

Prime Minister (9)

9 May 1986

I suggest that you read it

MR POWELL

cc Professor Griffiths

Mr Sherbourne

passages which

I have underlined. It

reveals a worrying state of affairs & you will note

PUBLIC OPINION AND DEFENCE

1. The attached letter, reflecting a discussion I recently had with Lord Trenchard and Lady Olga Maitland, raises some interesting points.

No discuss with the defence secretary soon how to rally

2. First, the confused state of British opinion. There is still a healthy majority favouring retention of an effective nuclear deterrent, but that is accompanied by a disturbing indifference between the United States and the Soviet Union (America seen as as great a threat to peace as Russia), and an equally worrying ignorance of the basic facts on Soviet armaments. To that we should now add a strong strain of anti-American and anti-Reagan sentiment.

opinion in favour of defence (and fund some of

these organizations).

Chernobyl will

3. Secondly, the need, as Lord Trenchard sees it, to step up the Government campaigning effort on defence. I incline to agree. It is, I believe, received wisdom that in electoral terms defence is a Government strength. I think this is right; it reflects an underlying soundness on the part of public opinion. But this underlying soundness is at present buried under such strata of misconception and prejudice, particularly on the part of the young, that considerable excavation will be required before the seam is revealed. Not a job that can be left to the later stages of a campaign.

only make matters more difficult.

CDP 9/5

4. Third, the importance that Families for Defence and the Foundation for Defence Studies continue to receive adequate private support.

5. Mr Loades' 'Journey through Russia' illustrates point 2 above - ignorance and pro-Soviet predisposition on the part of an intelligent man, readily dispersed by contact with reality. The Prime Minister should find it worth reading.

u  
-  
PERCY CRADOCK



THE VISCOUNT TRENCHARD, M.C.

17th April 1986

Sir Percy Craddock  
Foreign Affairs Advisor to the Prime Minister  
10 Downing Street  
London S.W.1.

*Personal and Confidential*

Dear Sir Percy,

This letter is to confirm some of the things we discussed at lunch on 14th April. The letter will deal with the activities and needs of two quite separate organisations which both Olga Maitland and I fully support, and she of course is Chairman and moving spirit of the Families for Defence, whose membership is growing due to the efforts of her and her band of voluntary helpers in various parts of the country. *This letter comes from both of us.*

We both believe that public confusion on the essential elements of our defence situation has increased in the past two years. I send you a full copy of the Gallup Opinion Poll published by the Foundation for Defence Studies for its conference in December of last year. We say this not only because of the poll findings, but also because of the feel which Olga and others get at their many public meetings. It is not surprising that this should be so, bearing in mind, first that the Russians under Gorbachev are using our free society much more effectively than in the past to distribute their propoganda, and secondly that the Labour Party has more stridently than ever before departed from traditional British and NATO defence policy, and finally because anti-Americanism is doing far too well.

The worrying aspects of the Gallup Poll include the fact that only 30% are aware that the Warsaw Pact has a superiority of conventional arms over NATO; that only 29% are aware that Russia has more intermediate range missiles than the West. The figures for the under 25's are worse. The very high don't know percentage, over 40% in both cases, is thought to include a big element of people who "don't know what to believe". This reflects the contradictory statements being made by British political parties in addition to Russian propoganda.

Another aspect of the poll is the huge exaggeration of defence costs, and of the costs of nuclear defence shown in reply to questions 7 and 8. It is clear that the constant reiteration of "over £10 billion for Trident" has had an impact.

Of course one can take comfort from the relatively robust 68% who believe Britain should keep an effective nuclear deterrent (table 10), but this



would be much higher if they had the real conventional balance and the real costs of defence clear in their minds. Without giving too little credit to anti-Americanism, it is also quite easy to see that if you are a member of the public who believes NATO already has more strength than the Warsaw Pact, then it is not too difficult to wrongly believe that America is as great a threat to peace as Russia, which comes out in ~~question~~ in Table 9.

So, both Olga and I take the view that more understanding of the overall facts of the defence situation is very badly needed, and that the trends of public opinion are unhealthy. Previous nearly similar Gallup Poll questions showed less ignorance and confusion than came to light in our poll. We are trying to tackle this in two ways. The Families for Defence organisation is vigourously campaigning for British and NATO defence policy. With the current new Labour Party policy it is almost impossible to get leading Labour politicians to support this organisation. They do have grass root Labour members, but the regrettable lapse of any elements of bi-partisan defence policy has made her task harder. We were both, therefore, keen supporters for the establishment of the Foundation for Defence Studies, which has charitable status, and which came into being before the King's College conference, which conference was it's first main event. It's purpose is to provide high profile simple educational material and facts independent of Government. In this case it is hoped that we can provide a wider political balance and deeper expert credibility by forming a council for factual education. I am fairly sure now that we will be able to put together a council of defence experts of churchmen, academics and respected figures from more than one Party. The opinion poll had as one of it's objectives the making of otherwise boring factual education about what the real facts are into a more interesting subject for the media. The Foundation will probably repeat this using the same and different questions in opinion polls. It will probably also commission objective studies such as for instance the estimated costs of a non-nuclear defence policy.

