

DWF G 51/14
LLO 331/14

IMMEDIATE

[FCO/WH]

Soviet Union

ADVANCE COPY

X-13

X OO FCO DESKBY 140930Z X

Rec'd late

PP UKDEL NATO

PP WASHINGTON

PP PARIS

PP BONN

PP UKMIS NY

PP PEKING

PP NEW DELHI

PP ISLAMABAD

PP BELGRADE

PP BUCHAREST

PP BUDAPEST

PP SOFIA

GRS 1800

UNCLASSIFIED

FM MOSCOW 140745Z

TO IMMEDIATE FCO DESKBY 140930Z

TELNO 43 OF 14 JAN

AND INFO PRIORITY TO UKDEL NATO, WASHINGTON, PARIS, BONN
UKMIS NEW YORK, PEKING, NEW DELHI, ISLAMABAD, BELGRADE,
BUCHAREST, BUDAPEST, SOFIA, PRAGUE, WARSAW AND EAST BERLIN.

MIPT: BREZHNEV'S STATEMENT.

BREZHNEV DEALT FIRST WITH THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION.
HE CLAIMED THAT THE SOVIET UNION FOLLOWED A CONSISTENT AND

Ps.
Ps LPS
Ps Mr Blaker
Ps/Pus
Mr Bullard
Mr Fergusson
Hd of LLS
" News
" UND
" SAD
" MLD
" Oid

Ps No 10 D.S ✓

bab office

BREZHNEV DEALT FIRST WITH THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION. HE CLAIMED THAT THE SOVIET UNION FOLLOWED A CONSISTENT AND CREATIVE COURSE AIMED AT PEACE, DETENTE AND DISARMAMENT. BUT ON THE THRESHOLD OF THE 1980'S THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION HAD BECOME MORE COMPLICATED. THE FAULT LAY WITH IMPERIALIST FORCES AND, PARTICULARLY, CERTAIN CIRCLES IN THE USA. THE RULING CIRCLES IN THE US AND CERTAIN OTHER NATO COUNTRIES HAD EMBARKED ON A COURSE HOSTILE TO DETENTE, AS WAS SHOWN BY THE 1978 NATO SUMMIT, THE US LONG TERM DEFENCE PROGRAMME, THE CREATION OF NEW US BASES INCLUDING SOME IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND INDIAN OCEAN, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE QUICK REACTION FORCE.

THE STORY OF SALT II PROVIDED A FURTHER EXAMPLE. ITS SIGNATURE OPENED THE PROSPECT OF FURTHER SIGNIFICANT STEPS. BUT WHAT DID CARTER'S ADMINISTRATION DO? SCARCELY HAD SALT II BEEN SIGNED BEFORE IT BEGAN TO BE DISCREDITED IN THE US. THE PROCESS OF RATIFICATION WAS BEING USED BY THE TREATY'S OPPONENTS, NOT WITHOUT CONNIVANCE FROM THE US GOVERNMENT. THE US HAD FORCED NATO INTO A DECISION ON MEDIUM RANGE MISSILES, SILENCING THOSE WHO WISHED TO RESPOND TO THE SOVIET PROPOSALS.

