

# Britain and Rhodesia: The Route to Settlement

edited by

Dr Michael Kandiah &  
Dr Sue Onslow

ICBH Oral History Programme



# **Britain and Rhodesia: The Route to Settlement**

**The ICBH is grateful to the Institute of Historical Research for its support of the witness seminar programme.**

**ICBH Oral History Programme  
Programme Director: Dr Michael D. Kandiah**

© Institute of Contemporary British History, 2008

All rights reserved. This material is made available for use for personal research and study. We give permission for the entire files to be downloaded to your computer for such personal use only. For reproduction or further distribution of all or part of the file (except as constitutes fair dealing), permission must be sought from CCBH.

Published by  
Institute of Contemporary British History  
King's College London  
Strand  
London WC2R 2LS

ISBN: 1-905165-23-4

ISBN-13: 978-1-905165-23-0

**Britain and Rhodesia:  
Route to Settlement**

---

**Edited by Dr Michael Kandiah and Dr Sue  
Onslow**

**Seminar held 5 July 2005  
at The National Archives, Kew**

**Organised by:**

**Institute of Contemporary British History  
The Cold War Studies Centre, LSE  
The National Archives**



# Contents

Contributors	9
Citation Guidance	11
Questions for Consideration, Sue Onslow	13
Chronology, Sue Onslow	17
Seminar Transcript	
Session One	49
Session Two	79
Session Three	107
Interview with Sir Michael Palliser	129





## Contributors

### *Chairs:*

- PROFESSOR TERENCE RANGER, FBA** Rhodes Professor of Race Relations, and Fellow of St Antony's College, University of Oxford, 1987–97, now Emeritus Professor and Fellow.
- PROFESSOR ARNE WESTAD** Cold War Studies Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science

### *Participants:*

- SIR BRIAN BARDER KCMG** Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Head of Central and Southern, later Southern African Department, 1978–82.
- R. A. C. BYATT, CMG** Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Head of Rhodesia Department, 1972–75; HM High Commissioner in Zimbabwe, 1980–83.
- THE Rt. Hon. THE LORD CARRINGTON, KG GCMG, CH, MC, PC** Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, 1979–82.
- SIR DEREK M. DAY KCMG** HM Ambassador to Ethiopia, 1975–78; Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Assistant Under-Secretary of State, 1979, Deputy Under-Secretary of State, 1980.
- JOHN F. DOBLE, OBE** HM Diplomatic Service, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Commonwealth Department, 1977–78; HM Ambassador to Maputo, 1978–81.
- SIR JOHN GRAHAM BART., GCMG** Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Deputy Under-Secretary of State, 1977–79; HM Ambassador to Iran, 1979–80.
- ROBERT JACKSON** Member of European Parliament (Conservative) Upper Thames, 1979–84. Special Adviser to Governor of Southern Rhodesia (Lord Soames), 1979–80.
- THE Hon. PETER JAY** HM Ambassador to the USA, 1977–79.
- DAME ROSEMARY SPENCER, DCMG** First Secretary (Economic), Lagos, 1974–77; Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Assistant Head of Rhodesia Department, 1977–80.
- THE Rt. Hon. THE LORD STEEL OF AIKWOOD KBE, PC, DL** MP (Liberal 1965–88, Liberal Democrat 1988–97) for Roxburgh Selkirk and Peebles, 1965–82 and for Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale, 1983–97. Leader of Liberal Party, 1976–88. President, Anti-Apartheid Movement of Great Britain, 1966–69.

- DAVID M. SUMMERHAYES, CMG** Minister, Pretoria/Cape Town, 1974–78.
- WILFRED TURNER, CMG CVO & MRS TURNER** High Commissioner to Botswana, 1977–81.
- SIR PEREGRINE WORSTHORNE, KT** *Daily Telegraph*, 1953–61; Deputy Editor, *Sunday Telegraph*, 1961–76, Associate Editor, 1976–86, Editor, 1986–89.

*From the floor*

- DR RICHARD COGGINS** Magdalen College, Oxford
- DR PETER HENSHAW** University of Western Ontario, Canada
- DR DONAL LOWRY** Oxford Brookes University
- DR DAVID MOORE** University of KwaZulu-Natal
- DR PHILIP MURPHY** University of Reading
- BRIAN OLIVER** Assistant Secretary and then Under-Secretary to the Rhodesian Cabinet
- PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER SAUNDERS** University of Cape Town
- PROFESSOR VLADMIR SHUBIN** Russian Academy of Sciences

# Citation Guidance

References to this and other witness seminars should take the following form:

Witness name, in 'Witness Seminar Title', seminar held [date of seminar], (Institute of Contemporary British History, [date of publication], [full internet address of seminar]), page number of reference [use the number given in the header at the top of the page referenced].

For example, Peter Jay's comments about US involvement in the Carter-Callaghan period should be footnoted as follows:

Peter Jay, in 'Britain and Rhodesia: Route to Settlement', seminar held 5 June 2005 (Institute of Contemporary British History, 2008, <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ich/witness/diplomatic/Rhodesia2.aspx/>), pp.60-2.

For Harvard reference style, use (CCBH Witness Seminar, date of publication) in the text, and the following style in the bibliography:

'Witness Seminar Title', held [date of seminar], Institute of Contemporary British History, [date of publication], [full internet address of seminar].

For fuller guidance on the citation of all types of electronic sources, please refer to the H-Net Guide at:

<http://www2.h-net.msu.edu/about/citation/general.html>



# Questions for Consideration

## Sue Onslow

The Rhodesian issue posed a highly complex problem to British policy makers. Since 1923, Southern Rhodesia had enjoyed unique colonial arrangements with the British Crown, in her fiscal and administrative autonomy, control over the judiciary and police. In the immediate post-war period there had been an expectation that Southern Rhodesia would swiftly move to Dominion status. The country's amalgamation with Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland in the ill-fated Central African Federation between 1953 and 1963, and the dissolution of this experiment in multi-racial federation, left Salisbury in the enhanced position of improved defence and commercial links with the Republic of South Africa, as well as her own sizeable military capability. Despite pressure from the British Government, the Rhodesian Front Government held firmly to its view of entitlement to independence on the basis of the 1961 Constitution, refusing to consider modification of land ownership or widening the franchise. For London, there was also the emotive complication of 'kith and kin' – the substantial post-war emigration to Southern Rhodesia had swelled the white population to approximately 230,000.

Between 1965 and 1979, the international community looked to London as the formal colonial power, to resolve the issue of UDI. This responsibility was also emphasised by successive British governments, seeking to manage the potentially disastrous international repercussions of the lengthy crisis (most notably, upon the UK's substantial economic and defence interests in South Africa). The progressive adoption of mandatory sanctions against the Salisbury regime was designed expressly to rule out the use of force, while obliging the Smith regime to resume negotiations with the British government, or to precipitate the overthrow of the Rhodesian Front government. Yet, as London was all too well aware, the UK had few cards to play in her dealings with the Rhodesian Front Government and to achieve constitutional independence acceptable to the international community. The black majority in Rhodesia was in reality struggling to acquire independence from the white Rhodesian government, not the British Crown. Supported by Portuguese and, more importantly, South African assistance, Rhodesia's ability to withstand international pressure was manifest in the ensuing protracted negotiations: secret consultations between Smith and the beleaguered British Governor, Sir Humphrey Gibbs; successive British delegations and visitations, which culminated first in the failed talks on *HMS Tiger* in December 1966, then the discussions on *HMS Fearless* in October 1968. The Heath Government's renewed attempt to resolve the issue in the Pearce Commission failed when the constitutional proposals failed to satisfy the fifth principle: namely, that the independence settlement 'should be acceptable to the Rhodesian people as a whole'.

Between 1972 and 1975 there were three key developments on the Rhodesian domestic scene and in the international arena that fundamentally altered the dynamics of the Rhodesian question. First, the renewed African nationalist insurgency against the Rhodesian forces, leading to an increasingly bloody and intractable civil war; secondly, the collapse of the Portuguese empire in Mozambique and Angola, and thirdly the South African government's pursuit of *détente*, prompted by fear of radical black nationalism and its intersection with expanded Soviet and Cuban influence. This led to another approach by the Callaghan Government and the US Secretary of State, Dr Henry Kissinger, to resolve the thorny Rhodesia issue. Although this renewed attempt at settlement led the abortive Geneva Conference of 1976, in course of discussions with the American Secretary of State, Ian Smith had conceded the necessity of a transition of power within two years.

In the search for settlement, there were a myriad of issues which appeared to demand British attention, and which impinged upon British policy on the Rhodesia issue. We welcome the Witness Seminar's panels' consideration of the following aspects of final resolution of the problem:

1. Overall, what were the roots of British policy towards Rhodesia between 1977 and the final achievement of internationally recognised independence in April 1980?
2. How important was the British political scene?
  - the fragility of the Labour Government's parliamentary majority between 1977 and 1979?
  - opinion within Cabinet?
  - the impact of the Rhodesian question on the Conservative party, regularly brought to the fore by the annual need to renew sanctions legislation?
3. How important were personality and political relationships within government and the Foreign Office in influencing the formation or presentation of policy?
4. How far was the fractured nature of African nationalism, and Britain's inability to separate Joshua Nkomo from Robert Mugabe, an impediment to peaceful settlement before 1979?
5. How important was South Africa?
  - the associated issue of South West Africa, in underpinning international co-operation how helpful was Vorster and Pik Botha?
  - to what extent did South Africa become more problematic after P. W. Botha's appointment as Prime Minister?
6. How influential were the attitudes and diplomacy of the Front Line States?
7. To what extent was the Anglo-American relationship the key element in resolving the Rhodesian issue?
  - the importance of the inauguration of President Jimmy Carter?
  - the variety of personality and opinion within the American Administration on the Rhodesian question?
  - opinion within the United States' Congress, and pressure upon the Administration to lift sanctions?
8. How influential was the role of the international community?
  - the 'old' Commonwealth, particularly Canada and Australia?
  - The 'new' Commonwealth, in particular Nigeria?
  - The Commonwealth Secretary General, Sir Shridath Ramphal?
  - the United Nations?
  - the Organisation of African Unity?
  - the Non-Aligned Movement?
  - Members of the European Community? How far was this organisation a help or

hindrance?

9. To what extent was concern over Soviet/Cuban support and infiltration of Southern Africa a factor in British policy and diplomacy (in addition, Yugoslav and East German support and training).
10. How important a 'learning curve' was the Geneva Conference, and in what ways?
11. How far did successive diplomatic efforts by Britain between 1977 and 1979 help to change the Rhodesian scene to Britain's advantage?
12. Why was the Lusaka Conference a success? Who were the key players in achieving the outcome?
13. Why did Lancaster House Conference succeed whereas so many previous attempts at negotiated settlement had failed?
14. To what extent was this a combination of Rhodesian readiness for settlement, or should greater emphasis be placed on effective British diplomacy?
  - How far the product of 'pre-determined conference tactics' and clarity of goal?
  - How far the result of 'management, and the step-by-step process'?
  - Was it a question of *lack* of superpower involvement?
15. To what extent was success achieved because of the British governments 'perceived partiality', or adroit use of bluff?
16. How far was it achieved because the 'Tory right wing were 'neutralised'?
17. How important were 'external actors'? What part did the USA, the Front Line Presidents and South Africa play?
19. How important was Lord Soames's management of the transitional period?

*Sources:*

David Owen: *Time to Declare*.

David Owen: *Speaking Personally to Kenneth Harris*.

Michael Charlton: *The Last Colony in Africa. Diplomacy and Independence of Rhodesia*.

Cyrus Vance: *Hard Choices*.

Lord Carrington: *Reflect on Things Past*.

Jeffrey Davidow: *A Peace in Southern Africa: The Lancaster House Conference on Rhodesia 1979*.





## Chronology

- 1965 11 Nov UDI declared by Rhodesian government, and a new constitution published. Britain immediately invokes selective sanctions.
- 12 Nov Harold Wilson, British Prime Minister, declares UDI illegal (henceforth known as IDI) and an act of rebellion.
- 19 Nov UN Security Council Resolution declares UDI illegal and calls on Britain to end the rebellion.
- 3 Dec British Government suspends Governor and Directors of Reserve Bank of Rhodesia and freezes Rhodesian reserves in Britain.
- 12 Dec Britain imposes total economic sanctions against Rhodesia (renewed annually).
- 16 Dec Mr Wilson, appeals to UNO for support to end Rhodesian rebellion. Mr Wilson rules out use of force, and states British responsibility for addressing the problem.
- 17 Dec British government declares oil embargo against Rhodesia. Air lift of oil commences to Zambia.
- 1966 14 Jan Lagos Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference. Mr Wilson accepts use of force cannot be ruled out.
- 25 Jan Mr Wilson informs Parliament that no negotiations can be held with the illegal regime but the Governor (Sir Humphrey Gibbs) is authorised to talk at any time about a return to constitutional rule. Any constitutional developments would have to be based on the five principles, to which the sixth is now added (NIBMAR).
- 10 Apr UNO Security Council agrees that Britain should use force to prevent oil reaching Rhodesia via Beira (Mozambique).
- 27 Apr Mr Wilson announces informal talks at official level with Rhodesia.
- 15 Sep Communiqué issued after Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London details steps by which Britain might restore constitutional rule. Force is ruled out.
- 2 Dec Mr Wilson and Mr Smith meet on HMS Tiger to discuss possibility of settlement.
- 5 Dec Rhodesian Government accepts the six principles as the basis for a settlement. However, British proposals are rejected on the grounds that the investiture of the Governor with legislative powers and the dissolution of parliament cannot be tolerated.
- 16 Dec On application of British Government, UNO votes for selected mandatory sanctions (including oil) against Rhodesia.
- 20 Dec Mr Wilson announces in House of Commons that there will be no independence for Rhodesia before African majority rule.

- 1967 14 Jun Lord Alport (former High Commissioner to Central African Federation) visit to Rhodesia to discover whether stalemate can be broken.
- 26 Jul Announcement of new British initiative: whether HMS Tiger constitutional proposals can be renegotiated through Sir Humphrey Gibbs, by correspondence.
- 1968 29 May UNO Security Council approval of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia, proposed by Britain (Resolution 253).
- 10-13 Oct HMS *Fearless* talks between Mr Smith and Mr Wilson. British proposals for a settlement based on the Tiger proposals are tabled; some concessions over procedures for return to legality are included. A joint statement on 13 Oct states that the talks had ended without agreement 'on fundamental issues'.
- 2 Nov Mr George Thomson and Mr Foley (PUSS at the FCO) visit Rhodesia for talks which end in deadlock.
- 7 Nov Talks held separately with detailed nationalist leaders, Mr Joshua Nkomo (ZAPU) and Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole (ZANU).
- 1969 18 Nov Announcement of Rhodesian rejection of HMS *Fearless*' proposals.
- 20 Jun Rhodesian referendum on new Constitution and Republican status.
- 24 Jun Sir Humphrey Gibbs resigns as Governor of Rhodesia.
- 14 Jul British Residual Mission in Salisbury, and Rhodesia House in London, both closed.
- Nov Passage of Constitution Bill, Land Tenure Bill (dividing the country into European, African and national areas under which Europeans and Africans hold equal amounts of land) and an Electoral Bill, dividing Rhodesians electorally on a racial basis.
- 1970 2 Mar Rhodesia becomes a Republic and new Constitution takes effect.
- 17 Mar Britain and America use veto in UNO Security Council to avoid implementation of complete mandatory sanctions.
- 2 Jul The recently elected Conservative Government declares it will make a further effort to find 'a sensible and just solution' to the Rhodesian problem.
- 9 Nov Sir Alec Douglas-Home (Foreign Secretary) informs Parliament that contact has been made with the Rhodesian Government to determine whether a basis exists for renewing negotiations.
- 1971 30 Jun Arrival of Lord Goodman, British special envoy for talks with Rhodesian officials.
- 15 Nov Arrival of Sir Alec Douglas-Home, British Foreign Secretary, in Salisbury to discuss settlement proposals.
- 24 Nov Sir Alec and Mr Smith sign an agreement setting out proposals for settlement.

- 25 Nov Proposals for the settlement based on the five principals are outlined in Parliament. Under these, the 1969 Rhodesian Constitution (which permanently denied Africans a majority in the House of Assembly) would be modified. The African franchise would be considerably widened, and provision for unimpeded progress towards majority rule made. A justifiable Declaration of Rights, to reduce discrimination and promote racial harmony, is also proposed, and a commission of enquiry is to be set up to look at the question of discriminatory legislation.  
In addition, British aid of £50m over 10 years is to be made available for economic and educational development in African areas; this would be matched by the Rhodesian Government.  
The package would be submitted to the Rhodesian people for approval, with a test of acceptability to be conducted by a commission appointed by the British government and led by Lord Pearce.
- 16 Dec The African National Council is set up as a temporary non-political body under Bishop Abel Muzorewa to oppose the settlement terms.
- 1972 11 Jan Pearce Commission arrives in Rhodesia to conduct test of acceptability of settlement proposals.
- 10 Mar The ANC is transformed into a political organisation, calling for a constitutional conference.
- 11 Mar Pearce Commission leaves Rhodesia.
- 23 May Publication of Pearce Commission Report, that settlement proposals were not acceptable to 'the people of Rhodesia as a whole'.
- 31 May US Senate votes against re-imposition of embargo on Rhodesian chrome.
- Nov Sir Alec Douglas-Home declares the government's belief 'that to ensure a harmonious future, the proposals for a settlement must now come from the Rhodesians'.
- 21 Dec Attack on Altena farm in Centenary area. Marks beginning of upsurge of insurgency activity.
- 1973 9 Jan Rhodesian border with Zambia closed, on condition that Zambia would cease to harbour guerrillas. (reopened by Rhodesia 4 Feb, though Zambian side remains closed).
- 22 May Britain and US veto UNO Security Council Resolution to extend sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 21-25 Jun British delegation, led by Sir Denis Greenhill (PUS, FCO) visit to Rhodesia for talks with Rhodesian civil servants and Bishop Muzorewa.
- 27 Jun Sir Alec Douglas-Home, addressing the House of Commons, urges Europeans and Africans to try to seek solutions to their problems between themselves. No settlement would be stable without a greater measure of agreement between Europeans and Africans.
- 17 Jul First official meeting between Mr Smith and Bishop Muzorewa (ANC).

- 1974    2 Mar    ANC inaugural conference agree on a mandate for continuing talks with the Rhodesian regime.
- 18 Mar    Mr Callaghan (now Foreign Secretary following Feb 1974 British General Election) announces in the House of Commons: ‘There is still one area of Southern Africa which remains a specifically British responsibility – Rhodesia’.
- 2 Jun    Joint proposals agreed between Bishop Muzorewa and Mr Smith, based on the 1971 Constitutional proposals and laid before the ANC Central Committee, are rejected, but further talks encouraged.
- 3 Jul    An ANC delegation tells the British Government it is not prepared to continue talks with the Mr Smith regime, but wants a constitutional conference attended by Britain and detained nationalist leaders.
- 31 Jul    Victory of Rhodesian Front (all 50 seats) in Rhodesian general election. Although the ANC boycotted the election, ANC supporters successfully contested 6:8 elected African seats as independents.
- Nov-Dec    Meetings held in Lusaka attended by Presidents of Botswana, Tanzania and Zambia, leaders of the four Rhodesian nationalist groups and representatives of the Rhodesian regime. Mr Nkomo and the Rev Sithole are allowed out of detention in Rhodesia to attend.
- 9 Dec    Leaders of African Nationalist movements sign the Lusaka Declaration, uniting ZAPU, ZANU, FROLIZO and ANC under UANC and chairmanship of Bishop Muzorewa.
- 11 Dec    Although the Lusaka Declaration established that negotiations between the UANC and the Rhodesian regime were to be held without preconditions, a ceasefire arranged and detained nationalist leaders and their followers released, the agreement is interpreted differently by the two sides. This is particularly on the implementation and status of the agreed ceasefire.
- 1975    Jan    The Rhodesian regime halts the release of nationalist detainees, alleging that the ceasefire is not being observed. The UANC claim that agreements on freedom of political activity for Africans are not being honoured.
- 14 Jan    Following a visit to African countries (Zambia, Botswana, Malawi, Tanzania, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa) Mr Callaghan announces in Parliament that he believes there is ‘a greater degree of understanding’ over the Rhodesia question ‘between Britain and the African governments than at any time since UDI’. He also discussed with South African Prime Minister BJ Vorster ways of achieving an agreement settlement between the two sides in Rhodesia.
- 15 Mar    Mr Smith and senior Ministers visit to South Africa for talks.
- 18 Mar    Rhodesia’s Diplomatic Mission in Lisbon told to leave by 30 April.
- 15 Jun    Meeting between Mr Smith and UANC ends in deadlock over venue for constitutional conference.

- 9 Aug After talks in London, Mr Callaghan and Bishop Muzorewa announce they have agreed to 'continue their efforts to bring discussions about and secure a successful constitutional conference'.
- 13 Aug The Pretoria Agreement, announcing a constitutional conference to be held in South African Railways coaches on Victoria Falls Bridge. This is signed by Mark Chona, President Kaunda's special adviser.
- 25 Aug Conference at Victoria Falls Bridge, attended also by President Kaunda and Prime Minister Vorster.
- 26 Aug Deadlock at Victoria Falls Conference.
- 4 Sep Split emerges within UANC, between ZAPU led by Mr Nkomo and Bishop Muzorewa and the Rev. Sithole in Lusaka.
- Nov The Zimbabwe People's Army (ZIPRA) set up in Mozambique by guerrilla leaders. Guerrilla cadres are chiefly ZANU members; Robert Mugabe becomes ZIPRA spokesman.
- Dec Negotiations open between Mr Smith and Mr Nkomo.
- 1976 3 Mar Following border clashes, President Machel of Mozambique announces the closure of the border with Rhodesia, and the application in full of UN sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 19 Mar Talks between Mr Smith and Mr Nkomo break down over the timing of majority rule, the extent of the franchise and the composition of an interim government. Mr Smith said he believed Britain 'should now actively assist in resolving the constitutional issue in Rhodesia'.
- 22 Mar Following earlier contacts between the British Government and the Rhodesian regime (including an exploratory mission by Lord Greenhill), Mr Callaghan proposes in Parliament a two stage operation for a peaceful settlement:
1. Prior agreement by all parties to a number of preconditions.
    - a. Acceptance of the principle of majority rule.
    - b. Elections for majority rule to take place in 18-24 months.
    - c. Agreement that there will be no independence before majority rule.
    - d. The negotiations must not be long drawn out.
 Assurances would be needed that the transition to majority rule and to an independent Rhodesia would not be thwarted and would be orderly.
  2. the negotiation of the actual terms of the independence constitution.
- 2 Apr Proposals endorsed by Heads of Government of the European Community.
- 25 Apr After discussing the Rhodesian situation with the Foreign Secretary Mr Crosland, the US Secretary of State, Dr Kissinger, announces that the American and British views on Rhodesia are identical and that the US Government strongly support Mr Callaghan's proposals.
- 27 Apr During a tour of 7 African countries, Dr Kissinger emphasises in Lusaka the US commitment to an early negotiated settlement and urges acceptance of Mr Callaghan's proposals.

- 8 Aug 300 terrorists killed in Mozambique, following Mr Smith warning of possible 'hot pursuit' operations if attacks across Mozambique/Rhodesian border continued.
- 4 Sep Prime Minister Vorster and Secretary of State Dr Henry Kissinger meet in Zurich.
- 13 Sep Mr Smith meeting with Mr Vorster in Pretoria.
- 19 Sep Mr Smith meeting with Dr Kissinger in Pretoria. Dr Kissinger presents Mr Smith with a discussion paper containing a set of draft proposals aimed at solving the constitutional issue.
- 24 Sep Mr Smith's broadcast to Rhodesian nation that he has accepted the Kissinger proposals for majority rule in two years, conditional upon the removal of sanctions and end of the insurgency. Mr Smith announces that the Kissinger proposals also provided for representatives of the Rhodesian Government and African leaders 'to meet immediately at a mutually agreed place' to organise an interim government. This would comprise a Council of State with equal numbers of black and white members, nominated by their respective sides, and a white chairman without a special vote; and a Council of Ministers with a majority of African members and an African First Minister, taking decisions by a two-thirds majority. For the period of the interim government, the Minister of Defence and Law and Order would be white. When the interim government was established, sanctions would be lifted and all acts of war, including guerrilla warfare, would cease. Substantial economic support would be made available by the international community to stimulate the Rhodesian economy.
- 26 Sep The Presidents of Zambia, Angola, Botswana, Mozambique and Tanzania (the Front Line States) issue a statement in which, while discounting the proposals as outlined by Mr Smith, they call upon Britain immediately to convene a conference outside Rhodesia with 'the authentic and legitimate representatives of the people' to discuss the structure and functions of the transitional government and to set it up, to discuss the modalities for convening a full constitutional conference to work out the independence constitution, and to establish the basis upon which peace and normality could be restored in the territory.
- 29 Sep Mr Crosland announces that Britain has decided to convene a conference to discuss the formation of an interim government.
- 9 Oct Formation of a joint 'Patriotic Front' announced by Mr Nkomo (ZAPU) and Mr Mugabe (ZANU). A joint statement declares that the front has 'decided to intensify the armed liberation struggle until the achievement of victory'. The co-leaders agree to attend any conference as a joint delegation under joint leadership.
- 28 Oct Opening of Geneva Conference on Kissinger Plan, under chairmanship of Mr Ivor Richard.  
Delegations representing the Rhodesia Front (led by Mr Smith), and nationalist movements (led by Mr Nkomo, Bishop Muzorewa, Rev. Sithole and Mr Mugabe) attend. Plenary sessions are also attended by government observers

- from Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia, and representatives of the Organisation of African Unity and the Commonwealth Secretariat. After discussing a possible date for independence, the conference turns to the central issue of the structure and functions of an interim government. The nationalists were not prepared to negotiate on the basis of the five points accepted by Mr Smith.
- 3 Nov Mr Smith returns to Salisbury, leaving P K van der Byl (Minister of Foreign Affairs) to head Rhodesian delegation.
- 12 Nov Britain renews sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 12 Dec Mr Smith returns from visit to Geneva Conference.
- 14 Dec Geneva talks adjourned until 17 Jan 1977.
- 29 Dec Formation of ZUPO (Zimbabwe United People's Organisation).
- 1977 1 Jan Ivor Richard arrives in Rhodesia to present new British proposals.
- Jan Inauguration of President Carter.
- 11 Jan Reopening of Geneva Conference postponed.
- 19 Jan Beginning a second round of consultations in Africa, Mr Richard presents a document embodying the ideas already discussed. The plan provides for a transitional government to be headed by an Interim Commissioner appointed by Britain, and a Council of Ministers with a substantial African majority. The Council of Ministers would have full executive and legislative competence, subject to the Interim Commissioner's reserve powers in certain matters (primarily external affairs, defence, internal security and the implementation of the independence programme.) These powers would enable the Commissioner to ensure a smooth transition to majority rule and independence. A National Security Council, presided over by the Interim Commissioner, would be responsible for defence and security and for ensuring effective government control of the defence and security forces. The Council of Ministers would implement the independence programme and work out a constitution. For this purpose it would appoint a constitutional committee presided over by the Interim Commissioner, and representative of the political groupings.  
The proposals are accepted as a basis for negotiation by the FLS and by all the nationalist leaders.
- 24 Jan Mr Smith broadcasts to the nation, rejecting British proposals on the grounds that they differ considerably from the Anglo-American proposals as presented by Dr Kissinger. As an alternative, he hints at the possibility of an 'internal' solution.
- 10 Feb Vorster discussions with US and British Ambassadors about new settlement initiative.
- 12 Feb British Foreign Secretary, Tony Crosland, falls ill.  
Mr R W (Pik) Botha, South African Foreign Minister, meets Cyrus Vance,

- US Secretary of State in Washington for discussions on Rhodesian settlement initiative.
- 19 Feb Death of Tony Crosland.  
Appointment of David Dr Owen as Foreign Secretary.  
Frank Judd appointed as Minister of State.
- 21 Feb Meeting at Foreign Office, chaired by Dr Owen, to consider breakdown of Geneva initiative (prompted by R. F. Botha). Attended by Ivor Richard.
- 23 Feb Amendment to Land Tenure Act announced. (White farming lands and industrial and commercial lands in central districts to be open to all races, but Tribal Trust Lands to remain the preserve of Africans.).
- 2 Mar 12 Rhodesian Front MPs rebel against Land Bill.
- 4 Mar Land Tenure Bill passes in Rhodesian Parliament.
- 10 Mar Prime Minister Callaghan and Dr Owen visit to Washington for talks with President Carter and Secretary of State Vance. Dr Owen decision to work as closely as possible with Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, as well as Angola and Tanzania, and South Africa and Rhodesia.  
Launch of a new joint Anglo-American initiative. The aim is to reach agreement with the parties on the independence constitution and on arrangements for a brief transition period, during which elections will be held.
- 16 Mar Repeal of Byrd Amendment allowing the USA to import Rhodesian chrome.
- 19/20 Mar Informal Labour/Ulster Unionist Pact.
- 22/23 Mar Lib/Lab pact.
- 30 Mar Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole reveals deaths of over 260 ZANU fighters in factional infighting in Mozambique.
- 2 Apr Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole forms own branch of ANC, in opposition to Bishop Muzorewa.
- Apr Dr Owen meeting with Mr Nkomo in London.
- 10-17 Apr Dr Owen visits Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, Botswana, Zambia, Rhodesia, Angola and Nigeria for talks.
- 13 Apr Dr Owen meeting with Mr Smith at the British Ambassador's residence, Cape Town.
- 15 Apr Dr David Owen, British Foreign Secretary, arrives in Rhodesia. Meetings with variety of Rhodesians.
- 16 Apr Dr Owen announces preference for transition to caretaker government – whites to be encouraged to stay.
- 11 May Britain announces formation of roving Consultative Group in Southern Africa for negotiations on constitutional and transitional arrangements to



- majority rule (Graham-Low group). Anglo-American proposals backed by Front Line States.
- 15 May Mr Smith announces that constitution must be drafted before agreement can be reached on transition to black majority rule.
- 16 May Kaunda announces Zambia is in a 'state of war' with Rhodesia.
- 26 May Anglo-American envoys, John Graham (Deputy Under Secretary, FCO) and Stephen Low (US Ambassador to Zambia), arrive in Salisbury for discussions with cross-section of Rhodesian opinion.
- 27 May Messrs Graham and Low meeting with Mr Smith.
- 29 May Messrs Graham and Low visit to Maputo, Mozambique.
- 1 Jun Anglo-American envoys discussion with Nkomo (co-leader of Patriotic Front).
- 23 Jun Dr Owen and Cyrus Vance meet in Paris to discuss Rhodesia.
- 5 Jul OAU summit meeting in Gabon gives backing to the military aims of the Patriotic Front whilst emphasising that the question of political leadership should be left to the Rhodesian people to decide.
- Jul Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference, London.
- 10 Jul Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole returns to Rhodesia after over two-year exile. Denounces terrorism, and endorses the present Anglo-American settlement initiative.
- 17 Jul Large rally greets Muzorewa after 6-week absence.
- 18 Jul Mr Smith announces General Election on 31 Aug as a preliminary to seeking an internal settlement.
- 23 Jul Muzorewa presents 4-point plan culminating in one-man one-vote general election by Mar 1978.
- 25 Jul Following discussions with Mr Vance and President Carter, Dr Owen informs Parliament that it has been agreed that the Anglo-American initiative should continue.
- 27 Jul Mr Nkomo visits London for talks with Mr Callaghan and Dr Owen.
- 5 Aug President Nyerere meets President Carter and Mr Vance in Washington. Carter modifies wording of Anglo-American proposal to read the security forces will be based primarily on the liberation forces.
- 11 Aug Dr Owen met Bishop Muzorewa in London.
- 12 Aug Dr Owen and Mr Vance held talks with the South African Foreign Minister, Mr R F Botha, in London.
- 16 Aug Dr Owen holds further talks with Bishop Muzorewa in London.
- 18 Aug Mr Botha meets Mr Smith in Salisbury.

