

Mr Ingham

PRIME MINISTER

INTERVIEW WITH L'EXPRESS

You have an interview with L'Express on Friday afternoon. It is intended as a curtain raiser for the Anglo/French Summit a week later, and also for the European Council.

The two interviewers - both of whom speak fluent English - want to concentrate on European defence matters, the European Community, arms control and East/West relations and terrorism. You will want to use the opportunity to get over some points about Britain's excellent economic performance and its consequences for our role in the world. This is still not widely enough appreciated in France.

You might draw on the following points (your message to President Mitterrand is attached).

European defence

- the single most important task is to maintain the United States' commitment to the defence of Europe. This must be a particular concern in a US Presidential election year;
- this means that efforts to strengthen Europe's contribution to our common defence must centre on NATO, so that the emphasis is on the co-operation between Europe and the US. That is one reason why you have encouraged the holding of a NATO Summit;
- it is for France to determine its role in relation to NATO. We do not want to re-open the theological disputes of the 1960s;
- but we would like to see much closer practical military co-operation between France and NATO. You have put a number of ideas to President Mitterrand and M. Chirac and look forward to discussing them at the Summit. They include possible involvement of French forces in the forward defence of Germany in the NORTHAG area, exercising reinforcement of British

- forces through the Channel ports and naval exercises;
- it is extending practical military co-operation of this sort rather than creating bilateral defence institutions which will do most to strengthen European defence;
- no one should question Britain's commitment to European defence. Our forces in Germany are the most striking evidence of this. We keep them there despite the heavy foreign exchange costs. Our defence spending has increased substantially over the past years. We have participated fully in efforts to make something of WEU. But resistance to developing it in practical ways comes from others rather than us. For instance we would like to see it located in Brussels beside NATO where it can make the most effective contribution to strengthening the European pillar of the Alliance;
- there is a need for bilateral defence co-operation alongside the multilateral approach. The United Kingdom has very substantial co-operation within NATO with Germany through the presence of 66,000 British forces stationed forward to defend German territory. We are also developing defence co-operation with France in a number of important areas, including nuclear defence and conventional weapons procurement;
- but what worries us are attempts to develop exclusive bilateral relationships outside NATO. They carry the risk of undermining NATO in the longer term. It does not make much sense to set up institutions to discuss European defence and strategy which do not include some of the main participants;
- so far as we are concerned therefore the focus must be on NATO and on developing practical military co-operation between those who are fully-fledged members of its integrated military structure and those who have chosen to remain outside;

European Community

- useful progress was made at Copenhagen towards bringing agricultural spending under control and putting the Community's finances in order;
- even so it was more a question of moderating future increases rather than of fundamentally reforming the CAP;
- the fact that the Community is up against the 1.4 per cent ceiling is a unique opportunity to bring spending under control. It is much more important to get the right agreement than a quick agreement. You are prepared to go on as long as necessary;
- it would be most unfortunate if Member States now tried to back away from the progress made at Copenhagen. If that happens, there is no way we shall reach solutions at the European Council in Brussels;
- it is absolutely essential that there should be effective agricultural stabilisers and binding financial discipline. Only then are you prepared even to consider an increase in the Community's own resources;
- there is a role for set-aside but only as a complement to price cuts and stabilisers;
- there has been quite good practical co-operation between Britain and France on EC issues. The real difference lies with Germany, with its structure of small, part-time farmers and its determination to drag prices up to German levels;
- there can be no tampering with the United Kingdom's abatement. Our net contribution to the Community has actually grown since Fontainebleau. Even so, we are not seeking to improve our position: but we shall not accept any further deterioration;
- only when these problems are sorted out will the Community be able to devote its full attention to the important issues such as completing the internal market and strengthening Europe's performance in research and development;

