



Handwritten initials: *Handwritten initials*  
cc 720

10 DOWNING STREET

THE PRIME MINISTER

11 June 1980

*Dear John.*

Thank you for your letter of 28 May about the Yalta Memorial. I enclose a copy of the reply the Foreign and Commonwealth Office sent to the two letters Mr Crawford wrote to me on 1 and 8 May.

In my view there can be no objection in principle to a memorial which commemorates innocent people who died as a result of circumstances beyond their control. On these grounds, I decided that I should not stand in the way of the erection of a memorial to Russians and Eastern Europeans who died following their repatriation at the conclusion of the second world war. At the same time, I took the view that a memorial could not appropriately be erected on Crown Land if it sought to perpetuate a particular interpretation of complex historical events or implied criticism of the policies of previous British Governments. I therefore told the organisers of the Memorial Appeal that I was giving my consent to the memorial's erection on condition that its inscription was not controversial and did not impute guilt to previous British Governments. The Government subsequently discussed the inscription with the organisers and agreement was reached on a form of words, which in my view, met the conditions I had imposed.

I do not consider, therefore, that this memorial condemns the policies of the Governments of the period 1944-47 or the actions of those who made and carried out those policies. I shall be taking an opportunity to make this clear publicly.

*Yours ever*  
*Rogant*

The Right Honourable Sir John Eden, Bt, MP

*JS*



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

2 July 1980

Dear Michael,

MS

Yalta Memorial

In my letter of 9 June I said that Lord Carrington considered it necessary that the Government's attitude to the erection of this memorial should be made clear publicly, in the first instance by an inspired PQ. The Prime Minister in her letter of 11 June to Sir John Eden said she would be taking an opportunity to make her position clear publicly.

The Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary suggests that the enclosed draft Question and Written Reply by the Prime Minister should be used for this purpose.

Yours etc

Paul

(P Lever)  
Private Secretary

M O'D B Alexander Esq  
10 Downing Street  
LONDON

DRAFT: minute/letter/teleletter/despach/note

TYPE: Draft/Final 1+

FROM:

Reference

DEPARTMENT:

TEL. NO:

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

TO:

Your Reference

- Top Secret
- Secret
- Confidential
- Restricted
- Unclassified

Copies to:

PRIVACY MARKING

SUBJECT:

.....In Confidence

DRAFT PQ FOR WRITTEN REPLY BY THE PRIME MINISTER

CAVEAT.....

To ask the Prime Minister on what grounds permission was given for a memorial to the ~~so-called~~ 'victims of Yalta' to be erected on Crown land, and if she will make a statement.

DRAFT REPLY

In the Government's view the purpose of the memorial is to commemorate those who died. A condition of the Government's agreement to the memorial being on Crown Land was that the inscription should not impute guilt to previous British Governments and should be uncontroversial. The intended inscription fulfils those conditions. I do not, therefore, consider that the memorial condemns the policies of Governments of the relevant period or the actions of those who made and carried out those policies.

Enclosures—flag(s).....



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

*Draft to type for signature,  
as amended.*

*Am*

9 June 1980

*Dear Michael,*

Yalta Memorial: Letter to the Prime Minister  
from Sir John Eden

*see  
copying*

Thank you for your letter of 4 June. I enclose the draft of a reply from the Prime Minister to Sir John Eden. I also enclose copies of Mr Crawford's two letters to the Prime Minister and of the Department's reply (the Department had earlier been in touch with him by telephone).

Lord Carrington has had it in mind since receiving your letter of 14 May about the invitation to the Prime Minister to unveil this memorial to advise the Prime Minister that the Government's attitude towards its erection should be made quite clear publicly, in the first instance by an inspired PQ. He considers this necessary both because of the tendentious way in which the Yalta Victims Memorial Appeal has presented the Prime Minister's decision publicly, and also to reassure people, such as Mr Crawford, who were directly involved in events at the time and who now feel that they have been let down. A further factor is the serious view which the Soviet Government have taken of the decision: Mr Gromyko made a strong complaint about it and threatened retaliation when he met Lord Carrington in Vienna on 17 May. You will see that the draft reply from the Prime Minister to Sir John Eden reflects Lord Carrington's views.