We anticipate that the material produced by the Foundation will be found to be useful for campaigning organisations, including Families for Defence, who support NATO policy. The two organisations are entirely separate, but as individuals we support strongly the success of both of them. We believe that in the long term if a greater public awareness of the facts about the balance of arms is achieved, it will probably have the effect of forcing political parties to return to a greater degree of common British defence policy.

It is our view that the Government should step up it's own campaigning effort and that it was a pity that the policy unit in the M.O.D. was disbanded. Greater Government effort provides



a direct help to Families for Defence, but we think that private non-Government organisations can make that effort more effective, and on the education side we believe that the Foundation can help to underline the credibility and factual accuracy of Government and NATO policy.

Both organisations have far too little money. The Kings College conference and the Gallup Poll cost over £7000. The Foundation had a plan which would have cost up to £50,000 a year, but as a realistic target we are trying to raise £25,000 a year for the first two years. We do not want Government funding. The Foundation is independent, and must be seen to be independent, but we do need money. The Families for Defence organisation really needs £25,000 a year also, and with no charitable status on that side it is harder to find.

Finally I enclose a copy of Robert Loades' report on his journey through Russia. His simple observations will be no surprise to you, but I think they are pungently written, and one of the interests to me is that a highly intelligent 45 year old director found the conditions in Russia a real surprise to him. This reflects the fact that there is also far too little publicity about conditions in Russia, and particularly the apparent state of permanent mobilisation. I personally believe that the Prime Minister would like to glance at this short report, and I also venture to suggest that the opinion poll would be interesting to her.

It was nice to see you again.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Trenchard".

Trenchard

# GALLUP

Attitudes towards defence  
and disarmament

30 October-4 November 1985

Conducted on behalf of:

Foundation for Defence Studies

# Omnibus Report

## INTRODUCTION

These tables show the results of an enquiry undertaken by the Gallup Poll.

The sample is representative of the population of Great Britain, aged 16 and over. It was stratified by region and town size.

Interviewers were given quotas for sex by age, class and employment of their respondents. Over 100 separate sampling points were covered.

At the tabulating stage the sample has been weighted where necessary to give the correct proportion by sex by class within region. Details of the sample obtained are given in Appendix.

## Notes on the Tables

All figures are percentages calculated on the weighted sample shown.

Regional analysis: inevitably, the number of sampling points covered in any one region is small - on average, one for every ten interviews. This fact should be taken into account when interpreting regional differences.

The sign 0 = less than 0.5 per cent.

These tables have been produced by a computer. The percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number and consequently, do not always add to 100 per cent exactly. To some questions contacts gave more than one reply. In such cases, therefore, the total of the replies exceeds 100 per cent.

The questions asked are shown at the head of each table.

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 1 WHICH MILITARY ALLIANCE - NATO OR THE WARSAW PACT - HAS MORE CONVENTIONAL FORCES (TANKS, AIRCRAFT, ARTILLERY, INFANTRY) DEPLOYED IN EUROPE?

	VOTING INTENTION					SEX			AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
NATO	23	19	29	22	20	15	21	26	20	26	25	21	25	18
WARSAW PACT	30	37	22	23	39	45	18	43	18	27	34	33	32	24
BOTH EQUAL	4	6	5	5	1	7	5	6	3	4	3	5	5	5
DON'T KNOW	43	38	44	49	40	34	57	25	58	43	37	42	38	53

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 1 WHICH MILITARY ALLIANCE - NATO OR THE WARSAW PACT - HAS MORE CONVENTIONAL FORCES (TANKS, AIRCRAFT, ARTILLERY, INFANTRY) DEPLOYED IN EUROPE?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
NATO	23	16	24	25	24
WARSAW PACT	30	45	32	27	23
BOTH EQUAL	4	4	6	5	3
DON'T KNOW	43	35	37	43	50



CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 2 IS THAT A LOT MORE OR A LITTLE MORE?