Arms Control and East/West Relations

- there is a very close identity of views between Britain and France on all the main issues of arms control and East/West relations;
- you very much value co-operation in this field and are confident it will continue;
- in particular, Britain and France are both determined to maintain their independent nuclear deterrents. Both believe that nuclear deterrence will remain vital to the West's defence;
- we both oppose any further reductions in nuclear weapons in Europe, at least until there is parity in conventional forces and their armaments, and chemical weapons have been eliminated;
- despite some German statements, you believe that Germany agrees that the priority must be the effective defence of Europe and that will require us to maintain and modernise NATO's nuclear weapons;
- your admiration for Mr. Gorbachev's efforts to achieve reform in the Soviet Union but continuing suspicion of the Soviet Union's policies towards the outside world;

Terrorism

- we have an absolutely firm policy of not making deals with terrorists. That has been espoused by the European Community and the Economic Summit countries too;
- it is vital that all of us continue to abide by our commitments. Anything else is an invitation to terrorists to take more hostages;
- M. Chirac has assured you that France did not make any promises or arms sales to secure release of French hostages;
- there is good co-operation between Britain and France on anti-terrorist matters. We particularly appreciated the action taken to intercept arms shipments to the IRA (the Eksund).

CHARLES POWELL

21 January 1988

Jan 215
Royal Household
M.E. Marcuse

825 3400

1. Mr Ingham.

2. PRIME MINISTER.

YOUR INTERVIEW WITH L'EXPRESS

You are to be interviewed by the French weekly L'Express at 2.30 tomorrow.

The interviewers will be Jerome Dumoulin, Foreign Editor, and Elie Marcuse, the paper's specialist on both Britain and Defence matters. Both have visited Britain frequently and speak fluent English. There will also be one photographer. I shall accompany them, because Bernard Ingham is engaged with the Sunday Lobby, and the COI will record.

Charles Powell has done a separate briefing (attached) on the substance of their main interest.

In addition to the political questions, the interviewers hope at the end of the interview to put a few questions about design. They are preparing a cover-story on European design and, knowing your interest in the subject, would like to ask about your commitment to improving industrial aesthetics and its contribution to British industrial revival.

Content to use the study?



MICHAEL BATES
Press Office
21 January 1988

RESTRICTED

100101
MDLIAN 8376

RESTRICTED
FM PARIS
TO PRIORITY FCO
TELNO 1308
OF 181705Z DECEMBER 87

Prime Minister
Mr. Ingham (deputy PM!)
What do you think?
CAD

ANGLO/FRENCH SUMMIT : POSSIBLE PRIME MINISTERIAL PRESS INTERVIEW

1. WHEN THE DATE OF THE ANGLO-FRENCH SUMMIT IS FORMALLY ANNOUNCED, WE ARE LIKELY TO GET REQUESTS FROM THE FRENCH MEDIA FOR INTERVIEWS WITH THE PRIME MINISTER.
2. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE PRIME MINISTER SHOULD GIVE AN INTERVIEW. THE BEST CANDIDATE WOULD BE 'L'EXPRESS', ON WHICH WESTON'S LETTER OF 16 APRIL TO RATFORD, MOST OF WHICH (MUTATIS MUTANDIS) REMAINS VALID. TIMED TO APPEAR AT THE END OF JANUARY, SUCH AN INTERVIEW WOULD BE A FIRST-CLASS OPPORTUNITY TO PROJECT HMG'S POSITION ON (1) INTERNATIONAL DISARMAMENT ISSUES, (2) COMMUNITY ISSUES, (3) BRITISH ECONOMY AND BRITISH SOCIETY, (4) RELATIONS BETWEEN FRANCE AND BRITAIN, INCLUDING COLLABORATION IN MILITARY MATTERS.
3. THE PRIME MINISTER GAVE NO INTERVIEW TO FRENCH MEDIA IN 1987.

FERGUSSON

(COPY PASSED AT REQUEST OF WED)
YYYY

DISTRIBUTION

ADDITIONAL 1

PS/NO 10 DOWNING ST

NNNN

J. Powell

1 This would be useful in the build up to Brussels (Feb 11-12), which seems to me to be far more important than bilateral. But the bilateral presents a real opportunity to set out our EC policy. "Express" is OK. But TV is more friend with public. Both?