*G G H Walden*

(G G H Walden)

M O'D B Alexander Esq  
10 Downing Street

*[Handwritten mark]*

DRAFT: ~~minute~~/letter/teleletter/despatch/note

TYPE: Draft/Final 1+

FROM:

Reference

Prime Minister

DEPARTMENT:

TEL. NO:

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

TO:

Your Reference

Top Secret

Rt Hon Sir John Eden Bart MP  
House of Commons  
London SW1A 0AA

Secret

Copies to:

Confidential

Restricted

Unclassified

PRIVACY MARKING

SUBJECT:

.....In Confidence

Thank you for your letter of 28 May about the Yalta Memorial. I enclose a copy of the reply the Foreign and Commonwealth Office sent to the two letters Mr Crawford wrote to me on 1 and 8 May.

CAVEAT.....

~~I should like to make my attitude towards this memorial quite clear to you.~~ <sup>in</sup> My view is that there can be no objection in principle to a memorial which commemorates innocent people who died as a result of circumstances beyond their control. On these grounds, I decided that I should not stand in the way of the erection of a memorial to Russians and Eastern Europeans who died following their repatriation at the conclusion of the second world war. At the same time, I took the view that a memorial could not appropriately be erected on Crown Land if it sought to perpetuate a particular interpretation of complex historical events or implied criticism of the policies of previous British Governments. I therefore told the organisers of the Memorial Appeal that I was giving my consent to the memorial's erection on condition that its inscription was not controversial and did not impute guilt to previous British Governments. The Government subsequently discussed the inscription with the

Enclosures—flag(s).....

organisers and agreement was ~~finally~~ reached on a form of words, which in my view, met the conditions I had imposed.

I do not consider, therefore, that this memorial condemns the policies of the Governments of the period 1944-47 or the actions of those/<sup>who</sup>made and carried out those policies.

I shall be taking an opportunity to make this clear publicly.



Home Affairs

10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

14 July 1980

Dear Mr Crawford,

I am replying on the Prime Minister's behalf to your letter to her of 26 June about the 'Yalta' Memorial. As you will no doubt have seen, the Prime Minister has now, in answer to a Written Question from Mrs. Jill Knight, MP, stated the grounds on which permission was given for this Memorial to be erected. (Hansard, 11 July, Column 260 W. - copy enclosed). I hope this will have gone some way to meet your concerns.

It is not clear to me from your letter whether or not you are aware of the precise inscription which the Memorial will bear. The wording is as follows:

" This Memorial was placed here by Members of Parliament of all Parties, and others, to commemorate the thousands of innocent men, women and children from Russia and other Eastern European nations, who were imprisoned and died at the hands of Communist Governments after their repatriation at the conclusion of the Second World War."

Yours sincerely

Michael Alexander

T. R. Crawford, Esq., MBE.

21

also written to my right hon. Friend proposing a meeting to discuss this matter, and that this proposal has been accepted.

### ACT OF SETTLEMENT

**Rev. Ian Paisley** asked the Prime Minister if she will publish the letter which she has received from the leaders of the Orange Institution in the United Kingdom regarding the operation of the Act of Settlement; and what reply she has sent.

**The Prime Minister:** The Rev. Martin Smyth wrote to me on 7 May and my office replied on my behalf on 28 May. It is not my normal practice to publish exchanges of correspondence, but the Rev. Martin Smyth is at liberty to do so if he wishes.

**Rev. Ian Paisley** asked the Prime Minister whether Her Majesty's Government propose to take steps to seek to alter the provisions of the Act of Settlement which prohibits the Monarch from becoming a Roman Catholic or marrying a Roman Catholic.

**The Prime Minister:** As I told the House in 8 July, the Act of Settlement remains in force and the Government have no plans to change it.

**Mr. Michael Brown** asked the Prime Minister what representations she has received relating to the amendment of the Act of Settlement; and what replies she has sent.