	VOTING INTENTION						SEX			AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
ALL SAYING NATO	23	19	29	22	20	15	21	26	20	26	25	21	25	18
LOT MORE	9	6	14	6	6	0	11	10	8	15	5	8	9	6
LITTLE MORE	10	10	11	14	10	11	5	12	8	8	15	9	11	6
DON'T KNOW	4	4	5	2	4	3	5	3	5	3	4	3	4	6
ALL SAYING WARSAW PACT	30	37	22	23	39	45	18	43	18	27	34	33	32	24
LOT MORE	22	31	15	18	27	22	13	34	11	19	27	22	24	17
LITTLE MORE	7	4	7	5	10	23	4	8	5	6	7	9	7	5
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 2 IS THAT A LOT MORE OR A LITTLE MORE?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
ALL SAYING NATO	23	16	24	25	24
LOT MORE	9	7	8	11	9
LITTLE MORE	10	5	11	11	11
DON'T KNOW	4	5	5	3	4
ALL SAYING WARSAW PACT	30	45	32	27	23
LOT MORE	22	36	23	21	15
LITTLE MORE	7	7	8	6	6
DON'T KNOW	1	2	1	1	2

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 3 AND WHICH MILITARY ALLIANCE - NATO OR THE WARSAW PACT - HAS DEPLOYED AND STILL HAS MOST MEDIUM-RANGE NUCLEAR MISSILES IN EUROPE OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS?

	VOTING INTENTION					SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB					MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200	
NATO	21	19	25	17	16	26	23	25	17	23	25	24	20	13	
WARSAW PACT	29	37	22	25	36	26	12	40	19	26	28	25	33	29	
BOTH EQUAL	4	3	5	3	2	6	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	4	
DON'T KNOW	47	41	48	55	46	42	60	30	62	48	42	48	43	54	

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 3 AND WHICH MILITARY ALLIANCE - NATO OR THE WARSAW PACT - HAS DEPLOYED AND STILL HAS MOST MEDIUM-RANGE NUCLEAR MISSILES IN EUROPE OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
NATO	21	23	20	21	20
WARSAW PACT	29	36	33	25	25
BOTH EQUAL	4	3	3	4	5
DON'T KNOW	47	38	44	50	50

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 4 IS THAT A LOT MORE OR A LITTLE MORE?

	VOTING INTENTION						SEX			AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
ALL SAYING NATO	21	19	25	17	16	26	23	25	17	23	25	24	20	13
LOT MORE	8	7	9	4	5	19	9	7	8	12	9	10	7	2
LITTLE MORE	11	10	13	12	9	7	11	16	6	9	15	9	12	9
DON'T KNOW	2	2	3	2	2	0	3	2	2	2	2	5	2	2
ALL SAYING WARSAW PACT	29	37	22	25	36	26	12	40	19	26	28	25	33	29
LOT MORE	18	24	14	16	20	22	4	26	11	11	18	15	25	18
LITTLE MORE	8	8	8	6	12	4	8	12	5	14	9	7	5	9
DON'T KNOW	2	4	0	4	4	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	3	2

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 4 IS THAT A LOT MORE OR A LITTLE MORE?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
ALL SAYING NATO	21	23	20	21	20
LOT MORE	8	7	6	8	9
LITTLE MORE	11	10	12	12	9
DON'T KNOW	2	5	2	1	2
ALL SAYING WARSAW PACT	29	36	33	25	25
LOT MORE	18	25	19	15	17
LITTLE MORE	8	7	12	9	7
DON'T KNOW	2	4	3	2	2

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 5 DO YOU THINK THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IS TRUE OR FALSE?  
BEFORE THE ARRIVAL OF US CRUISE MISSILES IN BRITAIN IN 1983,  
THERE WERE NO SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF AMERICAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
IN BRITAIN .

	VOTING INTENTION						SEX		AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
TRUE	31	28	37	30	24	27	29	37	26	39	30	27	29	29
FALSE	42	47	36	43	46	44	37	47	37	36	45	47	46	34
DON'T KNOW	27	25	27	28	30	29	34	17	37	24	25	26	25	37

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 5 DO YOU THINK THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IS TRUE OR FALSE?  
BEFORE THE ARRIVAL OF US CRUISE MISSILES IN BRITAIN IN 1983,  
THERE WERE NO SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF AMERICAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
IN BRITAIN .

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
TRUE	31	29	26	36	30
FALSE	42	51	51	39	32
DON'T KNOW	27	21	23	25	37

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 6 WHAT PROPORTION DO BRITISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS REPRESENT OF SOVIET NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

	VOTING INTENTION						SEX		AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	21	18	20	18	26	39	22	30	13	19	26	18	26	13
5-9 PER CENT	12	14	9	18	14	7	11	15	10	14	14	16	11	8
10-19 PER CENT	11	13	11	9	10	26	4	13	9	11	14	10	11	9
20-29 PER CENT	6	7	6	10	5	3	3	8	5	8	5	8	6	6
30 PER CENT	6	6	6	3	6	2	6	6	6	8	6	6	5	5
DON'T KNOW	44	42	47	42	39	24	54	28	58	40	36	42	41	59

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 6 WHAT PROPORTION DO BRITISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS REPRESENT OF SOVIET NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	21	28	24	19	16
5-9 PER CENT	12	17	14	12	9
10-19 PER CENT	11	10	10	14	10
20-29 PER CENT	6	8	7	6	5
30 PER CENT	6	4	5	7	6
DON'T KNOW	44	33	40	42	54

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 7 WHAT PERCENTAGE OF OUR ANNUAL DEFENCE BUDGET DO YOU THINK IS SPENT ON BRITAIN'S NUCLEAR FORCES?

