



Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster

PRIME MINISTER

You asked me to jot down some of the points we discussed on Friday.

1. My successor. The best solution would be minimum change: ie if you offered both the Civil Service job and the Arts to someone you wanted in your Cabinet, and who was also good "up front" with the public. The Arts job is high in visibility and that visibility can be used to good political effect as well. I think Lynda would be perfect and I know you yourself could rely on her. Failing this, a good Minister of State, again doing both jobs as I did in 1983-84. On reflection, I do not think George Young would be right, because I have been wooing the tobacco companies for support for the Arts and they are scared of him. David Mellor a possible. Vital to keep present structure of the Arts Ministry i.e. small and independent.

2. Arts policy. The two key issues are Abolition and Tax.

(a) Abolition. You yourself should see William Rees-Mogg privately. He is a great ally, as you know, and has stood up to the arts lobby. But in my absolute (and now disinterested) judgment he will need an additional £15-20m next year to deal with the effects of abolition i.e. an Arts Council budget around £140m in 1986-87. Our supporters are among those most worried about the effects of abolition on the South Bank etc. The figleaf for the Treasury would be to treat the British Library as a "separate" item; its presence is wholly distorting our manifesto commitment to maintain arts funding.



(b) Tax. With Adam Ridley's help, Leon and I have made a package of tax proposals designed to promote corporate and private charitable giving. These would increase our popularity over a far, far wider field than the arts at modest cost. I do urge you to help here; it would also do Nigel a lot of good. However reluctantly, the arts and heritage world is now behaving much more entrepreneurially than hitherto. The package would give a real boost to the concept of self-help and greater self-reliance.

3. Other issues

(a) GCHQ. We have won the principle; GCHQ is now un-unionised. You may not be able to fudge over the 12 eager would-be martyrs. But if you can it would be politic rather than a climb-down as it is the kind of issue Labour needs to take the minds of the millions of trade unionists who supported us at the last election off the fact that our policies are still a lot more popular than theirs. Interestingly, both the Mail and the Telegraph take this view.

(b) Education. I know little about this but had I been able to accept your generous suggestion, I think my instinct would have been that the first step towards de-radicalisation of the profession would be settling the dispute. The money gap appears to be narrow enough now to do this without PSBR shocks. I do believe that this dispute is the major trouble for us politically and hope Norman Tebbit will look at it urgently.



(c) Jeffrey Archer. Vice-Chairman of the Party and/or Sports Minister. Remit is to get us back on the playing fields of the world and even if he fails, the effort will reap just rewards. I could tell him privately how to play the Lords difficulties, as he is a friend. The same difficulties, by the way, were raised over David Young, one of your best appointments.

(d) Cecil. I believe the public would accept his return and as they did so, so would the Party. DTI would be best. Yesterday's Telegraph leader said it all. But I have to say that I believe of more significant effect on public opinion would be the return - if not now, in the New Year - of Peter Carrington. I feel from talking to him that he misses national politics and he is, as you know, a profound admirer of yours.

4. Lastly, yourself. You are the best postwar PM and the only far sighted one. Your support in policy terms is still the strongest of the party leaders. Out-and-about you are the best with the public (if security makes this too difficult, have lots of do's at No 10 for a very wide selection of people). The problem is longevity, and the difficulty your colleagues have in government of thinking tactically i.e. "these are our strategic aims (tax etc); how does this or that decision in the short term affect the long term?". Stick to the big Thatcher issues and don't show you mind conceding small ones: indeed, exploit the fact that you've given way. Show people your huge capacity for enjoyment. Please do not mind this memorandum (my wife has typed it) which is written with personal gratitude and devotion as well as a fierce admiration for all you are doing.



GOWRIE  
24 August



# THE DAILY TELEGRAPH

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 1985

135, FLEET STREET, LONDON, EC4P 4BL.

TEL: 01-353 4242. TELEX: 22874/5/6.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS: 01-583 3939.

## THE PRODIGAL SON?

IT IS REPORTED that Mrs Thatcher would like to invite Mr CECIL PARKINSON back into the Government. It is also reported that some of her colleagues, including the sagacious Tory Chief Whip Mr JOHN WAKEHAM, think that this would be a bad move. Where does the balance of advantage lie?

Some say that it is possible to exaggerate Mr PARKINSON'S political talents. But it is possible to exaggerate most things, and, bearing in mind his contribution to the winning of the last general election and the general level of talent now available to the Prime Minister, it is hard to resist the conclusion that his return would be a conspicuous benefit.