- 20 Aug African nationalist leaders move towards a new political line-up (Rev. Sithole, Senator Chief Chirau and Dr Gabellah [Vice President of Muzorewa's ANC].
- 24 Aug Muzorewa dissolves ANC executive.
- 25 Aug Dr Owen meets the UN Secretary General, Dr Waldheim, in London and the Nigerian External Affairs Commissioner, Brigadier Garba, in Lagos, before visiting Southern Africa.  
Announcement of Anglo-American proposals for Rhodesia.
- 27 Aug Mr Smith meeting with Mr Vorster in Pretoria.
- 27-30 Aug Dr Owen and Mr Andrew Young (US Ambassador to the UN) hold meetings in Lusaka with FLPs and the Patriotic Front; with Mr Vorster and Mr Botha in Pretoria; with President Nyerere in Dar es Salaam; and with Mr William |Eteki Mboumoua, Secretary-General of the OAU, in Nairobi.
- 28 Aug Mr Vorster discusses latest settlement proposals with Anglo-American negotiators in Pretoria.
- 31 Aug Rhodesian General Election. Rhodesian Front wins all 50 European seats.
- 1 Sep Dr Owen and Mr Young arrive in Salisbury to present Anglo-American proposals (Command Paper 6919) *Rhodesia: Proposals for a Settlement*. - end of Mr Smith government and six-month transition period leading to general election on basis of one-man one-vote. Independent Zimbabwe by 1978, and establishment of interim government to be supervised by Britain with UN presence, including a UN Force; an independence \constitution providing for a democratically elected government, the abolition of discrimination, protection of individual human rights, and the independence of the judiciary. A development fund to revive the economy is also to be established.).  
The British Government also undertakes to place before the Security Council proposals for the Independence Constitution and for the administration of the territory during the transitional period. The latter is to comprise: the appointment of a Resident Commissioner, whose role is to include organising and conducting a general election within a period not exceeding six months, taking command of all the armed forces in Rhodesia (apart from the UN Zimbabwe force) and the assumption of responsibility for the police force; the appointment of a Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General; the establishment of a UN Zimbabwe force; the assumption of responsibility for law and order by the police forces; the establishment of new Zimbabwe National Army; the establishment of an electoral and boundary commission; arrangements for a ceasefire on the agreed day on which power was transferred to the transitional administration.  
Field Marshall Lord Carver is appointed Resident Commissioner-designate. Lord Carver emphasises that law and order will be the crucial issue during the transitional period. It is a fundamental principle that on independence day the government should have under its command one unified army loyal to the people and their elected government.
- 7 Sep The Rhodesian Government submitted to the British Government a memorandum seeking clarification of points which were negotiable.

- 12 Sep Death of Steve Biko in South African police custody.
- 14 Sep Patriotic Front leaders announce their objections to some aspects of the proposals.
- 15 Sep Mr Smith sends representations to British government on proposals.
- 18 Sep Mr Smith announces the formation of a new white-dominated Cabinet and the shelving of the interim settlement plan.
- 19 Sep Dr Owen holds talks with President Kaunda's Special Adviser, Mr Mark Chona, and Mr Archie Mogwe, Botswana Foreign Minister in London.
- 25 Sep Mr Smith meets President Kaunda in Lusaka. (The meeting is not revealed until 1 Oct, when it is described as 'cordial and wide-ranging' by Rhodesian officials.).
- 27 Sep UN Security Council meets to consider Anglo-American proposals. Dr Owen addresses the UN General Assembly. He says that peace is unobtainable in Rhodesia unless there is agreement between the parties concerned and that the UN had an important role to play in the transition.
- 29 Sep The Security Council adopts Resolution 415 (1977) by 13 votes to nil (The USSR abstains; China does not participate.) It requests that the Secretary-General appoint a Representative 'to enter into discussions with the British Resident Commissioner-designate and with all parties, concerning the military and associated arrangements that are considered necessary to effect the transition to majority rule in Southern Rhodesia.'
- 1 Oct Dr Owen and Mr Vance aim for conference on Rhodesia in neutral country.
- 3 Oct Lieutenant General Prem Chand appointed as UN special representative to Rhodesia.
- 9-11 Oct In Moscow, Dr Owen discusses with Mr Brezhnev and Mr Gromyko Britain's initiative to involve the UN in efforts to reach a settlement in Rhodesia.
- 10 Oct Zambia calls for UN sanctions on South Africa, including an oil embargo.
- 19 Oct P K van der Byl dismisses idea that security forces would be disbanded under Anglo-American proposals.
- 20 Oct The Commonwealth Committee on Southern Africa reported on oil sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 25 Oct The Mozambique Foreign Minister, Mr Joaquim Chissano, discusses the Anglo-US proposals in London with Dr Owen.
- 26-28 Oct The Rev. N Sithole, speaking in London where he has met Dr Owen, said that most Africans accepted the Anglo-American settlement proposals.
- Nov UN Security Council Resolution 421, Mandatory arms sanctions on South Africa.
- 1-10 Nov Lord Carver (accompanied by General Chan) holds talks in Dar es Salaam, Salisbury, Gabarone, Lusaka and Lagos. Subjects include ceasefire and transi-

- tional arrangements, covering proposals for the maintenance of law and order and military arrangements.
- 1 Nov Lord Carver brief meeting with Nkomo and Mugabe in Lusaka.
- 2 Nov Lord Carver and General Chand arrive in Salisbury for discussions.
- 3-9 Nov Mr Graham visits Rhodesia for discussions on the independence constitution.
- 5 Nov Mr Smith announces 'no progress' following discussions with Carver and Chand.
- 8 Nov Lord Carver and General Chand meeting with President Kaunda in Lusaka to debrief on Salisbury talks.  
Dr Owen announcement in London that as long as African nationalist leaders are divided, no solution is possible without an election.
- 10 Nov Preliminary soundings about possible round-table talks in Malta.
- 11 Nov Dr Owen, in the House of Commons, identifies three essential elements to be resolved: the transitional constitution, the independence constitution, law and order.
- 12 Nov Announcement in House of Commons of Carver's proposed establishment of Rhodesian Security Forces (all white units to be disbanded, six battalions to be created from nationalist units, Air Force to remain intact.).
- 18 Nov Muzorewa and Rev. Sithole announce their continuing support for Anglo-American proposals.
- 24 Nov Mr Smith declared acceptance of the principle of black majority rule and announces his intention to hold settlement discussions with African leaders in Rhodesia.
- 25 Nov Dr Owen reiterates that independence must involve a genuine transfer of power to a government representing the majority of the people of Rhodesia following elections based on universal adult suffrage.
- 1 Dec President Kaunda indicates in an interview published in *The Times* that he might support an internal settlement in Rhodesia if this met with the approval of the Patriotic Front and the Front Line States.
- 2 Dec Talks held between Mr Smith government and nationalist parties (UANC, Rev. N Sithole ANC and Chief Jeremiah Chirau (ZUPO) on an internal settlement.
- 5 Dec In London, Rev N Sithole declared his intention of working with the Anglo-US proposals.
- 5 Dec Walter Mondale, US Vice President, says fair elections in Rhodesia could provide 'a good hope for peaceful and democratic government'.
- 6 Dec President Kaunda announces the Zambian view that elections under the Anglo-US initiative should not come before independence. Zambia would

- make no further contributions to the proposals by participating in further discussions with the British Government, but would continue to participate in meetings with other Front Line Presidents.
- 8 Dec Mr Nkomo and Mr Mugabe decline an invitation to meet Dr Owen in London on 13 Dec. The invitation is later renewed for talks in the New Year.
- 18 Dec The Presidents of Angola, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia, meeting at Beira, reaffirmed their commitment to the Anglo-US settlement proposals.
- 1978 6-9 Jan Lord Carver (Resident Commissioner-designate) and General Prem Chan hold talks in Maputo with President Machel. Lord Carver continues on to Pretoria and Gaborone.
- 17 Jan Internal settlement talks in Salisbury delayed in an attempt to reach a compromise on the question of applying a blocking mechanism on a future parliament.
- 20 Jan Rhodesian Government launches 'safe return' programme for nationalist guerrillas wishing to return to Rhodesia in peace.
- 30 Jan Meeting in Malta between Dr Owen, Lord Carver, Mr Andrew Young and General Prem Chan, and PF leaders, Mugabe and Nkomo, to discuss Anglo-American proposals. Each side agreed to consider proposals made by the other and to meet again.
- 6 Feb Malta proposals received in Salisbury.
- 15 Feb Announcement by Mr Smith and Muzorewa of internal settlement, including establishment of an interim government to lead Rhodesia to majority rule.
- 16 Feb Andrew Young, US Ambassador to the UN, reacts negatively, predicting 'another Angola-type situation'.  
David Dr Owen, UK Foreign Secretary, responds differently, informing Parliament, 'the quicker Rhodesia can be brought to independence on the basis of the agreement, the more likely we are to get a satisfactory solution.'  
Four prominent US Senators introduce resolution in Senate urging the Carter Administration to give it 'serious and impartial consideration'.
- Feb Speech by John Davies, Shadow Foreign Secretary, welcoming prospect of internal settlement provided 6 principles are met.
- 26-27 Feb OAU Foreign Ministers' Conference, Tripoli, rejects the Salisbury negotiations and calls for further talks on the basis of the Anglo-US proposals.
- 1-2 Mar African States at the UN called for a Security Council meeting to consider proposals to block acceptance of any internal settlement which does not include the PF.  
Parties to the internal settlement talks agree that Rhodesia should become independent under majority rule on 31 Dec 1978. Proposals for a transitional administration also agreed.
- 3 Mar Internal Settlement reached between Ian Mr Smith and Bishop Abel Muzorewa (head of ANC), Rev. Ndabagini Sithole (leader of ZUPO), and Chief

- Chirau: the Salisbury Agreement. Includes provision for:
- i) a Constitution to provide for majority rule on the basis of university adult suffrage;
  - ii) 100 member legislative assembly (72 black and 28 white);
  - iii) a Declaration of Rights;
  - iv) the independence, qualifications and security of the judiciary;
  - v) an independent Public Services Board;
  - vi) establishment of a transitional government to bring about a ceasefire and deal with matters relating to the future composition of military forces, release of detainees, review of sentences for political offences, removal of discrimination, election and the drafting of a Constitution;
  - vii) Composition of the transitional government:
    - a. An Executive Council, comprising Bishop Muzorewa, the Rev. Sithole, Chief Chirau and Mr Smith (chairmanship by rotation);
    - b. A Ministerial council, with black and white parity (chairmanship by alteration), responsible for initiating legislation and for duties referred to it by the Executive Council;
  - viii) continuation of Parliament during the life of the transitional government for the purpose of passing or enacting legislation as required to implement the agreement;
  - ix) independence on 31 Dec 1978.
- 5 Mar Dr Owen refuses to give assurances that Britain will not recognise the agreement without the involvement of the Patriotic Front.  
16 members of Congressional black caucus urge President Carter to reject the internal settlement.  
The Patriotic Front issue a *communiqué* condemning the internal agreement and advocating negotiations on the basis of the Anglo-American proposals.
- 6 Mar UN Security Council debate on the Salisbury Agreement; later decided that any internal settlement to be 'illegal and unacceptable'. Resolution 423 (adopted 10:0 with 5 abstentions, including Britain and other Western Security Council members).
- Mar Front Line President's meeting in Dar es Salaam: FLP call upon the US and UK to make their stance on the Anglo-American plan clear.
- 8 Mar Dr Owen visits Washington for talks with President Carter and Mr Vance.
- mid-Mar Mr Mugabe and Mr Nkomo meeting with Dr Owen in London.
- 9 Mar Meeting between President Carter, Mr Vance and Dr Owen, at which it is agreed the Anglo-American plan (of an all-party conference) is the best basis on which to proceed.
- 10 Mar Joint announcement by British and American Governments that they wish to bring together at one conference all the parties to the Salisbury and Malta talks with a view to widening the areas of agreement.
- 13-16 Mar Dr Owen holds further talks in London with the Patriotic Front leaders, Chief Chirau and Bishop Muzorewa.

- 14 Mar US and UK abstention in UN Security Council on African sponsored resolution calling for rejection of the internal settlement.
- 17 Mar British and American representatives meeting with Rhodesian officials in Pretoria.  
UN Security Council Resolution 424 condemning the Rhodesian raid on Zambia (6-7 Mar).
- 17-18 Mar Mr John Graham (FCO) and US officials have meeting in Pretoria with Mr Jack Gaylord, Secretary to the Cabinet in Rhodesia, and representatives of Rev. Sithole to explain British and American thinking behind the proposed meeting of all parties.
- 21 Mar Rhodesian Executive Council established, ministerial status being given to Bishop Muzorewa, the Rev. Sithole and Chief Chirau.  
Mr Young visits Dar es Salaam to assure President Nyerere of President Carter's commitment to the Anglo-American Plan.
- 25-26 Mar Front Line Presidents and the Patriotic Front Leaders hold summit meeting in Dar es Salaam. They condemn the internal agreement ('as illegal as the previous regime'); criticised the British and US Governments for not condemning it; called on the two governments to convene a meeting as a follow-up to the Malta talks; demanded an intensified armed struggle; and called on the international community to tighten and widen sanctions.
- Mar Mr Smith accepted idea of a new conference provided it does not entail the renegotiation of the internal settlement.
- 1 Apr Meeting in Lagos (during President Carter's visit to Nigeria 31 Mar to 2 Apr) of representatives of the Front Line States, including the Foreign Ministers of Zambia and Botswana (Angola and Mozambique are not represented), Mr Vance and Sir Sam Falle, British High Commissioner in Nigeria. The Nigerian Foreign Minister, Brigadier Garba, presides.
- 3 Apr Mr John Graham (FCO) and Mr Stephen Low, US Ambassador to Zambia, hold a series of consultations with all the parties concerned and the interested governments in the area, to discuss the intention of the two governments to invite all the parties to an early meeting.
- 5 Apr Mr Graham, of the Foreign Office, departure to Lusaka and Maputo, accompanied by Stephen Low, US Ambassador to Lusaka, to meet PF leaders.
- 7-16 Apr Mr Graham and Mr Low hold talks in Maputo with Mr Nkomo and other representatives of the PF; with the South African government representatives in Johannesburg and Pretoria; and with representatives of the Rhodesian Executive Council in Salisbury.
- 14-15 Apr Meeting between Dr Owen, Mr Vance and Patriotic Front in Dar es Salaam. (accompanied by Lord Carver and General Prem Chand, Representatives of Front Line Presidents and Nigeria). Representatives from the governments of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania and Zambia are also present as observers. And with representatives of the regime in Salisbury.  
*Communiqué* issued at the end of the meeting stated that GB and US regarded

- PF proposals as fundamental deviation from Anglo-American plan, which would have to be negotiated.  
Rhodesian Ministerial council (9 portfolios: 18 co-ministers) 'sworn in'.
- 17 Apr Subsequent discussions in Pretoria and Salisbury, between Dr Owen, Mr Vance and Executive Council.
- 18 Apr Dr Owen informs Parliament that the PF leaders had accepted an invitation to round table talks and the signatories to the Salisbury Agreement had undertaken to give it 'serious consideration'. In Salisbury's view, this is taken as little signs of progress.
- 20 Apr First meeting of the Rhodesian Ministerial Council.
- 25 Apr Executive Council of Rhodesia interim government replied to the Anglo-US proposal for a round table meeting. It urges the two governments to re-examine their policies 'in the light of the racially changed circumstances in Rhodesia' and that it does not believe that a conference on the lines suggested will have any more chance of success than in 1976.
- 2 May Executive Council call for ceasefire, and lift 16-year ban on ZAPU and ZANU.
- 3 May Mr Nkomo rejects the ceasefire call and amnesty offer.  
A spokesman for Mr Mugabe says that his soldiers will ignore the call for a ceasefire.  
UANC criticises the plan for a ceasefire, which it says could become effective only when racial discrimination is removed.
- 4 May Debate in House of Commons on Rhodesia.  
Dr Owen announces that Mr John Graham will go to Africa to prepare the way for round table talks. He will work closely with Mr Stephen Low and will keep in touch with all the parties.  
President Kaunda agrees in London that there should be round table talks and appeals to Mr Smith to go to the conference table.
- 16 May The Executive Council announces that there will be a constitutional rather than an executive President in Zimbabwe after independence.
- 26 May Mr Smith announces at a Press Conference in Cape Town (after talks with Mr R F Botha) that he was confident that a general election would be held before the end of the year at which point he would stand down as Prime Minister.
- 27 May Speech by Mr Vorster, expressing support for the internal settlement, and plea for international recognition and removal of sanctions.
- 30 May Executive Council announces 'party list' system will be used to elect 72 black MPs in forthcoming election (under this system each party submits list of candidates, electors vote for party of their choice, and seats are then allocated in proportion to votes cast for each party).



- 1-4 Jun Mr Graham and Mr Low hold talks with the parties to prepare the way for a round table conference. In Lusaka, they meet ZAPU representatives; Mr Mark Chona, Special Adviser to President Kaunda; and Mr Nkomo.
- 6-14 Jun Graham-Low visit to Salisbury to try to persuade Zimbabwe/Rhodesian government to accept the idea of an all-party conference. Talks with Rev N Sithole, Chief Chirau (ZUPO), Bishop Muzorewa, and the 4 Deputies of the Executive Council.  
Visit to Maputo to try and persuade Mr Mugabe to participate in direct talks with Bishop Muzorewa.
- 13 Jun Four Rhodesian African MPs publish a memorandum criticising the internal agreement.
- 15 Jun Mr Graham and Mr Low have discussions with a ZANU delegation led by Mr Mugabe, in Maputo.  
Mr Smith, in a BBC Television interview, says the efforts of the transitional administration to achieve a ceasefire are not proving as successful as he had hoped. He calls on Britain to give more support to the transitional administration and to arrange for sanctions to be lifted.
- 16-20 Jun Mr Graham and Mr Low have talks with representatives of the Tanzanian Government and of the OAU in Dar es Salaam; with ZAPU officials in Lusaka; with President Khama in Gaborone, and with Mr Fourie, South African Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in Pretoria.
- 19 Jun Mr Nkomo meeting with State Dept officials in Washington: rejects idea of all-party settlement.
- 20 Jun Dr Owen holds talks with Mr Mark Chona in London.
- 21-28 Jun Mr Graham and Mr Low have meetings in Salisbury with Mr Smith and other officials of the transitional administration.
- 22 Jun 13 of the 15 African MPs in the Rhodesian Parliament issue a statement calling on all nationalist leaders to agree to attend an all-party conference.
- 23 Jun This precipitates Conservative criticism of Labour government's policy: Calls for Dr Owen to rule out further talks with PF, and to recognise internal settlement.  
Mr Smith announces in Parliament that the transitional administration is not opposed to attending an all-party conference provided that the arrangements are 'constructive' and there is a chance of success.
- 28-29 Jun Mr Graham and Mr Low have talks with President Banda in Malawi and with Mr Nkomo in Lusaka.
- 29 Jun US pro-Rhodesian pressure group, led by Senator Jesse Helms, resolution calling for lifting of sanctions by Sep 1979. Resolution is defeated 48-42.
- 3 Jul Mr John Davies, Opposition spokesman on Foreign Affairs, has talks in Lusaka with President Kaunda and Mr Nkomo.

- 4-6 Jul Mr Graham and Mr Low talks with Mr Chikerema in Salisbury, with Mr Fourie in Pretoria, and with President Machel and Mr Mugabe in Maputo.
- 5 Jul Mr John Davies arrives in Salisbury on fact-finding mission.
- 4-9 Jul Bishop Muzorewa pays an official visit to South Africa.
- 5 Jul The transitional administration forms a committee of six ministers (three white and three African) to investigate ways of removing racial discrimination. A government spokesman says that it has been accepted in principle that discrimination should be abolished 'except where its retention is necessary or desirable in the national interest'.  
Mr Smith says he still hopes that an all-party conference with the Patriotic Front is possible.
- 6 Jul Mr Davis has talks in Salisbury with political leaders, the Security Force Commander and representatives of commerce and industry.
- 6-7 Jul Mr Graham and Mr Low talk with Mr Mugabe in Maputo and Mr Nkomo in Lusaka.
- 10-11 Jul Mr Graham and Mr Low hold talks with President Kaunda in Lusaka and with President Nyerere in Dar es Salaam.
- 11 Jul A spokesman for the Council of OAU Foreign Ministers in Khartoum announces that 'while supporting the Patriotic Front in the context of the armed struggle, the Council still maintains that other political groups should be involved in an all-party conference (and) choice of leaders in Zimbabwe is up to the people of Zimbabwe.'
- 12 Jul Mr Graham and Mr Low begin discussions in Salisbury, lasting several days, with Mr Smith and members of the transitional administration.
- 17 Jul Bishop Muzorewa visit to Washington, to lobby for the lifting of sanctions.
- 19 Jul Chief Chirau says that ZUPO would be prepared in principle to attend all-party talks.
- 26 Jul US Senate votes by 48-42 against an amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill, providing for the immediate lifting of sanctions. After a conference with the House of Representatives, which also debated a similar amendment, Senators Case-Javitz compromise amendment, calling for sanctions to be lifted by Dec 31 1978, 'if the President determined that the Rhodesian government had demonstrated its willingness to attend an all-party conference' and a new government had been installed following 'free, internationally supervised elections.' Approved by the Senate 59-36.  
Mr Rowan Cronje, Rhodesian Joint Minister of Manpower and Social Affairs, said at Salisbury news conference, at which the provisional timetable for the election was announced, that UN and OAU observers would be welcome at the election. Polling would be between 4-6 Dec. A referendum on the Independence Constitution would be held among the white electorate on 20 Oct.

- 31 Jul Mr Shridath Ramphal, Commonwealth Secretary-General, said in Botswana that Britain should take full charge of Rhodesia as a colonial power. He urges Mr Smith to invite the British Government to step in.
- 2 Aug During House of Commons debate on Rhodesia, Dr Owen reaffirms the government's determination to achieve a negotiated settlement which will bring an end to the war, and to maintain its policy on sanctions. Conservative attempt to force Government to lift sanctions defeated in House of Commons 171-165.
- 3 Aug Case-Javitz Amendment ratified by House of Representatives.
- 4 Aug Dr Owen has talks with Chief Chirau in London.
- 6-16 Aug Mr Graham and Mr Low have further talks in Salisbury with Mr Smith, Mr Gabellah, Bishop Muzorewa and Rev N Sithole.
- 8 Aug Executive Council announces a partial relaxation of racially discriminatory legislation: all public places (mainly of entertainment) will be open to people of all races and restrictions will be removed on trading and industrial areas, on facilities operated by local authorities and on voting in local government elections. However, hospitals, schools, the government service and residential areas are not included.
- 10 Aug Joint committee from both Houses of Congress meets to resolve differences over resolutions concerning lifting of sanctions. Case-Javitz Amendment approved.
- 13 Aug Dr Owen holds talks with Mr Sithole at the latter's request. 200 provincial delegates of the UANC unanimously pass a vote of confidence in Bishop Muzorewa; reject the Anglo-US proposal for an all-party meeting, and decide to expel from the party four senior officials who had criticised Bishop Muzorewa.
- Aug Meeting between Brigadier Garba and Julius Nyerere.
- 14 Aug Mr Smith-Mr Nkomo secret meeting in Lusaka, attended by Brigadier Garba of Nigeria.
- 17 Aug Chief Chirau says that ZUPO will fully support the proposal for an all-party conference.
- 18 Aug Mr Smith tells a Rhodesian Front rally in Bulawayo that the transitional administration would support an all-party conference if it were convinced that it would be in the interests of the country. They would first want to know what was on the agenda.
- 18-20 Aug Mr Nkomo and Mr Mugabe meet for a Patriotic Front coordination meeting in Lusaka. Following this, Mr Mugabe flies to Lagos and returns with Brigadier Garba, the Nigerian Foreign Minister, who has talks with the Front leaders and with President Kaunda. Brigadier Garba later flies to Maputo for talks with President Machel. Mr Mugabe announces to the Press that ZAPU and ZANU will soon unify under one leader.

- 20 Aug Mr Smith says on television that the 'government' needed clarification as to the aim and nature of an all-party conference. He would not discuss the disbandment of the Security Forces at such a meeting.
- 23-25 Aug Mr Graham and Mr Low hold talks in Salisbury with Chief Chirau; representatives of the Catholic Archbishops and the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace; and Bishop Muzorewa.
- 24 Aug Mr R. F. Botha, South African Foreign Minister, has talks in Salisbury with members of the Executive Council.
- 31 Aug Sithole publicly accuses Mr Smith of negotiating secretly with Nkomo. It is announced in London that the Bingham Report on oil supplies to Rhodesia is to be published in full and that it is being referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions.
- 1-2 Sep Emergency meeting of Front Line Presidents (Presidents Kaunda, Nyerere, Khama, Neto and Machelto discuss Nkomo-Mr Smith talks. (Also present re the PF leaders and the new Nigerian Commissioner for External Affairs, Major-General H. E. Adefope). Reaffirm support for Anglo-American plan.
- 2 Sep Nkomo reveals details of the meeting on 14 Aug. He said that he refused Mr Smith's offer of the chairmanship of the transitional administration. Mr Smith also confirms that the meeting had taken place, but denies having made any specific offer to Mr Nkomo.
- 3 Sep Air Rhodesia Viscount civilian aircraft shot down by ZIPRA fighters, using SAM missile. 10 of 18 survivors killed by ZIPRA guerrillas.
- 8 Sep Mr Graham and Mr Low have talks with Mr Mugabe in Maputo.
- 9 Sep In London, following a review of the situation by Dr Owen, Mr Richard Moose, US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr Anthony Lake, Director of Policy Planning at the US State Dept, Lord Carver, Mr Graham and Mr Low, a statement is issued expressing the conviction of both the British and American Governments that a negotiated settlement can be achieved and their determination to continue to work towards a successful meeting of all the parties.
- 10 Sep Mr Smith announces the introduction of martial law in certain areas; and a ban on ZAPU and ZANU inside Rhodesia.
- 11 Sep In response to Mr Smith's statement, Mr Nkomo, speaking as President of ZAPU and not as joint leader of the PF, states in Lusaka that an all-party conference is 'dead and buried'.  
US Senate approves the Foreign Aid Bill.
- 12 Sep Mr Edgar Tekere, Secretary-General of ZANU (Mugabe), says in Lusaka that the PF is still committed to negotiations.
- 18 Sep The Executive Council announces that it has accepted an invitation from 27 Democratic and Republican Senators to visit the US.

- 22-23 Sep Meeting between Prime Minister Callaghan, Dr Owen and President Kaunda in Kano, Nigeria. Fails to inject new impetus.
- 27 Sep Speaking at the UN General Assembly Dr Owen says that Britain will live up to her responsibilities as the colonial power in Rhodesia, and would continue efforts to achieve a satisfactory solution on principles endorsed by the UN and approved by the British Parliament. Britain had ruled out the use of force to settle the dispute and had committed herself to seeking a solution through the international community.
- 4 Oct The American State Department grant visas to Mr Smith and members of the Executive Council for visit to USA, in face of African protest.
- 7-20 Oct Meeting between Vance, British Ambassador to Washington, Mr Smith and Sithole: Mr Smith still refuses to attend all-party conference.
- 12 Oct Mr Smith concedes in US Foreign Relations Committee that the Rhodesian Executive Council would attend 'an adequately prepared all-party conference' (in compliance with Case-Javitz amendment, and in face of Muzorewa's objections).
- 13 Oct Bishop Muzorewa and Chief Chirau arrive in Washington.
- 20 Oct Meeting between US and UK officials with Executive Council at State Department. At conclusion of meeting, Mr Smith announces agreement to five basic points with which the conference will be associated.  
provision for holding free and fair elections  
cease-fire  
transitional administration  
formation of armed forces to serve the independent government  
basic principles to be included in the independence constitution, including guarantee of individual rights
- 22 Oct Nkomo rejects all-party conference. Endorsed by Kaunda.
- Nov Mounting pressure on President Carter and Prime Minister Callaghan to endorse an all-party conference.
- 7 Nov US mid-term elections.
- 7,8,9 Nov House of Commons Debate on the Bingham Report. Both Houses of Parliament then vote by large majorities of the renewal of the legislation providing power for the enforcement of UN sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 8 Nov Chief Ndiweni resigns from Transitional Government and calls for the return of Nkomo.
- 15 Nov South African Premier P. W. Botha and R. F. Botha meeting with members of the Executive Council for talks.
- 16 Nov Executive and Ministerial Councils decide it is not possible to meet the 31 Dec date set down for the transfer of power. A revised election date set for 20 Apr 1979.  
The new timetable provides for a white referendum in Jan on the acceptabil-

ity of the new constitution, which would then be passed in Parliament at the beginning of Mar. Nomination day would be at the end of Mar, leaving one month for campaigning for the elections.

Mr Mugabe issues a 'death list' of more than 50 Africans associated with the Salisbury regime who would be shot unless they resign their positions.

Following his resignation as Joint Minister for Foreign Affairs and Vice-President of ZUPO, Chief Ndiweni announces that he is to form a new political party: the United National Federal Party (UNFP).

- Nov Lord Carver and FO team tour of Southern Africa.
- 23 Nov Mr Callaghan announcement of another initiative: tour of Mr Cledwyn Hughes, to be accompanied by Stephen Low to Nigeria and Southern Africa, to investigate whether conditions were 'right' for convening all-party conference.
- 24 Nov A further 27 areas of Rhodesia declared under martial law (introduced on 10 Sep) bringing about 75% of the country under restriction.
- 29 Nov-12 Dec: In the course of his mission, in which he is accompanied by US Ambassador Low, Mr Cledwyn Hughes holds discussions with members of the Executive Council (collectively and individually) and other representatives of Rhodesian opinion in Salisbury; with Mr Nkomo and Mr Mugabe; and with all the Front Line Presidents, the Nigerian Head of State and the South African Foreign Minister.
- 30 Nov Resignation of Lord Carver as Resident Commissioner designate.
- 12 Dec US Senator George McGovern arrives in Salisbury on a fact finding mission.
- 13 Dec UN General Assembly adopts resolution condemning the transitional administration and calling for strengthening of sanctions. Britain, the US, France, Canada and West Germany abstain.
- 15 Dec Mr Callaghan announces that the government would recommend to Parliament the establishment of a special committee of enquiry into the handling of oil sanctions.
- 1979 2 Jan Publication of proposed new Constitution. The country is to be called Zimbabwe-Rhodesia.
- 9 Jan Constitutional Referendum campaign opens.
- 17 Jan Publication of Mr Hughes' report. Mr Callaghan announces in Parliament that he has accepted Mr Hughes' advice that no good purpose would be served by convening a meeting of the parties to the conflict in the immediate future.
- 30 Jan Constitutional referendum for white voters. Of the total European electorate of 94,700, 57,269 vote in favour whilst 9,805 'no' votes are cast. Results declared the following day: 71.5% vote, 85% of which vote in favour.
- 1 Feb Referendum rejected by British and American governments.