	VOTING INTENTION					SEX			AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	4	5	4	3	2	0	6	5	3	1	9	3	3	3
5-9 PER CENT	6	8	3	10	7	0	1	9	3	7	5	5	6	6
10-14 PER CENT	11	13	8	15	10	24	6	13	8	11	14	11	10	8
15-24 PER CENT	15	14	14	14	19	24	7	19	11	10	21	16	16	10
25-49 PER CENT	17	18	17	15	16	17	16	17	17	24	15	22	15	9
50 PER CENT OR MORE	11	6	16	5	10	16	8	12	10	18	9	9	9	8
DON'T KNOW	38	35	38	38	36	20	56	26	49	29	26	33	42	56

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 7 WHAT PERCENTAGE OF OUR ANNUAL DEFENCE BUDGET DO YOU THINK IS SPENT ON BRITAIN'S NUCLEAR FORCES?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	A8	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	4	5	4	5	1
5-9 PER CENT	6	9	6	6	3
10-14 PER CENT	11	10	13	12	7
15-24 PER CENT	15	13	14	13	18
25-49 PER CENT	17	24	17	18	11
50 PER CENT OR MORE	11	9	14	10	9
DON'T KNOW	38	30	32	35	50

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 8 WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT IS TAKEN UP BY BRITISH DEFENCE SPENDING?

	VOTING INTENTION					SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	DONT KNOW			MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	3	3	2	1	3	0	3	4	1	2	5	1	4	2
5-10 PER CENT	10	12	7	12	11	14	7	14	6	11	13	7	11	8
11-15 PER CENT	9	11	6	9	8	17	9	12	6	7	10	13	7	8
16-20 PER CENT	12	11	13	18	12	21	5	16	9	13	18	14	11	6
21-30 PER CENT	13	12	15	6	16	8	9	14	12	16	13	14	12	10
OVER 30 PER CENT	10	7	11	11	11	23	5	10	10	13	10	8	11	6
DON'T KNOW	43	43	45	41	39	16	61	29	56	37	32	42	44	60

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 8 WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT IS TAKEN UP BY BRITISH DEFENCE SPENDING?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
LESS THAN 5 PER CENT	3	4	2	3	2
5-10 PER CENT	10	18	14	8	5
11-15 PER CENT	9	12	10	10	5
16-20 PER CENT	12	14	13	13	10
21-30 PER CENT	13	10	13	14	13
OVER 30 PER CENT	10	11	12	9	8
DON'T KNOW	43	32	36	43	56

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 9 WHICH SUPERPOWER DO YOU BELIEVE POSES THE GREATER THREAT TO PEACE IN EUROPE - THE UNITED STATES OR THE SOVIET UNION?

	VOTING INTENTION					SDP/ ALLI- ANCE OTHER	DONT KNOW	SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	LIB			MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
UNITED STATES	32	22	40	35	31	32	34	35	29	39	35	29	27	30
SOVIET UNION	33	41	26	36	32	32	32	31	35	33	31	33	33	34
BOTH EQUALLY	28	30	25	24	30	28	25	28	27	19	30	33	29	26
DON'T KNOW	7	7	8	4	6	8	9	6	9	8	3	5	11	9

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 9 WHICH SUPERPOWER DO YOU BELIEVE POSES THE GREATER THREAT TO PEACE IN EUROPE - THE UNITED STATES OR THE SOVIET UNION?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
UNITED STATES	32	21	33	32	36
SOVIET UNION	33	37	31	34	32
BOTH EQUALLY	28	35	30	27	22
DON'T KNOW	7	7	7	7	9



CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 10 DO YOU THINK THAT BRITAIN SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT KEEP AN UP-TO-DATE NUCLEAR DETERRENT AS LONG AS THE SOVIET UNION CONTINUES TO POSSESS NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

	VOTING INTENTION					SEX			AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
SHOULD	68	88	52	70	68	64	61	69	68	65	65	63	72	74
SHOULD NOT	23	6	38	22	22	28	25	28	19	25	27	31	19	17
DON'T KNOW	9	6	9	9	10	8	14	4	13	10	8	6	9	9

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 10 DO YOU THINK THAT BRITAIN SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT KEEP AN UP-TO-DATE NUCLEAR DETERRENT AS LONG AS THE SOVIET UNION CONTINUES TO POSSESS NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
SHOULD	68	70	68	70	65
SHOULD NOT	23	22	25	22	23
DON'T KNOW	9	7	7	7	12

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 11 BEFORE WE ENTER INTO ANY ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT ALWAYS BE A RELIABLE METHOD OF CHECKING THAT BOTH SIDES ARE NOT CHEATING ON THE CONDITIONS OF SUCH AGREEMENTS?

