The Spectator 99 Gower Street London W.C.1

Telephone Euston 3221 (Stines.)

B

16 November 1967

A Som Kalph

Thank you for your kind letter. I quite understand your feeling about our failure to write about your publications. From time to time, we do, of course, comment on a particular pamphlet or such like, but we have a really intolerably difficult space problem. But I shall certainly do my best to improve on our poor record.

Nigel Lawson

Ralph Harris, Esq.,
The Institute of Economic Affairs Ltd.,
Eaton House,
66a, Eaton Square,
SW1

15th November, 1967.

Nigel Lawson, Esq., The Spectator, 99, Gower Street, London, W.C.1.

Of course we entirely forgive you for the rather forceful expression of your doubts about our recent opinion surveys. Indeed, I think we have learned a good deal from Friday's discussion and will be reviewing our further plans with Mass-Observation in the light of both destructive and constructive criticisms.

Personally, I find it a little less easy to forgive the more or less consistent failure of the Spectator (under previous and present management) to provide any sort of showcase for our publications. If you don't do something on the pricing volume which comes out on Monday, I will know that we had best abandon all further hope of reviews or encouragement from your journal.

Telephone Euston 3221 (5Lines.)

13th November 1967

M Sen Kalpa

Sorry I had to slip away last Friday without thanking you and Arthur for a very pleasant lunch. I hope you will forgive me for having been so destructive in the subsequent discussion: as you know, I am broadly with you in spirit but I do feel there is a real danger of getting bogged down in the murky statistics of market surveys and opinion research.

Nigel Lawson

Ralph Harris, Esq., Institute of Economic Affairs, 24, Austin Friars, E.C.2. Months Sel Michael Behrans: For ian Ble

Michael Behrans: For ian Ble

Mr. Mankwan: Net 5666

638

Consideratial Mankwan: Bruney: - Debenhams

Nigel Lawson Esq., Contacts

London S. W. 7.

584-7978.

Rend

First may I apologise for not having sent you Hayek without being prompted. I was astomished to find that in a review list running to more than 100 names you are not automatically included. You will be henceforth even though not all of our titles are so obviously right up your street as is Hayek. To judge from both the DT and the TBN leaders this morning we can hope for a continuing place for Hayek in the debate on "Incomes policy".

I was anyway about to write to say how grateful we would be if you could make early progress with arranging lunches (or dinners?) with your two buccaneers. It so happens that the Debenman subscription comes up for renewal and that the Ionian bank has just cancelled. So it may be a good moment to strike.

Since lunches often get booked up months ahead, might we keep up our sleeve the alternative offer of dinner which we could lay on at either St. Stephen's or the Reform? In addition to Arthur and John Wood we might also invite Rhodes Boyson who is a genuine convert to the market aconomy and all that. Needless to say, I take it for granted that for these occasions we act as hosts.

Over the next few months I am resigned to devote a large part of my time to strengthening the Institute's finances against the ravages of inflation. The first effort is to get existing subscribers to increase their annual payment which is often a fraction of what the chairmen would think appropriate for Aims of Industry and similar outfits. The second obvious method is to bring any companies which do not at present subscribe onto our list, especially the surprisingly large number that contribute to NIESR and PEP but not to us. From your writings and TV ap earances (of which I am always hearing good

reports) you will obviously have a strong following among precisely the kind of businessmen who should support the IEA. Might you

therefore go on thinking about individuals connected with subscribing companies (list enclosed) or others we might hope to recruit. I venture to trouble you at such length because I assume that we may regard you as one of our best allies now in journalism and shortly in Farliament, and that you will have common interest in seeing our work and influence grow rather than be cut back as is now threatened.

file 24. HYDE PARK GATE. 24 t ang LONDON, S.W.7. Thank you for your letter of 27th June and enclosures. Anyway, your letter to him (thank you for sending me a copy) reads admirably, and I trust it will be fruitful. Do let me know what response there is: I don't think it would be a good idea for me to take the initiative in following it up unless I happen to bump into him accidentally. On another matter altogether, thank you for inviting me to the Mont Pellerin meeting: I am afraid I am still not quite sure whether or not I will be able to be there (I would certainly like to go) but I will let you have an answer as soon as possible.