What, however, about the moral aspects of the matter? Mr PARKINSON allowed himself to be beguiled by one of the strongest of human passions. Having wriggled indecisively on the dilemma which adultery so often produces, he made the right Christian decision to go back to his wife and family and to do everything in his power to discharge his obligations to the mistress he was to desert. Human nature being what it is, this is not a uniquely bad performance, and it is one which might be expected to evoke the particular charity which the New Testament enjoins for such offences. If it were a question of punishment, it might be thought that his two-year exile from politics was enough; but the more sophisticated moral argument is that the public delinquencies of public men, and any tolerance which may be seen to be shown to them, undermine morality. Political forgiveness to a reformed adulterer, after a suitable lapse of time, does not seem to us to come into this category.

But what about the real arguments—that the electorate includes many people who feel so strongly about the sanctity of the family that they would never vote for a government containing Mr PARKINSON, and many others who suspect that his enemies, or disappointed friends, will never allow the public to forget his error? As to the first of these arguments, we do not believe it; as to the second, we believe that the embarrassment could be borne. Mrs THATCHER should stand her ground.

## MR GANDHI'S GAMBLE

MR RAJIV GANDHI'S decision to go ahead with elections in Punjab next month despite the assassination of SANT MARCHAND SINGH LONGOWAL, the moderate Sikh leader, is certainly a gamble but it is one worth taking. Predictably opposition parties in the Indian Parliament and some senior leaders of the Akali Dal, SANT LONGOWAL'S party, wanted the elections postponed because they said they would be indecent and hasty. Mr GANDHI, however, has argued that putting off the elections would mean surrendering to the terrorists and he has gone on to insist that it matters not whether his Congress or the Akali Dal win or lose so long as the "lamp of democracy is not extinguished." There is no reason not to believe him—although in fact the best outcome for India might possibly be an impressive Akali Dal victory.

When Mr GANDHI came to power last October, effectively as a direct result of the years of sectarian conflict in Northern Punjab State, he saw this would be his first and most urgent political problem. He had to solve. The July 24 agreement with the Sikhs was a fair one.



## COMMENTARY

T. E. Utley

IT SEEMS to me that one of the main recent achievements of the Left has been to capture "green politics". By this I mean that the Left has succeeded in convincing the world that it has a monopoly of virtue in the protection of the landscape, the nation's architectural heritage and all the other moral concepts associated with these ideas—such, for example, as the notion that genuine communities with a reverence for their past and a sense of commitment to their posterity should be encouraged and sustained.

In my youth these were essentially Tory ideas. They were also essentially British (or, at any rate, quite incontrovertibly English) ideas. There are still, I would have thought, thousands of votes in them, and votes drawn from a large cross-section of the community. The Left has manifestly cottoned on to this last fact. In rural south-eastern England the SDP is likely to do very well out of it.

How, then, did the Tories come to abandon "England's green and pleasant land"? I think mainly because they allowed themselves to be hustled into the view that there is a natural antithesis between prosperity and conservation. This is one aspect of a deeper error of modern Conservatism—the assumption that when people are allowed, within reasonable limits, to do what they want the results are bound to be anarchy, greed, pollution and all the other familiar evils of the divided society.

In fact, it is strongly arguable that all the most seriously devastating assaults on our environment since the war have been the result, not of unfettered private avarice but of benevolently intentioned State planning. It is more than arguable that what is called "the Thatcherite revolution," with its insistence on small businesses (sometimes veritable cottage industries) and the preference it gives to services rather than manufacturers, is friendly rather than hostile conservation.

Preserving the "national heritage" does not require some vast expansion of busybodying bureaucracy, but a few judicious tax reforms and some comparatively gentle legislation of a restrictive kind.

Well, I can now report to you that the Tories have woken up to these profound if somewhat ponderous truths. The Centre for Policy Studies (Mrs Thatcher's annexe to the Tory party) has commissioned a young genius called Andrew Sullivan to produce a pamphlet elaborating the thesis proposed above. It is to be called "Greening the Tories" and is to appear on Sept. 5 with a flourish of trumpets from William Widdowson.

## Along



Taking the urban tram

IT WAS dinosaur Blackpool. One of the last trams waited for some delegates to open many conferences with that other survivor, the coal industry, the width of the protected tram from gates covering in the to protect themselves driving autumnal rain pulled in between them tram and they piled in.

It was a good illustration of disadvantage suffered by in the traffic of the '60s.

Blackpool had been place in Britain to offer the convenience of the tramway, 100 years month. By that rainy day Blackpool was the where they could still and the tram had become attraction.

Could other towns done the same? Alas, early post-war years became apparent to the Clapham omnibus more so, to the driver acquired car, that this in his way.

There was no place tram in this brave new shopping precincts, one-way streets. The modernised their system considered they of step.

The tram got in socialism, too. It powered by locally electricity. Nationalism the replacement of by more economical. But the catch was that monopoly, tramways another customer to "full commercial" were often higher than of the so-called urban