2. BREZHNEV THEN TURNED TO AFGHANISTAN. A MOUNTAIN OF LIES, AND A SHAMELESS ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN HAD GROWN UP ABOUT EVENTS IN THAT COUNTRY. THE FORCES OF THE PAST, SUPPORTED FROM ABROAD, HAD TAKEN UP ARMS AGAINST THE REVOLUTION OF APRIL 1978. THOUSANDS AND TENS OF THOUSANDS OF INSURGENTS HAD BEEN ARMED AND TRAINED ABROAD. THE AFGHAN LEADERSHIP BOTH UNDER TARAKI AND SUBSEQUENTLY HAD TURNED FOR HELP TO THE USSR, WHICH HAD WARNED THOSE WHO NEEDED WARNING THAT IT WOULD NOT LEAVE THE AFGHAN PEOPLE IN THE LURCH. AMIN, WHO HAD SEIZED POWER AND UNLEASHED HARSH REPRESSION AGAINST THOSE WHO HAD GUIDED THE AFGHAN REVOLUTION, HAD FURTHERED THE CAUSE OF THE AGGRESSORS. THE AFGHAN PEOPLE, LED BY THE PARTY UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF KARMAL, ROSE AGAINST AMIN'S TYRANNY AND PUT AN END TO IT. WHY WAS THIS BEMOANED IN WASHINGTON, UNLIKE AMIN'S ACTS OF REPRESSION? EXTERNAL REACTION HAD CREATED A REAL THREAT TO AFGHANISTAN'S INDEPENDENCE, AND THREATENED TO MAKE IT A BRIDGEHEAD FOR IMPERIALISM ON THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE SOVIET UNION. FOR THE SOVIET UNION NOT TO HAVE RESPONDED TO THE AFGHAN REQUEST WOULD HAVE MEANT SURRENDERING AFGHANISTAN TO IMPERIALISM (CF. CHILE) AND COUNTENANCING A DIRECT THREAT TO SOVIET SECURITY. IT HAD NOT BEEN A SIMPLE DECISION TO SEND TROOPS TO AFGHANISTAN, BUT THIS RESPONSIBLE TASK HAD BEEN UNDERTAKEN, AND THE TROOPS WOULD BE WITHDRAWN AS SOON AS THE REASONS FOR THEIR PRESENCE NO LONGER APPLIED.

AS SOON AS THE REASONS FOR THEIR PRESENCE NO LONGER APPLIED.

3. BREZHNEV ALLEGED THAT IMPERIALIST AND PEKING PROPAGANDA HAD CONSCIOUSLY SLANDERED THE ACTIONS OF THE SOVIET UNION IN AFGHANISTAN. THERE HAD BEEN NO INTERVENTION OR AGGRESSION; THE SOVIET UNION HAD HELPED "NEW AFGHANISTAN" TO DEFEND ITSELF AGAINST EXTERNAL AGGRESSION. EVENTS IN AFGHANISTAN DID NOT AFFECT THE NATIONAL INTERESTS OR SECURITY OF THE USA OR OTHER GOVERNMENTS. "AFFIRMATIONS THAT THE SOVIET UNION HAS SOME SORT OF EXPANSIONIST PLANS DIRECTED AGAINST PAKISTAN, IRAN OR OTHER COUNTRIES OF THIS REGION ARE UTTERLY FALSE. THE POLICIES AND PSYCHOLOGY OF THE COLONIALISTS IS FOREIGN TO US. WE DO NOT HANKER AFTER OTHER PEOPLE'S LANDS NOR REACH FOR FOREIGN WEALTH. IT IS THE COLONIALISTS WHO ARE DRAWN BY THE SMELL OF OIL". IT WAS PHARISAICAL TO SPREAD STORIES ABOUT THE SOVIET THREAT ON THE PART OF THOSE WHOSE RECORD INCLUDED THE DIRTY WAR IN VIETNAM, THOSE WHO DID NOT LIFT A FINGER WHEN THE CHINESE ATTACKED VIETNAM, WHO MAINTAINED A BASE ON CUBA AGAINST ITS GOVERNMENT'S WISHES AND WHO BRANDISHED THEIR ARMS AND THREATENED BLOCKADE AGAINST THE REVOLUTIONARY PEOPLE OF IRAN.

4. BREZHNEV WENT ON TO SAY THAT THERE WAS INDEED INTERFERENCE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF AFGHANISTAN AND THAT THE UN WAS BEING USED FOR THIS PURPOSE. WHY ELSE WAS "THE AFGHAN QUESTION" BROUGHT UP AGAINST THE WISHES OF THE AFGHAN GOVERNMENT ITSELF? THE LATTER SIMPLY WISHED TO BE LEFT IN PEACE. AGGRESSION CONTINUED, HOWEVER, AGAINST THE LEGITIMATE AUTHORITIES IN AFGHANISTAN. "THE WHITE HOUSE RECENTLY SPOKE OPENLY OF A DECISION TO INCREASE THE SUPPLY OF MILITARY MATERIAL TO THESE ELEMENTS AND TO GIVE THEM WHATEVER WAS NECESSARY FOR HOSTILE ACTIVITY." THE US MINISTER OF DEFENCE HAD SPOKEN IN CHINA ON COORDINATING SUCH ACTIVITY WITH THE CHINESE LEADERSHIP.