J. Powell
12

CONFIDENTIAL



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

21 January 1988

Dear Charles,

Anglo-French Summit: The Prime Minister's interview with
"L'Express": 22 January

/ You will have seen Paris telegram 71 (copy attached) giving details of the interviewers and the subjects they wish to raise.

We think the key points suggested in the telegram are very much on the right lines. The following amplifies the main themes.

EC Future Financing

We recommend the Prime Minister should aim to get across the message that:

- All member states are now pursuing coherent policies to ensure inflation free growth, combined with steps to maximise the opportunities for business, industry and the individual.
- Our major common goal is the achievement of a single market in Europe to widen our competitive base and to enable us to meet the challenge from the US, Japan and the industrializing nations of South-East Asia.
- We can achieve that only if we have policies for the 1990s. mustat include a policy for agriculture which reflects the role of agriculture in the modern economy, not the role of agriculture as it was in the 1950s.
- The massive subsidies paid by the Community (the amount per cow is more than the personal incomes of half the people in the world) distort the world economy and our own economies. That distorting effect increases unemployment. The subsidy paid to the farmer to keep him in business may put a worker in industry on the dole.
- The debate in the Community is not like that of the early 1980s. We are now talking about the future viability of the Community as a whole.
- The present system of subsidies undermines the position of the competitive farmer such as the French cereals farmer. It is also a very inefficient way of helping the poorer farmer, because half total budget simply goes on storage and disposal of surpluses and does not benefit farmers directly. Other

CONFIDENTIAL



/social

ways can and should be found to help the poorer farmer, not just national/security measures, but Community assistance to areas in greatest need under the Structural Funds and a set-aside programme to take marginal land out of production. But these are adjuncts to reform, not a substitute for it.

The Prime Minister could also draw on the following points as necessary:

(i) Agricultural stabilisers.

- Not a British idea, but one put forward by the Commission in recognition of need prevent unconstrained growth of products for which there is no longer an expanding market.

- Role of agricultural stabilisers is to act as both a warning of when production is getting out of line with available markets, and as a means of linking production to the market place. Agriculture cannot continue to be the one sector of a modern economy which is divorced from market reality.

- Of course this would require farmers in all our countries to adapt. But the farmer now finds himself in an untenable situation with a shrinking market and not knowing from year to year what level of support he can count on. The establishment of stable markets is one of the first requirements laid down by the Treaty of Rome for the Common Agricultural Policy. We are looking for stability for the taxpayer, the consumer and the farmer too.

(ii) UK abatement.

- The agreement reached at Fontainebleau, under President Mitterrand's chairmanship, recognised that we were paying much more than our fair share to the European Community budget. Although nowhere near the top of the Community league in terms of our prosperity, we were the second highest net payer.

- The agreement reached at Fontainebleau means that we now pay our fair share, and not more than our fair share, to the Community budget. This still leaves us as the second largest net contributor in the Community after Germany. This means that, even after the benefits of the Fontainebleau abatement, we make a net payment to the Community budget of 7,700 million francs a year (France pays 2,700 million francs).

- If we are to consider a further increase in the amount of taxation to be raised on behalf of the Community, which means a further increase in the amount of our net payments, then it is essential that the agreement reached at Fontainebleau



should continue to be honoured. The case for the Fontainebleau abatement mechanism, which was agreed nearly four years ago, remains valid. The budget burden on the UK has increased threefold since then.

- Agreements are often hard to reach in the Community, but, once they are reached, it is important that we all stand by them. So we look to our partners to stand by the agreement made under French chairmanship in 1984.

(iii) Cohesion/Structural Funds.

- The creation of a single market will benefit all the member states. Already membership of the Community has led to a massive surge of inward investment into Spain and Portugal. Portuguese economy is one of the fastest growing in Europe.

- Of course there are member states which have particular economic problems or particular regional problems. Structural Funds exist to help. They have grown over the last four years. We are prepared to see them growing over the next five years. But their effort has got to be concentrated on the areas of greatest need, which include the backward regions of the Community, and on particular problems such as unemployment.