	VOTING INTENTION					SEX		AGE						
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	155	179	265	200
SHOULD	88	93	85	88	90	94	77	90	87	90	87	81	92	90
SHOULD NOT	3	1	5	1	3	0	12	4	3	3	4	8	2	2
DON'T KNOW	8	6	10	10	7	6	11	6	10	8	8	12	6	9

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 11 BEFORE WE ENTER INTO ANY ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, DO YOU THINK THAT THERE SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT ALWAYS BE A RELIABLE METHOD OF CHECKING THAT BOTH SIDES ARE NOT CHEATING ON THE CONDITIONS OF SUCH AGREEMENTS?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
SHOULD	88	87	89	92	84
SHOULD NOT	3	4	4	2	4
DON'T KNOW	8	8	6	6	12

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 12 DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A COUNTRY WHICH REDUCES ITS DEFENCES:

	VOTING INTENTION					SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	LIB				MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200	
IS LESS LIKELY TO BE ATTACKED BECAUSE IT POSES NO MILITARY THREAT TO OTHERS	27	14	38	29	26	29	29	28	26	31	30	28	23	26	
IS MORE LIKELY TO BE ATTACKED BECAUSE IT IS LESS ABLE TO DEFEND ITSELF	52	71	37	49	53	47	47	52	52	43	49	53	57	56	
DON'T KNOW	21	15	25	23	21	24	24	20	22	26	21	19	20	18	

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 12 DO YOU BELIEVE THAT A COUNTRY WHICH REDUCES ITS DEFENCES:

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
IS LESS LIKELY TO BE ATTACKED BECAUSE IT POSES NO MILITARY THREAT TO OTHERS	27	16	29	33	25
IS MORE LIKELY TO BE ATTACKED BECAUSE IT IS LESS ABLE TO DEFEND ITSELF	52	61	50	48	52
DON'T KNOW	21	23	20	19	22

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 13 A LARGE NUMBER OF LOCAL COUNCILS HAVE DECLARED THEIR AREAS TO BE 'NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES'. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT LIVING IN A 'NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE' MAKES BEING ATTACKED MORE LIKELY, LESS LIKELY, OR HAS NO EFFECT ON THE LIKELIHOOD OF BEING ATTACKED?

	VOTING INTENTION							SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
MORE LIKELY	8	5	11	3	6	9	13	8	7	8	6	5	7	11
LESS LIKELY	8	3	10	9	10	17	4	10	6	13	8	11	3	5
NO EFFECT	76	84	70	79	76	64	65	78	73	70	79	77	79	73
DON'T KNOW	9	8	9	9	7	10	17	4	14	8	7	7	11	11

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 13 A LARGE NUMBER OF LOCAL COUNCILS HAVE DECLARED THEIR AREAS TO BE 'NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES'. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT LIVING IN A 'NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE' MAKES BEING ATTACKED MORE LIKELY, LESS LIKELY, OR HAS NO EFFECT ON THE LIKELIHOOD OF BEING ATTACKED?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
MORE LIKELY	8	7	3	8	11
LESS LIKELY	8	2	6	8	12
NO EFFECT	76	84	86	77	62
DON'T KNOW	9	7	5	7	16

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 14 HOW MANY ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGREEMENTS DO YOU THINK HAVE BEEN SIGNED BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST IN THE LAST 25 YEARS?

	VOTING INTENTION					SEX			AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65+
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
LESS THAN 5	14	13	14	15	15	10	12	19	9	13	18	9	15	13
5 - 10	19	20	17	23	20	24	13	21	16	21	23	21	17	12
11 - 15	11	12	10	9	12	16	8	12	10	16	10	10	11	8
16 OR MORE	10	11	11	2	10	14	5	13	7	6	10	14	10	9
DON'T KNOW	47	44	49	51	43	35	63	35	58	43	39	45	48	59

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 14 HOW MANY ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGREEMENTS DO YOU THINK HAVE BEEN SIGNED BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST IN THE LAST 25 YEARS?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
LESS THAN 5	14	17	17	13	9
5 - 10	19	21	23	18	14
11 - 15	11	12	12	11	10
16 OR MORE	10	9	9	11	8
DON'T KNOW	47	40	38	47	59

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 15 WHICH SIDE DO YOU THINK HAS BEEN THE MORE CONSTRUCTIVE  
IN ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS OVER THE LAST 25 YEARS - THE  
EAST OR THE WEST?

	VOTING INTENTION					SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	SEX		AGE				
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	LIB			DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-64
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
EAST	14	10	21	8	11	14	12	17	11	19	13	10	13	14
WEST	36	43	31	37	34	32	29	37	34	31	36	34	41	34
NEITHER	25	25	21	27	28	44	24	30	20	23	30	31	22	21
DON'T KNOW	26	21	27	28	27	10	36	16	35	27	21	25	25	31

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

TABLE 15 WHICH SIDE DO YOU THINK HAS BEEN THE MORE CONSTRUCTIVE  
IN ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS OVER THE LAST 25 YEARS - THE  
EAST OR THE WEST?