5. "IN A WORD EVENTS IN AFGHANISTAN ARE NOT THE REAL CAUSE OF THE CURRENT WORSENING OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION. IF IT HAD NOT BEEN FOR AFGHANISTAN THEN CERTAIN CIRCLES IN THE USA AND NATO WOULD IN ALL PROBABILITY HAVE FOUND SOME OTHER EXCUSE TO AGGRAVATE THE SITUATION IN THE WORLD". THE STEPS TAKEN BY THE US ADMINISTRATION OVER SALT II, COMMERCIAL GOODS, GRAIN, BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS AND SO ON SHOWED THAT WASHINGTON WAS TRYING TO SPEAK THE LANGUAGE OF THE COLD WAR. CARTER'S ADMINISTRATION SHOWED ITS LACK OF RESPECT FOR IMPORTANT INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS BY BREAKING SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL TIES. IT WOULD BE HARD TO ENUMERATE THE TREATIES,

AND CULTURAL TIES. IT WOULD BE HARD TO ENUMERATE THE TREATIES, AGREEMENTS AND UNDERSTANDINGS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION BROKEN BY PRESIDENT CARTER. "WE OF COURSE WILL GET BY WITHOUT THESE OR OTHER TIES WITH THE UNITED STATES AND IN GENERAL NEVER COUNTED ON THEM BELIEVING THAT THEY WERE A MATTER OF MUTUAL ADVANTAGE AND ANSWERED THE MUTUAL INTERESTS OF BOTH COUNTRIES, ABOVE ALL AS A MEANS OF STRENGTHENING PEACE." WASHINGTON'S ATTEMPT TO ASSERT A RIGHT TO REWARD OR PUNISH INDEPENDANT SOVEREIGN GOVERNMENTS RAISED A QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S ACTS WERE A BLOW TO INTERNATIONAL LAW. "AS A RESULT OF THESE ACTIONS, CARTER'S ADMINISTRATION IS MORE AND MORE SEEN IN THE WORLD AS CONFIRMING THE SUPPOSITION THAT THE UNITED STATES IS A COMPLETELY UNRELIABLE PARTNER IN INTER-GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, IS A GOVERNMENT WHOSE LEADERSHIP IS INSPIRED BY SOME SORT OF WHIMS, CAPRICES OR FLASHES OF EMOTION, WHOSE IDEAS ARE FILLED WITH NARROWLY CONCEIVED MOMENTARY ADVANTAGE, AND IS READY AT ANY MOMENT TO BREAK ITS INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIP UP TREATIES OR AGREEMENTS IT HAS SIGNED." IT WAS EVIDENT THAT SUCH BEHAVIOUR WAS DESTABILISING. IT WAS ALSO CLEAR THAT THE USA WOULD NOT DEAL THE SOVIET UNION THE BLOW IT WAS COUNTING UPON. "CYNCICAL CALCULATIONS ABOUT A 'WORSENING' OF THE FOOD POSITION IN THE SOVIET UNION AS A RESULT OF THE UNITED STATES' REFUSAL TO SELL US GRAIN ARE BASED ON A FALSE UNDERSTANDING OF OUR ECONOMIC POTENTIAL. THE SOVIET PEOPLE HAVE SUFFICIENT CAPACITY TO LIVE AND WORK PEACEABLY, FULFIL THEIR PLANS, AND INCREASE THEIR WELFARE. IN PARTICULAR I CAN CONFIRM THAT PLANS TO SUPPLY THE SOVIET PEOPLE WITH BREAD AND GRAIN PRODUCTS WILL NOT BE LESSENERED BY A SINGLE KILOGRAMME". THE ACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN ADMINISTRATION COULD ONLY BE SEEN AS AN ATTEMPT TO BLOCK INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS TO LESSEN THE DANGER OF WAR AND STRENGTHEN PEACE AND TO LIMIT THE ARMS RACE. THEIR UNILATERAL MEASURES WOULD BE A BOOMERANG AGAINST THEMSELVES, IF NOT TODAY, THEN TOMORROW.

