



10th September 1976

Confidential.

The Rt Hon William Whitelaw CH MC MP House of Commons SWIA OAA

You may remember that you and I corresponded — with copies to Margaret and Geoffrey — earlier in the year about the BBC lecture series on economics by Galbraith. I think we all agreed that the BBC had — in the light of Galbraith's open support for the social contract, incomes policies, Wilson, etc — initiated what might in effect be or at least include a very partisan presentation. I think that you were contemplating writing to the BBC to warn them that they ought to reconsider their alleged belonce plan — particularly in the light of Galbraith's open support for the Government's policies in articles and letters to our press — or at least allow equivalent time to someone who would take a very different point of view.

It may be that you have already spoken to the BBC.

Perhaps it may be useful if I pass on the little extra information that I now have.

The BBC still seem to be going ahead. I made a very gentle and noncommittal enquiry and was told that the series would not start for several months - (so there is still time for them to reconsider or to fit in with our request - my NOC, NO Their!)

In the meanwhile you may have been aware that Milton Friedman - at the invitation of the IEA - gave a lecture on the Economics of Galbraith to a fairly crowded audience at St John's, Smith Square, at the end of last month. The BBC had a recording van present and they have therefore some critical material, since Friedman - while chivalrous, impeccably courteous and personally friendly about Galbraith, was devastating in his analysis of the man's economics.



But even if Friedman's entire lecture were broadcast it could not conceivably offset the tone of voice and possibly the implications in the proposed thirteen Galbraith lectures.

Galbraith is socialist, interventionist, antienterprise, and totally indifferent to the realities
of life. He is not respected by economists but he
is a facile journalist sort of a writer with a huge
lay following who believe the rubbish he propagates
- and he could do the country and us as a party immense
damage if he is given the pedestal which the BBC proposes.

At the risk of going on too long I now turn to the question of possible protagonists.

I am not an expert on TV quality. I assume, so as not to underestimate the danger, that Galbraith is good. I am told that he was demolished by Enoch in a televised Oxford Union debate some years ago - but that won't help us now. There are very few people, if any, who have the ideal combination of

- (a) fame Galbraith is damnably well known to a large potentially frating section of the population:
- (b) projectly articulate Galbraith is a powerful coiner of phrases - "the affluent society": "private affluence and public squalogir": "the technostructure":
- (c) deeply informed in economics and in industry, with precise examples and anecdotes at command in order to be able to rebut Galbraith's highly selective abuse of economics and misuse of so-called industrial evidence:
- (d) robust and yet warm enough in character to make a powerfully destructive case without appearing at all inhuman:

and

(e) preferably witty and pungent.



You will agree that it is a tall order!

I am copying this letter of course to Margaret and to Geoffrey. You and they - if you and they are with me so far! - will have your own ideas. I - as a non-TV expert - have two ideas.

My first choice would be Frank McFadzean ex civil servant, Visiting Professor at Strathclyde
University, ex-Chairman of SHELL, now Chairman of
BRITISH AIRWAYS. I know nothing about his capacity
on TV but I can vouch that he is ideal under every
other head.

The second is more exotic - Professor Peter Bauer - ex-Hungarian, still with an accent: ideal, apart from that, under every other head. I am told that he had a television triumph on some very controversial subject like foreign aid and I know that he was snowed under by letters of agreement from the public.

The other academics who would take our point of view do not seem to me to have the colour and vitality needed, and few of the industrialists have the moral, philosophic and economic depth and self-confidence that McFadzean has at command.

Finally, I have one piece of what I think you will agree is good news - whatever happens. Some years ago McFadzean, in his Visiting Professor capacity, gave a series of four lectures on Galbraith to the students of Strathclyde. They were annihilating. I read them at the time - and treasured them. I heard of the Galbraith danger I wrote to Frank and told him that it was his public duty to bring the lectures up to date so that they could be republished to coincide with Galbraith's series if it came off. He, managing both SHELL and BRITISH AIRWAYS in tandem!, naturally refused. But - great character that he is, he recognised the danger of a rampant Galbraith philosophy, and changed his mind. Despite his huge tasks, he has totally rewritten the lectures. I have the manuscript. He proposes to add a further ten pages to cover one aspect that he has so far ignored and there will therefore be available for publication - by the Centre for Policy Studies - a first-class roughly 20,000 word booklat at the time that seems most apt.





But, welcome though this is and deeply grateful as I am to Frank, it will not on its own offset the harm that could emerge to country and party.

I am sending a copy of this not only to Margaret and Geoffrey as above but also to Peter Thorneycroft, Angus Maude and Chris Patten so that each of them may be informed. The McFadzean booklet is still confidential though of course if either you or Margaret or Geoffrey do happen to see him I am sure that a word of appreciation for the really public spirited extra effort he has undertaken would be much appreciated.

(x A few other conductors from industry Amoral Rall. Amoral brain. Amoral brain. Amoral braintock. Musical Islam - but you will no doubt his reportions from a few of we his reportions from a few of we you work to do so. They wently if you work to do so. They wently all lack the Foodscan's solid group all lack the Foodscan's solid group of both philosophy and reality.