- 2 Feb Eight anti-discrimination Bills passed by Senate at the end of Jan enter into force.
- 5 Feb Executive Council invites Britain and US to send official observers to witness forthcoming elections.
- 10 Feb US Senate table formal motion to lift sanctions against Rhodesia by 30 Apr.
- 12 Feb ZIPRA shoot down another Viscount aircraft.
- 6 Feb Publication of Conservative Party Manifesto:  
'If the Six Principles, which all British Governments have supported for the last 15 years, are fully satisfied following the Rhodesian Elections, the next Government will have a duty to return Rhodesia to a state of legality, move to lift sanctions and do its utmost to ensure that the new independent state gains international recognition.'
- 28 Feb Final session of the Rhodesian Parliament in its present form.
- 5 Mar Dr Gabellah resigns from ZANU, and quits Ministerial Council.
- 8 Mar UN Security Council adopts Resolution 445 condemning the Rhodesian elections and urging member States not to send observers.
- 12 Mar Announcement of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia general Election.
- 14 Mar US Foreign Relations Committee pass motion to send unofficial observers to election.
- 15 Mar Prime Minister Callaghan declines to send official British observers.
- 17 Mar Executive Council (EXCO) announce general amnesty to ZANLA/ZIPRA.
- 22-29 Mar Messrs Low and Renwick (of FCO) visit Salisbury, Maputo and Lusaka.
- 28 Mar UK Government defeated in vote of no confidence. US Senate vote 66-27 on the McGovern/Hayakawa resolution proposing that observers should be sent to the Rhodesian elections.
- 24 Mar Speech by Mrs Thatcher, stating that the Conservative party would judge the election on the basis of the report by a team of party observers.
- 3 Apr Conservative Party names team to observe elections.
- 4 Apr UK/US join move to lift sanctions.
- 5-9 Apr Leaders of Front Line States meet in Dar es Salaam and appeal to the PF to close ranks.
- 9 Apr Conservative party announce it will recognise Rhodesian government after 'satisfactory elections'.  
House of Representatives rejects sending US observers to Zimbabwe/Rhodesia by 190-180 vote.
- 10 Apr The white electorate vote for 20 of the 28 white seats. The Rhodesian Front party won all four contested seats as well as the unopposed seats.

- 12-13 Apr CIO sponsored assassination attempt on Nkomo, and destruction of ZAPU's headquarters in Lusaka.
- 13 Apr Arrival of 'Boyd Commission' (Lord Boyd, Lord Elton, Viscount Colville of Culross, Sir Charles Johnston and Miles Hudson. John Drinkwater, 'apolitical adviser'.)
- 15 Apr Commencement of poll for 72 Common Roll seats.
- 17 Apr Commencement of Rhodesian ballot.
- 21 Apr Polling ends.
- 23 Apr Reverend Sithole calls for independent commission to investigate his charges of irregularity in the election after withdrawing his earlier 'free and fair' statement.
- 24 Apr Election Results announced:  
 UANC 1,212,639 votes (67.27%) 51 seats.  
 ZANU (Sithole) 262,928 votes (14.59%) 12 seats.  
 UNFP 194,446 votes (10.79%) 0 seats.  
 NDU 18,175 votes (1.00%) 0 seats.  
 Following the announcement of the election results Mr Sithole called for a commission of enquiry into 'gross irregularities'.
- 26 Apr OAU declares the Rhodesian election results 'null and void'.
- 28 Apr Presidents Kaunda and Machel meet in Maputo with Mr Nkomo and Mr Mugabe.
- 29 Apr Mr Sithole says that the 12 ZANU members would not take part in the establishment of the new government unless an independent commission of enquiry investigated his charges of election irregularities.
- 30 Apr Adoption by UN Security Council of a Resolution condemning the Apr elections in Rhodesia and reiterating the call on member States not to accord recognition to the ensuing government. The UK, US and France abstain.
- 3 May Conservative victory in British General Election.
- 4 May Rhodesian Parliament dissolved.
- 6 May Lord Carrington, new Foreign Secretary, statement: 'I do not think anyone can ignore an election in which 65% of people voted.' Announces that the British Government was committed to restoring Rhodesia to legality if the elections were found to have been free and fair.
- 7 May Final 8 white MPs elected. ZANU (Sithole) boycott of all Parliamentary proceedings.
- 8 May Members of the new Rhodesian House of Assembly sworn in. Election of Mr John Chirimani as Speaker and Mr Walter Mthinkhulu as Deputy Speaker.
- 10 May Bishop Muzorewa as PM designate officially appeals to US for recognition.



- 10-14 May Mr Joshua Nkomo visits Lagos.
- 14 May Vote in US Senate 75:19 calling on President Carter to lift sanctions within 10 days of formation of black-majority government in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia.
- 15 May Opening of the first session of the new British Parliament during the debate on the Queen's speech, Mrs Thatcher, the Prime Minister says that the government's objective is to build on the major change that has taken place in Rhodesia to achieve a return to legality in conditions of wide international recognition.  
US Senate adopts a 'sense of the Congress' Resolution calling on President Carter to lift sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 15-18 May Visit by Sir Anthony Duff, Deputy Permanent Under-Secretary of State in FCO, to Salisbury.
- 16 May Lord Boyd reports to the Prime Minister.
- 18 May Sir Ian Gilmour, Lord Privy Seal, speaking in the House of Commons, emphasises that the British Government will make a new approach to the problem, taking into account the fundamental change in circumstances inside Rhodesia brought about by the emergence of a black majority in Parliament.
- 20-23 May Mr Cyrus Vance visits Britain for discussions with Lord Carrington.
- 22 May Statements by Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington in Houses of Commons and Lords. Mrs Thatcher repeats her pre-election undertaking. Lord Carrington indicates that the British Government would be guided by Lord Boyd's conclusions. He announces Mr Derek Day to be envoy to Rhodesia on a frequent 'report back' basis.
- 23 May Deputation of Commonwealth High Commissioners and Mr Ramphal are told by Lord Carrington that the Thatcher government believed the Rhodesian election had transformed that country's position.
- 24 May Publication of reports by Lord Boyd and Mr John Drinkwater QC on the results of the Rhodesian elections.  
Announcement in London that Mr Derek Day, Assistant Under Secretary at the FCO, is to go to Salisbury to consult the new Administration.  
Meeting of OAU Liberation Committee warns UK and US against recognition of new regime in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia.
- 26 May Lord Harlech named as the Prime Minister's special envoy to Africa.
- 29 May Bishop Muzorewa sworn in as Prime Minister.
- 30 May Bishop Muzorewa names his 17-man Cabinet. Ian Mr Smith to act as Minister without Portfolio. P K van der Byl, David Smith, William Irvine and Christopher Anderson also included in Cabinet. Bishop Muzorewa himself took on the War and Defence Ministry.
- 31 May Mr Derek Day arrives in Salisbury.  
Mr Nkomo and Mr Mugabe meet in Dar es Salaam.

- 1 Jun Rhodesian constitution comes into effect.
- 2 Jun Bishop Muzorewa, as Prime Minister, offers an amnesty to guerrillas but says that Rhodesia will continue to defend herself.
- 3 Jun Front Line States meeting in Dar es Salaam; also attended by Nigerian Foreign Minister.
- 4 Jun Renewed air/ground strikes into Mozambique.
- 7 Jun President Carter announces that the US will continue to impose sanctions as the recent elections do not comply with the requirements of the Case-Javitz amendment.
- 11 Jun Lord Harlech leaves London for tour of African states. He visits Botswana, Lusaka, Tanzania, Mozambique, Malawi, Angola and Nigeria. Returns to London 4 Jul 1979.
- 12 Jun US Senate rejects (52:41) Carter Administration compromise proposal that sanctions would not be lifted until 1 Dec.
- 13 Jun US Senate support for a rider on a military bill calling on the US Administration to lift sanctions immediately.
- 15 Jun<sup>1979</sup> Bishop Muzorewa visit to Republic of South Africa for talks with Prime Minister Botha and Foreign Minister (R F Botha).
- 18-24 Jun Mr Richard Luce MP visits Zaire, Senegal, Ivory Coast and Liberia.
- 20 Jun Mr James Chikerema resigns from UANC to form the Zimbabwe Democratic Party.
- 25 Jun Lord Harlech and Mr Day report to Lord Carrington. Mr Jeffrey Davidow named as US unofficial envoy to Rhodesia.
- 26 Jun Opening of Rhodesian Parliament, boycotted by 12 ZANU (Sithole) MPs.
- 28 Jun US House of Representatives votes 350-37 in favour of a Bill, initiated by Representatives Solarz and already approved unanimously by the Foreign Affairs Committee, calling for the termination of sanctions against Rhodesia on 15 Oct unless President Carter determines that it is against US interests to do so.
- 2-4 Jul Lord Harlech meets Bishop Muzorewa, Chief Ndiweni, Rev. Sithole, Mr Ian Mr Smith and General Walls in Salisbury.
- 5 Jul Lord Harlech reports to Lord Carrington on his discussions.
- 8 Jul Bishop Muzorewa visit to Washington.
- 10 Jul Lord Carrington informs the House of Lords that Britain has a constitutional responsibility to achieve a proper basis for Rhodesian independence. It is the government's intention, when consultations have been completed, to make firm proposals to bring Rhodesia to legal independence on a basis which Britain believed would be acceptable to the international community.

- 11 Jul Bishop Muzorewa meets President Carter and Mr Vance, together with Congressional and other leaders in Washington, to put the case for lifting US sanctions against Rhodesia.
- 11 Jul Liberian Government announces that no representatives from the Rhodesian administration, nor anyone who had participated in the internal settlement in Rhodesia, would be permitted to enter Liberia to attend the OAU summit.
- 12-14 Jul Bishop Muzorewa visits London at his own request for talks with the Prime Minister and Lord Carrington.
- 21 Jul The 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Heads of State of the OAU adopt a resolution calling on member states to 'apply effective cultural, political, commercial and economic sanctions against any State which accords recognition of the illegal racist minority regime in Zimbabwe or lifts the mandatory sanctions against it in violation of the UN Security Council resolutions'. The resolution recognises the PF as 'the sole, legitimate and authentic representative of the people of Zimbabwe'. Five countries – Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, Liberia and Zaire– enter reservations on this section.
- 23 Jul ZANU (Sithole) file a High Court petition alleging corrupt and illegal practices during the Rhodesian elections.
- 25 Jul Mrs Thatcher says in the House of Commons that the British Government is now engaged in a process of consultation with a view to bringing Rhodesia to legal independence with the widest possible international acceptance. It will put forward proposals, based on the six principles which have been supported by successive governments, after further consultations at the Meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government in Lusaka.
- 30 Jul The Prime Minister formally acknowledges the 'Boyd Report' in written response to Lord Boyd. Joint US Senate/House of Representative Committee agree that President Carter is required to end sanctions by 15 Nov 1979 unless it is against the national interest.
- 1 Aug Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conference convenes in Lusaka.
- 2 Aug Nigerian Government announces it will nationalise BP interests in the country.  
12 ZANU members their seats in the Zimbabwe/Rhodesia House of Assembly.  
Mrs Thatcher says that the British Government is wholly committed to genuine black majority rule in Rhodesia. Britain accepted constitutional responsibility for granting legal independence. The present Rhodesian constitution was defective in certain important respects. The British Government's objective was to establish independence on the basis of a constitution comparable with constitutions agreed with other countries.  
President Nyerere of Tanzania calls for a ceasefire in Rhodesia, a fresh constitution, and elections.  
In relation to the situation in Rhodesia, the Commonwealth Heads of Government:

Confirm that they are wholly committed to black majority rule for the people of Zimbabwe;  
 Recognise, in this context, that the internal settlement constitution is defective in certain important respects;  
 Fully accept that it is the constitutional responsibility of the British Government to grant legal independence to Zimbabwe on the basis of majority rule;  
 Recognise that the search for a lasting settlement must involve all parties to the conflict;  
 Are deeply conscious of the urgent need to achieve such a settlement and bring peace to the people of Zimbabwe and their neighbours;  
 Accept that independence on the basis of majority rule requires the adoption of a democratic constitution including appropriate safeguards for minorities;  
 Acknowledge that the Government formed under such an independent constitution must be chosen through free and fair elections properly supervised under British Government authority, and with Commonwealth observers;  
 Welcome the British Government's indication that an appropriate procedure for advancing towards these objectives would be for them to call a Constitutional Conference to which all parties would be invited; and  
 Consequently, accept that it must be a major objective to bring about the cessation of hostilities and an end to sanctions.

- 8 Aug Z/R security forces attack ZIPRA target in Botswana.  
 Mr Derek Day returns to London to brief Lord Carrington on Bishop Muzorewa's reaction.
- 12 Aug Mr Derek Day returns to Salisbury for talks with Government for constitutional Conference to be held the following month.
- 14 Aug British Government announces it will convene a Constitution Conference in London in Sep aimed at ending the conflict in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia.  
 Outline proposals for an independent constitution published.
- 15 Aug Zimbabwe/Rhodesia Government and PF invited to send 12 delegates each to the Conference.  
 Zimbabwe Government accepts invitation.  
 ZANLA and ZIPRA forces clash in the Midlands.
- 20 Aug PF announces it will attend the Conference in London.
- 22 Aug Zimbabwe/Rhodesian Air force jets strike against Mulungushi and Solwezi, Zambia.
- 4 Sep Advance delegation from Zimbabwe arrives in London .
- 5 Sep Deputy Prime Minister (David Mr Smith) arrives in London.
- 6 Sep Zimbabwe security forces strike against bases in Mozambique.
- 7 Sep Zimbabwe Prime Minister and delegation arrive in London .
- 7-9 Sep Meeting of Non-Aligned Movement in Havana, attended by Patriotic Front.
- 9 Sep Lord George-Brown arrives in Salisbury on fact-finding tour.

- 10 Sep Formal opening of Lancaster House Conference in London.  
Further clashes between ZIPRA and ZANLA forces in 7 Tribal Trust Lands.
- 14 Sep British and Patriotic Front draft Constitutions published.
- 17 Sep Donald McHenry appointed US Ambassador to the UN.
- 18 Sep Patriotic Front issue own plan for transitional arrangements.
- 21 Sep Zimbabwe/Rhodesia government announces acceptance 'in principle' of British constitutional proposals in return for the lifting of sanctions (11:1 vote). Acceptance by secret ballot.
- 24 Sep Liberal Party Conference in Margate.  
Patriotic Front accept 20% proportion of reserve representation for whites.
- 26 Sep Bishop Muzorewa visit to Vienna for talks with Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky.
- 27 Sep-2 Oct Security forces raids into Mozambique.  
Lord Carrington proposes third Constitutional draft. Delegates given until 8 Oct to decide.
- 2 Oct Labour Party Conference in Brighton.
- 3 Oct Death of John Giles, legal draftsman to Zimbabwe/Rhodesian delegation in London.
- 5 Oct Bishop Muzorewa accepts expanded British draft constitution (11:1).  
Announces will also accept new elections.
- 7 Oct Mr Smith returns to Salisbury to brief Rhodesian Front caucus.
- 8 Oct Lord Carrington demands formal decision from Patriotic Front by 11 Oct.  
Lord Jellicoe, former leader of House of Lords, arrives in Salisbury.
- 10 Oct Conservative Party Conference.
- 12 Oct Lord Carrington postpones Lancaster House Conference indefinitely. However, privately indicates Britain will be prepared to offer financial aid for land settlement/redistribution schemes.
- 13 Oct Mr Smith returns to London.
- 15 Oct Lord Carrington schedules press conference, at which he announces he is entering bilateral negotiations with Bishop Muzorewa.
- 16 Oct Meeting between Lord Carrington and Sir Shridath Ramphal.  
Arrival in London of South African Foreign Minister, RF 'Pik' Botha.
- 17 Oct British Government puts transitional proposals to delegations.  
'Pik' Botha meeting with Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington.  
Arrival of General Sir Peter Walls.
- 18 Oct Patriotic Front accepts constitution 'if (they) are satisfied beyond doubt about the vital issues of the transitional government.' Patriotic Front con-

- firm's British and American assurances on land issue 'go a long way to alleviate (their) concern over the whole land question'.
- 21 Oct Chief Justice of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia arrives in London to attend talks.
- 22 Oct Lord Carrington issues 13 paragraph proposal for transitional arrangements. (British governor will assume direct control.)
- 28 Oct Bishop Muzorewa accepts the British proposals for transitional arrangements.
- 1 Nov Lord Carrington announces he is prepared to extend the transitional period by approximately two-three weeks.
- 2 Nov Lord Carrington presents amplified 41-point transitional plan.
- 5 Nov Bishop Muzorewa formally accepts 41 point plan.  
Zimbabwe/Rhodesian Government cuts rail link to Zambia for maize imports.
- 7 Nov Gilmour informs House of Commons that Mrs Thatcher will not seek to renew sanctions legislation, but most will remain in force.  
Gilmour introduces legislation to enable Government to implement portions of the Constitution, appointment of a British governor and to hold elections.
- 9 Nov British government announces it is prepared to contribute to a Commonwealth monitoring force.
- 10-11 Nov President Kaunda visits London and has meetings with Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington. Also meets Patriotic Front and Secretary General Ramphal.
- 11 Nov Mr Smith and part of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia delegation return to Salisbury from London.
- 13 Nov Independence Bill enacted in House of Commons.
- 14 Nov House of Lords approves Bill for independence for Zimbabwe/Rhodesia.  
President Carter informs Congress he is prepared to lift sanctions after arrival of British Governor and the process of elections has commenced.
- 15 Nov Rhodesian Front caucus supports London Constitution.  
Travel ban lifted on Zimbabwean/Rhodesians.  
British and Patriotic Front delegations accept plans for transitional period: Britain to house and feed returning guerrilla fighter during transitional period. British Governor to control civil service, and police and defence force.
- 16 Nov Lord Carrington introduces 10 point Ceasefire proposal.
- 18 Nov Bishop Muzorewa and delegation return to Salisbury, via Johannesburg.
- 20 Nov President Kaunda mobilizes Zambia for war situation against Zimbabwe/Rhodesia.

24 Nov	Lord Carrington publishes amplified ceasefire proposals.
26 Nov	Bishop Muzorewa's delegation formally accepts ceasefire proposals. Patriotic Front visit Dar-es-Salaam for meeting with Front Line Presidents.
28-30 Nov	RF 'Pik' Botha visits London. PW Botha announces South African forces have been operating in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia 'for some time'.
3 Dec	Acting Chairman of Bishop Muzorewa's delegation informs Lord Carrington he is departing for Salisbury. Lord Carrington obtains Order in Council giving Mrs Thatcher authority to select the British Governor. Also applies for another Order In Council to give British legal authority to introduce a new Zimbabwe/Rhodesian Constitution.
6 Dec	Lord Soames named British Governor.
8-9 Dec	Zimbabwe/Rhodesian security forces launch major raids into Mozambique and Zambia.
11 Dec	Zimbabwe/Rhodesia Constitutional Amendment Bill is passed in both Houses of Parliament in Britain. Lord Carrington announces Lord Soames' departure for Salisbury; also that the expanded (now 1,200) Commonwealth Monitoring force will be at the 15 assembly points.
12 Dec	Lord Soames arrives in Salisbury as Governor of Rhodesia UDI ends. Sanctions lifted by Britain.
13 Dec	British establishment of ceasefire monitoring headquarters in Salisbury.
14 Dec	Lord Carrington ultimatum to Patriotic Front that ceasefire arrangements must be agreed by 15 Dec.
15 Dec	Lord Soames given authority to create more assembly points. Mrs Thatcher and Lord Carrington leave for official visit to the United States. US lifts sanctions against Rhodesia.
17 Dec	PF initial ceasefire agreement.
21 Dec	Agreement signed at Lancaster House for a cease-fire between Government of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia and PF, and new Constitution.
1980 Mar	Election in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia. Victory for Mugabe.

### Sources:

Zimbabwe/Rhodesia: Chronological Table of Events, Zimbabwe Rhodesian Information Office.  
Chronology of Events, The Foreign Office.  
Papers of Sir John Biggs Davison, House of Lords Records Office, BD/1/424 Rhodesia 1979.





# Britain and Rhodesia: The Road to Settlement

The Institute of Contemporary British History (also known as the Centre for Contemporary British History) held a series of seminars on 'Britain and Rhodesia: The Road to Settlement' at The National Archives on 5 July 2005. The first two sessions were chaired by Professor Terence Ranger and the introductory paper was presented by Dr Sue Onslow. The third session, of historians, was chaired by Professor Arne Westad. The witnesses and contributors were: Sir Brian Barder, R.A.C. Byatt, Lord Carrington, Sir Derek Day, John Doble, Sir John Graham, Robert Jackson, Peter Jay, Dame Rosemary Spencer, Lord Steel of Aikwood, David Summerhayes, Wilfred Turner, Mrs June Turner, Sir Peregrine Worsthorne, Dr Richard Coggins, Dr Peter Henshaw, Dr Donal Moore, Dr Philip Murphy, Brian Oliver, Professor Christopher Saunders and Professor Vladimir Shubin.

## Session One

**PROFESSOR TERENCE RANGER** I think we should start. I have been asked to chair this session and the next. I am an historian, although really an historian of the other side, so to speak, as the books that I have written have been about the African nationalist movements, guerrilla war and so on. I am sorry; I jumped the gun because we are to be welcomed by Sarah Tyacke.

**SARAH TYACKE** Hello. I am extremely pleased to see you all this afternoon. As some of you know, we have these seminars from time to time both to improve the understand of the history of the country and to ensure that we understand what it is we should do when selecting from departments. I am extremely pleased therefore to welcome the Centre for Contemporary British History and the Cold War Studies Centre at the London School of Economics. In an era of freedom of information, it is extremely important to hear what the people who were present at the time in question thought about the events and none more so than in relation to Rhodesia.

Some of you will also know that our first seminar was held in September 2000 when we discussed the events leading up to the Unilateral Declaration of Independence by Rhodesia in 1965. The purpose of today's seminar is to complete the picture by discussing the settlement of the Rhodesia question from 1977 to 1980, a topic of immense historical interest and some contemporary relevance, given the importance of its contested history. This is an opportunity for us to gain a unique oral historical account of events from those of you who were engaged in the process. I am pleased to be let off fatigues as Chief Executive, so that I can listen to what you who have contributed to history have to say. Thank you very much for coming this afternoon. I shall now give way to Professor Ranger.

**RANGER**

Who will give way to Sue Onslow?

**DR SUE ONSLOW**

I will take up only a brief amount of your time because we have come here to listen to your insights and reminiscences rather than to listen to me as an historian talk about what I think happened. Thank you very much indeed for joining us. We take this opportunity to welcome you. It seems from the connections that you are making with each other that you are pleased to see each other, too. That is pleasing to us.

We have divided the afternoon into two broad panels. We will then add on an historians' panel. This is an extraordinary occasion because so many people who played a unique part in the final resolution for British policy of the Rhodesia question are gathered here. That will be chaired by Professor Arne Westad of the Cold War Studies Centre and International History Department at the London School of Economics. Professor Chris Saunders from the University of Cape Town will also be joining us, as will Professor Vladimir Shubin from the Russian Academy of Sciences. That will be the third session, which we hope will be interactive with a chance for us as historians to put questions to you and to give you a

chance to comment on our misperceptions. Thank you very much indeed.

## **RANGER**

The seminar has been organised by the Centre for Contemporary British History, the Cold War Studies Centre at the LSE and the National Archives. It will be recorded and transcribed. I have been asked to say that those attending should not attempt to record it. The transcription will be sent to the participants so that they will have an opportunity to check it, after which the transcript of the proceedings will be published along the same lines as the UDI Seminar was published.

In the second of the two sessions, I shall probably call on people from the audience to comment. It is important that all speakers identify themselves for the sake of the record. In your packs, you will find a consent form that we would like you to sign. It deals with matters of copyright, privacy and so on that one has to consider these days. The full edited transcript will be published and in black capital letters on my instructions, it says 'Not Chatham House rules.' Those who have spoken at Chatham House will know what that means. It means that whatever is said can be attributed to you. The seminar is divided into two sessions with a break in between. The first session will address the years to 1979; the second session will address Lancaster House itself, and the governorship of Lord Soames\* and the settlement in Zimbabwe.

Lord Soames (Christopher Soames, 1920–87), Conservative politician. Governor of Southern Rhodesia, 1979–80.

A witness seminar is a sort of 'groovy' interview, although I am hoping very much that the witness will interview each other rather than my having to ask a series of questions. You will all have received Sue [Onslow]'s helpful chronology and also a brief introduction by her, which raises a number of questions. I want to add to those questions. One concerns the significance of the internal settlement, the election that Muzorewa\* won and how far that helped to change the position. Sue's narrative refers to 'a number of statements that it had changed the situation.' I should like to hear

Abel Muzorewa, Methodist bishop and Zimbabwean nationalist leader. Prime Minister, Zimbabwe Rhodesia, 1979.

people's reflections on the internal settlement. The second question concerns land, which is currently important and emerges once again in Sue's narrative, because assurances were being given even before the Lancaster House talks began about land and land acquisition.

Jeremy Paxman, journalist and broadcaster, chair of the quiz programme *University Challenge*.

I am not a university quiz master, partly because I do not know all the answers as Jeremy Paxman\* does and partly because, as I said, we hope that this will be a flowing conversation when the Chairman needs to put an oar in only once or twice.

The last thing I want to say is that I should like the participants in the witness seminar rapidly to go round and introduce themselves, not of course reproducing the impressive *curricula vitae* that I have in front of me, but saying briefly why they are here and why we should think that they know anything about Rhodesia. I shall start with Lord Steel.

**LORD STEEL  
OF AIKWOOD**

At the time of UDI, I was President of the Anti-Apartheid Movement in this country. I later was the leader of the Liberal Party during the time of the transition to self-government in Rhodesia.

**DAME ROSEMARY  
SPENCER**

While I was in Lagos doing an economics job, I was seconded to the Rhodesia Conference in Geneva in autumn 1976. On returning from Lagos the following year, I was posted to the Rhodesia Department at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and four months later became its Assistant Head until the beginning of 1980.

**SIR DEREK DAY**

The reason I am here is that I was sent to Zimbabwe/Rhodesia by Lord Carrington, after the Conservative Government came to power, in 1979 to establish contact with Bishop Muzorewa's Government. I remained in Salisbury until returning to London as a member of the Secretary of State's team at the Lancaster House Constitutional Conference.

**DAVID SUMMERHAYES** I was Minister – that is, number two – in the Embassy in Pretoria and Cape Town from 1974 to 1978. That was fairly early in the story that we are about to hear. We in Pretoria were never able to go to Zimbabwe – to Rhodesia. It was off limits to us, but we had visitors coming from there, such as Johnny Graham who was directly involved.

**SIR JOHN GRAHAM**

Sir Alec Douglas-Home (Lord Home of the Hirsel (14th Earl of Home, disclaimed peerage 1963), 1903–98), Conservative politician. Prime Minister, 1963–4. Foreign Secretary, 1970–4.

Ian Smith, Rhodesian politician. Prime Minister, 1964–79.

A Royal Commission, headed by Lord Peace, was set-up by the British Government in 1972 to ascertain the reaction of black Africans to the sanctions against Rhodesia. It carried out a referendum on majority rule, which was supported by Rhodesia Front Government of Ian Smith, but rejected by the African National Congress (ANC) on behalf of the Nationalist Parties.

**WILFRED TURNER**

David Owen (Lord Owen of Plymouth), Labour politician. Foreign Secretary, 1977–9.

My first involvement with Rhodesia was as Private Secretary to Sir Alec Douglas-Home\* in the autumn of 1971, when the settlement then agreed with the Ian Smith\* Government was later rejected following the Pearce Commission.\* After going away to other posts, I came back and from the spring of 1977, I was Under-Secretary at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and appointed by David Owen,\* the Foreign Secretary, to liaise with all the parties and to mediate and bring about a settlement, an objective which we thought that we had achieved, but the settlement proposed failed.

I was British High Commissioner in Botswana from 1977 to 1981. Botswana was a Front Line State, but peculiar front-line state in that contrary to the reactions of the other front-line states relations across the border with Zimbabwe were perfectly normal. The trains ran from South Africa to Rhodesia, through Botswana two or three times a day. Communications were normal and so on, so the position was peculiar until almost the end when things became rather nasty because of incursions across the border by the Rhodesian army in pursuit of refugees who were potential guerrillas. I suppose that I am here to look at matters from the view of a representative in a Front Line State and to explain reactions to what was happening across the border.

**MRS JUNE TURNER**

I was with my husband in Botswana for the four years from 1977 to 1981. It was a fascinating time to be there. Everyone came through

our house. I was running the domestic side and looking after people's welfare, but listening to all the conversations, too. I have always remembered what an enjoyable time we had and that is why I asked to come here.

**LORD CARRINGTON** I was Foreign Secretary between 1979 and 1982.

**RANGER** Enough said!

**R. A. C. BYATT** I have more to say, but it may be less interesting. I was Head of the Rhodesia Department during the early 1970s until 1975. In 1976 I was a member of the British delegation at the Geneva Constitutional Conference on Rhodesia. Then in New York I was intermittently involved in Rhodesian business in the Security Council. In 1976 I was recalled to stand by to go out to Salisbury when the discussions leading up to the Lancaster House conference began. I was with Lord Carrington's delegation for the first two weeks of the conference. I then went out to what was still Salisbury and was a sort of *sub rosa* British representative in Salisbury until the end of the conference. I was then British High Commissioner in Salisbury, later Harare, from 1980 to 1983.

**SIR BRIAN BARDER** I was only tangentially involved in Rhodesia. I was a member of the UK mission to the United Nations at the time of UDI, dealing with colonial affairs. Much later, I became involved around the time of Lancaster House. I was Head of the Southern African Department, but was not dealing directly with Rhodesia. My main task was to try to help David Summerhayes at the Embassy in Pretoria and others to keep the South Africans off Lord Carrington's back.

**RANGER** We shall find out how successful you were.

**SIR PEREGRINE  
WORSTHORNE** I was writing for *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Sunday Telegraph* during the period that we are talking about, from a generally white

supremacist point of view, which was the point of view of those newspapers at the time.

**JOHN DOBLE**

I was number two at the Embassy in Mozambique from 1978 to 1981. I was in charge from the beginning of May until the end of September 1979 because the Ambassador had retired after a heart attack.

**ROBERT JACKSON**

I played a slightly eighteenth century role at Government House, after Christopher Soames went there, as his unpaid volunteer and friend. I was there because I had been educated at Falcon College in Rhodesia and I had got to know Christopher Soames when he was Commissioner and when I was in his Cabinet. I was elected to the European Parliament in 1979, but took three months off and spent that time with him. I also deputy-edited Chatham House's *International Affairs* from that distance. I am really only a witness in respect of the period after the arrival of Soames in Salisbury. I am wondering why Lord Renwick\* is not with us. That is an interesting absence.