- We oppose an overall doubling of the Funds because not all member states need such an increase. Doubling of the Funds would be a backward step from the agreement we reached in 1984 on applying at the Community level the same sort of budget control measures we all have to apply at home. The author of that proposal was the then French Finance Minister, M Delors.

(iv) Economic and Monetary Union/British membership of the Exchange Rate Mechanism

- We need to be realistic. In a Community of twelve member states, with economies as divergent as Germany at one end and Portugal at the other, it makes most sense to concentrate on practicable goals, such as the liberalisation of capital movements (on which a lot of progress has been made in the last two years and where France has followed the lead set by Britain) and on opening up the market in financial services.

- We are interested in M Balladur's proposal for a European Central Bank. That, as he acknowledges, is an issue for the future. He, like us, is concentrating on the steps which need to be taken now.

- British membership of the Exchange Rate Mechanism is not a closed issue. It remains under active review.



- If Britain joined the Exchange Rate Mechanism, for the Press it would be a one-day wonder; but for us and for our partners it has to be something which is workable on a permanent basis.

Arms Control

We recommend that the Prime Minister welcome the INF Treaty as a good agreement which sets the principles of unequal reductions and stringent verification which will be necessary in other arms control negotiations. It is the first agreement ever to reduce nuclear weapons and vindicates the Alliance approach of negotiating from strength.

The Prime Minister could also draw on the following points:-

- We are proud to have played a part in the deployments which made agreement possible and following ratification we will play our part in verification. It is highly important that ratification is achieved: it would do grave damage to the United States' reputation as a reliable negotiating partner if it were not. The Europeans accepted responsibility for deployment and now all want ratification; failure to ratify would deeply divide the Alliance.

- The Treaty is not the first step to denuclearisation of Europe. We shall need to continue to rely on nuclear weapons as part of our deterrent. We must ensure that the deterrent is kept up to date. It will be important to retain the European basing role: we cannot just rely on US strategic systems.

- We reject any suggestion of decoupling. What couples is over 300,000 US troops in Europe and US interests in our continent. Furthermore, the Treaty will not undercut deterrence: no exact number of nuclear weapons or set of nuclear systems is necessary. It is the totality of NATO's nuclear and conventional forces and the political cohesion underlying them which deters.

- NATO Ministers agreed in June and December 1987 that next arms control priorities are START, conventional and chemical. Since 1979 the Alliance has unilaterally reduced the number of theatre nuclear warheads by 2,400; there can be no SNF reductions before we have dealt with chemical and conventional problems. FRG singularisation does not arise. US, UK and French forces are stationed in the FRG and as vulnerable as their German counterparts. The risk is shared. Moreover, remaining Soviet nuclear systems can still target all Western European countries.



- We believe that the political impetus exists to achieve a START agreement. Verification will have to be worked out carefully: this would be more complex than for INF. There can be no question of involving the UK deterrent in the 50% cuts.
- The Soviet Union has massive CW superiority and the CW proliferation among third world countries is a real danger. The global elimination of all chemical weapons remains an Alliance priority. But the remaining problems must not be underestimated; and the recent Soviet claim that its chemical weapons stockpile amounts to only 50,000 tons raises as many questions as it purports to answer.
- On UK/France Nuclear Cooperation discussions are in train: the December meeting between Mr Younger and M Giraud was particularly valuable. Such cooperation is entirely natural between the two European nuclear powers. It is right that we should examine areas where cooperation could exploit complementary expertise. We are looking at the French stand off missile but no decision has been taken.

East/West Relations

The Prime Minister might welcome, besides the INF Agreement, the prospect of a further summit in Moscow. She could stress the closeness of UK and French views, and the importance of a full European rôle in East/West relations. Prospects for further progress this year are good, but we should beware of exaggerated expectations. We continue to press for progress in all areas - human rights, regional issues - not just arms control.