6. BREZHNEV SAID THAT IF THESE ATTACKS ON SOVIET POLICY WERE DESIGNED TO DEMONSTRATE STRENGTH, THEY IGNORED THE LESSONS OF HISTORY. NO ONE ASKED PERMISSION FOR THE 1917 REVOLUTION AND THE SOVIET PEOPLE WOULD NOW AGAIN DECIDE BY WHAT LAWS TO LIVE. IMPERIALISM HAD TRIED IN VAIN TO CRUSH THE REVOLUTION AT BIRTH. FASCIST AGGRESSORS HAD BEEN DEFEATED. THE SOVIET PEOPLE HAD ENDURED THE RIGOURS OF THE COLD WAR. THESE THINGS SHOULD NOW BE RECALLED.

7. IN ANSWER TO A SECOND QUESTION,

7. IN ANSWER TO A SECOND QUESTION, ABOUT THE PROSPECTS IN EUROPE, BREZHNEV CONTINUED BY SAYING THE EUROPEAN SITUATION WAS MUCH BETTER THAN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 70'S BUT THAT WASHINGTON'S IRRESPONSIBLE POLICIES HAD HAD THEIR EFFECT HERE TOO. THE US WAS NOT CONTENT WITH RUINING SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS BUT WANTED TO DO THE SAME TO SOVIET-EUROPEAN RELATIONS. THE USA WAS UNDERMINING THE SPIRIT OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT AND AIMED TO DOMINATE THE GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE, ESPECIALLY ITS ALLIES. THE FUNDAMENTAL INTEREST OF THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE, HOWEVER, WAS BOUND UP WITH DETENTE. THEY HAD EXPERIENCED WAR AND WERE NOT READY FOR ADVENTURES. IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO BELIEVE THEY WISHED TO THROW AWAY THE FRUITS OF DETENTE. THEY, AND THE US ALSO HAD NO LESS INTEREST IN DETENTE THAN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AND THE SOVIET UNION. THERE WERE PLENTY OF POSSIBILITIES FOR CONSTRUCTIVE DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE, IN MADRID AND THE WARSAW PACT SUGGESTION OF A CONFERENCE ON MILITARY DETENTE AND DISARMAMENT. THE SOVIET UNION WAS

EMPQ
TICALLY IN FAVOUR OF STRENGTHENING AND DEVELOPING WHAT HAD BEEN ACHIEVED IN EUROPE OVER THE YEARS. IN CONTRAST TO THE EXTREMIST POLICIES OF WASHINGTON, THE SOVIET UNION WAS FOR CONTINUING NEGOTIATIONS BEGUN IN RECENT YEARS. "I REPEAT", SAID BREZHNEV, "WE ARE FOR NEGOTIATIONS, FOR HONEST, EQUAL, NEGOTIATIONS WHICH OBSERVE THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY OF SECURITY. IT WAS JUST SUCH NEGOTIATIONS WE RECENTLY PROPOSED SHOULD BEGIN ON THE QUESTION OF MEDIUM RANGE NUCLEAR SYSTEMS. NO ONE CAN EXPECT THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL ACCEPT NATO'S CONDITIONS, BASED UPON THE CONDUCT OF NEGOTIATIONS FROM A POSITION OF STRENGTH. THE PRESENT POSITION OF THE NATO COUNTRIES MAKES NEGOTIATIONS ON THIS PROBLEM IMPOSSIBLE. WE TOLD THE GOVERNMENT OF THE USA ABOUT THIS OFFICIALLY A FEW DAYS AGO."

