out one thing which both

19 December 1980 Policy Unit Gran

GOVERNMENT STRATEGY UT wrongs that i weeks to the companie chield because I could of pull income in this because

We will be putting to you on Monday, as promised, our STRATEGY PAPER NUMBER 3.

The questions we have to ask in reviewing Government strategy seem to me to be these:

- (1) Are you satisfied that the Government's central strategy is going well enough?
- (2) If not is this due to lack of clear objectives, or lack of an adequate strategy, or failure to implement the strategy?
- (3) If strategy or implementation are at fault do you believe that colleagues and officials can put it right?
- (4) If so will they do it by trying harder? Or by starting all over again? Or by working in a different way? Or some combination of these?
- (5) If putting it right requires working in a different way where will this new way come from?

The paper is written from the <u>businessman's viewpoin</u>t: that is, it assumes that when things do not go according to plan, you must look at the <u>organisation</u> and the <u>way of thinking and working</u>, rather than at the people concerned. Business experience suggests that even the ablest people are <u>quite useless</u> if the approach and organisation is wrong. The quality of people alone is not enough. Experience at making new things happen counts too. This is an <u>entrepreneurial skill</u>.

In the Policy Unit, we are <u>amateurs</u> in the <u>political field</u>, in the Parliamentary and legislative process. We would fall flat on our faces if we suddenly tried to operate in that area. But I think you accept that the businessman's way of thinking really does have something to offer to politicians and senior civil servants who do not get much training or direct experience of management as such. This is where I

think we, and other political advisers with business backgrounds, can make the best contribution.

Papers - whether good or bad, short or long - can achieve nothing by themselves. I hope we shall have a chance to discuss the paper (which I will copy - to Geoffrey and Keith) in the New Year.

Jb.

JOHN HOSKYNS