Sir Robin Renwick (Lord Renwick of Clifton), civil servant and diplomat. Counsellor, Rhodesia Department, FCO, 1978–80. Interviewed on 30 Jan. 2006.

**ONSLOW**

He was invited.

**JACKSON**

He would have been a much better witness than me, but I have some things to say.

**PETER JAY**

I was at the British Embassy in Washington between the summer of 1977 and 1979. I had some involvement in the Anglo-American collaboration and initiative during that period.

**RANGER**

Thank you.

We shall start with the Owen period and the events prior to the coming in of the Conservative Government. It seems sensible to start with John Graham. Will you say whatever comes into your head, but be guided by the chronology in question? Perhaps you

will say what you consider to be the major points of that period. Sue [Onslow]'s chronology sets out a bewildering set of events and it is hard to tell which of them were significant in the long term and which of them were not. When I read historians' books about the period, it seems that there was one damn thing after another. It would be useful to know which of the damn things we ought to know about, and which we can forget.

## GRAHAM

Looking at the chronology, I am astonished at how much we seem to have been doing at the time. As has already been mentioned, I owe, a lot to the hospitality of colleagues in the various capitals. I returned from Iraq in the spring of 1977 and went with David Owen, the newly appointed Foreign Secretary, on his tour, which is mentioned in the chronology, of Salisbury, South Africa and many of the other Front Line States. I was appointed to go to the area in May, with my American colleague. A key point at that time had been the Kissinger\* speech and the involvement of the Americans in the joint effort to bring about a settlement.

Henry Kissinger, American academic and statesman. Secretary of State, 1973–7.

I was fortunate in my colleague, Stephen Low,\* who was American Ambassador to Zambia. We developed a happy and close collaboration. Opened up the former High Commission house in Salisbury. We drew on blocked funds to finance us and one of the interesting things was that members of the former domestic staff of that house came out of the bush and were re-employed. They were very happy to see us.

Stephen Low, American diplomat. Ambassador to Zambia, 1976–9.

We started off facing a great deal of suspicion, particularly on the part of the Patriotic Front, the Zimbabwe African National Union and the Zimbabwe African People's Union, but also among the Smith Government. Ian Smith had accepted the broad outline of the Kissinger approach, but I do not think that he accepted what was involved.

Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwean nationalist leader and politician. President, ZANU, 1977–87. Prime Minister, 1980–7; President, 1988–.

Towards the end, I think that we established a certain trust between us. We had great difficulty at first in tracking down Mugabe.\* When



Henry Steel, lawyer. FCO Legal Counsellor, 1976–9.

we went to Maputo, he went to Dar es Salaam and when we went to Dar es Salaam to catch him, he nipped off to Maputo, but we eventually ran him to ground. I had not met them all before at the Geneva Conference, but I asked Henry Steel,\* my legal advisor, who they were. He wrote down their names and added, 'All murderers'. It was not a good start.

James Earl (Jimmy) Carter, American politician. President, 1977–81.

One of the questions concerns the influence of British politics and the Labour Government's relatively small majority on our work. I do not remember whether that figured in my work. However, what did figure was the American political situation with the Senate passing resolutions to end sanctions and the House of Representatives rejecting them. President Carter\* took a keen interest in the matter. He surprised us in, I think, the autumn of 1977 when he described the future forces of independent Rhodesia/Zimbabwe as being 'based on the liberation forces', a phrase that we had studiously avoided using in our efforts. That was a great setback to the white Rhodesians at the time. We managed to work out a constitution, which was basically the same in most points as that finally adopted at Lancaster House, except that we went for an executive presidency instead of a constitutional presidency. There were no doubt other detailed differences.

The problem was always the transition period: who would manage it and how we would bring the war to an end. It seemed to us at the time that no settlement that did not bring the fighting to an end was worth anything. We were not prepared to enforce a settlement by force. We established a degree of trust between us and the various parties. Indeed, when I took my leave in the autumn of 1978, Mugabe who, as I have said, had been difficult to track down to begin with, tapped me on the back and said, 'Don't leave it so long next time'. At least, we had established an element of trust there.

Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU). See chronology, 3 September 1978.

The final event that ended my direct involvement was the shooting down by ZAPU\* of the civilian airliner travelling from Salisbury to

the Victoria Falls. After a pause of some months I was appointed to Tehran.

**RANGER**

Why was that?

**GRAHAM**

I think there was a feeling that that phase had come to an end with the shooting down and perhaps David Owen thought I was rather more inclined towards the Internal Settlement than he was.

**RANGER**

I shall come to you about the Internal Settlement. Since we are talking very much about American participation, will Peter Jay comment?

**JAY**

I do not have much to add, certainly nothing to depart from what Johnny Graham accurately said as I understand it. The only small factual error of which I am aware in the chronology is that under the date of 5 August 1977 – Johnny [Graham] mentioned the incident, but not the error – it states that ‘Nyerere\* met Carter and Vance’.\* In fact, he met Carter and Moose.\* I do not think that Vance was present on that occasion. If he had been, he might have made a difference to that somewhat awkward turn of events in Washington, without any British participation at the time, although that is only speculation. I think that Ministers in London, the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister had to work hard over the next month or two to begin to soften the edge of that difficulty.

I arrived in the summer of 1977 at the time when the Anglo-American collaboration was resting very much on the strong personal relationship between Owen and Vance that was reinforced by the good personal relationship between Carter and Callaghan,\* which was already up and running. Within the first 24 hours of my being physically in Washington – I think that Johnny was there – I was involved in a meeting in the White House with David Owen, Jimmy Carter, Cyrus Vance, Dick Moose and others. At that time, there seemed to be wide agreement about what the Anglo-American ini-

Julius Nyerere (1922–99), Tanzanian politician. President, 1964–85.

Cyrus Vance (1917–2002), American statesman. Secretary of State, 1977–80.

Richard M. Moose, American politician. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, 1977–81.

James Callaghan (Lord Callaghan of Cardiff, 1912–2005), Labour politician. Prime Minister, 1976–9.

tiative was trying to achieve in relation to Rhodesia and other southern African issues at the time, such as Namibia and so on, but Johnny knows more about that than I do.

During the next two years, there were from time to time moments when the relationship was put under bits and pieces of strain, but at no time was the strain catastrophic, because the relationship between Owen and Vance was strong enough to handle that. That between Carter and Callaghan certainly was. However, there were moments when Andy Young,\* the American Ambassador to the UN in New York, and Dick Moose, the Assistant Secretary of State for Africa in the State Department, were what might be crudely paraphrased more shoulder-to-shoulder with a Patriotic Front view of things than British Ministers, at least as to what was practical and sensible diplomacy and as to what was practical and sensible politics. I do not think that British Ministers had any personal sympathies with those whom they were up against in Salisbury.

There was a critical period – we shall no doubt come to this in more detail – when some back channels were exchanging suggestions with Joshua Nkomo.\* Again, Johnny Graham could give a more precise account of matters. On the face of it, it was more of a British than an Anglo-American process, but it is important at this point in history to know and recall that at every point in that process Cyrus Vance was fully informed by David Owen of what he was doing and what he was thinking. In retrospect, I think that it is a source of regret to David Owen that when the events were unfolded by Joe Garba,\* the Nigerian representative, to Julius Nyerere in Dar es Salaam, the opportunity was not taken to use the British official who was present at the time in Dar es Salaam to brief Nyerere on the London view of affairs, so in the end he received purely a Joe Garba view of them.

Joe Garba was a strong supporter of what was going on, but he represented a different Government and was a different man. In consequence of that, Nyerere came out strongly with a negative

Andrew Jackson Young, Jr, American politician. Ambassador to the UN, 1976–9.

Joshua Nkomo (1918–99), Zimbabwean nationalist leader. Leader and founder of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU).

Joseph Nanven Garba (1943–2002), Nigerian soldier and diplomat. External Affairs Commissioner, 1975–8.

Kenneth Kaunda, Zambian politician.  
President, 1964–91.

view of the exchanges with Joshua Nkomo, which contributed to the eventual failure. Probably, however, a more important factor in that failure was that Joshua Nkomo probably never had the stomach for the kind of risks that he would have had to have taken if he were to act on the matters that were discussed between him, Garba and Kenneth Kaunda\* in Zambia.

More broadly, it was my feeling at the time and in the early retrospect that there was a logical historic progression with three major turning points in the same direction, leading from UDI to the situation of black majority rule, which I do not think anyone involved had any doubt in believing was the right general direction in which to be progressing. The problems were about how, not whether. One point was when Henry Kissinger prevailed on Ian Smith to acknowledge that there would be black majority rule within – I forget, Johnny, how long he said. Was it two years?

**GRAHAM**

I think it was two years.

**JAY**

Yes. There is now some historical doubt about whether Ian Smith ever said that, but the fact that Henry Kissinger thought he had, and told the world that he had, was as good as if he had said it.

The second point was the Anglo-American collaboration in the Owen-Vance, Carter-Callaghan period, and the third was Peter Carrington's heroic achievement at Lancaster House. Those three steps took us in an essentially shared direction, with some nuances and all three of them contributed to the eventual outcome. Those of us who were involved at the time – I certainly speak for myself – thought that that was broadly what we should be doing and needed to achieve.

**RANGER**

Why were the Americans at that point so agreeable to being involved? They had not been before and essentially they were not much involved at Lancaster House. Why, at that particular time, were they involved? Was it because of Carter's presidency?

**JAY**

L. B. Johnson (1908–73), American politician. President, 1963–9.

There were a number of important factors, but one fundamentally important one was the profound political change that had taken place in the United States, particularly on Capitol Hill, in respect of civil rights in the United States from the Lyndon Johnson\* period onwards, and the establishment of civil rights, voting rights and personal rights of black Americans. That was an absolute revolution that was achieved almost entirely peacefully and which started in the late 1950s. It led to an intense – although it was not a widespread mass public event – feeling of African connectedness, African roots and African loyalties among black Americans, particularly black American Congressmen who felt strongly and who became extremely important in the various arguments about sanctions.

It is important to remember that sanctions in that connection, because of their nature, was a Congressional issue, not a purely Administration issue. The Congress has to change the law. As people from Europe always fail to understand, it is part of the Government of the United States; it is not a Parliament. It monitors the Government and it needed to be involved. When the Congress eventually imposed biting financial sanctions on South Africa, the story in that country began to change. That is different from what is happening today, but it was part of the same story. Political change in the United States was an important part of the answer to your question.

Secondly, Jimmy Carter succeeded Henry Kissinger at the helm of American foreign policy. He did not succeed him as President, but he succeeded him as the man really driving American foreign policy. I greatly admire Henry Kissinger. His achievements in the negotiation and protection of peace have been extraordinary in many parts of the world. None the less, he was perceived to be an old-fashioned diplomat and operator of power-political balances and I think that that is partly how he saw himself.

Jimmy Carter perceived himself differently. He had a moral foreign

policy – others have used the phrase subsequently and, indeed, previously. He had a strong commitment to human rights, which were an important part of the platform on which he was selected, nominated and elected in 1976. He had appointed not only Cyrus Vance who was sympathetic to all that, but people such as Dick Moose and Andy Young who were strong expressions of that.

The broad answer to your question is American domestic policy. I do not think that a revolution in foreign policy thinking suddenly led to that conclusion. Brzezinski's\* attitude to it all was to see it as part of the Cold War and he believed that if the new regime in Zimbabwe came to power at the head of a column of Russian tanks, it would be a Russian-sympathising regime, and if it came to power as a consequence of a Western-negotiated diplomatic process, it would be more sympathetic to Western interests – a view that I also took.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, American statesman. National Security Advisor, 1977–81.

## **CARRINGTON**

The Chairman asked why the Americans did not become involved in the subsequent part. I think Peter [Jay] would agree that the Carter-Vance Administration had anxieties about Margaret Thatcher's\* attitude to Africa. Margaret Thatcher had great worries about the attitude of Andy Young and the American Administration to South Africa. There was not a great meeting of minds at the time and American involvement was not particularly welcome.

Margaret Thatcher (Baroness Thatcher of Kesteven), Conservative politician. Prime Minister, 1979–90.

## **JAY**

I am sure that that is absolutely correct. If I may say so, you showed great skill in managing that situation.

## **JACKSON**

I just want to put down a footnote from the time that I was in Salisbury. In the American press and among the many American observers who were passing through, with whom I had a lot of interaction, there was intense suspicion of what the British were up to in the final stages and whether we had some arrangement to fix the outcome of the election. We were obviously aware of that and I remember that at one point it was felt necessary for Christopher

Soames, who was not involved in Lancaster House, to ask Lord Carrington whether there were any understandings about the outcome. I also remember the extraordinary security precautions that surrounded that telephone call with all sorts of decamping into an open area and elaborate jamming apparatus being erected. That must have been directed against the Americans, because I am sure that it was well beyond the capacities of the Rhodesians who might have been listening in.

## RANGER

Does Lord Steel wish to comment on what has been said or to throw in additional perspectives?

## STEEL

First, I must apologise for not being able to stay for the second half of the session.

Unlike others round the table, I was only a bystander, not a participant. I do not believe that at the time of UDI anyone would have expected the whole operation to last for 15 years, through four British Prime Ministers: Wilson,\* Heath,\* Callaghan and Thatcher. At the time of UDI the Liberal Party, uncharacteristically, took a much more belligerent attitude than did the two main parties. We certainly criticised the Wilson Government for effectively ruling out the use of force or military support for the governor prior to UDI. At the time, my predecessor became known as Bomber Thorpe\* because, to make sanctions effective, he recommended the high-level precision bombing of the railway lines from Beira\* and South Africa.

I think I was the Commonwealth spokesman for the party at the time and also President of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. The first time I visited Rhodesia was in 1972. It was suggested that I and Denis Healey,\* the Labour Spokesman for Foreign Affairs at the time, went on what was technically called a fact-finding mission. Alec Douglas-Home, the Foreign Secretary, called us in and said, 'Don't go, because you will not get in.' So we did not go. However, in 1972 I went to South Africa and with my assistant entered Rho-

Sir Harold Wilson (Lord Wilson of Rievaulx, 1916–1997), Labour politician. Prime Minister 1964–70 and 1974–6.

Sir Edward Heath (1916–2005), Conservative politician. Prime Minister, 1970–4.

Jeremy Thorpe, Liberal politician. Party leader, 1967–76.

Beira in Mozambique, well before UDI and subsequent sanctions, had used as a port for the land-locked country.

Denis Healey (Lord Healey), Labour politician. Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1974–9.

Francis Leslie Pym (Lord Pym), Conservative politician. Opposition spokesman on Foreign and Commonwealth affairs, 1978–9.

desia by the back door through Botswana and Bulawayo undetected. We spent three days talking to many people. I was arrested at the airport on leaving and given a handsome certificate inviting me not to go back again – I have it on my wall to this day. I went back during the transition period when Bishop Muzorewa got the UDI lifted by the Cabinet. I went back largely at the invitation of an interesting man called Jack Kaye, who was a tobacco farmer in Wedza. He had been a constituent of mine in the Scottish Borders – a typical Scottish farmer – and had left and settled in Rhodesia after the war. He later became a member of Mr Mugabe’s Government. I talked to many people during that visit in 1978 and wrote a report for David Owen with copies to Robin Renwick, who was an old personal friend, and Francis Pym,\* who was then the shadow Foreign Secretary, in which I said that I thought the Government were misreading the situation and that the person who was most likely to emerge from the election was, in fact, Mr Mugabe. That was not a popular view as everyone was banking on a sort of Nkomo-Muzorewa arrangement. How did I reach that conclusion?

**RANGER**

That was as early as 1978?

**STEEL**

Yes, 1978. There were several reasons, but one is an interesting factual story. When I visited Jack Kaye on his farm in Wedza, he said, ‘You must talk to my people in the kitchen because my kitchen boy is Muzorewa’s local constituency chairman.’ I asked him who he thought would win the election and he said, ‘Mr Mugabe’. I thought that, if Muzorewa’s key people on the ground reckoned that Mugabe would win, that was a pretty good indication that we were not reading the situation right. I wrote the report, but unfortunately I do not have a copy, although it is probably somewhere in the archives of this wonderful building.

My conclusion at the end of that time – a rather sobering one – was that I did not think that any of the efforts of the British or the Americans would lead to a settlement because the Smith regime



kept falling out, hoping that a Thatcher Government would settle on much better terms, encouraged by people like Perry Worsthorne, it would be fair to say. He said it himself and I think it is true. It is greatly to the credit of Lord Carrington that, when the change of Government took place, the Smith regime did not get better terms than it would have got earlier, but the whole process was delayed by the political scene in Britain.

HRH The Prince of Wales. Son and heir to HM Queen Elizabeth II.

My last anecdote is about when I went to Zimbabwe for the independence celebrations with Lord Carrington and Prince Charles,\* and attended the wonderful dinner presided over by Christopher Soames on the eve of independence. Two days later, I visited Martin Smith who had been the Deputy Prime Minister under Ian Smith, and whom Mugabe wisely kept on as Minister for Economic Affairs to maintain stability. I went to see him in his office and he said, 'You and I had tremendous arguments on television and radio during the Lancaster House process and I strongly resented some of the things you said, but I have served in this country under four Prime Ministers and Mr Mugabe is not only the most able, he is also the most courteous.' In view of what is happening today, I just thought that you would like to know that.

**RANGER**

Very interesting. Do you want to rise to that provocation, Peregrine?

**WORSTHORNE**

'Want to' may be an exaggeration, but perhaps I ought to.

I was in touch with part of the Conservative Party at that time with which I was fully sympathetic and wrote its views. It said that the longer African majority rule could be postponed, the better for all concerned, particularly for the white farmers, which is manifestly the case in Zimbabwe, and, one could argue now, as we argued then – perhaps our opinions have not totally been disproved – that it was also better for the African population itself.

The group of Conservative MPs and journalists of which I was a part also took the view that, although it was pretty clear that white

supremacy was a doomed attitude and would in the end be reversed, the longer that grim reversal with such fateful consequences for the African continent could be postponed, the better. The view that the less enthusiastic British support was for that end and the more we could postpone the moment when officialdom in Britain felt that *force majeure* had to be caved into and we would sell the whites down the river, was, again, something that we could put our shoulder to.

It would be to misjudge the events that we have been discussing from the official point of view – American and British officialdom – not to say that the kind of results that had transpired seemed at the time inevitable, but the timing was not inevitable. I remember going to see Dr Verwoerd\* after Harold Macmillan's\* winds of change speech in 1961,\* I think, when he was on a tour of Africa. He had no servants, black or white, and when I arrived at Groot Schuur\* there was no one to answer the door, so I poked my nose round it and there was no sign of any security. I went into the garden and there was the great man, sitting in a wicker chair. He was probably reading the Bible in Dutch or Afrikaans. He said, 'I listened to your Prime Minister's speech about the wind of change blowing through Africa. I wished that I had been able to get up to interrupt him and say that the real wind of change was blowing through the whites of Westminster.' I think that that was true.

At the time, it was the lack of British will to postpone the moment of destiny that marked the real change and why eventually the past was sold. It was not only, or even primarily, black nationalism; it was white absence and white imperialism.

Those are my only comments because, as a journalist, I did not have insight to the negotiations that were going on, but those negotiations in respect of the British had to take into consideration at every turn that there was a strong faction within the Tory party that did not wish to see a settlement, at least a settlement that opened the way to black majority rule. As has been said, it was perfectly

H. F. Verwoerd (1901–66), South African politician. Prime Minister, 1958–66.

Harold Macmillan (the Earl of Stockton, 1894–1986), Conservative politician. Prime Minister, 1957–63.

Macmillan delivered the speech on 3 Feb. 1960 to the Parliament of South Africa, in Cape Town. In it he famously remarked: 'The wind of change is blowing through this continent. Whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact.'

The President of South Africa resides in the Groot Schuur Estate, which was rebuilt in the late nineteenth century by Cecil Rhodes.

true that Lord Carrington, with Mrs Thatcher's surprising approval, did reach the settlement, but he must have known while he was doing it that a great many of his Conservative colleagues were not wishing him well and were hoping that it would not come about.

**RANGER**

We shall hear more about that after tea.

**JACKSON**

I have a little anecdote on Conservative thinking to balance what Perry said. I guess that Lord Carrington would testify that there was also a strong vein of realism. My little anecdote relates to Alec Douglas-Home. I spent the 1970 General Election as his bag-carrier and bottle washer. We talked about Rhodesia because I had been at school there and he told me of a conversation that he had had with, I think, Ian Smith in 1963 – remember that he was talking in 1970. He had said to Ian Smith, 'Look, you are thinking about going on your own. That will not work because the Portuguese are not going to be able to hold out, and when the Portuguese go, you will go.' I think that that realistic appraisal was always a factor in Conservative thinking and was probably the most important factor that led in the end to Lancaster House.

**RANGER**

Yes, now is a good moment to bring in some of the people who were in the surrounding countries during the period. However, before doing that, I shall make an improper chairmanly observation: you can argue that the longer the war went on in Rhodesia with all its sufferings and atrocities on both sides, the worse the prospects for the future were. That is a counter argument. Perhaps I should not express my opinions, but that is what I think.

Can we hear from those who were in South Africa at the time about how the situation looked from there? Perhaps David Summerhayes would like to say something.

**SUMMERHAYES**

I shall start with the question of how important was South Africa's role? When we consider the issue from the South African point of

view, we have to recognise that at that time the South African government was under international pressure on three fronts: it was under pressure over apartheid; it was under pressure over South West Africa and it was under pressure on the Rhodesian issue because South Africa was, after UDI, the principal economic supporter of Rhodesia and the UDI Government.

South Africa and Rhodesia were closely linked by history since the days of Cecil Rhodes.\* The whites in Rhodesia had many friends and contacts in South Africa. I am thinking especially of the Foreign Minister P.K. van der Byl,\* and Air Vice-Marshal Hawkins,\* whom I had a great deal to do with in Pretoria as the diplomatic Rhodesian representative, had a large diplomatic and military mission in Pretoria. All those people had an influence in South Africa, especially with the more extreme Afrikaner and nationalist point of view and with the defence establishment. The South African government was disposed quite naturally, because of common links, to do the best that it could to support white rule in Rhodesia. The apartheid issue that South Africa faced was similar to that which Ian Smith believed he faced in Rhodesia.

South Africa was under growing pressure from HMG to reduce its economic and military support for Ian Smith's regime. In Pretoria, we always had the problem of how far could South Africans be pushed against their entrenched tendency to natural instincts, which were to support Smith. We faced a difficult task until Prime Minister John Vorster\* began to worry about the infiltration of Communist influences in Southern Africa. First, we had Angola. The South Africans moved into Angola and began to face military difficulties up there; eventually they had to pull out. We helped them at the last moment to arrange for an orderly withdrawal of their forces. They thought that Mozambique would go the same way as Angola. It was this Communist threat, as he saw it, that led John Vorster to agree to a process of what he called *détente*. This opened the way to promoting Western influence in South Africa.

Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902), a leading proponent of British imperialism after whom Rhodesia was named.

Pieter K. van der Byl (1923–1999), Rhodesian politician. Held various portfolios in the Smith Government including Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism, and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Air Vice Marshal Harold Hawkins, Rhodesian soldier.

John Vorster (Balthazar Johannes Vorster, 1915–83), South African politician. Prime Minister, 1966–78; President, 1978–9.

We could use that leverage and the Americans also. We could use that leverage, and the Americans also.

Although the South African government were not naturally disposed to be with us, they were inclined now to be more helpful. In my time in Pretoria, we had a reasonable understanding with the South Africans. They were always prepared to co-operate in respect of visits, meetings and other aspects of diplomacy. My memory is that when they could they were always co-operative. Brand Fourie,\* the Political Director in the Department of Foreign Affairs was particularly helpful and also Hans Van Dalsen, the Under-Secretary for Africa, and Ray Killen, who later became Ambassador to London.

B.G. 'Brand' Fourie, South African diplomat. Director General of Foreign Affairs, 1966–82.

## RANGER

I have heard it said – in fact, one of my graduate students wrote a thesis on this – that there was no fundamental ideological sympathy with Rhodesia because white Rhodesians had spurned the opportunity to join South Africa. They had a mock-up, non-ideological form of racial discrimination and, in a way, they did not deserve to survive. Do you think that that was an element in South African thinking?

## SUMMERHAYES

That was certainly an element in right-wing Afrikaner thinking. If we go back to the foundation of Rhodesia, Cecil Rhodes was highly unpopular with the Afrikaners. But, South Africa and Rhodesia had come together very much during World War II. There had been co-operation throughout the war with the training of Royal Air Force pilots and so on. The military net was closely linked, and that had endured from the war-time period. I think that South Africa initially showed quite strong ideological feeling about Rhodesia. However an undercurrent of self-interest was more evident when Pik Botha\* became Foreign Minister because he was a *détente* man.

Roelof Frederik 'Pik' Botha, South African politician. Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1977–94.

## RANGER

Thabo Mbeki, South African politician. President, 1999–.

It is interesting to compare that with the Mbeki\*-Mugabe relationship.

Let me ask Wilfred Turner how it looked from Botswana? You said

earlier that it was a Front Line State without a front line. I have recently seen a catalogue from the Botswana archive of the President's office that is full of details relating to refugees, turning a blind eye on guerrilla training on Botswana territory and so on. Were you aware of that dimension while you were there?

## **TURNER**

According to Mr Turner, some members of the Botswana Defence Force may have been more sympathetic to the guerrillas. Their whole rationale for being, as a new army formed as recently as 1967, was that there should be a feasible enemy. The Rhodesian Army probably filled this role.

I was not aware of any guerrilla training in Botswana. Nor do I think that the majority of the population were aware of it. I do know that the majority of Ministers and senior officials would not have approved it. It should be remembered that refugees crossing the border were apprehend, disarmed if necessary and corralled in the two huge refugee camps administered by the ICR at Francistown and Selibe Phikwe.\* Botswana was thus in a peculiar position. First, it did not share in the sanctions of other Front Line States, mainly because it was a land-locked state and its neighbours realised that it was poor and had to depend on South Africa and Rhodesia for its internal resources and the sort of life that its people wanted to lead. The railway service was tremendously important. Without that, Botswana would not have been able to survive. Oil came up from South Africa as did all the other supplies for a normal life. Dairy products like milk, cheese and bacon came from Rhodesia. Apart from the practicalities, there was a feeling that Botswana wanted a quiet life. Botswana was of course unhappy about the racist regimes across the borders but were not prepared to get involved in violent opposition to them.

Sir Seretse Khama (1921–80),  
Botswanian politician. President,  
1966–80.

In fact, Seretse Khama\* was very concerned about Rhodesian independence. He told me, 'Of course, one has to support Rhodesian independence, but I am afraid that there will be bloody mayhem when it happens.' Afterwards, he was extremely pleased that the Mugabe government appeared to be pragmatic about race relations. Seretse Khama was certainly the most sympathetic of the Front Line leaders to the British attitude. In fact, he was very co-operative and I never had a problem about explaining British policy to him.

He more or less indicated that he saw the sense in it. When he went to Front Line State meetings, he would get in touch with me shortly afterwards and tell me that he would give me briefing on what happened. I think that that must have helped London, although I do not know how much.

I reported such matters, but I was not sure how relevant it was to London. It was certainly encouraging that one Front Line leader was on our side. I think that the Botswana government policy reflected the attitude of people themselves. I do not think that they were too bothered about Zimbabwe, nor about South Africa and apartheid, because they could go shopping, visit there for religious ceremonies, medical treatment and when they wanted. It was an extraordinary Front Line State, which people did not appreciate at the time. I certainly think that the other Front Line States did not react to the ambivalent attitude in Botswana possibly because it was seen as a small country whilst at the same time Seretse Khama was respected as a distinguished and successful African.\*.

Mr Turner has added that this was confirmed by the emotional reaction of the Front Line leaders when Khama died in 1980.

## **RANGER**

A couple of references have been made to the importance of what happened in Mozambique and I wonder if John Doble would like to say something about that.

## **DOBLE**

Four points seem to have arisen. First on South Africa and Zimbabwe and reflecting on what you said, Mr Chairman, it seems that it was absolutely critical that, until the time when South Africa's view of Rhodesia changed, the world had for 15 years, as Lord Steel said, tried to achieve changes and had succeeded in nothing because South Africa was supporting Rhodesia. When South Africa decided that it was no longer in its interests to support Rhodesia, change began to happen immediately. Likewise now, the whole world wants to do something about Mr Mugabe, but he will go on exactly the same while Mbeki goes on supporting him. If the South Africans were to change their attitude, the situation in Zimbabwe would similarly change.

Samora Moisés Machel (1933–86), Mozambican politician. President, 1975–86.

Edgar Z. Tekere, Zimbabwean politician.

Fernando Honwana (–1986), Mozambiquan politician.

Secondly, looking at matters purely from Mozambique, I considered that US influence on Machel\* and ZANU was rather limited. I remember that at the end of 1978 when Andy Young and David Owen were trying to set up a conference somewhere – the question was whether it should be in New York or London – the Secretary General of ZANU, Edgar Tekere\* came to me and said, ‘Oh, if there is to be a conference, it must be in London, because we are your people and you are our tricky British, but we understand you better than the Americans.’ There were mixed feelings towards the British on the part of the ZANU.

Thirdly, the influence of Mozambique was critical because it saw itself as being gradually destroyed by the war between Mugabe’s guerrillas and the Smith regime. There were ever deeper raids into Mozambique, with the blowing up of railways and oil storage facilities in Beira. It desperately wanted an end to the war and a settlement in Rhodesia.

Machel had an able foreign affairs adviser, a young man called Fernando Honwana\* who was tragically killed when Machel’s plane was blown up. He went to the Commonwealth conference in Lusaka. He had been educated at Waterford in Swaziland and York University. There was a Communist regime with a very broad-minded, well-educated young man next to Machel advising him all the time that he should push for a settlement. We were obviously close to that.

I do not believe that Mugabe particularly wanted to go to Lancaster House and that it is doubtful that he would have done. He felt that ZANU would win in the end and I think that he wanted to conquer and go in as the victor. But the Mozambique Government virtually ordered him to go to Lancaster House and said that, if he did not go, his bases would be closed down. Mozambique played a critical role and was grateful for the outcome. Whenever the communist leader, Machel, made a public speech it was full of eulogies for Mrs Thatcher that used to continue for 20 minutes or so.



David Smith (1922–96), Rhodesia and later Zimbabwean politician. Minister of Agriculture, 1968–76; Minister of Finance; Deputy Prime Minister; Minister of Commerce and Finance.

My last point concerns what Lord Steel said about Mugabe and what David Smith\* said: that he was the most able and courteous Prime Minister. There is a view that early on everyone thought that Mugabe would be wonderful. In some circles in southern Africa, there is even gossip that we plotted to get him in and manipulated the elections. That is not the case at all. Our reporting from the Embassy in Maputo was that ZANU was likely to win, but we did not think much of ZANU or Mugabe. We thought that he would bring in communist policies and nationalise everything. He said that he would nationalise shops, businesses and take over all the land. We had no illusions at all about the nature of a Mugabe-ruled Zimbabwe.