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
EAST	14	10	11	15	16
WEST	36	36	38	39	30
NEITHER	25	37	34	22	14
DON'T KNOW	26	16	17	24	39

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

SAMPLE DETAILS

	VOTING INTENTION						SEX		AGE					
	TOTAL	CONS	LAB	LIB	SDP/ ALLI- ANCE	OTHER	DONT KNOW	MEN	WOMEN	15-24	25-34	35-44	45-64	65-
BASE	1021	311	347	90	177	25	72	490	531	193	185	179	265	200
UNWEIGHTED	1021	306	345	87	183	26	75	480	541	192	186	177	276	190

CQ990A - 30TH OCTOBER - 4TH NOVEMBER 1985

PERCENTAGES DOWN

SAMPLE DETAILS

	CLASS				
	TOTAL	AB	C1	C2	DE
BASE	1021	169	230	321	301
UNWEIGHTED	1021	172	253	292	304

25th June 1985.

A TWELVE DAY VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION

6TH - 17TH APRIL 1985

A PERSONAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

THE PURPOSE OF THE VISIT

My brother (A.E. Loades) and I decided that although we had been to Japan before, on industrial visits, we wanted to update ourselves on the latest machine tool technology. Particularly the flexible manufacturing systems for application to our aerospace and defence work. There was a secondary reason for the visit to Japan. A part of our business is prototype motor car body build. We trade internationally in this type of work and we wanted to visit Honda and Nissan, (who are setting up in England to manufacture), with a view to offering them our services. We had a week in Japan and every day was occupied visiting machine tool companies and at the end of it we had potentially fruitful discussions with both Nissan and Honda.

We are awaiting certain aircraft component and defence orders which would suit manufacture with F.M.S. systems. We learnt a very great deal. It does not necessarily mean we shall buy Japanese machine tools but certainly we saw the latest systems available.

Because we were visiting Japan for a week it had always been an ambition of both my brother and myself to travel on the Transiberian Express and we discovered that we could actually travel back from Japan on the Transiberian Express for 10 days for less than the cost of a first class return ticket by aeroplane from Japan. We therefore decided to make the best of the opportunity and visit Russia.

OUR ROUTE IN RUSSIA AND THE PLACES WE VISITED

After the week in Japan we flew from Niigata to Khabarovsk which is about 150 miles inland from the coast line of Eastern Russia. The journey was originally from Vladivostock by train which is on the coast but this was stopped because of the fact that Vladivostock is an important Naval base and for security reasons you fly into Khabarovsk and board the train there.



The basic plan was, of course, that we travel approximately 4,000 miles to Moscow from the area that the Russians call the Far East region, not Eastern Siberia, and then right across Siberia, then through and over the Urals and then finally across to Moscow. During that trip we had a full day in Khabarovsk; two days at Irkutsk which is on the huge 'Lake Baikal'. Then we had one day at the city of Novosibersk, which used to be called Novonicholi before the revolution. In the evening of our visit there we attended the Ballet at the famous Opera Building there. Finally we spent two days in Moscow.

The train journey without stops is a continuous six days and nights. We took twelve days including our stay-overs as previously described. Therefore in addition from the visits to the cities we had the opportunity of meeting and observing the Russian people. Also, we saw many interesting facets of the country both from the windows of the train and in the environs of the 90 plus stops at villages and towns.

To what extent was our visit representative of the Soviet Union? We were not seeing the south of the country, the whole mass of Georgia and the Southern Steppes. We travelled mainly through the Taiga and some Steppes and we were not seeing the areas West of Moscow which is more prosperous than parts of the East. We did not see the cities to the South of Moscow, Rostof, etc., and indeed we were not seeing Leningrad to the North of Moscow. Nevertheless we were seeing quite a lot of the country.

#### POLITICS AND ECONOMICS

I think it ought to be said (before I state some fairly strong opinions), what my feelings were prior to the visit of what I was likely to see in Russia. My views and outlook were and are as follows: I am a democrat and therefore I have anti-Communistic views. However, I always wanted to try and understand why the Soviet system existed and what were the causes of it's creation. I wanted to be sympathetic towards certain aspects of Russian life. I must say from reading articles in the West and seeing television programmes here about Russia I had a general feeling that the people were fairly well off and possibly reasonably content with their lot in life. Also I always felt that Russia would perhaps move slowly over the years into a more liberal state.

With regard to the standard of living for the people I imagined that perhaps it might be as ours was say in the early 60's in the U.K. or in Europe. As it turned out this was not the case in quite a startling way.