On Afghanistan, the Soviet Union continues to create expectation of a withdrawal this year. We are encouraging this, but emphasising that the Afghans must be free to choose their own government.

On CSCE, the Prime Minister could stress the importance of a continued firm line by the West on human rights. She could express scepticism as necessary about the Soviet proposal for a Moscow Humanitarian Conference.

The Prime Minister may be asked her view of Gorbachev and his prospects. She could reaffirm our welcome for his attempts at reform within the Soviet Union; he seems determined to press ahead in the face of deep-rooted resistance in some areas, but results will take time and attitudes will have to change radically. Meanwhile the West can have little influence on the process and we should be careful to keep our guard up (realism, vigilance and an open mind).

CONFIDENTIAL



Bilateral Relations

If asked whether Britain is not being left out while Franco-German cooperation surges ahead, the Prime Minister could welcome the reconciliation between France and Germany which has been a key element in the construction of post-war Europe. We are not left out because we have excellent relations with both countries; even though they receive less media attention. For example, one third of our army and half our tactical air forces are deployed in Germany and committed to forward defence. With France, the summit on 29 January will confirm the importance of our common interests. M Chirac last year described Anglo-French relations as the best for 20 years: now it is 21. We enjoy close consultations in the EC framework, shared perceptions on East/West relations and close contacts the defence field. France is our third largest trading partner and considerable industrial collaboration takes place, for example Airbus. The Channel Fixed Link project has now been successfully launched. The intensity of ministerial contacts speaks for itself.

Terrorism

We recommend that the Prime Minister again welcome French cooperation over the seizure of arms on the Eksund. If asked about alleged French deals with Iran over hostages, she could refer to Chirac's assurances on this subject and re-affirm our own policy of no substantive concessions.

Yours ever,
Lyn Parker
(L Parker)
Private Secretary

C D Powell Esq
PS/No 10 Downing Street

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

to audience
submit an answer
through postcard
162047
MDHIAN 4141
in France.

CONFIDENTIAL
FM PARIS
TO DESKBY 191600Z FCO
TELNO 71
OF 191433Z JANUARY 88

ANGLO/FRENCH SUMMIT: THE PRIME MINISTER'S INTERVIEW WITH
'L'EXPRESS', FRIDAY 22 JANUARY.

1. THE INTERVIEWERS WILL BE JEROME DUMOULIN, IN PRACTICE FOREIGN EDITOR OF L'EXPRESS, AND ELIE MARCUSE, THE PAPER'S SPECIALIST ON BOTH DEFENCE MATTERS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM. BOTH HAVE VISITED BRITAIN FREQUENTLY AND SPEAK FLUENT ENGLISH. THERE WILL ALSO BE A LONDON-BASED AGENCY PHOTOGRAPHER WHO WILL BE IN CONTACT DIRECT WITH THE PRESS OFFICE AT 10 DOWNING STREET.

2. THEY WILL WISH TO CONCENTRATE ON EUROPEAN SECURITY MATTERS INCLUDING BRITAIN'S PLACE IN THE ALLIANCE AND THE WEU, FRANCO-BRITISH DEFENCE CONTACTS, AND THE BRITISH VIEW OF FRANCO-GERMAN RELATIONS. THEY WILL ALSO BROACH EC MATTERS ARMS CONTROL AND EAST/WEST RELATIONS, COUNTER-TERRORISM AND POSSIBLY THE UK REACTION TO FRANCO-IRANIAN DEALINGS OVER HOSTAGES. WE OFFER NOTES ON KEY POINTS.