## JACKSON

A footnote on Machel from the period during the Soames governorship and the critical role of Fernando Honwana who had been at Lancaster House, but was now based in Salisbury. He talked to everyone and was very interesting. There was a meeting between Soames and Machel, which followed up the previous diplomacy, to persuade Machel to persuade Mugabe to let up a bit on the campaign of intimidation in the election. That seemed to be a good card to play and probably had some effect.

I remember a conversation with Fernando Honwana when he tried to explain that the British could work with Mugabe. His line was that Mugabe was not a real Marxist and was not like the people back in Mozambique. In Mozambique, the people come from a Portuguese and Catholic background, so were naturally ideological and hard-line, whereas all the people in Rhodesia came from the soft Anglo-Saxon British tradition and were fundamentally liberals at heart, but talked Marxism. That was his analysis. I think he genuinely believed it, and it may also have been partly true.

## WORSTHORNE

Was Mugabe not Jesuit-educated?

## JACKSON

Indeed. He was a practising Catholic.

- DOBLE** Can I make one comment? It is always said that Mugabe is a devout Catholic and religious. I made a point of investigating that and talked to the Papal Nuncio. I asked, 'As far as you are concerned, to what extent is Mr Mugabe a practising Catholic?' He said that he had been in Maputo for seven or eight years and had never once seen Mugabe in church. He had once arranged for Mugabe to call on the Pope, when he was visiting Rome. It was all fixed up, but Mugabe never did call on the Pope, because he preferred to make a speech to communist students at the University of [Modena and] Reggio Emilia or somewhere. He stood up the Pope.
- RANGER** He went to the funeral.
- DOBLE** He may have gone to the funeral, but entirely for political reasons and to shake Prince Charles's hand.
- JACKSON** That is an education.
- RANGER** It is more of an anecdote.
- GRAHAM** In our contacts with Machel, we formed a high opinion of him and when he said that he would do something, unlike some of the others we talked to, he did it. We tried to persuade him to agree to the all-party conference in the summer of 1978 and Mugabe was in the waiting room outside and went straight in after us. The next day, Mugabe agreed to the all-party conference. I am sure that he was told to by Machel.
- I have heard a story that Machel once said to Mugabe, 'Don't make the mistake that I made and drive out your white farmers.'
- RANGER** We are coming to an end, but I will take a couple more comments after which I want to hear Geneva mentioned before we go to tea.

**BYATT**

Ndabaningi Sithole (1920–2000), Methodist minister and Zimbabwean Nationalist leader. Founder of Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) in 1963.

I was about to mention that and to make a couple of comments and an anecdote about Fernando Honwana and Mugabe's personality.

I first met Mugabe at the Geneva conference. He had just taken over the leadership of ZANU from Ndabaningi Sithole\* and was a man under great strain and obviously not entirely confident of his position. He was rigid, inflexible, disagreeable and a totally unattractive personality. The next time I had substantial dealings with him was after independence.

One of the most remarkable things that was achieved in the Lancaster House process by Lord Carrington and Lord Soames was to convince Mugabe that, when he had won the election, there was an alternative way of doing things and that it could work. Mugabe had become charming, courteous, as David Smith has said, and quite a different personality from the one that I had known four years earlier. The difference was that at Geneva he was unsure of himself, but when he had won the election in Zimbabwe he was confident. However, it became clear eventually that, if the alternative way was followed much longer, his party would be voted out of office. So, in the year 2000, we got the Geneva-style Mugabe again and we still have him. He is ruthless and showing the other side of his personality.

I shall make a short comment about Honwana to show the closeness of his relationship with the British. I had met him at the Lancaster House Conference. He came to Harare – or Salisbury as it was then – a few weeks after independence and I remember being invited to a lunch given for Honwana by the Mozambique Ambassador.

After lunch, when Honwana got up from the table, he said, 'Robin [Byatt], come with me.' He took me into the garden and said, 'What is really going on in this country?' He looked to the British, rather than his Ambassador, for an account of what was happening, which I thought was fascinating.

**RANGER**

For those who do not know, the Honwanas were the most elite family in Mozambique and still remain so.

**SPENCER**

I am sure that Robin Renwick could tell a much better story of Geneva than I can, but I want to make one comment. I had a feeling that the process was doomed to failure from the outset. We could not engage with anyone on a basis that would enable us to engage across the board. We could make a little progress with one person and then with someone else, but bringing it all together eluded us completely. There was simply not enough pressure at that stage on any of the parties involved to make them feel that it was worth their while to give any substantive ground, and it became clear that a settlement would have to be played into the long grass, at least for the time being. The result was a conference that began hopefully, but started work with difficulty because we had all sorts of procedural objections. It looked as though it might be going somewhere for a bit, but then it more or less fell apart. I found that it was a dispiriting exercise, but Robin [Byatt] will have a comment to make.

**BYATT**

It was ghastly, wasn't it? The real trouble was that there was only one delegation that thought it was in its interest to reach a settlement, and that was the British delegation. The others, for different reasons, all felt that it was not the time.

**RANGER**

Let me ask you the question with which I began. It was ghastly, but was it significant? Should we know about it?

**BYATT**

Yes, it was important. It was a lesson to the British in how not to run a Rhodesian constitutional conference. I believe the decision to call to a conference was taken largely at American urging. I was recalled at short notice from a university sabbatical to join the British delegation. It quickly became evident that we had a clear objective (get everyone to agree on early majority rule independ-

ence for Rhodesia) but no very clear idea of how to achieve it. There was no proper strategy; no 'game plan'. My briefing, in just 48 hours in London, must have been a bit more detailed but it remains in my memory as little more than, 'Well, good luck. Have a good conference.' This lack of pre-planned method, which carried over into the running of the conference itself, coupled with the reluctance of all Rhodesian participants to be committed to anything at all, led to the endless and largely pointless wrangling. The conference ran slowly into the sand. By contrast when I was recalled from New York to the Lancaster House conference, Sir Anthony Duff, who had shared the Geneva experience, was already up to the eyebrows in planning every detail of the Lancaster House conference. Lord Carrington will agree that his spadework was vital to the final conclusion.

The British delegation was always two or three jumps ahead of the others. For example, I was sent out after three weeks – when we were just starting to discuss the constitution – to begin discussions on how to work a ceasefire. We were always pushing ahead and making sure that we knew exactly what would happen not just at the next step, but the step after that.

**CARRINGTON**

I agree. They would not accept the next stage until they had agreed on the first stage.

**BYATT**

Exactly, and once they had agreed, we were grateful to be ready for the next stage.

**RANGER**

We should break for tea, but my favourite participant will come in with another short anecdote.

**JACKSON**

You asked about the significance of the Muzorewa internal election and I wanted to say a word about that in light of what David Steel said about his conversation with the cook boy. One of the problems was that, when we came to the end game and the Soames

governorship, no one had any idea about the balance of opinion among the Africans, particularly among the Shona. There had been a successful election and Muzorewa had a following, had won seats and had formed a Government. I think that the white Rhodesians and Nkomo, and indeed the British, were pinning great hopes on a division among the Shona such that there would be a Muzorewa faction and a Mugabe faction. The critical decision that Soames made as Governor was, to recognise that we simply did not know what the outcome would be and that it would be extremely dangerous to make presumptions before the election on the assumption that there would be a division in the Shona vote. That turned out to be correct.

## **RANGER**

In a way, Lancaster House succeeded only because everyone was deceived into thinking that they would win. Now the great British institution of tea interrupts us.

## Session Two

**RANGER**

People at the back have told me that they have found it difficult to hear. There are other chairs available, and instead of making us old gentlemen speak loudly, perhaps they could come closer if they found the first session difficult to hear? I know that there is a natural shyness about sitting near the front, but if no one sits in the chairs I shall not take their complaints seriously.

We now come to the second session, having left a tremendous amount undiscussed in the first session. We now move on to the Lancaster House process itself and to the Soames Governorship in Zimbabwe. I have asked Lord Carrington to begin.

**CARRINGTON**

Before the Conservative Government were elected, I was not the Shadow Foreign Secretary. That was Francis Pym. I was a director of Barclays International and of RTZ and had the opportunity to go round Africa and to get to know some of the people who were involved in the Rhodesian problem. In fact, I saw them all with the exception of Mugabe, who refused to see me. Someone said earlier that Mugabe knew that he would win the battle in the end and that he did not really think it necessary to talk to anyone very much. Just before the Conservative Government were elected, the Shadow Cabinet more or less said, although not quite, that it would accept the Muzorewa election if it were a free and fair election. I felt that that was a great mistake, but it was not my business at the time.

When I became Foreign Secretary, the more I thought about the matter and the more I learnt about it, the more worried I became about what would happen if we accepted that the Muzorewa Government elections were free and fair. First, neither Nkomo nor Mugabe, nor their parties, had taken part in the election. It is true that 60 per cent. or whatever it was of the electorate voted, but the Africans had never voted before, so there was obviously an incentive to vote. That did not seem to be a good basis on which we could accept the outcome.

Moreover, it was clear to me that no one else in the world would consider the elections to be a really adequate expression of the intentions of the people of Rhodesia. None of the European Union members, at the time, was supportive of the Muzorewa election. The Americans – Vance and Carter – were very opposed to any recognition of Muzorewa, as was the Commonwealth. We would have been isolated if we had recognised the Muzorewa Government, with the possible exception of the support of South Africa, which would have gone along with us. Real fears were expressed to me – they were probably true – that it might lead to a break-up of the Commonwealth and, curiously enough, might lead to sanctions against us by the Commonwealth. It seemed that that would be a disaster from the British point of view.

Alan Lennox-Boyd (1st Viscount Boyd of Merton, 1904–83), Conservative politician. He led what has come to be called the Boyd Commission, 1979.

Lord Harlech (David Ormsby Gore, 1918–85), Conservative politician.

The problem was that Alan Boyd\* was sent round with a number of other people to see whether it was a free and fair election and by those standards, it was, but it did not make much difference to the outcome or the consequences as I saw them. I sent David Harlech\* around Europe, Africa and so on to find out what the general feeling was about the Muzorewa Government. He came back with the strong view that it would not be recognised by anyone except the South Africans. With the help of my colleagues in the Foreign Office, we set about trying to convince our colleagues that the right thing to do was to have another go at a conference.

The questions on page 5 of the paper relate to the consequences of Lusaka and Lancaster House, and why they succeeded. Lusaka was a success because Margaret Thatcher played an important part. When she went there, she was a pleasant surprise to those who had rather doubted whether she really intended to get an agreed settlement. That was extremely important. I confess that, having got the Lancaster House Conference on the agenda with everyone agreeing to it, I did not think for a moment that it would be a success. I thought that it was certainly worth a try and that it was the only thing that we could do, but I thought that the likelihood of success



was minimal.

When we started the Lancaster House conference, I had never seen Mugabe. I gave a dinner for him. He had been very badly treated by Ian Smith's Government. He had been locked up for 11 years and was not even allowed to go to his only daughter's funeral. I asked him whether he was feeling bitter about that and he said, 'I am not bitter about people. I am bitter about the system.' I thought that that was a revealing remark. In spite of the awful things that are happening in Zimbabwe at present, we must look back on what Mugabe did for the first 12 or 15 years, which were not really all that bad. He did not start off too badly.

Why did the Lancaster House Conference succeed when others did not? The main reason was that, at the time, all parties wanted a settlement. Nkomo was getting on and he saw himself as a father figure in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe and wanted a settlement. He was exiled in Zambia and felt that the time had come. Ian Smith had decided that things were becoming bad in Rhodesia. After 15 years, sanctions were beginning to bite, the war was causing the whites – the wealth-creators in Zimbabwe – to disappear and flight. The economy was pretty bad. The South Africans wanted a settlement because they were spending too much money, time and trouble supporting the Rhodesians. Machel and Nyerere wanted a settlement because they were suffering as a result of the war. Machel had incursions into Mozambique and was not getting the food that he wanted from Zimbabwe. The same was true of Nyerere. Kaunda had Nkomo's army in Zambia, but it was doing absolutely nothing. All the fighting was being done by Mugabe, who was a great trial. The only person who did not want a settlement was Mugabe. As was said earlier, he thought that he would win anyway so there was no need for a settlement.

The second reason why Lancaster House was a success was that we decided that it was a British problem and that only those who were immediately concerned should come anywhere near the confer-

Benjamin Mkapa, Tanzanian politician. Foreign Minister, 1977-80.

ence. We excluded all the Front Line States and the Americans, and it became an entirely British responsibility. We had a ring fence around Lancaster House to prevent others from coming in. They all wanted to interfere for one reason or another, particularly Nyerere who had an agenda for Mugabe. After we had agreed on the election, he said, 'I want you to know that, unless Mugabe wins the election, I shall not consider it a fair election.' At Independence, he did not come but his Foreign Minister\* did and he said to me, 'The President wanted me to ask you why you made Mugabe win by so much.' I am sure that one of the good things about Lancaster House was that we kept all but the principals out and made it an entirely British thing.

Charles Powell (Lord Powell of Bayswater), diplomat. Special Counsellor for Rhodesia negotiations, 1979-80.

The third thing that made Lancaster House a success was that it was a step-by-step approach. I was fortunate to have Derek Day, Tony Duff, Robin Renwick and Charles Powell,\* who were absolutely splendid in the way in which they operated and the plans they made. None of it would have happened but for them. It was remarkable.

How far was it achieved because the Tory right-wing had neutralised? Perry [Worthstorne], the Tory right-wing was not neutralised, believe you me. In the middle of the Lancaster House Conference, there was a Conservative Party Conference at Blackpool. The Suez Group, or whatever the Tory far right were called, had organised banners all around the inside of the hall saying, 'Hang Carrington'. It was not exactly neutralised.

How important was Lord Soames's management of the transitional period? It was absolutely vital. Christopher Soames did two things that made it a success. One was that, although he was advised by some not to recognise the election as being free and fair – they were all playing dirty tricks – he recognised that Mugabe had won by an enormous amount and that it would be have been madness to try to upset the election. The second thing he did was to get along-

side Mugabe and get him to trust him. That made all the difference for the first 12 or 15 years of independence in Zimbabwe.

**RANGER**

David Steel and many others have said that they predicted that Mugabe would win, but at the conference what did the British Government think? There was strong confidence on Muzorewa's side and Nkomo had always enjoyed electoral support. That is what I meant earlier by saying that things were succeeding because everyone was deluded into thinking that they could win.

**CARRINGTON**

Everyone deluded themselves. I certainly did not delude anyone into thinking that they could win. They all thought that they would win. That is absolutely true.

**RANGER**

You thought what at the time?

**CARRINGTON**

We feared that Mugabe would win because he was an unknown quantity. He was a Marxist and we did not quite know where we stood. There was a hope that perhaps Nkomo would break away from Mugabe if the election were close and join up with Muzorewa. The South African and Rhodesian intelligence all thought that that was likely to happen. However, I have discovered during a long period in Government that intelligence services are almost always wrong.

**RANGER**

I am sure that that is right.

**JAY**

Peter [Carrington], can you confirm that there was in fact a sweepstake in the Foreign Office on the outcome of the election and that it was won by the person who got the result exactly correct to the exact number of seats – your Principal Private Secretary, George Walden?\*

George Walden, diplomat. Principal Private Secretary to Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, 1978–81.

**CARRINGTON**

I was kept from the sweepstake.

**JAY**

Your office was well informed.

**JACKSON**

Mr Chairman, do you want to talk about Lancaster House first? I would like to say something about how I saw the Soames period.

**RANGER**

We will talk about Lancaster House and then come on to Soames. That seems most logical.

**DAY**

I am here because, shortly after the Conservative Party came to power, it was decided to send a representative to Salisbury to establish contact with the new Government of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia. I remember sitting round a table in the Secretary of State's office when Cyrus Vance the United States Secretary of State visited and the matter came up. A number of us were sitting there and Mr Vance asked whether someone was to be sent to Salisbury. Lord Carrington looked in my direction, pointed at me and said, 'Are you doing anything at the moment?' That was how I came to be appointed to go to Salisbury.

It might be helpful if I explain what my objectives were in going to Salisbury, as it then was. First, it was to establish as good a working relationship as one could with the new Government of Zimbabwe/Rhodesia. It was very new with a black Prime Minister and many black Ministers, but also a number of Ministers from the Rhodesia Front, many of them pretty hard line: Charles Irvine\*, PK Van der Byl and others.

It was also an objective to convince members of the Government and the business and farming communities that the new Conservative Government were deadly serious in their desire to reach a settlement to the Rhodesia problem. It had been going on too long and they wanted an early solution. The more difficult part of the task was to persuade the new Ministers in Salisbury and, indeed, the white community generally that the British Government were not just going to recognise the internal settlement and the Muzorewa Government.

Charles Irvine. Minister in the Rhodesia Front Government under Ian Smith. Appointed Minister of Agriculture in the Muzorewa Government.

Most people in Rhodesia – whites, certainly – had assumed from the hints that had come out during the general election in the UK that, with the internal settlement in Rhodesia and Mrs Thatcher as Prime Minister in the UK, Britain would recognise the new Government. It came as something of a shock to people in Rhodesia to find that that was not the case and that, unless there could be some further progress in the constitutional process, recognition was unlikely to be forthcoming. During the first four or five weeks in Salisbury, I spent most of my time talking to representatives of all elements of the community, as well as the Government, explaining that some further constitutional changes were necessary.

It was also necessary to explain that, if there were to be a settlement, the British Government would have to devise a settlement to the British Parliament that would be acceptable. It is doubtful whether a blanket recognition of the internal settlement would have gone through Parliament, but it might have done. However, as Lord Carrington said, it would certainly not have been accepted throughout the Commonwealth or the international community as a whole. It would certainly not have led to the lifting of sanctions. That was basically my objective in going to Salisbury.

In due course, after a period of weeks and with the prospect of a Constitutional Conference in London, opinion began to mellow. People began to accept that it was no good assuming that the status quo would be acceptable and that some further progress would have to be made. Why was that? There were several reasons, one of which Lord Carrington has touched on. War weariness was growing in Rhodesia. I spoke to many white farmers and representatives of the Commercial Farmers Union, and several said, 'I am going to plant one more crop and if we do not get a settlement by the time I harvest that, I am out. We cannot go on living like this.'

Many farmers stayed on their farms. But their wives and families had moved into the towns. Their children were being educated in the towns, at boarding schools and so on. Older men who were not

doing military service were called up for police duties and were out at all times of the day and night on duty. Their children were conscripted into the Rhodesian Army and many were killed or wounded. A sense of war weariness was growing and that was one of the reasons why there was general acceptance of the idea of a conference in the hope that it could produce a final settlement. There was a suggestion that a delay in the process would have produced a better outcome. I do not believe that that view was shared by many of the whites on the ground in Rhodesia at the time. Many of them had had enough.

When the Lancaster House conference was agreed in Lusaka, it was instructed to invite Muzorewa to nominate 12 representatives from the Government and Zimbabwe- Rhodesian. Each element of the Patriotic Front would nominate a similar number. Muzorewa said that that was no good for him and that he had to have more because he not only had to accommodate his Government, but also the Reverend Sithole who was sitting on the sidelines, having refused to join in the interim Government.

Chief Jeremiah Chirau, tribal chief-tain, Zimbabwean politician.

Another figure whose name has now faded was Chief Chirau.\* The chiefs in Rhodesia had also been an element in the earlier process, but Muzorewa decided that there was no room for them in his delegation, so I had an uncomfortable half hour, having been summoned by Chief Chirau, to ask why he had not been invited to Lancaster House. I had to explain that it was not up to me nor the British Government who should represent the Zimbabwe/Rhodesian Government, but that it was up to the Prime Minister and that he had better talk to him.

I still have a copy of the *Salisbury Herald* of 1 June with the big headline, 'Zimbabwe/Rhodesia is born'. Down the side was a headline saying, 'Tory envoy arrives'. In a sense, that is slightly symbolic because Zimbabwe/Rhodesians thought, 'Okay, Zimbabwe is born; the Tories are in power; all will be well.' It was a major task both for the Government at home and during my time in Salisbury to per-

suade them that more than that was required. At the end the process, one could say, 'If we could get the agreement, the British Government would certainly call for the immediate suspension of sanctions as a comprehensive settlement.' That, as Lord Carrington said, was a prize that they were anxious to achieve.

That is a brief account of those three or four months between 1 June and the Lancaster House conference.

**RANGER**

It must have been fascinating. Have you written about it, or are you going to write about it?

**DAY**

I did find this little book containing some notes that I wrote at the time, but they will remain there.

**RANGER**

Perhaps there will be a top historian's smash and grab raid before you leave today.

Sir Brian, would you like to say something?

**BARDER**

Well I was hardly involved at all. My task, if there was one, was to head off any second thoughts from the South African end. The instructions to the Embassy in Pretoria came from the Rhodesia Department, not my Department.

My main role was once a week to look into Robin Renwick's room, wring my hands and say, 'You are much too blunt and tough with the Africans. We have to live with them afterwards, so can't you moderate your language and be a little less rough with them?' I always received the response that you would expect from Robin Renwick. My role did not extend much beyond that.

**DAY**

Bishop Muzorewa has now faded from the scene and I do not know where he is or what he is doing. He is very much yesterday's man, but in a strange way, the Muzorewa Era was almost an essential and a valuable stepping stone in the transition from white majority rule, through Muzorewa, to genuine black majority rule.

There was a Rhodesian black sitting in the Prime Minister's office and occupying the Prime Minister's house in Salisbury. Other black ministers were sitting in Government Departments working with white Permanent Secretaries. To be fair, I think that the whites still maintained the dominant influence over almost all aspects of the Government, but the general populace had seen a black person sitting in the Prime Minister's chair and after three or four months, when life had gone on reasonably for them, perhaps they thought that it was not so bad after all. That period was a valuable part of the process.

## **CARRINGTON**

There was one other plus. We had no cards to play if things went wrong at Lancaster House with Nkomo and Mugabe, but it was always in the back of their minds – rightly so, because we put it there – that if the Lancaster House Conference failed, we would recognise the Muzorewa Government, and they really did not want that at all.

I referred earlier to excluding everyone from the Lancaster House conference except the Rhodesians themselves. You will remember, Derek [Day], that when we arrived on the first day, all the delegations went and had coffee. They were all talking to each other because they had all been at school together. Even Ian Smith was talking to – What was the man called?

## **DELEGATES**

Josiah Magama Tongogara (1938–1979), Zimbabwean nationalist leader. Leader of Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army, 1973–9.

Tongogara.\*

## **CARRINGTON**

There was quite an atmosphere of all old boys together. It did not last long, but –

## **BARDER**

Just an afterthought: it should be remembered that the new UN initiative for the independence of Namibia was just getting under way at the time, which was an additional pressure on the South Africans.



It was also an extraordinary example of international co-operation among the Namibia Five – the contact group. We were working at that time extremely closely and in huge detail with the Americans, in particular. That was all going on in another part of the forest and I think that it played a bit of a role in South African attitudes because it was yet another pressure on them. Many of the South Africans felt that they could not sustain a war on two fronts, as it were. They knew that they would have to do something about Namibia when the UN settlement plan had been adopted and, embraced and was being actively pursued by the five western powers. The last thing that they wanted was a simultaneous major row over Rhodesia.

#### **RANGER**

Many people have said that Mugabe did not want to come into it because he knew that he would win. What did that mean? His guerrillas were not going to win a military struggle. Someone said that ZAPU in Lusaka was doing nothing, but it was building up a formidable convention on military spend, whereas Mugabe's guerrillas were on the ground and talking to people, but they were never going to win militarily.

#### **CARRINGTON**

Why not? I thought that they would.

#### **JACKSON**

On the atmosphere in Salisbury, I was involved only when I went out there, which was in December. Derek [Day] referred to the atmosphere: the Rhodesians were approaching the end of their tether. We must remember that it was only five years since the collapse of Angola and Mozambique, and the flight of several million Portuguese from those countries back to Portugal, leaving behind an absolute desert. The great phrase at the time was 'taking the gap'. People were getting out and going South. There was a real feeling that the pressure was mounting to an unsustainable degree. I am sure that that must have been the most important thing driving them. We shall talk about the Soames period, but this sentiment

General Peter Walls, Rhodesian soldier. Chief of the Rhodesian Armed Forces.

became critical right at the end when at the last minute Ian Smith asked Walls\* to put together a kind of coup the weekend before the election, but Walls said that that was not on. The fundamental reason why it was not on was because he made a military judgment about what was a sustainable position.

**RANGER**

Yes.

**BYATT**

I agree with all that has been said by Derek [Day] and Robert [Jackson]. I went to Harare at the end of September during the Lancaster House process and I remember that Nkomo and Mugabe also sent people out to be on the ground and to act as contact points. Mugabe's man and I had very little contact – he kept the British at arm's length – but Nkomo's man was quite forthcoming and we used to meet fairly frequently to chat about this and that. I remember his saying at about the beginning of November that the conference would succeed. I ask him how he knew that and he said that the boys from the bush came to see him quite frequently and had told him that they were not going back so we had to make it work because they had had enough. It was not only the whites who were becoming war weary; the freedom fighters were also beginning to feel that it was a rough way of life and that it had gone on long enough.

The other point worth making is that, although they could hit out effectively at guerrilla in Mozambique or Zambia and could deal militarily with any armed group, it was clear to me soon after I got there that the Rhodesian armed forces were, in fact, slowly, inexorably and inevitably losing the war, not in the sense that they would lose the pitched battle, but in the sense that there was less and less of the territory in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia that they could govern effectively. They could send out an army patrol, knock hell out of a village and then get out and go home before dark, but they could not administer on the ground more than on the central plateau spine of the country. They were being forced slowly back and back,

so they were, even in military terms, actually losing the war. People such as [General] Walls were very conscious that time was against them.

**RANGER**

Yes.

**TURNER**

I want to make a point about the influence of Botswana in the Front Line States on their attitude leading up to Lancaster House. It is not often remembered that in January 1979, Seretse Khama called a meeting of all the Front Line Economic Ministers in Gaborone [Botswana]. Out of that, an economic agreement arose on what would ultimately happen after Zimbabwe independence. That was terribly important. It was getting down to the real stuff of living afterwards. It gave the impression to Front Line Leaders that there would be some better life for them also after the settlement. At that time Seretse Khama told me that his motive was that he feared that the Front Line States would break up into conflict when the unifying effect of the struggle for Zimbabwe independence ended. Seretse Khama's initiative led to the establishment of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference, which still exists as the Southern African Development Community. I believed that the prospects of a better life of the whole region after Zimbabwe independence helped to change the attitude in the Front Line States about what Britain was trying to achieve at that stage.

**RANGER**

Yes.

**JAY**

On the question of military victory by the Patriotic Front, it is worth keeping in mind that part of the American thinking during the period, certainly by those Americans such as Brzezinski who tended to see this, as he saw everything else, in terms of the geopolitical chessboard of a world gripped in a struggle between communism and freedom, believed that it was indeed likely that the Patriotic Front would win militarily in the way in which such strug-

gles are won, which is not, as you say, in a pitched battle on the front lawn, but by destroying the economy, the morale and so on of the opponents. It was precisely because they thought that, that they thought it was extremely important that the victory did not overtly happen, as I said earlier, by Mr Mugabe arriving in Salisbury at the head of a column of Russian tanks. That would, in Brzezinski's world, make the new regime in Salisbury some sort of Soviet satellite and, therefore, unfriendly to our side. It made it important that if there were to be a Mugabe or at least a Patriotic Front regime, it should be seen to happen as a result of a process that was western-sponsored, rather than Soviet-sponsored.

While I have the floor, may I make one other point? One big question that historians struggle with endlessly is how far wisdom and insight are achieved by looking at very large sweeps of history – for instance, was the French Revolution caused by something that had happened 400 years earlier – or by looking in close detail at what happened the day before. No doubt there will never be a final answer to that question among historians, but it is worth taking into account, along with all the other important points that are made, that between some time during the late 1950s when white supremacy of any kind began to die in the United States and the time when Nelson Mandela\* finally entered the Presidential Office in South Africa, there was a big and fundamental change. That was that the United States no longer offered the prospect of support or underwriting, even in the last resort, to any regimes that were based on minority white rule.

That penny took several decades to drop, and it did not drop at the same time in all places. It dropped perhaps first in the Portuguese colonies; it dropped in Rhodesia as part of the process that culminated in Peter Carrington's very successful conference; and it dropped finally in South Africa. For that reason, the sequence of events that originated from internal domestic changes within the United States of America – the world's most powerful country by

Nelson Mandela, South African politician. President, 1994–9.

the end of the process and perhaps throughout the process – was a fundamental cause, but not the cause, of what happened in Rhodesia as, indeed, happened in one form or another in all those places. It is important to include that, while also recognising that the history of Rhodesia is unique and that not all the same factors were present on all other occasions.

## **RANGER**

I note that Mugabe did not have any Soviet tanks or even armoured carriers, whereas Nkomo did. We must bear that in mind.

## **DOBLE**

On the Russian attitude, it was clear to us in Maputo that the Russians were doing everything possible to undermine the process and wanted it to fail.

Achilles Papadopoulos (1923–96), diplomat. Ambassador to Mozambique, 1979–80.

I have a nice story. When our new Ambassador – Achilles Papadopoulos,\* a wonderful British diplomat, who was born a Greek Cypriot – arrived at the end of October, I gave a welcoming party. The Russian Ambassador came up to him and asked him about the conference in London and what it was all about. Achilles Papadopoulos said, ‘We are trying to establish democracy in the country.’ The Russian said, ‘Yes, but bourgeois democracy or people’s democracy?’ Achilles Papadopoulos, the Greek Cypriot, said, ‘The type of democracy that has served my country very well for 1,000 years.’

## **DAY**

On the Front Line States and their influence on all of this, it is not widely known that throughout the Lancaster House Conference a Commonwealth Committee on Southern Africa met two or three times each week after the Lancaster House Conference had wound up for the day. It often met fairly late in the evening at 6, 7, 8 or 9 o’clock at night when one of us from Lord Carrington’s team would give an account in general terms of how things were going. Those meetings became absolutely exhausting because certain Commonwealth representatives seemed to think that they could renegotiate the whole process again that evening, led by the Front Line States,

we were challenged on why we were doing this, why we were not doing that, and why we had asked the Patriotic Front to do that. As a group, with perhaps a few exceptions, it became a mouthpiece for members of the Front Line States and the Patriotic Front.

Although the meetings were, more often than not, chaired by the Deputy Secretary-General Chief Enyoku,\* the Secretary-General, Sonny Ramphal,\* also had a considerable influence. I confess that I found his inclinations were far more towards the views of the Patriotic Front than those of the British Government at the time. I had no idea what the contacts were between the Front Line States' representatives and Mugabe and Nkomo at the time, but it was clear that they were encouraging them to squeeze the British Government as hard as they could in every area rather than to act as a mollifying influence as the conference progressed.

Chief Emeka Enyoku, Nigerian diplomat. Secretary General of the Commonwealth, 1990-9.

Sir Shridath 'Sonny' Ramphal, Guyanese diplomat. Commonwealth Secretary-General (1975-90).

**RANGER**

Yes.

**GRAHAM**

I had a brief experience of that. They were the most disagreeable meetings that I have ever attended.

**DAY**

I resented being preached to about democracy by the then representative of Guyana.

