLES MUST FIND THEIR OWN SOLUTIONS. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THERE WOULD BE DANGERS IN THE COUNTRY SPLITTING UP. IF THIS HAPPENED SOUTH AFRICA WOULD BE STRONGLY CRITICISED. MR VORSTER SAID IT WAS NOT HIS FAULT THAT SWAPO BOYCOTTED THE ELECTIONS SOUTH AFRICA COULD NOT ACCEPT SWAPO AS THE SOLE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SOUTH WEST AFRICAN PEOPLES. HE DID NOT THINK THAT THEIR DESTINY WOULD WORK OUT AS ONE COUNTRY. IF THEY CAME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THEY DID INDEED WANT TO BE ONE COUNTRY THEN THEY WOULD HAVE HIS BLESSING AND HE WOULD RESPECT THEIR CHOICE. HE WAS SORRY THAT MR CALLAGHAN HAD SEEN THE SWAPO LEADERS AS THIS ENCOURAGED THEM. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT WE KNEW THAT MR VORSTER DISAPPROVED OF SWAPO. BUT OUR POLICY WAS TO BUILD UP CONTACTS WITH THEM AND HELP THEM IN VARIOUS WAYS. WE DID NOT REGARD THEM AS THE SOLE REPRESENTATIVES OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA BUT WE THOUGHT THEY WERE NEVERTHELESS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT WITH WHOM WE SHOULD MAINTAIN CONTACT. MR VORSTER SAID THAT HOWEVER THIS MIGHT BE THE PEOPLES WOULD DECIDE. SOUTH AFRICA.

15. MR CALLAGHAN REMARKED THAT IN MANY WAYS THE POSITION OF SOUTH AFRICA WOULD BE IMPROVED IF ONCE PROGRESS HAD BEEN MADE OVER THE QUESTION OF RHODESIA AND SOUTH WEST AFRICA. DR MULLER SAID THAT SOUTH AFRICA ALWAYS SEEMED TO BE CRITICISED INTERNATIONALLY

QUESTION OF RHODESIA AND SOUTH WEST AFRICA. DR MULLER SAID THAT SOUTH AFRICA, ALWAYS SEEMED TO BE CRITICISED INTERNATIONALLY WHATEVER NEW INITIATIVE THEY TRIED TO TAKE. MR CALLAGHAN SAID THAT THE TROUBLE WAS THAT SOUTH AFRICA WAS INTERNATIONALLY UNPOPULAR. THERE WAS VERY STRONG FEELING IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IN MANY OTHER COUNTRIES ABOUT THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID. HOWEVER, IN HIS STATEMENT IN DECEMBER IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ABOUT BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS SOUTHERN AFRICA HE HAD MADE IT CLEAR THAT HMG WERE IN FAVOUR OF CONTINUED BUSINESS AND TRADING RELATIONS WITH SOUTH AFRICA. DR MULLER SAID THAT ANY CHANGES IN SOUTH AFRICA HAD ALREADY TAKEN PLACE AND MORE WOULD DO SO. MR VORSTER SAID THAT THIS WAS INDEED SO. FOR EXAMPLE ONE OF THE HOMELANDS AT LEAST WOULD GET THEIR INDEPENDENCE THIS YEAR AND OTHERS WOULD GET THEIRS IN DUE COURSE. SOME OF THEM WOULD BE A GOOD DEAL BETTER ENDOWED THAN FOR EXAMPLE LESOTHO.

ENDS

RITCHIE