8. BREZHNEV CONCLUDED BY SAYING HE LOOKED AT THE FUTURE WITH WELL FOUNDED OPTIMISM. AMERICAN IMPERIALIST POLICIES EXPRESSED THEIR DISCONTENT WITH THE STRONGER POSITION OF SOCIALISM, THE RISE OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE AND THE INCREASE OF FORCES IN FAVOUR OF DETENTE AND PEACE. DETENTE WAS SUPPORTED BY POWERFUL FORCES. THE SOVIET PEOPLE AND THEIR FRIENDS ABROAD COULD BE SURE THE SOVIET UNION WOULD NOT HESITATE IN ITS LENINIST FOREIGN POLICY, TRIED IN THE PAST, AND CONSTANT IN ITS LOVE OF PEACE AND RESISTANCE TO AGGRESSION.

KEEBLE

NNNN

[FCO/WH]

IMMEDIATE

ADVANCE COPY

DWF G 93/14

XX

7/1/57

X-13

LLO 332/14

Ps.

Ps LPS

Ps/Mr Blaker

Ps/PUS

Mr. Billard

Mr Fergusson

Head of LLS

News D

UND

SAD

MED

OIS

Ps No 10 D.S ✓

Cabs office

X OO FCO DESKBY 141130Z X

PP UKDEL NATO

PP WASHINGTON

PP BONN

PP PARIS

PP BELGRADE

PP PRAGUE

PP BUCHAREST

PP BUDAPEST

PP SOFIA

PP EAST BERLIN

PP UKMIS NEW YORK

PP DELHI

PP ISLAMABAD

PP PEKING

PP WARSAW

PP WARSAW

GRS

GRS 750

CONFIDENTIAL

FM MOSCOW 141030Z

TO IMMEDIATE FCO DESKBY 141130Z

TELNO 42 OF 14 JAN

AND INFO PRIORITY TO UKDEL. NATO, WASHINGTON, BONN, PARIS,
BELGRADE, PRAGUE, BUCHAREST, BUDAPEST, SOFIA, EAST BERLIN,
AKMIS NEW YORK, NEW DELHI AND ISLAMABAD.

BREZHNEV ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION.

1. MIFT CONTAINS A SUMMARY OF A STATEMENT DATED 13 JANUARY MADE BY BREZHNEV IN ANSWER TO TWO QUESTIONS PUT BY A PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT ABOUT THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE PROSPECTS FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE.
2. THE PRINCIPAL FOREIGN TARGET OF BREZHNEV'S REMARKS WAS THE UNITED STATES. HIS STATEMENT WAS CLEARLY DESIGNED TO ISOLATE THE US, DIVIDE IT FROM EUROPE AND OBSCURE THE QUESTION OF AFGHANISTAN IN A CLOUD OF OTHER ISSUES. BREZHNEV'S TONE WAS SCORNFUL AND BELLIGERENT TOWARDS THE UNITED STATES AND "CARTER'S ADMINISTRATION". HE ATTACKED THE UNITED STATES AS AN UNRELIABLE PARTNER WHICH BROKE AGREEMENTS AND THE NORMS OF INTERNATIONAL LIFE. THE AMERICANS HAD FOR SOME CONSIDERABLE TIME PURSUED POLICIES DESIGNED TO INCREASE INTERNATIONAL TENSION. THE UNITED STATES WAS GOVERNED BY FLASHES OF EMOTION AND SHORT-TERM CONSIDERATIONS.
3. THE TONE OF BREZHNEV'S COMMENTS ON EUROPE WAS IN NOTABLE CONTRAST TO WHAT HE HAD TO SAY ABOUT THE USA, ALTHOUGH IN SUBSTANCE THEY GAVE NO REASON TO SUPPOSE THAT ANY REAL PROGRESS ON THE POINTS AT ISSUE BETWEEN WESTERN EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION IS POSSIBLE. HE REAFFIRMED THAT NO NEGOTIATIONS ON THEATRE NUCLEAR FORCES WERE POSSIBLE FOLLOWING NATO'S DECISION OF LAST DECEMBER. IT WAS EVIDENT FROM WHAT HE HAD TO SAY THAT THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP WOULD STILL LIKE DETENTE ON ITS TERMS IN EUROPE ALTHOUGH THE SUBJECTS HE MENTIONED (THE GSCE MEETING IN MADRID AND WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS FOR TALKS ON DISARMAMENT) ARE ONES IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS INTIMATELY INVOLVED.