**JACKSON**

Do you want to move on to Soames?

**RANGER**

Before moving on to Soames, I want to ask about land, which I am sure can be answered rapidly. It is the key question about Lancaster House now in the discourse about Zimbabwe. What guarantees, if any, were given at Lancaster House about land, either to persuade people to attend the meeting or to persuade them to stay at the meeting?

**CARRINGTON**

I think that we agreed to help out with compensation, as did the Americans.

- JAY** The Commonwealth Fund.
- DAY** I cannot remember any details, but there was certainly encouragement that, if there were a final settlement, we would be sympathetic to some form of assistance over land resettlement and redistribution.
- CARRINGTON** And the Americans were going to help, too.
- RANGER** Yes, but they did not. What happened?
- CARRINGTON** We did pay some money out.
- JACKSON** It was called the Commonwealth Fund.
- JAY** I do not know about others chipping in, but my recollection is that there was a British programme of support for land purchases in Zimbabwe that went on for about 10 years, but we dropped it, I think, basically because the land was not going to the people. It was basically going to Mugabe and his Ministers.
- RANGER** I was told the other day that there is still money left in the fund and that it is in a bank account in Malawi and waiting for a request from the Zimbabwean Government before spending it. I do not think that the Americans ever came in, but let us move on, as Robert [Jackson] is anxious to do, to the Soames era.
- BYATT** I want to say two things about money for land settlement. First, my recollection is that we offered money for land settlement, but compensation is the wrong term. It was always on the basis of willing seller, willing buyer. There was no question of compensating people who were expropriated.
- Secondly, the amount was initially £30 million and it got under way during my time as High Commissioner. It was an increasing

amount of money and two or three settlements schemes were up and running. Many years later, I asked one of my successors what was going on about land settlement – this is only hearsay – and was told that it had reached a stand-off and that nothing was happening with the land settlement programme because the British Government had taken the line that it was British taxpayers' money and that they had to be satisfied about the schemes on which it was being spent. The Zimbabwe Government were taking the line that it was their land and that we should mind our own business, give them the money and they would get on with it. I believe that the thing came to a blinding halt on that basis.

## **RANGER**

Sir John Major, Conservative politician. Prime Minister, 1990–7.

Tony Blair, Labour politician. Prime Minister, 1997–2007.

I do not know whether it is realised that Zimbabwe is perhaps the one place where the end of John Major's\* Prime Ministership was sincerely regretted. The rhetoric is that Major wanted to keep the agreements, but Tony Blair\* said that colonialism was over and did not want to keep them. I will not ask you to comment on that, but it is interesting to know about. Let us come now to Lord Soames.

## **JACKSON**

Claude Cheysson, French politician. European Communities Commissioner, responsible for development, 1977–81.

Peter [Carrington] has referred to the importance of Lord Soames and I agree with his assessment. I shall try to fill in the details as I saw them. However, I want first to say a word about the amazing baroque arrangements for the Government in 'Southern Rhodesia' as it became known again after ceasing to be Zimbabwe/Rhodesia. It was an astonishing set-up in which everything had to be done with smoke and mirrors. I remember afterwards that Claude Cheysson,\* the European Development Commissioner – a rather chauvinistic Frenchman – remarked to me when I went back to the European Parliament that only the British could have pulled off something like that. I think that that was a correct assessment.

What sort of set-up was there? First, we were operating entirely through Rhodesian civil servants and the civil administration. There were substantial Rhodesian military and intelligence services, which were not wholly on side. There were certainly elements in



them who were playing an active part in what they called ‘Psy-ops’. As far as the British were concerned, we had our own military presence and there was also the Commonwealth factor. It was dispersed throughout the country, co-located with the guerrillas who had placed themselves under the Governor’s authority and assembled in assembly places. They were technically part of the military services of the Crown.

Brigadier Andrew Parker Bowles, soldier. Former husband of HRH, Duchess of Cornwall, wife of the Prince of Wales.

I remember flitting around in a helicopter with Andrew Parker Bowles\* to visit half a dozen of them and they were amazing places. We had small detachments of British, New Zealanders, Fijians and others stuck out in the bush with those characters. We had election monitors and I remember vividly that the chief executive of Cambridge County Council was one of them. A number of such people were monitoring what was going on in the elections. Thus there was only a small scattering of British and Commonwealth people who were basically working through the existing regime.

Government House at the centre – I am not a diplomat, so I shall speak undiplomatically – was fraught with tensions beneath the cordial surface. I may be drawing the picture to sharply, but my reading was that, the plan had originally been that Tony Duff would be the Governor, but that this did not happen. Duff was Deputy Governor and Robin Renwick was there. They were the two people who had been at Lancaster House so they knew where the bodies were buried and had been through it all. I think that Christopher Soames was envisaged as a figurehead. Certainly everything was being managed by the Deputy and Robin Renwick. Christopher was basically sitting around. He was not able to go out very much and Mary Soames was doing the representational work. It became quite a difficult atmosphere, because I think there was a bit of an agenda on the part of the Deputy Governor and Robin Renwick. They were certainly pushing a particular line.

The line was that the Governor should use the powers that he had for supervising the elections to ensure that the outcome would be a

balanced Parliament in which the Governor – there was some legal discussion about precedents – would then exercise the Crown’s role in deciding who should be called on to form a Government. The preferred scenario was that Joshua Nkomo would do that, together with the Bishop [Muzorewa] and Ian Smith. It was felt that the way to achieve this was to use the undoubted intimidation that was going on – intimidation was pretty general – as a basis for suspending the election in a number of constituencies that would have been won by Mugabe’s party. That was the line that was being pushed. The great achievement of Christopher Soames was that, in the end, he resisted that. He came into his own and made the final decision. There was a lot of grinding and gnashing of teeth about it. A meeting was held with the election monitors at which they were asked to give their views. It was a funny meeting because there was quite a lot of prompting from the Deputy. But the result was that Christopher decided that he would not proceed. I think that he made a fundamentally political decision. He saw correctly that there was no way in which to predict the outcome and that it was possible that Mugabe would win a comprehensive victory. No one knew what the outcome would be and if we had proceeded in a way that was hostile to him, and he won, we would be buggered. So he made that decision.

As I said earlier, Christopher Soames talked to Lord Carrington on the telephone about whether there had been understandings that might have prevented him from acting in that way. He then had the nous to go beyond that and recognise that, having decided not to act against Mugabe, he should establish a good personal relationship with him. The previous relationship had been managed by Tony Duff and was very hostile and frigid. I was asked to telephone Mugabe and invite him to come and see the Governor. There had been several such meetings – the invitations had been issued by others – and he expected to have another bollocking. He asked who should come with him and I said that the Governor wanted to see

him by himself. Mugabe immediately saw the point. The whole issue was whether he would be banned. There was a high-pitched giggle at the other end of the telephone line and he got the point. The fact was that it then became a good personal relationship, which helped to ensure that the transition was smooth and that at least we had 15 years, as Peter Carrington said, of stability before the true nature of the man came to the surface or whatever happened.

**RANGER**

I have an idea that Lord Carrington muttered, 'I made the final decision.'

**CARRINGTON**

You might like an anecdote.

**RANGER**

I love anecdotes.

**CARRINGTON**

When we decided to appoint a Governor, it would obviously go down badly at the Lancaster House conference because no one sitting around the table wanted a British Governor, least of all Ian Smith, Mugabe or Nkomo. I thought that it would be a terrible session in which I announced that we were sending a Governor. I made the announcement and there was absolute dead silence around the table for what seemed eternity. Finally, Joshua Nkomo put up his hand and said, 'Will he have plumes and a horse?' That defused it all. Do you remember that, Derek?

**DAY**

Yes.

**RANGER**

There is so much more that we could talk about, but the audience have been promised in writing that they will have an opportunity before the end of the session to raise points or ask questions. I apologise that there is only 10 minutes, but I am sure that the audience will agree that what we have been listening to has been fascinating. Who would like to comment or ask a question?

**DR DONAL LOWRY**

I want to go back to the 1976 acceptance by Ian Smith of the Kissinger agreement, or proposals. It was actually said that Rhodesia needed majority rule within two years. Apart from that, an important part of the settlement was a trust fund to which the Americans and the British would contribute to assist in the buying-out of Rhodesian farmers, or at least to assist them in the scheme. Farmers' investments in their own farms would be guaranteed under the trust fund. Did that trust fund completely fall away under the subsequent arrangements and negotiations? It was supposed to be substantial and was one of the selling points for Smith, and it very important to the particular proposal. I wonder if the trust fund ever figured again. Was it real at the time or was it just a way of getting Smith to concede majority rule?

**JAY**

Perhaps Johnny Graham remembers better than I do the historical answer to your question. I am afraid that I simply do not know. By way of not answering your question, I shall answer a different one and let you know what David Owen said to me within the last 10 days on that question. He said that, looking back on it all, he had thought that during that period perhaps we had overestimated the importance of land because later and for a long while it seemed to disappear almost entirely off the agenda. Looking back now, he thinks that in retrospect perhaps we were right to have been worried about land.

David Owen's other comment, if I understood him correctly, was that the Labour Government had had great difficulty, partly with Denis Healey, the Chancellor, in mobilising significant amounts of money for that purpose. He expressed his approval of Peter Carrington in, as it were, cracking the Gordian knot by simply having something called the Commonwealth Fund, which was mainly British money, for that purpose. That may have assisted in the final settlement at Lancaster House.

I am not sure what happened to the Kissinger Fund. There had, of

course, been a fairly fundamental change of Administration in the United States and money for farmers in any form was not, as I recall – Johnny [Graham] will correct me if I have it wrong – a significant part of the Anglo-American proposals during that period.

## **GRAHAM**

It was certainly the case that the proposals that we put forward in August/September 1977 included a Bill of Rights that would guarantee and provide protection from deprivation of property and that, if property had to be taken, there would be compensation. Part of that was the Zimbabwe Development Fund. The United Kingdom and the United States had agreed to co-operate in helping to organise an international economic effort in support of the Rhodesian settlement. The proposals were not accepted at the time and I do not know what happened to the fund.

## **RANGER**

After 1980, it was difficult to get other nations to give money to buy from white farmers. They wanted to give money for schools, clinics and so on. It was extremely difficult to raise money that would seem to benefit the whites. The American role was important.

**DR RICHARD COGGINS** I will make some observations and ask one question.

Hilary Squires, Rhodesian politician.  
Justice Minister, 1976–8.

Jack Mussett, Rhodesian politician.  
Internal Affairs Minister.

As for who people thought would win the election, I was talking to Rhodesian Ministers such as Hilary Squires\* and Jack Mussett,\* who seemed to be under the impression that the British were convinced that Nkomo would win and perhaps that is one of the reasons why the Rhodesians thought that they had wanted them to sign up to a settlement.

Ken Flower. Head of the Rhodesian  
Central Intelligence Organisation  
(CIO), 1963–80.

What was the role behind the scenes at the Lancaster House conference of various shady characters such as Ken Flower\* and Peter Walls, head of the Rhodesian security forces, in bringing the whites to the settlement?

**JACKSON**

I shall say a quick word about the British view on the outcome of the elections. No one thought that Nkomo could possibly win. The assumption was that he would win all the Matabele votes, but the Matabele were only about 15 per cent of the population. There would be a block of white votes, but the critical question was how the Shona vote would split. No one knew how it would split. We were getting news from Rhodesian intelligence – that was the main source of information although we had our own people out there listening on the ground – but no one really knew what the outcome would be. That was an important reason why Soames decided in the end not to take any action predicated on assumptions of what the outcome would be.

**CARRINGTON**

No, but there was hope on the part of white Rhodesians that there would be a tie-up between Muzorewa and Nkomo, and that the election would be much closer than it turned out to be. A lot of people hoped that that would happen to stop Mugabe.

**RANGER**

In 1964, when the parties were banned, ZAPU had much more support in some areas than ZANU. Nkomo felt that that would still prove to be the case. He certainly had not written off the Shona vote. What had happened was that people were confronted with ZANU guerrillas and so on.

**CARRINGTON**

On the other point, Peter Walls was extremely helpful, as was David Smith. Ian Smith was unhelpful all the way through and round about the middle of the conference he went back to Salisbury and never appeared again. It was left to David Smith and Peter Walls, who both wanted a settlement for the reasons that we talked about earlier.

**DAY**

That is right. Peter Walls was deeply engaged in all the discussions about the assembly areas and where they would be. It was quite a battle to reach agreement with him on the various assembly areas.

As Robert Jackson pointed out, guerrillas were coming out of the bush fully armed with their weapons and being controlled by probably only four or five Commonwealth soldiers, who were outnumbered 1,000:1 in many cases. It was a major negotiation with Peter Walls to reach agreement on where exactly the areas would be because the fear – not totally unjustified – was that, wherever the assembly areas were, ZANU and ZAPU fighters from those areas would somehow or other seek to influence the result of the election in that area. I endorse what Lord Carrington said. By and large, both Peter Walls and David Smith were helpful, but fighting their corner very hard throughout the conference.

## **JACKSON**

Just a further word on Walls: Robin Renwick and Peter Walls were constantly playing tennis together. That was an important link. I think Walls was a very helpful influence – no doubt also at Lancaster House – basically reflecting the military concerns. There was a dramatic period on the weekend before the election when Smith apparently called everyone together, including the Bishop, and asked Walls to mount a coup d'état, which he was in a position to do. We were, of course, extremely vulnerable, being strung out in the assembly places like hostages. Walls basically said, 'No.' I do not know whether he has ever explained his reasons or written his autobiography, but it would be interesting to know more about that episode.

## **RANGER**

Books have been published in South Africa about how the Rhodesian Army did not really lose the war, containing details of the coup arrangements that were being made and waiting for the command from Walls that never came.

## **WORSTHORNE**

I wonder whether, for the benefit of posterity which may eventually look at these points of view, we should take note of or refer to the fact that this seminar took place 48 hours after the Live8 Concert,\* which emotionally charged the whole world, perhaps partly as a

The Live8 Concert was held on 2 July 2005 to end world hunger.

result of the decisions taken and so on and the various official conferences. Many years later, we could not fail to be aware that an African baby was dying every three minutes. Everyone is desperate to do something about African poverty, which is one of the great disgraces of modern mankind and perhaps mankind at any time. Yet as a result of our decisions there is no way in which the problem can be solved because there is no Government machinery in Africa able to do that. We have been discussing how we destroyed the one that was our responsibility, but there is no African Government that can do anything about it.

We have had a self-congratulatory discussion about what went on under our eye on our watch. The results now, which could not have been more spectacularly demonstrated, have been disastrous and look as though they will continue to be disastrous precisely because there is no official world in Africa that can be relied on to do anything about such appalling poverty. Posterity ought to know that that was mentioned at the end of our discussions about how magnificently we conducted ourselves during that tragic episode.

**RANGER**

I shall refrain from commenting or from asking anyone else to comment because we must really come to an end. If I had my way, I would lock the doors and make everyone stay here for days until we had thrashed out all these matters. However, we have had two extremely rewarding sessions and, as rather an anti-climax, you will now hear from some historians, who will continue to question the participants.

**CARRINGTON**

Do you think that Perry ought to have the last word?

**RANGER**

No, of course not.

**CARRINGTON**

Perry, do you really think that, if there had not been a Lancaster House agreement, there would have been a good Government in Rhodesia at the present time?



**WORSTHORNE**

No. I accept the fact that you had responsibilities, which in the short term, you had to perform in that way. Outside the official world, one is allowed to see the appalling irony. I remember Harold Macmillan saying that it was an absolute tragedy that the wind of change bringing about the withdrawal of Britain and the West from any responsibilities in Africa should happen just at the time when the western world was moving into a position when it would have the resources that it never had between the great world wars to do something effective and to be of use to Africa in the long term. We would have the resources because of technology that we had never had before to make things better. At that time, ironically, he was the first British Prime Minister ever to set foot on African soil south of the Sahara just to wave them goodbye. He was full of awareness of the irony.

If we had managed to prolong our responsibilities a bit further – it would not have had to be much further because technology was creating resources – something could have been done. I agree that in the short term perhaps there was nothing that we could do, but it is a terrible irony. Posterity will think, ‘Good God, if they could have kept going just 50 years longer, that continent could have been saved from these appalling, utterly ghastly calamities and human tragedies.’

**CARRINGTON**

Why do you think that that would have been so?

**WORSTHORNE**

Because –

**CARRINGTON**

Things might have been as they are now, only 50 years later.

**RANGER**

The trouble is that there is no point in trying to deny him the last word. You have given him an extravagante, so we shall end.



## Session Three

**PROFESSOR  
ARNE WESTAD**

I am working on Cold War issues at the International History Department at the LSE. Monitoring the discussion was a difficult task for Professor Ranger to take on and I am sure that I speak for all of us when I say that he did an outstanding job in guiding the discussion through its first two sessions. I shall follow up his approach. I certainly do not intend to allow the historians to speak too much. We know what the result of that would be. We want to concentrate on the memories and reminiscences of the people who were part of the process before and during the Lancaster House talks and also in Zimbabwe.

I shall ask the historians and the main participants to ask questions rather than make comments and to follow up on what we heard earlier this afternoon, perhaps in roughly chronological order. We shall start with the first part of the process and move on to Lancaster House. Please try to be brief as lots of people want to ask questions and the briefer they are, the more answers we can have. We also have a reception afterwards that will start at about 5.45 pm., if we do not run out of questions before then.

I spent part of the 1970s in Maputo and was watching what was going on from there, which was very interesting. I remember people in the new Frelimo\* regime saying fairly early on, 'When Mugabe comes to power in Rhodesia...' because they were certain throughout the negotiations that there would be a ZANU-led Government under Mugabe one way or the other. They were also certain that he would not make the same mistakes as the Machel Government had made in Mozambique and that he would learn from Machel's mistakes and, first and foremost, would keep the white Rhodesians on board.

Indeed, from the very beginning of the new regime, that seemed to be what would happen. I remember speaking to one white farmer

Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (Liberation Front of Mozambique) or Frelimo was formed in 1962 to end Portuguese rule and has led Mozambique since independence in 1975.

in a bar in Bulawayo who said that he used to say, 'If Mugabe comes, we leave!' – that was in 1982 or thereabouts – 'but now we say that if Mugabe leaves, we leave.' For the first 10 years or so, that seemed to be the direction in which it was going. I think that my friends in Mozambique were to some extent right and that lessons were learned from what had gone desperately wrong in Mozambique.

Gerald Ford, Jr, American politician.  
President, 1974–7.

I want to start with a question about the international setting, particularly the role of the United States, first to Peter Jay but also to others. It seems from the documents available, both from the Ford\* Administration and the Carter Administration, that there was great concern that, if there were no settlement or negotiated solution, or at least a negotiated process, that included the main African parties, that would be an invitation for further unrest or for communism to sneak in by the back door for a Russian role. I want to know more about how such concerns manifested themselves *vis-à-vis* the British Government.

How much pressure was exerted at the end of the Ford Administration and by the new Carter Administration on the British to reach a negotiated settlement more quickly? What kind of exchanges went on during the period from 1976 to early 1978?

**JAY**

Johnny Graham would give a more authoritative and complete answer because he was there more of the time than I was, and he was a professional and I was an amateur. Pressure is not something that goes on between British and American Governments. There was a pretty strong and spontaneous meeting of minds in early 1977 between Cyrus Vance and David Owen, and between Jimmy Carter and Jim Callaghan, about the general way in which they thought they should evolve and position themselves on southern African issues. As we have been rightly reminded, that included Namibia as well as Rhodesia.

I have talked already about the reasons why I think the Americans

John F. Kennedy (1917–63), American politician. President, 1961–3.

took the position that they took. It was a huge and historic long-term sea change in American activities that flowed from deep changes in their society and basically the civil rights struggles that started in the Kennedy\* period, followed by the legislation of the Johnson period and so on. That linked with the Cold War thinking of those people in the Administration who thought geopolitically – the chess players or the strategists rather than just the politicians. It was bound to strike anyone thinking geopolitically after Vietnam and all that that anyone engaged in a global struggle with another superpower that keeps backing manifest losers and rather disagreeable characters who had very little to be said for them and who looked bad on the world stage is one way in which to lose the geopolitical struggle.

I wrote an article entitled ‘Regionalism as Geopolitics’ on my thoughts about getting regional things right and not getting them wrong. Being on the side of white supremacy in southern Africa, if that had been an option, was an absolutely sure-fire way of losing that region in the geopolitical struggle. Some Americans, but not all, thought like that. Not even all American policy-makers or all American members of the Carter Administration thought like that, but some did. That was important.

## **JACKSON**

The Suez Crisis unfolded after Egyptian President Nasser nationalised the Anglo-French owned Suez Canal Company in July 1956. The UK, France and Israel colluded to invade Egypt on 29 Oct. 1956. International diplomatic pressure (especially from the USA), condemnation in the UN and a sterling crisis forced an end to the invasion in Nov. 1956 and a UN peacekeeping force was installed in the Canal zone.

On the historical context, I do not think that it started with the rise of the black lobby in the 1970s. In a sense, the argument between the British and the Americans at the time of Suez\* was about precisely that. The Americans took the view that we ought to work with the new nationalism in the Middle East. The British seemed to be allied with the old social forces that were on the way out, which produced a big confrontation in the late 1950s. The story has roots that go quite a long way back.

## **WESTAD**

Lord Carrington, do you have any comments on the position after the Conservative Government took over?

**CARRINGTON**

Ronald Reagan (1911–2004), American politician. President, 1981–9.

I spoke to Peter Jay about that. There was a sea change because both sides rather distrusted the Administration and therefore, until Reagan\* came on board, there was not much of a meeting of minds. Certainly the Americans never really took any part in the Lancaster House conference or the leading up to it.

**WESTAD**

Did they attempt to?

**CARRINGTON**

There was just not the same sort of *rapport* between the parties concerned as there was when Peter was Ambassador.

**WESTAD**

Did you consider that there was American pressure – a terrible, undiplomatic word – to move faster?

**CARRINGTON**

We were moving jolly fast.

**WESTAD**

Was this a recognition for that on the American side ?

**CARRINGTON**

No.

**WESTAD**

Are there any questions?

**DR PHILIP MURPHY**

I should like to draw a parallel with the early period. Perhaps that is unfair, given that the politicians here are heavily outnumbered by officials. Moreover, I do not want to say anything that might in any way underwrite Lord Carrington's courage in bringing off the Lancaster House conference. However, throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, the Rhodesian policy strikes me as a case of permanent government. Wilson came to power in 1964, having committed Labour in the sense of some of his statements to grant independence on the basis of majority rule. He quickly threw that out of the window, because he was given such a strong steer by his officials. Likewise, Thatcher tied her hands – ludicrously, I think – because of the Boyd Commission in 1979, and that almost implied that, as

long as the Zimbabwe/Rhodesian elections were free and fair, the incoming Conservative Government would recognise the Muzorewa regime. Was it the case that there was such a firm and longstanding official policy towards Rhodesia that changes of Government made little difference?

**WESTAD**

Would anyone like to answer?

**DAY**

When there was a change of Government in 1979, there was a change of approach by the then Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister to seek a settlement. It was very clear to us as officials that the policy was coming from Ministers and that we were implementing that policy, which was to try to seek a final settlement to the Rhodesian problem, but that it could not be done on the basis of just outright recognition of the Zimbabwe/Rhodesian Government which had just been elected. Lord Carrington would know, but I do not know whether that would have gone through Parliament easily. It would certainly not have attracted the support of the majority of the Commonwealth. It would not have been acceptable widely throughout the international community and, as was said earlier, had they done so, the British Government could well have found themselves isolated in the world community, apart from perhaps South Africa. I do not detect any sense of Lord Carrington just following the whim of his officials. His officials were certainly following a fairly clearly defined policy that had been set out by Ministers.

**CARRINGTON**

At the same time, we were all committed to black majority rule. All parties were committed to that. It was merely a question of how we did it. It so happened that the atmosphere and the circumstances had changed when we became the Government compared with the days of a Labour Government.

**DOBLE**

Frederick Peart (Lord Peart, 1914–88), Labour politician.

I noticed the complete difference at the end of 1979 when Lord Peart – Fred Peart\* – was sent out by the Labour Government on one of those missions. I remember him asking whether people in Maputo thought that a conference would work. He said that Mr Callaghan would not call a conference, unless he was practically sure that it would succeed. The huge difference was that the Conservatives with incredible courage went ahead with the conference, as Lord Carrington said, not knowing at all whether it would succeed – in fact, thinking that it might not succeed. There was a huge political difference.

**JACKSON**

Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb, 1859–1947), Labour politician. Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, 1929–30; Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1930–1.

The UK withdrew from Aden in 1967.

The UK withdrew from Palestine in 1948.

The policy was really set in the early 1920s by Lord Passfield\* with the paramountcy of native interests. That was the framework. The interesting question might be why successive British Governments continued to try to exercise responsibility for relations with Rhodesia when they had no power. I suppose that it was a theoretical option that we could have done what had happened in Aden\* and, indeed, earlier in Palestine,\* and just walk away, saying, ‘It’s nothing to do with us, mate. These people have power. We are not going to recognise them. We are not going to trade with them. We will follow the United Nations and Commonwealth rubrics on this, but we are not the colonial power in Rhodesia.’ That might have been an option, but the British rightly felt that they had responsibilities to fulfil – and, in the end, they fulfilled them.

**WESTAD**

I want to internationalise matters a little as we go on further. Chris Saunders has been looking at the matter from the South African perspective and perhaps we can have some comments from that angle, after which we shall hear from Vladimir Shubin from Moscow who has been waiting patiently to ask his questions. Perhaps we could talk in terms of changes taking place respectively in South Africa and the Soviet Union.



**PROF CHRISTOPHER SAUNDERS**

South Africa did not play a significant role in the last phase. Was there any agreement behind the scenes with the South Africans that, if they did not do more, we would not say much about what was going on in South Africa? Were there trade-offs about internal policy in relation to Rhodesia and Namibia? I know that the South Africans provided major funding for the Bishop in the election. Sir Brian [Barder] referred to Namibia. In 1977-78, people said that Namibia would become independent before Rhodesia. That did not happen. What is the thinking here about why that was? I think that the South African Government were not prepared to see SWAPO\* come to power in Namibia. I should be interested in your thoughts about that. Was there any possibility of resolution 435 of 1978 being implemented?

The South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO) was formed after the conclusion of the First World War and over the following decades emerged as the principal liberation movement in South West Africa, which since independence in 1990 is called Namibia.

**WESTAD**

Does anyone want to respond to that?

**BARDER**

I can talk about Namibia, but it will probably not be germane.

**WESTAD**

It is probably better if we stick to the Rhodesia issue.

**ONSLOW**

I have a question that connects to Namibia. To what extent did Lord Carrington and his civil servants specifically use the Namibia issue as a way to encourage people such as Pik Botha who came out in mid-October during the Lancaster House conference? He was particularly concerned about the South African military presence and the issue of Namibia seemed to be of burning importance at that particular time. Was it part of your conscious policy to manage South African concerns and also elements within the South African Government because it was by no means a homogenous unit? P.W. Botha\* and Pik Botha, as Foreign Minister, had a different intellectual agenda.

Pieter Willem Botha (1916–2006), South African politician. Prime Minister, 1978–84.

**CARRINGTON**

No. I do not remember them coming into our thoughts at all.

**SUMMERHAYES**

No. I think that we kept the two things very much separate. We were not playing one against the other, not in my time.

**CARRINGTON**

I remember Pik Botha being very difficult. Is that a strange thought?

**DR PETER HENSHAW**

Can I ask a follow-on question to Dr Onslow? How did the Rhodesia settlement fit into the whole question of growing international pressure for sanctions against apartheid in South Africa? Was it another case of a separate policy box or was it part of a broader calculation in South Africa?

**DAY**

It was totally separate. Everyone was so occupied with achieving a settlement in Rhodesia that there was no time to think about anything else. It was totally absorbing for all those involved. What was going on outside was in a sense peripheral.

**JACKSON**

I am sure that it played in some African things. I remember going to Namibia a couple of times and a chap called Sean someone was the brain box behind the South African regime in Windhoek in Namibia. His expression to me was, 'We have to give space in order to gain time.' From their point of view, Rhodesia was probably the space that could be given to get time to do whatever they were going to do in Namibia. I am sure that those factors were in their minds.

**WESTAD**

That is my impression as well from having looked at some South African archives for that period. As was said in our first session, there seems to have been a link between the right wing of the National Party being in ascendance and the idea that some kind of settlement was needed in Rhodesia. In other words, the South Africans thought, 'This isn't our problem. We do not want to deal with it. Let the British deal with it, then we can concentrate on keeping apartheid in South Africa and dealing with the Namibia issue.' That

is the impression that I gained from the South African side and the development of their thinking.

**PROFESSOR VLADIMIR SHUBIN** I am in a difficult position because I am an historian but I am a participant, too. Can I comment and double those comments?

**WESTAD** As long as you are reasonably brief.

**SHUBIN** I refer first to the exclusion of people from the conference. I agree that they were excluded from Lancaster House, but they were not excluded from London and Geneva. A couple of persons, Professor Veniamin Chirkin, a lawyer and Vitaly Fedorinov, a diplomat came to London as legal advisers *vis-à-vis* the ZAPU wing of the Patriotic Front. Earlier Chirkin, and another diplomat, Ambassador Vladimir Snegirev played the same role during the Geneva conference. Chirkin published a short memoir, an article about their role at both conferences. We cannot say that we were sabotaging the conference, that the Russians wanted it to fail, though our representatives who were there were not happy with the some results, especially with 20 per cent parliamentary seats for whites.

Mikhail Gorbachev, Soviet politician. Chairman of the Supreme Soviet 1989–90 and the Executive President of the USSR 1990–1.

Eduard Shevardnadze, Soviet politician. Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1985–90.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is an alliance formed in 1949 on the basis of the Treaty of Brussels (1948) by Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. Greece and Turkey joined in 1952, the Federal Republic of Germany in 1955, Spain in 1982, and the united Germany in 1990.

Zimbabwe People's Army (ZIPRA), armed wing of ZAPU.

Many people believe that the roots of the present problems in Zimbabwe are in Lancaster House and the decisions that were made there. I do not know whether anything was written, but I recall very well the late 1980s and the early 1990s when a lot of promises were given to Gorbachev\* and Shevardnadze\* about non-expansion of NATO\* and this and that. When it comes to this issue, there were certain similarities. I remember what was mentioned about the United States and Kissinger in 1977. I remember that the sum of 2 billion in US dollars was mentioned in the press, not £30 million. Has anybody had calculated how many millions would be needed? Russian tanks – I had better say Russian-made tanks – were mentioned. To some extent, the build-up of ZIPRA's\* conventional forces was heavy. They were a very serious challenge to the Rhodesian Army. The only thing that was missing was aeroplanes. If you

read Joshua Nkomo's memoirs he wrote that came to Moscow to look for aeroplanes, but his account was too optimistic.

I would also like to know the assessment of Soviet involvement, diplomatic, practically and military, especially if there is a specialist in this field here of a group of the Soviet military that was with ZIPRA in Zambia, and those who were with Zimbabweans in Angola.