DEFENCE

3. THE PRIME MINISTER'S RECENT MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT MITTERRAND AND HER FPA SPEECH OF 13 JANUARY ARE GOOD QUARRIES FOR BULL POINTS. IT WOULD BE DIPLOMATIC TO REITERATE OUR SUPPORT FOR FRANCE'S MOVES TO COOPERATE MORE CLOSELY WITH OTHER ALLIES, AND TO DISCOUNT ANY INTEREST ON OUR PART IN REFIGHTING THE THEOLOGICAL BATTLES OF THE 1960S. IF THE INTERVIEWERS SHOW ANY SIGNS OF QUERING BRITAIN'S PRACTICAL COMMITMENT TO EUROPEAN DEFENCE, THE PRIME MINISTER COULD REFER TO OUR FORWARD BASING AND OUR UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION TO NATO'S TRIAD OF FORCES. IF THEY ALLEGE LUKEWARM SUPPORT FOR WEU, THE IMPORTANT OCTOBER PLATFORM WAS THE PRODUCT OF FRANCO-BRITISH COLLABORATION, AND SHE MIGHT MAKE THE POINT THAT NOTWITHSTANDING FRANCE'S INTEREST IN REVITALISING THE WEU. OUR WILLINGNESS TO USE THE WEU FORUM TO COORDINATE NAVAL ACTION IN THE GULF CONTRASTS WITH FRANCE'S PREFERENCE TO INFORMAL BILATERAL COOPERATION AND THAT WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO SEE WEU COLLOCATED IN BRUSSELS BESIDE NATO (AND THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTIONS), AS PROOF OF SERIOUS INTEREST TO MAKE IT WORK STILL BETTER FOR THE EUROPEAN, PILLAR WITHIN THE ALLIANCE

*Alf dy
107 Robert
add HMG*

CONFIDENTIAL

162047
MDHIAN 4141

(THOUGH THAT POINT IS IN DIRECT CONTRAST TO FRANCE'S PREFERENCE TO SEE WEU ANYWHERE BUT BRUSSELS).

4. ON PURELY FRANCO-BRITISH DEFENCE COLLABORATION THE PRIME MINISTER MAY NOT BE ABLE TO BE AS OPEN AS HER INTERVIEWERS WOULD WISH, BUT THERE WOULD BE ADVANTAGE IN GIVING AN IMPRESSION OF COMMITMENT AND MOMENTUM, PARTLY TO COUNTERACT THE NEGATIVE IMPACT HERE OF THIS WEEK'S SUNDAY TELEGRAPH STORY. WE HAVE OF COURSE GIVEN MARCUSE A COPY OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S FPA SPEECH, AND HAVE DRAWN HIS ATTENTION TO THE PASSAGE ON NATO.

FRANCO-GERMAN RELATIONS

5. THE FRENCH AND GERMANS WILL SHORTLY BE CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELYSEE TREATY. DESPITE FRENCH DOUBTS ABOUT GERMAN LOYALTY, THIS COULD BE THE OCCASION FOR A GOOD DEAL OF RHETORIC THIS SIDE OF THE RHINE, ABOUT FRANCE AND GERMANY BEING THE ENGINE OF EUROPEAN CONSTRUCTION AND. PERHAPS, THE HARD CORE OF A NEW SORT OF EUROPEAN DEFENCE IDENTITY. WE HAVE NO REASON TO QUESTION THE VALUE OF CLOSE RELATIONS (INCLUDING DEFENCE RELATIONS) BETWEEN PARIS AND BONN, BUT THERE COULD BE NO HARM IN REMINDING FRENCH READERS OF THE OVERRIDING NEED TO RETAIN THE US MILITARY COMMITMENT TO EUROPEAN DEFENCE, AND THUS THE UNAMBIVALENT ROLE OF NATO AS THE KEY TO EUROPEAN IDENTITY.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

6. THE PRIME MINISTER MIGHT STRESS THE IMPORTANCE OF ACHIEVING A FIRM AND LASTING SETTLEMENT TO THE CURRENT COMPLEX OF FINANCING ISSUES AT THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL AT BRUSSELS NEXT MONTH IF AT ALL POSSIBLE. SO THAT THE COMMUNITY CAN CONCENTRATE ON THE LONGER TERM ISSUES THAT REALLY MATTER PARTICULARLY THE COMPLETION OF A SINGLE MARKET. BUT SHE WILL NO DOUBT WANT TO STRESS THAT THE RIGHT AGREEMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN A QUICK AGREEMENT. MORE GENERALLY THIS INTERVIEW PROVIDES AN IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITY TO RESTATE HMG'S POSITIVE PRIORITIES IN EUROPEAN POLICY FOR THE LONGER TERM, WHICH ARE IMPERFECTLY UNDERSTOOD HERE.