With regard to my feelings on our defence position in the West, in the United Kingdom, Eastern Europe and Nato Alliance,

my view has always been that we should have very strong defence forces and the nuclear deterrent. Although agreeing with the production of the new Trident missile, however, it's destructive power was so great that I had certain doubts as to whether we weren't overdoing it in the U.K. and the U.S. Certainly after what I had seen I have no doubts at all that we must have the strongest possible defence and Trident. I will now try and explain the experiences which we had and the ways in which they surprised me and changed my views.

First of all, however, a comment on the beauty and vastness of Siberia and the Soviet Union as a whole. Having read Tolstoy and Pasternak I always had a great feeling about the country in terms of it's people and geography. I always wanted to see it and I must admit I was certainly not disappointed in this respect. It is very difficult to describe it but the vastness of the country and it's lack of population in the East is amazing to experience and fascinating to actually witness it rather than read about it. Through such a vast country I suppose you cannot talk about the normal Russians or what an ordinary Russian is like, there are so many nationalities of course. There are a hundred plus nationalities in the Soviet Union. It is difficult to say what a Russian is, certainly we met some very kind Russian women and men on our trip. Mostly they were not anxious to enter into conversation, of course the vast majority did not speak any English anyway. They are probably discouraged from speaking to foreigners and sometimes we had trouble getting a 'good morning' or 'hello' out of people. Occasionally though, conversation does occur and friendships develop. For instance while we were on the train it was my 36th birthday and there was a lady Gynaecologist with her young daughter of 5 or 6 years of age in the same carriage. They got to hear about the celebration and the Gynaecologist persuaded her daughter to bring me a card and a small chocolate as a present.

What undoubtedly is evident is what appears to be a lack of fulfilment in people's lives. Very often they seem to be miserable not looking after themselves and their dress. The train stopped at the city of Omsk, for instance, which is a massive industrial city, many workers got on to the train and almost all seemed very miserable.

With regard to the standard of living of people I was shocked as to how extremely low it was. When I say this it must be said that everyone seemed to have sufficient money to clothe themselves quite well. They had leather boots, leather coats and of course the normal fur hat in the East. The temperature drops to minus 50 or 60 even, so a labourer would have a genuine fur hat to keep him warm and leather coat and leather boots. Also everybody looked well fed, very often apparently overfed but apart from that there is no sign of any luxury at all really outside of central Moscow. For instance, there are no

cameras; people look at you with astonishment if you have a camera.

For the vast majority of the trip between Khabarovsk and Moscow the typical village is described this way. It would be log cabins in a group or timber cabins, very small, sometimes attractive; but particularly in the extreme East, no evidence at all of what we would call normal civilized living, i.e. no made-up roads. Where it is frozen, the roads are hard, where it was not frozen (in low lands), the roads were deep mud. The scenes looked very like film sets for 'Fidler on the Roof'. No mains water to the houses; this was evident from seeing people going to wells. This rudimentary life was normal right the way through Russia.

In the extreme East there was no television and also for most of the Eastern parts no electricity either. This was evident because in the evening there were no bright lights in the villages that could be seen. Really the conditions were Dickensian without starvation.

With regard to the towns particularly in the East, Khabarovsk, Novosibirsk, Irkutsk. The accommodation is mainly apartments. High, concrete, ugly flats normally; they were very, very untidy and ill-kept. I acknowledge the fact that the roads and buildings are difficult to keep up because of the massive change in temperatures from Summer to Winter. The roads are in shocking condition even in the towns and cities.

We did not enter any of the personal dwellings but all the evidence outside generally was of grim, intensely inadequate housing for just about everybody. It really did seem very grim indeed and this was quite a shock to us.

There are almost no private vehicles at all, even in Moscow, but certainly outside of Moscow no private cars at all that I could see.

In each of the villages there are these little log huts but almost all with asbestos roofing. They perhaps have a small plot around the cabin but because of the length of the Winter and the severity of it they do not have any garden. What is often seen is perhaps one cow and a mound of hay around the cabin.

For the first thousand miles from East to West there is no agriculture at all mainly due to the severity of the Winter. It is certainly clear why they have to import a lot of their grain. Of course the first thousand miles is Taiga which is wooded marshlands, but there are some plains which look as if they could be developed for agriculture at least for one crop in the Summer, certainly they would not get more than one crop off the land.

Even in these areas the effort to develop agriculture appears inadequate.

After the Taiga you come to the Steppes and then Plains. There is then an opportunity of agriculture, there again only one crop a year. Where you come across this second stretch of country where agriculture can take place it is in evidence but it is unfenced. Probably largely the cutting of wild grasses for hay and for feeding of the cattle and beef herds. As you move further West (and Winter was just giving way to Spring) you start to see Hay Stocks certainly and as you get towards Moscow you then do start to see evidence of agriculture. Although in general there are very few mechanical implements in evidence. From West of the Urals onwards you then see much better organised agricultural land. However in general there is an apparent inefficient use of the land and very little mechanisation.