**The Prime Minister:** The Rev. Martin Smyth wrote to me on 7 May, and my office replied on my behalf on 28 May. In addition, I have received a few letters on this subject this week.

**Mr. Michael Brown** asked the Prime Minister whether she has any proposals for introducing legislation at any stage during the lifetime of the present Parliament to amend the Act of Settlement.

**The Prime Minister:** As I told the House on 8 July, the Act of Settlement remains in force and the Government have no plans to change it.

Home Affairs

### BRITISH ACADEMY

**Mr. Teddy Taylor** asked the Prime Minister if she will review the procedure by which the British Academy is used as the vehicle by which public funds are distributed to other bodies in the light of the academy's failure to remove from its list of fellows a self-confessed Soviet agent, Professor Antony Blunt.

**The Prime Minister:** I have full confidence in the way the British Academy administers its grant and do not therefore propose any changes. The question of Professor Blunt's fellowship is for the Academy.

### BRANDT COMMISSION

**Mr. Ioan Evans** asked the Prime Minister whether Her Majesty's Government have yet reached a conclusion as to which of the Brandt Commission proposals they intend to endorse.

**The Prime Minister:** The Government will shortly submit a memorandum on this subject to the Overseas Development Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

### YALTA MEMORIAL

**Mrs. Knight** asked the Prime Minister on what grounds permission was given for a memorial to the "victims of Yalta" to be erected on Crown Land; and if she will make a statement.

**The Prime Minister:** The purpose of the memorial is to commemorate those who died. The Government agreed to the memorial being erected on Crown Land on condition that this purpose was strictly observed. The planned inscription does so. It passes no judgment either on the policies of Governments in the relevant period or on the actions of those who made and carried out those policies.

### HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### Official Paid Envelopes

**Mr. Wrigglesworth** asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster if, in view of the Government's decision to cease using official paid envelopes in the Civil Service, he intends to dispense with their use in the House.



Library a list of her official engagements for the day on Tuesdays and Thursdays when the House of Commons is sitting.

**The Prime Minister:** While I appreciate the reasoning which lies behind my hon. Friend's suggestion, I told the House on 12 July last year that I was prepared to answer any oral question, whether open or substantive, which could reasonably and appropriately be directed to me. That remains the position, and since last July I have not transferred a single oral question. In these circumstances, it is for hon. Members themselves to decide whether to table open or substantive questions, and I do not think that I should seek to block the most popular form of open question.

### THE TAOISEACH

Q18. **Mr. Biggs-Davison** asked the Prime Minister when she expects next to meet the Taoiseach.

**The Prime Minister:** I have no immediate plans to do so. The date for the next bilateral meeting has not yet been fixed.

### ANGLESEY

Q22. **Mr. Best** asked the Prime Minister when she intends next to visit Anglesey.

**The Prime Minister:** I shall be visiting Anglesey on Friday 18 July.

### YORKSHIRE AND HUMBERSIDE

Q34. **Mr. Cryer** asked the Prime Minister when next she expects to visit Yorkshire and Humberside.

**The Prime Minister:** I have no immediate plans to do so.

### CHILD BENEFITS

Q35. **Mr. Peter Bottomley** asked the Prime Minister whether she intends to introduce proposals to make alterations in the relationship between child benefits for parents in and out of employment.

**The Prime Minister:** No, but the relationship between social security benefits

for children of families in and out of work is one of the factors taken into account during the annual review of the rates of child benefit.

### DEVOLUTION

Q42. **Mr. Wigley** asked the Prime Minister what is the timetable of the Government concerning changes in the constitutional relationships between various parts of the United Kingdom.

**The Prime Minister:** I have nothing to add to the statement made by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland on 2 July 1980.

### EMPLOYMENT BILL

Q46. **Mr. Arthur Lewis** asked the Prime Minister what action she has taken or intends taking on the communications sent to her by Mr. Peter Taylor, Q.C., Chairman of the Senate of the Inns of Court and the Bar, and Sir John Stebbings, President of the Law Society regarding the drafting of the Employment Bill; and whether she will make a statement on the subject matters of these letters.