BRITAIN

7. ALTHOUGH THE INTERVIEWERS MAY NOT RAISE THIS EXPLICITLY. THIS WOULD BE A GOOD CHANCE TO DRIVE HOME THE MAIN POINTS ABOUT THE STRENGTH OF BRITAIN'S ECONOMY, THE REVIVAL OF ENTERPRISE CULTURE IN BRITAIN, AND THE IMPACT SUCH DEVELOPMENTS HAVE ON BRITAIN'S FORCE

CONFIDENTIAL

162047
MDHIAN 4141

AND RELIABILITY AS AN ALLY AND PARTNER. MUCH OF L'EXPRESS'S READERSHIP WILL START FROM A VERY POSITIVE IMPRESSION OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LAST EIGHT YEARS.

NORTHERN IRELAND

8. FRENCH AUDIENCES NEED OCCASIONAL REMINDINGS OF THE MAJOR VERITIES ON THIS THORNY SUBJECT. A MAJOR DAILY AND A MAJOR WEEKLY HERE BOTH CARRIED INTERVIEWS WITH THE IRA SHORTLY AFTER ENNISKILLEN PURPORTING TO DEFEND THE BOMBING AND INDEED IN ONE CASE TO THREATEN THE PRIME MINISTER. THERE WILL BE PARTICULAR FOCUS ON IRELAND IN THE MEDIA NEXT MONTH IF MITTERRAND'S STATE VISIT (25 FEBRUARY) GOES AHEAD AS PLANNED.

INDUSTRIAL DESIGN

9. COINCIDENTALLY, 'L'EXPRESS' ARE PREPARING A COVER-STORY ON EUROPEAN DESIGN AND HAVE NOTED THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL INTEREST IN GOOD DESIGN. THEY HAVE ASKED WHETHER THE PRIME MINISTER COULD ANSWER ONE OR TWO QUESTIONS ON THIS SUBJECT EXPLAINING HER GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO DEEPENING INDUSTRIAL AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF INDUSTRIAL DESIGN AND THE POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION THIS HAS MADE TO THE REVIVAL OF INDUSTRY AS SUCH. COPIES OF THE QUESTIONS ARE BEING SENT BY FAX DIRECT TO BATES (PRESS OFFICE 10 DOWNING STREET). PERHAPS WRITTEN ANSWERS COULD BE PROVIDED IF THERE IS TIME.

FERGUSSON

YYYY

DISTRIBUTION

122

MAIN 118

LIMITED
WED
ACDD
CSCE UNIT
CRD
DEFENCE
EED
ERD

SPD
SOVIET DEPT
TRED
UND
PS/MRS CHALKER
PS/LORD GLENARTHUR
PS/MR MELLOR
PS/PUS

CONFIDENTIAL

162047
MDHIAN 4141

ECD (I)
ECD (E)
GHF
MAED
NENAD
NEWS DEPT
PLANNERS
RESEARCH DEPT
SCD
SEC POL DEPT

PS/SIR J FRETWELL
MR BRAITHWAITE
MR BOYD
MR RATFORD
MR KERR
MR SLATER
MISS PESTELL
MR HARVEY
MR GOULDEN

ADDITIONAL 4

PS/NO 10 DOWNING ST
PS/CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER
PS/HOME SECRETARY

PS/SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
(AGRICULTURE FISHERIES AND)
(FORESTRY)

NNNN

PRIME MINISTER

L'EXPRESS

Enclosed is a rather splendid picture of you, kindly sent by your L'Express interviewers Jerome Dumoulin and Elie Marcuse.

They say the interview was very ^{well} received in France.

I have acknowledged.



BERNARD INGHAM
10 February 1988