I have a short comment about ZAPU and ZANU. I completely agree with Professor Ranger when he said that, at the early stage, the prestige of Nkomo and ZAPU was very high in the Shona areas too. The trouble began in 1970 and 1971, when they split up, with important people in each group: Chikerema\* and Nyandoro, both Shona, going one way and Moyo, Silundika and Ndlovu, all of them Ndebele, going the other way. However, the commander of the ZAPU army, Nikita Mangena was Shona-speaking.

James Chikerema (1925-2006), Zimbabwean nationalist leader.

One more point: I liked the comments about plumes and horses for the Governor. I happened to be present, although I was a civilian at that stage, at one of the discussions in the Soviet Ministry of Defence was when Nkomo asked for 10,000 or 15,000 uniforms. He asked specifically for one big-sized uniform. Perhaps you remember the pictures. That is exactly how they originated.

## **WESTAD**

Would anyone like to comment on the Soviet role in general and the perceptions of that?

## **BYATT**

The comment about Soviet tanks brought back to my mind a conversation that I had totally forgotten. I do not think that the tanks made much difference, but possibly the Soviet training of ZIPRA – Joshua Nkomo's army – did. During the Lancaster House discussions when I was in Salisbury, I remember a Rhodesian senior general commenting to me that some of his troops had just had a nasty shock. They were used to being flown in by helicopter, landing and disembarking, and the guerrillas would fade away as guerrillas should. They might get one, but the rest would run off

into the bush. He said that the week before they had got on the helicopter and seen a group of ZIPRA forces, newly trained by the Russians. The devils didn't run away. They stopped and fought.' So perhaps that training did influence matters in Rhodesia.

**CARRINGTON**

I remember in 1978 seeing a very powerful Soviet official in Lusaka who I think was co-ordinating all Soviet policy in that part of Africa. He was a charming and very nice man –

**SHUBIN**

Ambassador Vassily Solodovnikov. He is a very good man and is alive and working. Everyone in the West and South Africa spoke about him as KGB general, while he was a former director of the Russian Institute of African Studies.

**CARRINGTON**

He was very nice, but what he was up to, I do not know.

**SHUBIN**

He was the man who believed that Nkomo would win.

**RANGER**

African National Congress.

Dumiso Dabengwa, Zimbabwean politician. Minister for Home Affairs, 1992–2000.

I wanted to say that there was an ambiguity in our earlier discussion of people who had hoped that Nkomo would win. It was Nkomo who was supported by the Soviet Union. Mugabe was not. After the election, I remember speaking to South African ANC\* people and people from the Soviet Embassy who were absolutely certain that Nkomo had been swindled. People here may remember that Dumiso Dabengwa\* was tactless enough to write a letter to the Soviet Embassy after 1980 saying, 'We hope you will continue to stand by us in our attempts to reverse the result.' The Russian Ambassador was tactless enough to reply, 'Yes, we will.' Both letters fell into the hands of the central intelligence organisation.

To think that Mugabe represented Soviet power in any sense would be ridiculous. He did not really represent Chinese power either because there was not any Chinese power. We must bear such things in mind.

A remarkable man called Jeremy Brickhill, who was working with

ZIPRA during the war and then became a doctoral student in Oxford, has written a draft thesis about ZIPRA military policy. It confirms all that has been said: that there was a great deal of training and equipment. After 1980, much of that heavy equipment was brought into the country and based at the Gwai river base. It was not completely true that all the ZAPU people were happy that the war had ended. Some of them wanted to test the equipment and show that they could even threaten the town. Their attitude towards ZANU was that it was a hopeless, peasant rabble that would never win militarily, but they hoped that they might be able to use the equipment. That, of course, is all counter-factual because it did not happen, but it is important to see that the Russians had a vested interest in Nkomo and were very fed up when he did not win.

## JACKSON

I do not think that the Soviet threat was a great factor. First, there is no doubt that there was general hope among many people that Nkomo would be the person who would take over. If he were the Russian stooge and the Russian man, and that was seen as the big problem, why would so many people, including all the others that I have been talking about, have been happy for Nkomo to lead? I guess that they thought they knew Nkomo and that they would be fairly safe with him, and that he represented minority interests.

My second observation is that I do not know how many of the people who were trained in Russia actually performed in the field or how they performed during the suppression of the Matabeleland situation after independence. It was a pretty brutal process, with the North Koreans helping. The Matebele resistance did not come to anything. I wonder really whether the Russian factor was ever a big issue.

There is a fundamental point about land. The suggestion is that, if we had actually embarked on a serious programme of land reform, not necessarily on a willing buyer, willing seller basis, a lot of nasti-

ness at the present time could have been avoided. But how much of an interest was it for Britain and the United States to act on a willing buyer, willing seller basis? It would have been enormously expensive. I am not surprised that not much money was put into it. It is possible that that is one of the reasons why things have gone wrong. In the end, was it a serious British or American national interest to commit that scale of resources to deal with the problem?

**WESTAD**

Sue.

**ONSLOW**

I have a question that goes from the international scene to the British political scene. It links into Philip [Murphy]'s question about continuity of policy and also David Steel's point about the British domestic climate. It seems that the election in which Mrs Thatcher was successful in early 1979 is a key marking point, because no longer could the Government of national unity hope for British political acceptance with Lord Carrington's emphasis on the need for an internationally accepted settlement.

My question is to Sir Peregrine [Worsthorne] about the British political scene. It concerns the element in which the pro-Rhodesia Right was not neutralised. It still had a coherent agenda to try to support the Muzorewa settlement – the Internal Settlement. How much pressure did you perceive that they managed to sustain as part of the background? Sanctions had to be renewed every year. The Tory Party Conference happened at a critical time during Lancaster House. What is your recollection of that?

**WORSTHORNE**

I speak from the Tory Party point of view. Mrs Thatcher went along with Peter Carrington. At some point, she danced with Kaunda and that seemed to have a tremendous attachment with Tory emotions. I do not remember the details, but I remember a big photograph in *The Daily Telegraph* of Mrs Thatcher dancing. Once she had given her backing to the Lancaster House conference and was supporting Peter Carrington, the game was up in the Tory party for a rebellion

Julian Amery (Lord Amery of Lustleigh, 1919–96), Conservative politician. MP for Preston North, 1950–66; Brighton Pavilion, 1969–92.

in favour of Muzorewa and generally making life difficult for the Thatcher Government. By that time, support for Mrs Thatcher, particularly from the right-wing of the Conservative party, was strong enough on economic and union grounds for the Government to be pretty invulnerable by that time to the old Suez group reactionaries, where my heart lay. We had really given up the ghost. Peter Carrington, too, was a much respected figure in those circles. As we said at the tea break, he reminded us how Julian Amery\* put up placards saying, ‘Hang Carrington’. They were two old school chums from Eton and shared a bottle of wine on the Pullman going back from Blackpool to London. I do not think that there was any likelihood or a serious possibility of any kind of right-wing trouble at that point.

**WESTAD**

You had a comment.

**DOBLE**

I was going back to ZANU’s affiliations with the communists.

**JACKSON**

I have a quickie on the Conservative Party. In the mid 1980s, Mrs Thatcher took to rather enjoying the credit for the outcome in Zimbabwe, which at that stage was seen as being extremely successful. However, her initial response to the settlement was very cool. Some of us will have been at the dinner she gave at No. 10 Downing Street for people who took part in the operation. She spent about one minute of a five-minute speech saying, ‘Thank you’, but her main theme was that we had all had the most tremendous luck. She then spent four minutes talking about the picture of Cecil Rhodes that was over the mantelpiece in Government House and saying what a great man she thought he was. She was very cool about it.

**WESTAD**

There were indications that Mrs Thatcher felt that she had been hoodwinked into agreeing to a solution that she did not really see as being in Britain’s interests. Does anyone have any information on



that or is that overstating the case? Was it just a sentiment along the lines that has been indicated?

**DAY**

I have no indication that that was necessarily her view, but I think Mrs Thatcher came to recognise that outright recognition of a Muzorewa Government would cause her enormous difficulty, possibly within her party, but certainly within the Commonwealth and with the wider international community. While her heart may have been in one place, her head told her that she had to do something slightly different.

**WORSTHORNE**

That is absolutely true. Before the conference got under way, she was making her doubts and reluctance known as she was always doing about the wets. It was not unusual for Mrs Thatcher to talk about her own Government and say, 'We don't want it; they do.'

**LOWRY**

The wickedness of government.

**WORSTHORNE**

Peter Carrington was extremely influential. He was a very emollient and charming character. She liked charming gentlemen. Although she was unenthusiastic and extremely dubious about the long-term consequences of the settlement, I do not think that there was any likelihood of her renegeing on it or publicly causing trouble. As someone said, she was given a lot of credit as Thatcher the statesman. I do not think that she would try to second-guess Lord Carrington.

**WESTAD**

John Doble.

**DOBLE**

Just to comment on ZANU's communist affiliations, I once said to Edgar Tekere, the Secretary-General of ZANU, 'You have travelled all over the world to so many countries during your negotiations and so on. Is there any particular country, from all that you have seen, on which you would like to model an independent Zimba-

bwe?’ Obviously, I hoped that he would say Britain. But, immediately, he said to my utter astonishment, ‘North Korea’.

**DAVID MOORE**

That was interesting because when I met Edgar Tekere, he was talking about a group of young radicals within ZANU and said, ‘We had to get rid of them. They were socialists.’

**WESTAD**

You do not have to be a socialist to support North Korea, perhaps the opposite.

**MOORE**

Roland ‘Tiny’ Rowland (Roland Walter Fuhrhop, 1917–98), businessman. Chairman, Lonrho, 1962–94.

First, what did Tiny Rowland\* have to do with all of this? What was his influence with various politicians and officials?

Sally Mugabe (née Hayfron, 1933–92). Married Robert Mugabe in 1961.

Secondly, I found an interesting copy of a telegram just across the courtyard when I was here in September. It was from the British representative in Accra to the FCO here saying, ‘We have a Mrs Sally Mugabe,\* who has been awarded a scholarship to study secretarial science in London. The scholarship has been arranged by the Ariel Foundation. Can you give her an entry permit?’

**WESTAD**

Will you identify yourself?

**MOORE**

I am from the University of KwaZulu-Natal. I have a Canadian accent, but I teach at the university.

Herbert Chitepo (1923–75), Zimbabwean politician and guerrilla leader. Leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union until his assassination in Mar. 1975.

The scribbles on the telegram say that the file does not have to be kept on the record, but it is still on record. They said something about the Ariel Foundation having arranged the scholarship and that they did not know about it, but to bear with them. I googled the Ariel Foundation and found that it was funded by the CIA to help young students set up conferences in Europe to counteract Soviet influence. A chap by the name of Denis Brennan was organising it. Who knows Denis Brennan? What are his connections with Mugabe? Some observers say that they are quite close. What does that mean for ZANU’s communism? There is another telegram from the British Embassy in Washington, when Herbert Chitepo\*

went at the invitation of the Americans in 1967. They were a bit worried that he got upset by Chinese restaurants and they were not sure about the trip.

## JACKSON

I have something to say about the Ariel Foundation. However, I think that your basic point is that there is a great deal of ideological fluidity and international affiliations. All those people were pretty opportunistic and highly flexible. That was probably more or less generally recognised. What you said about American involvement seems highly plausible.

On the Ariel Foundation, I had not heard anything about it, but when I came back from Zimbabwe, just before independence – I went back to being an MEP – I wrote an article in *The Daily Telegraph*, which was basically a report from the front line saying, ‘We can work with Mugabe’. On the strength of that, I was invited at the last minute to attend a conference in Guernsey sponsored by the Ariel Foundation. David Steel was there, so he might know more about all this. It apparently had met every year for 15 years it was really a group that had been constituted to apply pressure on the British to do the ‘right thing’ in Rhodesia. It consisted of British, American and Canadian parliamentarians. It was to be their last meeting, so it was rather a celebratory meeting.

I was received as a kind of great man who had just come from the great event in Zimbabwe and the success that it represented. I remember a discussion about future models for development that was led by a black American Congressman. He talked about different models and said that there was a Yugoslav model and a North Korean model. I put myself totally out of court around that table and became like the man in the Bateman cartoon when I observed that rather than those models there might be a question of African countries rather following the Haitian model, and I spelt out what that was.

## WESTAD

Can you identify yourself please?

**BRIAN OLIVER**

I was Assistant Secretary and then Under-Secretary to the Rhodesian Cabinet.

In reply to the gentleman's first point about Tiny Rowlands, he was bankrolling both Muzorewa and Ndabaningi Sithole. His group had tremendous business interests in mining and with huge tracts of land in the centre of Rhodesia. He was simply being a businessman who was trying to ensure that the butter remained on the right side of the bread.

**WESTAD**

We are moving towards the end of this session and I just want to go back to the Moscow connection before we finish. Sweepstakes have been brought into the discussion. What was the feeling in Moscow about the election? What were the best guesses that you heard, Vladimir, from different promise deliverers in Moscow circles?

**SHUBIN**

I have a little trouble here, because from September 1979 I was doing a PhD myself.

**WESTAD**

You had no money to put into sweepstakes?

**SHUBIN**

Something like one or two weeks before the election, we had a meeting of what used to be called the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. I was its secretary earlier. The Committee was responsible for the contacts with southern African liberation movements under supervision of the CPSU International Department. Dr Andrey Urnov, future Ambassador to Namibia and then the official of the International Department, made an informal assessment and, to my surprise, said that there would be a majority – not an absolute majority of course – for Mugabe. Apparently information was coming from different sources and knowledgeable people in Moscow decided that there were more chances for Mugabe than for Nkomo. Whether we were happy or not is another story. Let us not forget that ZANU's official ideology was not just Marxism-Leninism, but 'Mao Tse-tung's thought' as well. This was unaccept-

able for Moscow, but, nevertheless, generally, our people understood the situation.

**WESTAD**

There was a strong sense in Moscow that Mugabe and ZANU had a Chinese affiliation that would make it –

**SHUBIN**

The Central Intelligence Agency of the Government of the United States of America.

Definitely, at least with some people. Someone here also mentioned connections with the CIA\* and this or that foundation.

**WESTAD**

With a slightly different twist.

**JACKSON**

I honestly think that no one had a clue how the elections would go. The first real sign that we had at the centre was when Christopher Soames went off on a tour round the polling stations on the first day of the three-day election campaign. I went with him. There were huge long rows of people waiting to vote. You remember that the symbol of ZANU PF was a cockerel. All the people greeted the Governor with great respect and deference, but when he had walked past them, they were imitating a cockerel with their elbows flapping. They were all doing it, so he knew at that point that Mugabe would win.

**DAY**

Am I right in thinking that originally Mugabe wanted his election symbol to be a Kalashnikov?

**JACKSON**

Yes.

**DAY**

And the Governor said, 'No way. You cannot have that.'

**JACKSON**

Yes, that was the first row.

**DAY**

Mugabe then inquired what he could do. I do not know whether the Governor suggested that he had a cockerel symbol.

**JACKSON**

That was a much more effective symbol.

- DAY** It was obviously a more effective symbol than a Kalashnikov.
- WESTAD** One has to pick symbols with great care.
- JAY** I would just like to add to the story about how the Foreign Secretary's Principal Private Secretary in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office sweepstake got the result precisely right. When he was asked how he got it right, he said, 'Because Mugabe told me.'
- WESTAD** He was not taking any chances with his money.
- SHUBIN** May I make one point? I heard from British friends that old veterans of the military service were staying there under Lord Soames. Their prediction was really close to what happened. They said that Mugabe would win. They were on the spot.
- JACKSON** There was a sweepstake and I remember it being read out at a party at Government House afterwards. It was all over the place; they were people from different parts.
- WESTAD** We could have continued well into the evening with this conference. It has been absolutely fascinating and I have enjoyed it tremendously. I am sure that I am speaking for all the participants. I thank the Centre for Contemporary British History at the IHR and the National Archives especially for giving us this wonderful room at Kew. I also thank my institution, the LSE, because if I do not we will not get any more money from them.
- First and foremost, in terms of organisation, Sue Onslow has done an excellent job in preparing the conference. (Applause) It was extremely well done. I thank the participants or as we called them at a conference I attended in Moscow, the veterans. They have been kind, forthright and outspoken in their comments. We have all learned a lot from them. I express my gratitude and that of every-

one here and who is trying to write a history of the period for the insights that you have given us. Thank you very much.





## Interview: Sir Michael Palliser

Dr Sue Onslow and Dr Michael Kandiah interviewed The Rt Hon Sir Michael Palliser, GCMG, PC, on 13 January 2006 from 4.15 to 5.15pm in north London.

**DR MICHAEL KANDIAH** I am Dr Michael KANDIAH. It is 13 January and we are interviewing Sir Michael Palliser for the Rhodesia project. The principal interviewer will be Dr. Sue Onslow of the London School of Economics.

**DR SUE ONSLOW**

Sir Michael, thank you very much indeed for agreeing to see us. As you know from the paperwork that I sent you, this is building on the witness seminar that we held at the National Archives last summer to look at the process by which Britain moved the Rhodesia problem forward, concluding with the Lancaster House Settlement and then Zimbabwean Independence in the spring of 1980. You very kindly participated in the witness seminar that we held on the origins and early years of UDI.

C. A. R. Crosland (1918–77), Labour politician. Foreign Secretary, 1976–7.

I should like to begin in the mid 1970s, approximately 1975–76, when you were, of course, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office and responsible for briefing Tony Crosland\* as the incoming Foreign Secretary taking over from James Callaghan. Perhaps you could give us your comments and reminiscences on your view of Callaghan's contribution initially as Foreign Secretary and your views on the Rhodesia question.

**SIR MICHAEL  
PALLISER**

I do not have much recollection of Jim Callaghan on that because he and I had spent most of our time together when I was Brussels—which I was until the middle of 1975—dealing with the problems leading up to the referendum and then the post-referendum. We were very focused on Europe and most of the conversations that I had with him even when he was Foreign Secretary and when I was back in London as Permanent Under-Secretary were related to Europe rather than to Rhodesia. I think that he, like most of us, did

not care for Mr Smith and the regime in Rhodesia, but I am not sure that he ever really got down to Rhodesia as Foreign Secretary before moving over to Number 10.

To be honest, I have very little recollection of Jim Callaghan's approach to the matter. I imagine that he was more radical than the Conservative Government had been, but even the Conservative Government were not particularly sympathetic to Smith and company. They had the problem that they had people in the party who were very sympathetic and they had to handle them, but the Foreign Secretary and the Prime Minister were not in the least disposed to give way to Smith's ambitions. In a sense, I think that Callaghan would have been just picking up a ball that was running anyway. Crosland was different.

**ONSLOW**

In what way?

**PALLISER**

It would be difficult to find two more different people than Jim Callaghan and Tony Crosland. Both were keen members of the Labour Party, but Jim was very much from the labour part of the party and Crosland was an intellectual and radical socialist thinker. Interestingly, although Crosland had been almost the guru in the Labour Party, both nationally and in relation to other, foreign socialist parties, he came rather cautiously and reticently into foreign affairs. Again, to be honest, I do not remember much of what he did over Rhodesia. In some ways, I remember more of David Owen who succeeded him.

I said that Crosland was different from Callaghan and, in a sense, he approached the matter from a different, leftish-wing socialist view, whereas Callaghan on the whole – these contrasts are not easy to explain – approached it from a more right-wing Labour view.

**ONSLOW**

I understand what you are saying. I have been through the Crosland papers in the LSE Library and it seems evident to me that he was, as you said, an intellectual powerhouse who did not expect to be

Sir Roy Jenkins (Lord Jenkins of Hillhead, 1920–2003), Labour politician. Home Secretary, 1974–6.

made Foreign Secretary. Roy Jenkins\* was mooted to be Foreign Secretary.

**PALLISER**

He hoped to be Chancellor.

**ONSLOW**

The United Kingdom and Iceland have had a series of confrontations during the 1970s and before over North Atlantic fishing rights, which are commonly called the Cod Wars.

So Crosland appeared to be a surprising appointment. It seems that he knew nothing about Rhodesia when he became Foreign Secretary and knew more about the Cod War.\*

**PALLISER**

Yes. He was of course Member of Parliament for Grimsby and was very courageous over the Cod War because his constituents were not at all happy with the way he was handling it. He just said, in a sense, ‘There we are.’

**ONSLOW**

Do you recall how the Foreign Office and Tony Crosland felt about Kissinger’s initiative?

**PALLISER**

The Crosland-Kissinger relationship was interesting. Funnily enough, I went to a lunch on New Year’s Day at which I found myself sitting next to Susan Crosland, whose family I have known since then and with whom I have kept a little in touch. As you probably know, she has a severe physical disability, but there is nothing wrong with her mental ability. We talked about Crosland and Kissinger because we both remembered the first occasion when Crosland and Kissinger met. That, in itself, is not directly relevant to Rhodesia, but is interesting. We received a message saying that Kissinger was coming through London – I do not remember where from and it does not matter – and had only a short time here, but would like to meet the new Foreign Secretary. That was very shortly after Crosland had become Foreign Secretary.

Tony Crosland’s first instinct was that he did not want a meeting because he felt that he would be out-classed both intellectually and in terms of his knowledge of the world, foreign policy and so on, and that that combination would put him at a disadvantage. He

wanted more time to learn about things. He took an inordinate amount of time learning, which is not meant as a criticism. He took all the papers away and brainstormed over a topic. He did not really want to deal with it until he had done that, reached a view and knew about it. Whether on Rhodesia or anything else concerning international affairs, at that time he felt that here was the world's great expert and that he was not remotely expert. His first instinct was, 'No. Tell him I can't manage it.'

Although Susan did not say this to me, I suspect that she probably gave him the same advice as I did. I told him that he was making a serious mistake. First, because he would offend Kissinger if he behaved in that way and that was not a good idea. Whatever one may have thought about him or his policies, he was an important figure. Secondly, he was completely wrong in thinking that he would be at an intellectual disadvantage because he was not. Kissinger would not have expected him to know every subject as he does, but he would be interested to meet Crosland and in my view Crosland was fully equal in intellectual ability.

We had quite a discussion about that and finally – the meeting was to be on a Friday – he said, 'All right. In any case, I was going to spend the weekend in Grimsby. If he will come up there, I'll see him there.' I asked him where he would see him and he said, 'Well, he has got an aeroplane. There is a splendid Air Force base just outside Grimsby. Tell him we can have a breakfast meeting there. If he doesn't like that, he can do the other thing.' I cannot remember exactly now, but we spoke to Anne Armstrong\* who was the American ambassador and a delightful, very able, interesting woman. It was a very good appointment. I explained all that to her and I think she was a little taken aback, but said she would see what the Secretary [of State] said. I think it was quite a clever, instinctive move because Kissinger was (a) annoyed and (b) intrigued by that character who instead of doing what he was accustomed to – coming out to Heathrow to meet him on his terms – was, in effect, saying that

Anne L. Armstrong, American diplomat. Ambassador to the UK, 1976–7.

they would meet on Crosland's terms if he wanted to, although it was not put that way.

Anne Armstrong said she would be going up to Grimsby in Kissinger's plane with him and asked me if I would like to join them. I said that, of course, I would. Crosland was already up there. I went to Heathrow to Air Force number whatever it is that the Secretary of State uses and there was Kissinger in a huge converted aeroplane with offices and lots of people scribbling away, rather like we see in the movies. Kissinger and I had known each other a long time because he was one of the first directors of the Centre for International Affairs at Harvard, which I got to know very well when I was a planner and head of the planning staff. I do not want to exaggerate, but we were good friends. He welcomed me when I went on board and said, 'This is quite something isn't it? He is going to owe me for this.' I said that he would find that it was worth it because Crosland was a very interesting, intelligent man and, although he did not have Kissinger's experience in world affairs, he would find him a challenging, interesting man. Kissinger said, 'He had better be.' It was all very friendly and he was intrigued.

We got to Grimsby and had the meeting. We turned up in the Officers' Mess and had a big table and breakfast, and the meeting. Kissinger talked more than Tony, but Tony listened and reacted intelligently, as I knew he would. At the end of it, when we were flying back with Kissinger, I could see that he was interested by Crosland and rather taken with him. They were two remarkable intellects and they struck sparks off each other. When Susan and I were talking about it the other day, she said that Kissinger became quite a good friend and that he and Tony corresponded, quite apart from the office. At the beginning, he had been rather frightened of Kissinger and possibly rather suspicious of him. Tony was a left of centre socialist and Kissinger was a very right of centre Republican, although he would not fall into the current category of Neoconservative.\* He was quite different, but he was hard line.

The term Neoconservative or neocon is used to describe a political tendency that influenced the conduct of American foreign policy during the presidency of George W. Bush, 2000-2008. In relation to foreign policy, Neoconservatives dislike international institutions, like the United Nations, and favour unilateralist initiatives in the pursuance of US national interests and state security.

My instinct was first that Crosland was rather attracted by Kissinger and got on well with him and, secondly, that the notion of Kissinger helping was entirely acceptable to him.

**ONSLow**

Drawing in American power to help resolve things.

Do you recall the general consensus in the meeting on Rhodesia and how it went?

**PALLISER**

No, to be honest, I am afraid that I do not. It was certainly talked about and subsequently Kissinger became more involved. This is instinctive because I really do not remember, but I think that Crosland would have made it clear that it was a British problem that we recognised we had to handle, but I think that he would have been very happy to have any help that Kissinger could give him. There were lots of other things at that time that were also talked about. I suppose that the whole thing took about an hour or an hour and a half, and Rhodesia was only one of several topics. I just do not remember, but there must be a record of that meeting somewhere.

**ONSLow**

There is, and it will become available this year.

I have read Susan Crosland's note of it, as well as Tony Crosland's notes that were extremely sketchy. They set out his political philosophy and his counterpoint to Kissinger emphasising the Cold War aspect of Southern Africa, with which Tony Crosland did not agree. He might have accepted that the Russians had scored a success in Angola, but felt that the success was being exaggerated by the Americans and over-emphasised by the South Africans. He did not see Rhodesia as a Cold War issue. That was very much the tone that I gathered.

**PALLISER**

I think that that is almost certainly correct. One must remember that Tony [Crosland] was very interested in Latin America, or at least Central America. He knew it very well. He had friends in Costa Rica and other Central American countries. At that time –

perhaps it is still true – one cannot go to any of those countries without being conscious of the weight of the United States on top of them economically, politically and in every other way. I am sure that, with that sort of mental background, Tony would have been sceptical of an American analysis of the developing part of the world.

It is true that there was an enormous amount of Cold War competition in Africa. I served for just more than two years in West Africa in the early 1960s. Funnily enough, I lunched with the Czech Ambassador today and I reminded him that when I went to Guinea in 1961, just visiting, my passport was examined by an East German and my luggage was examined by a Czech. The Soviet Union was running Guinea, which in a sense was a totally unimportant country, but it had tribal and other connections spreading out across its borders. It was just one example of when the Soviet Union capitalised on anything that the West exposed to them.

It is not totally relevant to Rhodesia, but one of the first papers that the planning staff wrote when I started it up was on Soviet and Chinese penetration of Africa and competition therein. That must be on the files somewhere. I have just remembered that that was a topic that worried us. In a sense, it was understandable that Kissinger saw it as a Cold War issue. It was equally understandable and, incidentally, correct that Tony Crosland did not see it that way. Frankly, I do not think that anyone in London saw it that way. Indeed, it was not really a Cold Warsue, although it is true that Mugabe and his guerrillas received quite a lot of supplies from Soviet sources of one kind or another – East Germany and so on. Simply on the principle of making trouble for the West whenever they could, the Russians were certainly sympathetic to Mugabe and the rebels.

The other thing to remember – I do not know whether we said this to Kissinger – is that the Russians had never really been very successful in Africa because they had a profound racial distaste for

In 1960 the 'Peoples' Friendship University' was founded in Moscow, renamed the Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University in 1961. It aimed to educate to university level people from third world countries favourably disposed towards the USSR. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, in 1992, the university was renamed the 'Peoples' Friendship University of Russia'.

black people. We used to say, jokingly – but not only jokingly – that we would much rather see black African young men, women and leaders go to Lumumba University\* in Moscow than to the London School of Economics.

**ONSLOW**

What my university is responsible for.

**PALLISER**

The ones who went to Moscow came back very anti-Soviet, almost without exception.

**ONSLOW**

They were happy to take the money and the arms.

**PALLISER**

They were badly treated. The Russian people detested them because they just did not like black faces. But the ones who came here to the LSE had a better reception. I think that one of the factors at play in Soviet attempts in Africa was the fact that the Russians were not good with Africans.

**ONSLOW**

Do you recall whether that was a current view?

**PALLISER**

Yes. What I said about Lumumba University was very much the current view. I cannot remember when they started the Lumumba University. It must have been after the death of Patrice Lumumba, but it was set up in an attempt by the Soviet Union to train up future pro-Soviet African leaders and was pretty much a total failure. We saw that at the time. I suspect that it must have been talked about in the paper to which I referred, but the Chinese handled the Africans better. I do not think that they had a much more favourable view of black men than the Russians, but perhaps they were better at concealing it.

I think what happened was that when the Chinese did things in Africa – I think it is still true – it was all done by Chinese. They had



a network of people, rather as they do here. I was saying at lunch that, at the back of our garden here, there is a wall that separates our garden from the garden of a house in Lyndhurst Gardens which is the property of the Chinese Embassy. About four or five years ago, bits of the wall fell down and we got in touch with the Chinese because it was the weight of their property that was bringing down the wall. We discovered that they were using the house as a hostel for Chinese labourers, so they produced a team of about 10 Chinese who, within 10 minutes, had rebuilt the wall. They told us that they brought them to London. They had one man who was a sort of superintendent who stayed here for many years, but the labourers came for six months and were then sent back to China. That is the Chinese technique and I think that it operated very much in Africa.

**ONSLOW**

Speaking of communist rivalry in Africa, do you recall much concern about Yugoslavian activity?

**PALLISER**

Josip Tito (1892–1980) Yugoslav soldier and statesman. Communist and leader of the Partisan resistance against Nazi WWII occupation, then Leader of the post-war federal government of Yugoslavia. The only Communist leader able to sustain opposition to Stalin and the Soviet Union, he was subsequently prominent in the Non-Aligned movement. Elected President in 1953 and President for Life in 1974.

The short answer is yes there was concern but, because of the quarrel between Tito\* and Moscow, less attention was paid to it. If we had had to choose between seeing the Russians or the Yugoslavs active in an African country, we would have said. 'Let's have the Yugoslavs.' On the whole, we had pretty good relations with Yugoslavia. It was a strange phenomenon.

**ONSLOW**

It was certainly anomalous.

Going back to the Kissinger initiative, do you recall how Tony Crossland and Jim Callaghan felt as Kissinger moved into Africa, made his Lusaka speech, encouraged resolution of the Rhodesia problem and then began contact with the Vorster Government in trying to squeeze Smith? Do you recall how the British Government felt about that? Was there collaboration?

**PALLISER**

I think that they had mixed feelings. Again, I do not recall precisely, but dredging back into the mists of memory, I think that they were pleased to see Kissinger and, thereby, the United States involved and were pleased to see pressure being brought to bear on Smith, whether directly or via South Africa, but they were not wholly happy with Kissinger's *modus operandi*. One must remember that there was powerful pressure in the Senate for the Administration to take a much more sympathetic view of the Rhodesian regime. There was resistance, for example, to sanctions against South Africa. Kissinger had to navigate with some care having in mind the domestic situation behind him.