**The Prime Minister:** Both the Attorney-General and I have replied to the letters from Mr. Peter Taylor, Q.C., and Sir John Stebbings. The matters to which the letters referred were debated in the House of Lords on 8 July.

### GAELIC ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

**Mr. Parry** asked the Prime Minister what representations she has received from the Gaelic Athletic Association concerning the occupation of its land by the Army in Crossmaglen; what reply she has sent; and if she will make a statement.

**The Prime Minister:** I recently received a letter from Mr. Thomas Walsh of the Gaelic Athletic Association concerning the occupation by the security forces of part of the Association's land in Crossmaglen. A reply has been sent to Mr. Walsh on my behalf from the office of my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. I understand that the hon. Member has



Foreign and Commonwealth Office  
London SW1A 2AH

Telephone 01-

T R Crawford Esq MBE  
61A Patshull Road  
London NW5

Your reference

Our reference

Date

6 June 1980

*Dear Mr. Crawford,*

I have been asked to reply to your letters of 1 and 8 May to the Prime Minister about the 'Yalta Memorial' and also to thank you for sending a copy of the first letter to Lord Carrington. You may remember that we spoke on the telephone shortly after you had written.

I am sorry that you have heard nothing since then, but we found your letter of 1 May of considerable interest and have initiated some research into our records and those of the Ministry of Defence to see what further light they cast on some of the points you mention. We were very intrigued, for example, by your comments on the role of Commander Brykin at your meetings with the Soviet Military Mission and on the reports he was sending to Moscow. I think I may have mentioned to you on the telephone that we have done quite a lot of research into this complex and difficult subject in the FCO in recent years, but your letter has provided us with some further leads to follow up.

When our research has progressed further, I shall write to you again with any specific comments we may have. In the meantime, I am sure you will wish to know the background to the Prime Minister's decision to permit the erection of this memorial on Crown Land in Kensington. She believes that the purpose of the memorial should be to commemorate those who died as a result of circumstances over which they had no control. It is not her intention that the memorial should in any way perpetuate a controversial or incomplete view of the events in question or impute guilt to previous British Governments or their servants such as yourself. I hope you will find reassurance in this.

*Yours sincerely,*

*Stephen Band*

S H Band  
Eastern European & Soviet Department

-9 JUN 1980





10 DOWNING STREET

From the Private Secretary

4 June 1980

BF 6/6

I enclose a copy of a letter to the Prime Minister from Sir John Eden, Bt., M.P. about the Yalta Victims Memorial. This letter ties in with letters of 1 May and 8 May from Mr. Tucker Crawford on the same subject. I gather that Mr. Crawford's letters are under consideration in EESD and have not yet received any reply. In view of the considerable lapse of time, I should be grateful to receive a draft reply which the Prime Minister might send to Sir John Eden, together with a copy of whatever reply has by then gone to Mr. Crawford, by close of play on Friday 6 June.

M. O'D. B. ALEXANDER

Paul Lever, Esq.,  
Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

6

from: The Rt. Hon. Sir John EDEN Bt. M.P.

R29



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
LONDON S.W.1.

28 May 1980.

Dear Margaret,

Please excuse this hand-written note (catching up at home during the recess!).

Requested from  
FCO - again 30/5 -  
(again 2/6)

see  
film

You will have had a letter (1<sup>st</sup> May) from Tucker Crawford expressing his concern at your reported decision to authorise a memorial on crown land to the "YALTA VICTIMS". It is possible that you have already answered him. If this is the case, I would be grateful if your office would send me a copy. Tucker was a close friend of my father's, and I have known him since the end of the war.

My uncle often spoke to me about the repatriation decision. He strongly rejected the critics' stance that other options were open to him. In the context of events at the time, he believed there was no other way to be certain of securing the return of all British soldiers then inside Russia. Rightly, that was his first and overriding priority.

To condemn that policy now - and to imply that the Government of the Day was guilty of causing the death of Russian citizens - is both superficial and unfair.

Yours  
John