David Wolfson

TO: PRIME MINISTER.
FROM: DAVID WOLFSON.
SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

1. THE CONTINUED RETENTION OF LORD HAILSHAM IS A CLEAR SIGN OF WEAKNESS.

2. KEITH JOSEPH IS CERTAINLY THE NICEST PERSON I HAVE MET IN POLITICS. BUT JUDGED BY THE SAME STANDARDS AS OTHER CABINET MINISTERS, HE SHOULD GO. AGE AND RELATIVE LACK OF SUCCESS IN OFFICE ARE ADEQUATE REASONS. (THE FACT THAT HE HAS HAD ALL THE RIGHT IDEAS IS ALAS NOT RELEVANT: THEY HAVEN'T BEEN PROJECTED OR ACCEPTED) TO KEEP HIM BECAUSE OF PERSONAL FRIENDSHIP WOULD BE IMPROPER. INCIDENTALLY, THERE ARE ALREADY ENOUGH JEWISH MEMBERS OF THE CABINET: IF YOU WERE THINKING OF MOVING GEORGE YOUNGER AND BRINGING IN MALCOLM RIFKIND, THAT IS EVEN MORE REASON FOR A DECENT RETIREMENT OF KEITH.

3. UNLIKE KEITH, PATRICK JENKIN WAS SADDLED WITH HASTILY CONCEIVED AND ILL-THOUGHT OUT MANIFESTO COMMITTMENTS. THE TROUBLES IN ENVIRONMENT WERE NOT OF HIS MAKING. BUT POLITICS IS A ROUGH GAME, AND POSSIBLY HE HAS TO CARRY THE CAN FOR THE FAILURE TO WORK OUT SATISFACTORY SOLUTIONS DURING YOUR FIRST TERM.

4. I HOPE YOU ARE NOT GOING TO MOVE PEOPLE ROUND THE CABINET LIKE MUSICAL CHAIRS! IF NORMAN TEBBITT IS PREPARED TO BECOME PARTY CHAIRMAN, AND YOU WANT HIM THERE, THE LEAST DISRUPTIVE ANSWER IS GEORGE YOUNGER TO TRADE AND INDUSTRY, RIFKIND TO SCOTLAND, AND BAKER, MOORE, CLARKE ET AL FIGHTING FOR 2 CABINET SPOTS (IF JENKIN GOES AS WELL, OR FROM KING TO TRADE AND INDUSTRY, WITH ROOM FOR BAKER, MOORE AND CLARKE (OR A.N.OTHER). I THINK IT WOULD BE A MISTAKE TO SACK PETER WALKER, OR EVEN TO MOVE HIM FROM ENERGY WHERE HE IS A PERCEIVED SUCCESS. IT WOULD SEEM ILLOGICAL TO MOVE MICHAEL HESSELTINE FROM DEFENCE, WHICH SHOULD BE A LONG-TERM JOB, BUT THERE WOULD BE ADVANTAGE IN HAVING HIM IN A MORE PUBLIC JOB, TRADE AND INDUSTRY, IN THE RUN-UP TO AN ELECTION.

5. I DO NOT THINK YOU SHOULD BRING CECIL BACK. THERE ARE MANY FOR HIM IN THE PARTY AT LARGE, AND MANY AGAINST. I FEAR THAT THOSE AGAINST WOULD BE MORE OFFENDED BY HIS RETURN THAT THOSE IN FAVOUR WOULD BE PLEASED.

6. MOREOVER, YOU NEED TWO OR THREE HIGH-PROFILE WETS TO COME IN TO THE CABINET. PEOPLE WHO ARE SEEN TO CARE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT. POLICIES WILL HARDLY BE AFFECTED IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS, BUT PERCEPTIONS WILL BE. I THINK NICK RIDLEY HAS DONE A GOOD JOB, BUT YOU DON'T NEED TWO MORE OF HIM IN THE RUN UP TO AN ELECTION. PROSPECTIVE CABINET MEMBERS NOW SHOULD HAVE ONE PARTICULAR QUALIFICATION: THEY MUST NOT BE "ONE OF US"!