We visited quite a few shops in the towns and cities and apart from central Moscow the shops are very grim indeed. I would imagine that they are like those of the middle of last century in England. There was no imagination in the display and there were many queues for special items. What we would consider normal goods sometimes are very expensive, for instance televisions are very expensive and I particularly noticed a wafer thin electronic calculator which would probably cost at the most £3 - £4 here, as priced at £60 in one of the shops.

The next surprise was the impression of a war time economy (no doubt it has been this way since the Second World War). There was a terrific amount of military about and a lot of the labourers in the cities clearing the streets were in Army uniform who are called in to do menial tasks in the cities. An ordinary soldier is not smartly dressed; I noticed for instance their Great Coats which came right down to their ankles; the hem was just sheared off - it was not turned up to make a hem. I presume for economic reasons, they were just simply cut off to length. There was just the feeling of scruffiness about it and when one saw groups of soldiers they did not look smart, they did not look particularly disciplined either. (Senior Officers on the other hand very often did look well turned out).

As the world's second superpower the lasting impression was that it is fairly obvious the country's resources are going to a massive degree into weaponry and the military with very little resources going to the people of the country, conventional industry or agriculture.

There were servicemen in uniform everywhere; for instance when we went to the Ballet at Novosibersk there were very few foreigners there, it was almost all Russians, the place

took about 700/800 people, and I would think of the male section of the audience perhaps 40%/50% were in uniform. I was told later that they have to wear their uniforms anyway except during leave, so that would account for some of it but it was quite surprising to see officers everywhere.

Because of what we saw in terms of the low standard of living and the high militaristic evidence, it has completely reversed my view on one subject. I always considered it was wrong that the U.S. should supply grain to the Soviet Union. I now think it would be a drastic mistake not to do so. If the Russian system could not feed the people they would undoubtedly want to move West.

Regarding my own views as to our defence position in the West, having seen the very low standard of living, having had an impression about what would happen if they ceased to be able to feed their people, I am in no doubt that we must have very strong conventional and nuclear defences in place in the West. I am quite certain if we had not had the nuclear deterrent the Russians would have already moved West to gain agricultural land and additional resources. The Russian Government must be very aware of the fact that if they did reach the stage of not being able to feed their people and keep them at least at the level they are at now then there would be, without doubt, a second revolution.

Having said all that which sounds a bit grim I would make another point with regard to the current Geneva talks about limiting nuclear weapons between the two super powers. I now feel the Russians must be genuine in wanting to cut back on nuclear weapons. It is very, very clear that they simply cannot afford it or at least if they do afford it then they deprive the people of more and more resources. I would say that this is an optimistic note for the future in that sense. Especially they must be thinking that if the 'Star Wars' system goes ahead in America for them to compete in that; the effect on their available resources would be disastrous.

Then there is the propoganda which we expected, but which is frightening to experience. The time that we were out there was the 40 year celebration for them of the defeat of the Nazis. The Russians did suffer substantially more than anybody else in World War II. They talk about the Great Patriotic War not the Second World War. The essence of that being that in their view Russia was the principal agent of the destruction of the Nazis. (There was much literature on the train translated into English).

First of all the war started in 1941 it did not start in 1939 at all, and it was the fault of the Western Allies that the war took place i.e. that we did not resist Hitler sufficiently. There is no explanation incidently of why Russia did not resist Hitler's expansion themselves! And

they also do not happen to mention anything at all in their official history about the German/Soviet non-aggression pact. The war for them started in 1941 as a result of the French, English and American appeasement policy towards Hitler. And then of course there was very little military resistance (according to Russian history) in the West at all. They do not talk about the North African Campaign for instance. They actually say that the Normandy landings were almost unopposed and that the American and British advance through Western Europe was almost without resistance. Of course they talk a great deal about the 20 million Russians dead, the sacrifice we all know about.

Having seen all of this I understand much better the Russians attitude to the West if this is what they genuinely believe happened. In many ways I know it is an incorrect version of history but they seem to be certain that they were the ones that conquered the Germans and there was very little help from anyone else.

Of course there is no doubt that massive suffering did occur in Russia. The enormous destruction the Germans carried out on Russian soil in terms of people and property has left an indelible mark on the Russian people. Their whole policy really surrounds the events or emanates from the events, it seems to me, of World War II.

There were other examples of propoganda including their portrayal of President Reagan's refusal of Mr. Gorbachev's offer of a six month freeze on the production of nuclear weapons etc.

R.W. Loades  
Abbey Panels Investments P.L.C.  
Bodmin Road  
Wyken  
Coventry  
England.



10 DOWNING STREET

The King forward the  
for next birthday etc

Defense Security.

CDP  
12/5

~~CDP~~

- ① PC to CDP 9/5
- ② Viscount Trenchard to  
Sir PC + a.H.S. 17.4.86.