**ONSLow**

In an election year, being challenged by Reagan and wondering whether the third amendment would be repealed or not.

It has to be said that the Labour Government in London similarly were having to look over their shoulder as they became a minority Government in 1977 and had to do a deal with the Liberals. There were compromised political circumstances in both the United Kingdom and the United States.

**PALLISER**

The pressures were in opposite directions.

**ONSLow**

Yes, without a doubt.

Do you recall how the British Government felt as Kissinger succeeded in persuading Smith of the necessity of announcing majority rule within two years and then seemed to go out to the Front Line states and tell a rather different tale from what he had extracted from Smith?

**PALLISER**

To be honest, I do not. I remember that there was constant concern about his method. Again, this is not from direct memory, but thinking back to it there was profound distrust across the political spectrum in London – other than in the right-wing of the Tory Party – of Smith and of anything that he said he would do. That

was the inheritance of both the Wilson and Heath Governments. Smith was not someone whose word could be relied on.

**ONSLOW**

The Labour Government wanted him out.

**PALLISER**

The idea that Kissinger might be operating on the basis of expecting something from Smith that no one in London thought Smith would deliver cast doubt on Kissinger's approach. There was great scepticism about whether he could achieve something while, at the same time, a feeling that it was a good thing for him and the American Administration to be involved.

**ONSLOW**

It seems from what I have read and researched in the South African and Rhodesian archives – and the little in the British archives that were available – was that Britain felt itself landed or dumped with the Geneva Conference and that it was not ideal for Britain.

**PALLISER**

I think that is true. It was not an ideal situation. I just do not remember, but I think that you are right.

**ONSLOW**

Ivor Richard (Lord Richard of Ammanford), Labour politician. Deputy Spokesman, Foreign Affairs, 1971–4.

After all, it was a pretty thankless task that Ivor Richard\* had to embark on as Chairman of the Conference.

**PALLISER**

Yes. There was a lot of sympathy for Ivor Richard. He had very little hope of success of any kind.

**ONSLOW**

Why did Crosland not chair it?

**PALLISER**

I do not really know because I do not think that he ever explained why he did not want to chair it. He just said that he had too much on his plate and that we must get someone else to do it. Ivor Richard was a natural choice. I suspect that Crosland did not want to be too closely associated with what he reckoned would be a failure.

**ONSLOW**

It is interesting that, casting your mind back, that was the impression that was left, even if you did not have actual verbal confirmation. It was an abortive conference and it seems that, by the beginning of 1977, British policy had reached an impasse when Tony Crosland sadly died.

What was your view of David Owen's attitude and approach to Rhodesia on coming to King Charles Street?

**PALLISER**

David Cameron, Conservative politician. Leader of the Party, 2005–.

David Owen is an interesting, rather complex figure. I enjoyed him; maddening and difficult as he undoubtedly was in many ways. He was very difficult as he was with his staff and junior people, which was always rather surprising given that he was such a young man. He was two years younger than David Cameron.\* He made life very difficult for the people working for him and, as Permanent Under-Secretary, I had to do quite a lot of defending of our people. It was not always an agreeable business working with him, but I thought then and I still think that he had a remarkable instinct for international affairs and foreign policy and that he saw the Rhodesian business as a challenge to which he not only had to respond, but had to win. He took it very seriously indeed.

I had served for a few years in Africa and had some feeling for Africans. I went to Rhodesia two or three times while I was working for Wilson, so I had a bit of background on that too. David Owen tended to accept such advice as I gave him to a slightly unusual degree. On the whole, he did not respond to advice from officials, but he did accept that a certain number of us knew about Africa. He saw it as a real challenge, picking up from when Kissinger had been involved. He saw that it was necessary to have the United States involved. He and Cy[rus] Vance established a close and friendly working relationship. There were times when Cy found him a bit obstreperous, but Cy was a much older man and a wise old stager. They got on very well and, to his credit, David Owen

got on well in due course with Andrew Young. There was a serious attempt to sort it out.

**ONSLOW**

Did you feel that the style and personality of the Foreign Secretary and his receptivity or otherwise to advice from his staff affected British policy on Rhodesia, or is that going too far?

**PALLISER**

I think that it is probably going a bit too far. I would not want to overstate what I said just now, but David Owen was sceptical and critical of advice and advisers. I would not say that he disregarded advice, particularly if he felt that the person giving it knew about the subject, although he might be rather rough with him.

**ONSLOW**

He listened and could be persuaded by force of argument.

**PALLISER**

Yes. All our colleagues – myself and others who worked with him – found him exasperating, but stimulating. I do not know how much any of us enjoyed working with him, but it was certainly interesting. I kept a happy relationship with him. I have not seen him for a while, but we used to see each other quite regularly after we had both left the scene.

**ONSLOW**

Sir John Graham, civil servant and diplomat. Deputy Under-Secretary of State, FCO, 1977–9; 1980–82. Witness seminar participant.

You stressed the important and unique relationship that he established with Cy Vance and Andrew Young. How important would you say the partnership of Sir John Graham\* and Stephen Low was in helping to further settlement of the Rhodesia question?

**PALLISER**

I had known Steve Low for a long time. I had known him before. He and Johnny [Graham] were totally different characters in the same way that David Owen and Cy Vance were totally different. Steve and Johnny are both tall, which is about the only thing they have in common. Steve can seem a bit slow, but he is not. He is reflective and careful in what he says. On the whole, he is politically left of centre in the broadest sense to the extent that Americans can

be. I forget what part of the States he came from originally, but he is basically a rather classic State Department operator – nice, thoughtful and intelligent.

Johnny Graham is also nice, thoughtful and intelligent, but much tougher ostensibly. I think they were a very good complementary pair. They certainly seemed to get on very well. Johnny is also an old friend whom I have known for years and I have a great deal of time for him. He is extremely good. They were two excellent operators who came to the issue from slightly different viewpoints. My impression is that they operated very well together.

One of the problems was that basically there was no hope of getting the Smith Regime to accept anything until it had reached the point, both economically and militarily, where it realised that it had to, and that produced Lancaster House. That was a real problem throughout. Probably only a few of us felt that way because we had been involved in it, one way or another, from the beginning. I do not think that the Ministers who were involved day to day, such as David Owen, thought that it was hopeless. I certainly felt all along, having seen Smith on I do not know how many occasions, that he would make a concession, but then he thought that he should not really have given that away and that he could have got a bit more. So he tried to get a bit more and failed, which threw him into a mess. We were probably too pessimistic.

When we came back from *Tiger*,\* I went through the door of Number 10 and was met by the indefatigable George Wigg\* – that is a different subject and an entertaining one, but I will not go into it now. George asked how it had gone and I said that the Prime Minister thinks he has got an agreement. George asked me what I thought and I said that I did not think he had.

In 1966, at Gibraltar, Harold Wilson and Ian Smith met on board *HMS Tiger* to discuss the possibility of resolving UDI. Also see Michael Kandiah (ed), *Rhodesian UDI* (London: ICBH, 2001), <http://www.icbh.ac.uk/downloads/rhodesia.pdf>

George Wigg (Lord Wigg, 1900-83), Labour politician. Paymaster General, 1964-7.

## ONSLOW

That encapsulated it.

## PALLISER

That happened at every stage in the process one way or another. I do not mean that the various initiatives were a waste of time. The

whole process and certainly the Owen-Vance missions were not a waste of time, partly because they demonstrated to other parts of Africa that we were doing our best.

**ONSLOW**

A British commitment. It was important to be seen to be trying. You made the point that Smith was regarded with great distrust by the British political establishment, but do you recall the extent to which Smith was identified as the problem, or was it the Rhodesia Front that was identified as the problem?

**PALLISER**

It is very difficult to separate the two because Smith tended to indicate that he probably could accept something but he had to go back and consult his colleagues and then, two days later, we would be told that his Cabinet had rejected it. He had some very hard line, unattractive characters around him and had to consider his own domestic position. He was an immensely devious, strange creature and it was very difficult ever to get an agreement with him. Even at Lancaster House, he was being dragged along almost by the hair. Although there was a hard line element of people around him, I do not think that he fundamentally dissented from what they were saying. He had it permanently in his mind that if he had made an agreement, went back and they said it was no good, he was already disposed to think that he could have got more. He thought that he could get more if he said it was no good because they will concede more. Of course, they were manoeuvring a lot with the right-wing of the Tory Party here and making as much trouble as they could. As you said a few moments ago, the Labour Government were not in a very powerful position.

**ONSLOW**

How much was there acute concern or a perception in the Foreign Office about the role of South Africa in the Rhodesia question? Was there ever perceived to be a route to Salisbury through Pretoria?

**PALLISER**

I do not think that it was seen quite like that. There was resentment of the support the South African Government consistently gave. There was the problem that the Labour Party and Labour Ministers were tremendously anti-apartheid and that conditioned their attitude to South Africa and to people like Pik Botha, and so on.

One of the complications, which I am sure you know about, was that South Africans despised the white Rhodesians. They thought they were not really Africans, but a bunch of characters – it was a bit unfair because many white Rhodesians had been there for several generations. There had been a huge exodus from England at the end of World War II. It was a terrible blow when my barber at the Guards Club, who had cut my hair for eight years or so, announced one day that he was going out to Rhodesia to join his son-in-law and daughter who had settled there. I do not know what happened to him. There was a substantial exodus and the South Africans tended to identify all the white Rhodesians as people who were running away from England because England was a mess at the time and they wanted servants, sunshine and all the things that they found in Rhodesia.

**ONSLOW**

What the South Africans had.

**PALLISER**

Yes. The South Africans genuinely saw themselves as African and it was one of the great complications with the white South Africans. They resented the notion that they were somehow or other colonialists. They were not. They were African. They were a different sort of African, but they were African. I think that the reason why they propped up Rhodesia was not sympathy for the whites and I am not sure that there was even a feeling that, if the blacks won in Rhodesia, that would complicate life in South Africa. I think that they really despised the Rhodesians. I do not think we ever thought that South Africa was a way to a solution, but I think that we felt that pressure on South Africa might reduce the amount of support it gave to Rhodesia purely for practical reasons. I cannot remember



any British Minister, whether Callaghan or whoever, liking either Pik Botha or P.W. They were not attractive people.

Again, I think that Kissinger found it easier to get on with South Africans than our people did, partly because the South Africans were hard-headed realists and saw where the power lay. It was not in London; it was in Washington.

#### **ONSLOW**

That is very evident from looking at South African archives and the way in which, in 1976, Vorster and his like-minded colleagues – there was a division in Cabinet on how to deal with Rhodesia because of the whole Angola pull-out – really felt that they had struck up an affinity with Kissinger as the practitioner of real politics and who understood white Africans, appreciated the dangers of Angola and that Cuba might launch another adventure in Rhodesia if the security situation there deteriorated. Vorster co-operated with Kissinger because of Namibia and had thought that he had got the deal. It was not that Kissinger was pressing the South Africans. They were co-operating. That was very evident.

#### **PALLISER**

I agree. It was a very different relationship from the one that we had. Kissinger was willing to help us, but his prime concern was his view of American interests, which did not always coincide with our interests.

#### **ONSLOW**

1976 seems to emerge as an elaborate diplomatic dance between Kissinger, London and Pretoria, and Britain and the Front Line states. It was quite a kaleidoscope.

#### **PALLISER**

The 1982 Anglo-Argentine War fought over the Falkland Islands in the South Atlantic. See Dorman, Kandiah & Staerck (eds), *The Falkland Seminar: a gathering of the senior commanders and politicians who directed the course of events of the Falklands War of 1982*, Strategic & Combat Studies Institute Occasional Papers (2003) and Dor-

It was not unlike the Falklands\* situation when Washington and indeed its people in New York were torn between feeling that they had to support us, but there was a mood of considerable gloom about their relationship with and position in Latin America. If the Argentine regime had been a bit more user friendly, we would have had much more difficulty with the Americans. The only person

man, Kandiah and Staerck (eds), *The Falkland War* (London: CCBH, 2004), <http://www.icbh.ac.uk/icbh/witness/falklands/index.html>

supporting us initially in Washington over the Falklands was Cap Weinberger.\*

### **ONSLOW**

Caspar Weinberger (1917-2006), American politician. Secretary of Defense, 1981-7. See The Falkland Roundtable: [http://webstorage1.mcpa.virginia.edu/library/mc/poh/falklands/transcripts/falklands\\_2003\\_0515.pdf](http://webstorage1.mcpa.virginia.edu/library/mc/poh/falklands/transcripts/falklands_2003_0515.pdf)

Going back to Rhodesia –

### **PALLISER**

Sorry, but there is an interesting parallel in the American interest. Let us not forget about the British and all that, but with the Cold War and all the other things that the South Africans exploited, where did Kissinger come down? He did not come down entirely on our side.

### **ONSLOW**

With the failure of the Owen-Vance proposals and Smith's own decision, supported by South Africa, to go for an internal settlement, was there any debate within the Foreign Office about 'Let's accept this. It is a transition to moderate black African majority rule?'

### **PALLISER**

There was a distinct tendency to say that it indicated a shift in the total negativity of the Rhodesia Front and the Smith regime although it did not go far enough. It was not clear that it would work, but at least it represented the beginning of an understanding by the white regime that it had to make some concessions. That was probably how many people saw it.

### **ONSLOW**

It is interesting that the South Africans had hoped initially to get Joshua Nkomo in and to strike a deal with Muzorewa in the belief that, although the fighting would not stop, it would be an internationally accepted settlement. The same seems to be true of their attitude to Muzorewa – that it was a black moderate Government and although the fighting would not stop, they would be sufficiently

acceptable to the international community. How much do you recall that Britain was also guided by the fact that the fighting would not stop and, to push it forward, there had to be greater movement?

**PALLISER**

The 6th Lord Carrington, Conservative politician. Foreign Secretary, 1979–82. Witness seminar participant.

In a way, you have described the attitude that characterised the Conservative Government when they won the election and Margaret Thatcher and team came in. There is no doubt that Thatcher, Carrington\* and the others saw hope in Muzorewa and Nkomo. They were deeply sceptical about Mugabe, but hoped that, if something could be done with Muzorewa and Nkomo, it might have a general impact. That is what they were angling for. It was not until it became very clear at Lancaster House that Mugabe was the most effective and the top dog that that notion had to be abandoned, or at any rate mitigated. We had to see what happened.

**ONSLOW**

David Owen, who was kind enough to talk to us for nearly three and a half hours, placed great emphasis before he stopped being Foreign Secretary on hopes of secret negotiations brokered by Nigeria in 1978, which was before Thatcher came in. Was that his own initiative or did it have broader support from the Foreign Office and his advisers?

**PALLISER**

The mood was that anything was worth trying and that, if the Nigerians were prepared to help us, why not? There was a combination of deep pessimism but also, inevitably with that, we would clutch at any lifeline. There was certainly a feeling that Nigeria was a greatly powerful African country and that, if it were prepared to do something constructive, good luck to it.

**ONSLOW**

Going forward to Lord Carrington and his extraordinary diplomacy, which led to the Lancaster House settlement, from the Foreign Office's standpoint how much did the Lancaster House

settlement also stand on the Foreign Secretary's management of his Prime Minister?

**PALLISER**

Enormously. We were extraordinarily fortunate to have Carrington. Quite apart from any other reasons, after three years of David Owen, Peter Carrington was a rather pleasant change in many ways, but that is by the way. His relationship with the Prime Minister was absolutely crucial. Before, during and at the end of Lancaster House we – the collectivity – were dependent entirely on Carrington and Thatcher agreeing. It was obvious that, if they did agree, the rest of the Cabinet would say, 'Thank God and amen.'

Carrington spent hours talking to Margaret Thatcher, explaining things to her, sending her papers and generally bringing her along. We were fortunate in a way that because Carrington was who he was, was in the House of Lords and so on, he was probably the only senior member of the Cabinet whom she did not regard as a potential competitor. We must remember that every Prime Minister is constantly looking around – Tony Blair and Brown\* – for the people who are waiting for them to make a mess of something. That is human nature. It is instinctive. The great strength of Carrington was that he was not a competitor. He was not seen as someone who might be a candidate to be Prime Minister if she had to fall out for whatever reason.

Gordon Brown, Labour politician.  
Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1997–  
2007; Prime Minister, 2007–

**ONSLOW**

There was a sense of personal and political safety.

**PALLISER**

Yes. I am putting it at rather a low level. There was more than that to it. She had tremendous confidence in Carrington because she trusted his judgment. She knew that he knew a lot about the world and had had enormous experience in defence, foreign policy and so on, and she liked him. I do not want to over-emphasise the competition point, but it was the foundation. I do not think that she saw him as being contaminated by the Foreign Office. All Prime Ministers think at some point or other that their Foreign Secretary is

contaminated by those dangerous characters in the Foreign Office, who are interested only in encouraging foreigners. Again, there was a paradox with her because there is no doubt that she deeply distrusted the collectivity of the Foreign Office. At the same time, she relied constantly on senior Foreign Office people for advice. That is an apparent contradiction, but in the case of Peter Carrington she did not think that he was corrupted by the people around him and that added strength to his position.

Having said that, Mrs Thatcher was not happy with the thought of African majority rule in Rhodesia. She instinctively had sympathy for the regime and if an arrangement had been worked out that kept the whites more or less in control, but not too obviously, I think that she would happily have supported that. That is why she certainly felt that Muzorewa was the best bet in an unsatisfactory situation. Peter Carrington had a little of the same view. She was prepared to support him and back him, and she did so with great effect at the Lusaka Heads of Government Commonwealth meeting. She did not just dance with Kaunda. She backed Carrington in what he was doing and he could not have achieved what he did without her support, but it took hours of work.

Every evening after meeting at Lancaster House, Carrington went to Number 10 to explain what was happening and so on. She deeply distrusted Ian Gilmour,\* partly because of Europe. It was an uphill task and exhausting for Carrington, but he realised that he had to do it. Margaret Thatcher rewarded him, slightly kicking and screaming, by accepting what in the end he had agreed. Now she must be thinking, 'I told you so' but there we are.

Ian Gilmour (Lord Gilmour of Craigmillar, 1926–2007), Conservative politician. Lord Privy Seal, 1979–81.

## **ONSLOW**

Do you remember any particular points of discord or was it a constant process of debriefing by Carrington? Is that a better way of looking at it rather than a situation of critical points?

## **PALLISER**

There must have been the odd occasion when she gibed, but on the whole, with the process of patiently explaining, briefing and making

sure that nothing was happening that she did not know about, she was carried along. She was a realistic politician.

**ONSLOW**

She was persuaded by the force of the argument.

**PALLISER**

Yes.

**ONSLOW**

She was extremely susceptible to force of argument.

**PALLISER**

I agree.

**ONSLOW**

It seems to me that, having persuaded Mrs Thatcher, Lord Carrington successfully neutralised the Tory right and the Julian Amerys of this world. That is not to say that they were silenced, far from it, but by ensuring that the Prime Minister remained supportive he ensured his political base.

**PALLISER**

You are quite right, and they took their revenge on him at the time of the Falklands. They were beaten down and that was a great disappointment to Ian Smith. When he was here for the conference he was in constant touch with the Tory right and I am sure that they tried, but they did not succeed. However, they had it in for Carrington after that and stuck the knife in at the time of the Falklands.

**ONSLOW**

How much would you say that Lancaster House was a product of predetermined conference tactics? You alluded to the close team. It was evident at the witness seminar that it was a gathering of old friends who were genuine colleagues and that from the learning process that had gone on throughout the 1970s there had emerged an extraordinary sense of unity of purpose under a dedicated leader – Lord Carrington – with a very firm sense of purpose.

**PALLISER**

That is true of Robin Renwick and all that team. That is one reason why, when you first asked me if I would do this, I said that although

I went to a number of meetings at Lancaster House I was basically not much involved in the process because the shop needed to be run while Carrington was almost totally absorbed, and Gilmour too. I was very conscious and content that the team, which was jolly good, should get on with it. It was a very good team.

Another interesting thing was the African relationships. On the first evening at Lancaster House, a reception was held in a big room on the first floor and it was fascinating to see the Mugabe team, the Nkomo team and the groups, which tended to come together at the reception. It was like old school friends meeting – ‘Hello. How are you? I haven’t seen you for ages.’ There was an extraordinary sense of people who opposed each other bitterly being also old friends who had known each other for a long time. That was truer of the Nkomo group, the Muzorewa group and Sithole, of course. The two or three senior people with Mugabe were wandering around slapping on the back the people who were with Nkomo. There was a tremendous sense of being all Rhodesians together. It was a very interesting phenomenon. I must not exaggerate the importance of that, but it was interesting to see how those people, who disagreed, who came from different tribes and had all sorts of problems in their relationships, were all determined to make Rhodesia a black not a white country. There was a sense of common endeavour against the whites.

## **ON SLOW**

That is very interesting because, at the conference I organised last week on Rhodesian UDI, a Zimbabwean academic was arguing that, rather than looking at a black-white model, there was a black unity of desire to overcome the white minority regime. It is possible to look at it as an internal power struggle within the structure of Rhodesia-Zimbabwe of a number of different power groupings all jockeying for that one position. Rather than black-white, colour should be taken out of it. What do you say of that approach?

**PALLISER**

There is an element of truth in it, but it was more because there was recognition among many of the senior blacks that they needed the whites. Certainly the white farming community was necessary, as we have seen with their departure. There was genuine like and respect for some white people, but I still think that fundamentally there was a sense that they must achieve what they would call a black African solution. At that stage, there was not much feeling of wanting to banish the whites or get rid of them, but there was undoubtedly a feeling, first, that the Rhodesia Front had to be got rid of and, secondly, that over time – and not too much time – there had to be a basically black regime, not unlike Kenya in a way, although they were different peoples.

**ONSLOW**

Sir Michael Blundell (1907–93). Leader of New Kenya Group, 1959–63.

Rhodesia did not have Michael Blundell.\*

**PALLISER**

No.

**ONSLOW**

He was a delightful and remarkable man.

**PALLISER**

One of the problems was that it was such a small, almost incestuous group of white politicians and a pretty unattractive white community. The only people who I did not have reservations about were some of the farmers who had been out there for a long time. I was there on a number of occasions and, on one visit, I went on a Sunday to a Catholic school 20 miles out of Salisbury, as it then was. The pupils were mainly boys and girls of about 16, 17 and 18. I asked them who they thought was the most important African statesman and, without exception, they said Nkrumah. That was striking. That was in 1967, 1968 or something like that. It was after Nkrumah had gone, but thousands of miles away that was the figure who represented black Africa. I do not know whether that would have been the view of their elders – probably not – but it was interesting that it was the view of those young people. I do not



know what they went on to do – they are now 30 years older. It was an interesting reaction.

**ONSLOW**

Going back to the conclusion of the Lancaster House conference and the final process towards independence, how important do you think Lord Soames's role was?

**PALLISER**

I think that it was important. He was a Tory grandee and not believed to be particularly left-wing or liberal. He was Churchill's son-in-law, which was a positive asset, as indeed was Mary Soames to him in the job. He saw clearly the way in which things would go. He had to do several things with regard to the elections and all that, but I forget the details. It was a skilful appointment and one that he carried out awfully well.

**ONSLOW**

To what extent was his governorship managed from London?

**PALLISER**

Quite a bit, much more than a classic colonial governor. He had a team with him. I never knew how well he got on with Tony Duff. I think that it was a slightly complex relationship. Tony was a remarkable man, too. I worked with Christopher in Paris for three years and it was marvellous. We had a tremendously happy relationship, but I never had the feeling that he and Duff established that sort of partnership. I do not quite know why. I do not know whether that will emerge from any of the papers, but perhaps he considered that Duff was a bit too much the Whitehall mouthpiece, which in a way he was. He was there to keep an eye on Christopher and make sure he did not go over the top on anything. Having said all that, however, they worked together perfectly well and the governorship was a considerable success. I am not sure that I can think of anyone else at that time who would have done it better or been more acceptable.

Christopher Soames was an extraordinary man. He could be a bit of a bully, but he had a feel for people and he was a very skilful

political animal. He understood and managed the black politicians with considerable skill. He did things that they did not like, but he managed to get away with it. That was particularly true of his relations with Mugabe. At the end, everyone was disappointed that Mugabe had won, but not entirely surprised.

**ONSLOW**

Lord Carrington commented at the Cambridge conference that he had expected Mugabe to win, but that that was not the consensus of opinion in London and that Mrs Thatcher had not been of that view. Is that your recollection?

**PALLISER**

I think so. I certainly thought that Mugabe would win simply because such experience as I had, which was limited, of Africans and African nationalism told me that Mugabe had the edge over people like Muzorewa and even Nkomo. Nkomo was a powerful tribal figure, but he was older and a bit tired. I was not surprised that Mugabe won. Perhaps it was people wanting him not to win who were not just disappointed, but surprised that it should happen. I am sure that Carrington was not surprised.

**ONSLOW**

Sir John Leahy, diplomat. Ambassador to South Africa, 1979–8.

Sir John Leahy\* confirmed yesterday that the South Africans were stunned and appalled because they had put their eggs firmly in the Muzorewa basket.

**PALLISER**

Yes, and most people in the Government here had put their eggs in the Muzorewa basket. I cannot remember now the reporting from Christopher Soames, but it became fairly clear in the final stages of the electoral campaign where it was going to end and that we would have to adapt to it.

**ONSLOW**

One question that I have not asked other interviewees is how helpful or otherwise were Britain's European partners on the Rhodesia question.

**PALLISER**

They were certainly not unhelpful, or at least I do not recall any unhelpfulness. The French were very involved in Africa and concerned about the way things might go. The Portuguese had given up on Africa and anyway they were not in the Community at that time. The French took more of an interest. They had a sympathetic interest in the problem and followed what was going on.

**ONSLOW**

Britain's ability to press Rhodesia was certainly complicated by French commercial concerns.

**PALLISER**

There was Total and all that. There always is. One of the problems with foreign policy, particularly for its political operators, is that it is always very difficult to get them to understand the point of view of the other man. Looking at it from Paris, the French concern was the French interest, particularly the French commercial interest. They might have been prepared to be helpful to the UK provided that it preserved French interests – it has a fairly tight definition of French interests. Despite all that, they had seen the way in which Africa had gone and I think that they always felt that we had not kept enough post-independence control in the way that they did for a long time – some people would argue that they are still doing that. To that extent, there was a difference in our colonial regimes and a considerable difference in our post-colonial regimes. It was in the French interest to see as peaceful and rapid a settlement of the problem in Africa as possible. At the same time, they had commercial interests that were busy breaking sanctions and so on. One must accept that.

I do not think that the other members of the Community, as it then was –

**ONSLOW**

The Germans.

**PALLISER**

I think that they all felt that it was a British problem that the British had to solve. If we asked them for help, provided that it was some-

thing that they could do and which made sense, they would give it. I do not think that there was an anti-British feeling about it. I suspect that it was just a feeling of ‘Thank goodness we haven’t got that problem to deal with.’ I think that I would remember if there had been a lot of friction, and I do not remember that. Obviously I was interested in the European aspect, so I think I would remember. I think that they were content to leave the matter to us and hoped that we would resolve it.

**ONSLOW**

Do you recall attempts by the Foreign Office to persuade the French Government to encourage French commercial interests to other markets?

**PALLISER**

I do not recall that, but I feel pretty sure we must have done. We would have said to them that there were universal sanctions on the regime and that it would not benefit them if black people come out on top in Rhodesia and they had been helping the whites too much. If I had been in the Embassy in Paris at that time, no doubt that is what I would have been saying at the Quai d’Orsay, but without much feeling that it would cut a great deal of ice. As long as there was money to be made by French businesses without too much hassle with anyone, that was what they did.

**ONSLOW**

Sir Michael, you have been extremely generous with your time. Thank you very much indeed.

Is there anything that you feel I should have asked about?

**PALLISER**

I do not think so. I said at the beginning that my memory of the whole thing is paradoxically more precise about the period when I was with Harold Wilson at Number 10 during the early stages and, indeed, before that when I was a planner. There is one thing, however, I have always felt might have changed things. When I was head of the planning staff and George Thomson\* was the Foreign Office Minister dealing with Africa – I obviously discussed this

George Thomson (Lord Thomson of Monifieth), Labour politician. Commissioner, EEC, 1973–7

with him after UDI – he was immensely frustrated by the fact that the military, the War Office, the Ministry of Defence and so on said that we could not possibly have a military operation for a variety of reasons.

The undeclared reason was a sort of fellow feeling for the Rhodesian Armed Forces. I do not think that there was much of an appetite in the Ministry of Defence for fighting people like Smith, who had been a pilot in World War II. Before going to the planners, I was at the Imperial Defence College with the head of the Rhodesian Air Force. He is now retired and living in South Africa. He was a friend of all the air force officers at the Imperial Defence College, now called the Royal College for Defence Studies – imperial was thought to be a bit too much. There was a genuine reluctance in the Ministry of Defence to think in terms of a military solution. In any case, there were enormous practical difficulties.

I remember George Thomson saying in a mood of indignation when we were looking at the matter together, ‘Here we are spending £20 billion’ – I forget what the figure was but it must have been billions even then – ‘annually on defence and we are told we cannot do this.’ I said that I had a solution that might just work. That was a week after UDI. I said that the Rhodesian Armed Forces were divided in their loyalty – I felt that very strongly and still do – because they swore allegiance to the Crown and a number of them spent time in the Armed Forces during the war. I doubted whether they were tremendously keen on the Rhodesia Front regime, but equally they were Rhodesians and they were white Rhodesians.

HRH the Duke of Edinburgh, consort  
to HM Queen Elizabeth II.

I said that if we put the Duke of Edinburgh\* into an aeroplane with a company of Coldstream Guards – my former regiment – and flew them out to Salisbury and if he landed as the Queen’s Governor-General and went straight to Government House, summoned Ian Smith and dismissed him, the problem would be settled. George [Thomson] said that it was a very interesting idea, but it did not have a prayer because no one would get the Royal Family involved.

He was quite right politically, but if we had been able to do that it might have worked because at that time, with the mood in the Armed Forces, if they saw the Queen's consort arriving with a contingent of British troops they would have declared their loyalty to the Queen.

**ONSLOW**

There is also the distinction the Smith regime made in UDI between its loyalty to the Crown and its rejection of the Labour Government.

**PALLISER**

It is exactly for that reason that I thought the way to solve the problem was the Crown. Anyway, those are might-have-beens. I still think that, if it had been possible to do that, the whole thing might have been knocked on the head at the beginning, but it was probably both politically and in other ways impossible. I have no idea whether, if the Prime Minister had mentioned it to the Queen, she would have agreed. It would have been a tremendous gamble and it is difficult to gamble with the Queen's husband. It would have been embarrassing if he had been popped in jail.

**ONSLOW**

Just a little.

**PALLISER**

That is just a little postscript to our conversation. I knew that it was not really a runner and George simply confirmed that. I think that he was quite sympathetic to it, but he did not think that it was a feasible proposition. One has to throw oneself back to the mood of that first week. It would not have worked a month later, but I felt that it might have worked about a week or 10 days after UDI when there was enormous uncertainty and we knew that the Rhodesian Armed Forces were worried because of their conflict of loyalty.

**ONSLOW**

Sir Michael, thank you very much indeed.

**KANDIAH**

Thank you.