David Wolfson

TO: PRIME MINISTER.
FROM: DAVID WOLFSON.
SUBJECT: MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

1. THE CONTINUED RETENTION OF LORD HAILSHAM IS A CLEAR SIGN OF WEAKNESS.

2. KEITH JOSEPH IS CERTAINLY THE NICEST PERSON I HAVE MET IN POLITICS. BUT JUDGED BY THE SAME STANDARDS AS OTHER CABINET MINISTERS, HE SHOULD GO. AGE AND RELATIVE LACK OF SUCCESS IN OFFICE ARE ADEQUATE REASONS. (THE FACT THAT HE HAS HAD ALL THE RIGHT IDEAS IS ALAS NOT RELEVANT: THEY HAVEN'T BEEN PROJECTED OR ACCEPTED) TO KEEP HIM BECAUSE OF PERSONAL FRIENDSHIP WOULD BE IMPROPER. INCIDENTALLY, THERE ARE ALREADY ENOUGH JEWISH MEMBERS OF THE CABINET: IF YOU WERE THINKING OF MOVING GEORGE YOUNGER AND BRINGING IN MALCOLM RIFKIND, THAT IS EVEN MORE REASON FOR A DECENT RETIREMENT OF KEITH.

3. UNLIKE KEITH, PATRICK JENKIN WAS SADDLED WITH HASTILY CONCEIVED AND ILL-THOUGHT OUT MANIFESTO COMMITTMENTS. THE TROUBLES IN ENVIRONMENT WERE NOT OF HIS MAKING. BUT POLITICS IS A ROUGH GAME, AND POSSIBLY HE HAS TO CARRY THE CAN FOR THE FAILURE TO WORK OUT SATISFACTORY SOLUTIONS DURING YOUR FIRST TERM.

4. I HOPE YOU ARE NOT GOING TO MOVE PEOPLE ROUND THE CABINET LIKE MUSICAL CHAIRS! IF NORMAN TEBBITT IS PREPARED TO BECOME PARTY CHAIRMAN, AND YOU WANT HIM THERE, THE LEAST DISRUPTIVE ANSWER IS GEORGE YOUNGER TO TRADE AND INDUSTRY, RIFKIND TO SCOTLAND. AND BAKER, MOORE, CLARKLE ET AL FIGHTING FOR 2 CABINET SPOTS IF JENKIN GOES AS WELL. OR TOM KING TO TRADE AND INDUSTRY, WITH ROOM FOR BAKER, MOORE AND CLARKE (OR A.N.OTHER). I THINK IT WOULD BE A MISTAKE TO SACK PETER WALKER, OR EVEN TO MOVE HIM FROM ENERGY WHERE HE IS A PERCEIVED SUCCESS. IT WOULD SEEM ILLOGICAL TO MOVE MICHAEL HESSELTINE FROM DEFENCE, WHICH SHOULD BE A LONG-TERM JOB. BUT THERE WOULD BE ADVANTAGE IN HAVING HIM IN A MORE PUBLIC JOB , TRADE AND INDUSTRY, IN THE RUN-UP TO AN ELECTION.

5. I DO NOT THINK YOU SHOULD BRING CECIL BACK. THERE ARE MANY FOR HIM IN THE PARTY AT LARGE, AND MANY AGAINST. I FEAR THAT THOSE AGAINST WOULD BE MORE OFFENDED BY HIS RETURN THAT THOSE IN FAVOUR WOULD BE PLEASED.

6. MOREOVER,YOU NEED TWO OR THREE HIGH-PROFILE WETS TO COME IN TO THE CABINET. PEOPLE WHO ARE SEEN TO CARE ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT. POLICIES WILL HARDLY BE AFFECTED IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS, BUT PERCEPTIONS WILL BE. I THINK NICK RIDLEY HAS DONE A GOOD JOB, BUT YOU DON'T NEED TWO MORE OF HIM IN THE RUN UP TO AN ELECTION. PROSPECTIVE CABINET MEMBERS NOW SHOULD HAVE ONE PARTICULAR QUALIFICATION: THEY MUST NOT BE "ONE OF US"!