IN MADRID AND WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS FOR TALKS ON DISARMAMENT)
THE ONES IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS INTIMATELY INVOLVED.

4. BREZHNEV SAID NOTHING NEW ON AFGHANISTAN; INDEED HE WAS
NOTABLY UNSPECIFIC ABOUT THE COURSE OF EVENTS IN THAT COUNTRY
AND THE CALL FOR SOVIET SUPPORT. PERHAPS THE LEADER-
SHIP HAVE REALISED THAT THEIR COVER-STORIES ARE UNCONVINCING,
AND HOPE TO BLUR THE PICTURE. HE CLAIMED THAT AFGHANISTAN
WAS A FAR AWAY AND UNIMPORTANT COUNTRY FROM THE US POINT OF
VIEW, BUT A PLACE OF STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE TO THE USSR WHERE
EVENTS HAD LED TO A POTENTIALLY 'SERIOUS THREAT TO THE
SECURITY OF THE SOVIET STATE ON ITS SOUTHERN FRONTIER'.

5. BREZHNEV PROBABLY HAD A SOVIET AS WELL AS FOREIGN
AUDIENCE IN MIND. HE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN CONCERNED TO REASSURE
THE SOVIET PUBLIC AND PERHAPS ALSO SOME OF THE LEADERSHIP
ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICIES IN AFGHANISTAN. HENCE,
FOR INSTANCE THE INVOCATION OF THE SECURITY OF THE SOVIET
STATE. HE ADMITS THAT THE DECISION TO HELP THE AFGHAN GOVT
WAS NOT AN EASY ONE. IT WAS A LIE TO SUGGEST THAT THE USSR HAD
EXPANSIONIST AIMS TOWARDS IRAN OR PAKISTAN. THE SOVIET UNION
REMAINED COMMITTED TO DETENTE. THE SOVIET UNION HAD NOT
SOUGHT THE ARRANGEMENTS WHICH THE AMERICANS WERE NOW ABROGATING.
THEY COULD GET ALONG QUITE WELL WITHOUT THE UNITED STATES,
WHOSE COUNTER-MEASURES WOULD BOOMERANG, (BREZHNEV'S ASSURANCE
THAT THE SOVIET POPULATION WILL NOT SUFFER IN RESPECT OF
CEREALS OR CEREAL PRODUCTS WAS A TYPICAL SOVIET HALF TRUTH.,
IT IS ANIMAL FEED, LIVESTOCK AND MEAT WHICH WILL BE AFFECTED).

6. THE WHOLE STATEMENT IS IN FACT A HECTORING ATTEMPT TO
CONDEMN THE UNITED STATES AND WOO EUROPE. IT AVOIDS THE
PROBLEM THAT DETENTE REQUIRED A STABLE US-SOVIET RELATIONSHIP
AND DOES NOT EVEN GIVE ANY INDICATION OF SPECIFIC MEASURES
TO PROMOTE EUROPEAN CONFIDENCE IN SOVIET INTENTIONS.

KEEBLE

NN

Sekret Division

010



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

1 February 1980

ha. Paul

Dear Brian,

The Soviet Embassy is organising a reception on 21 February to mark the 62nd Anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces. A number of FCO officials have received invitations.

Lord Carrington's view is that it would be quite wrong for officials to attend such an event in present circumstances. He has therefore instructed FCO officials to decline the invitations. He hopes that Ministers and officials in your Department will do the same. I should therefore be grateful if you would ensure that any who may have received invitations to this reception are aware of Lord Carrington's views.

I am copying this letter to the Private Secretaries to the Secretaries of State for Trade, Industry and Energy, to the Private Secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and to Michael Alexander in No 10.

Yours etc

Paul

(P Lever)
Private Secretary

Brian Norbury Esq
PS/Secretary of State
for Defence
Main Building
Whitehall
London