



## British Embassy

3100 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington DC 20008

Telex Domestic USA 89-2370/89-2384

Telex International 64224(WUI)/248308(RCA)/440015(ITT)

Telephone (202) 462-1340

Bryan White Esq  
MCAD  
FCO

Your reference

Our reference

Date 18 July 1983

Dear Bryan,

MR JOHN CARBAUGH: BELIZE/GUATEMALA

1. Thank you for your letter of 30 June about John Carbaugh. I am sorry not to have replied earlier, but it has proved difficult to get a full account of the extent to which Carbaugh's claims were correct that he was making representations with the high level authority of the State Department, Pentagon and NSC.
2. I have now heard from the Pentagon that Carbaugh had indeed discussed with Ikle some of the points he raised on his visit to London, in particular the proposal that a training programme might be established in Belize to replace the British garrison. Although my source (Dov Zakheim, who works in Ikle's office) did not go so far as to say that Carbaugh was speaking with Ikle's specific authority, far less with that of the Secretary for Defense, it was clear that Carbaugh was reflecting Ikle's thoughts: as Dov observed with a touch of asperity, he has Ikle's complete confidence.
3. The State Department have been much more cagey. No-one there is willing to say specifically that Carbaugh was speaking with Enders' or Motley's authority: on the whole this is unlikely, the more so since the PUS was told by Eagleburger last week that the idea of a replacement training presence in Belize was a rotten one which was opposed by State Department and the Administration as a whole. Incidentally, you will see from our telegram 1951 that when I informed State Department and the Pentagon that we were willing to discuss the establishment of a training presence, this produced somewhat embarrassed shuffling of the feet. It therefore seems that in as much as Carbaugh discussed that topic, he was reflecting Ikle's view rather than that of the Administration.

/4.

CONFIDENTIAL



4. I asked Zakheim how he thought we should handle any response to Carbaugh's points. In spite of the number of reminders, he has so far been unable to come up with a reply.

5. So it seems to me that Carbaugh was, not for the first time, free-lancing. He was certainly not an emissary sent to express formal US government views, although it is true that he did reflect the views of some people within the Administration. Given subsequent indications that the Pentagon themselves were engaging in a little foreign policy of their own without State Department approval, I therefore think it would be best and simplest if we did not respond in any formal way. I think that the Americans now recognise that the ball is in their court and that it is up to them to look at ways of filling whatever vacuum is left by the departure of the British garrison from Belize.

Yours ever

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C D Crabbie', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

C D Crabbie

CONFIDENTIAL



RECEIVED  
22 JUL 1963



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

23 July, 1983

John John,

I am not surprised.

A. J. C. 27.

Mr John Carbaugh

p-a.

You saw Mr Carbaugh on 24 June after he had asked for a call on the Prime Minister. You will wish to see the enclosed letter from Washington indicating that so far as the Embassy have been able to establish, Mr Carbaugh had not been commissioned to express formal US Government views. The Embassy's view that no further response to Mr Carbaugh is required seems sound.

John Bone

(R B Bone)  
Private Secretary

A J Coles  
Private Secretary  
10 Downing Street