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ABSTRACT

In February, 1975, Great Britain's Conservative and Unionist Party elected the Right Honorable Margaret Thatcher, M.P. to the position of Leader of the Party. The Conservative Party was at that time a minority party; thus Mrs. Thatcher became the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition. Mrs. Thatcher became the first woman in Britain ever to head a major political party. She emerged after an intense ideological struggle within the Conservative Party. In the battle for the party leadership she defeated Edward Heath, then leader of the Party and former Prime Minister. From the time of her election in February, 1975, until the defeat of the Government in April, 1979, Mrs. Thatcher continued to rally strength and unity as the leader of the party. She led a shift in the ideological focus of the Conservative Party from the left to the right; instead of a party in sympathy with the social democrats and what some regarded as "a palatable brand of British Socialism", the Conservatives under Margaret Thatcher became proponents of free enterprise and de-nationalization.

On Wednesday, March 28, 1979, Prime Minister James Callaghan's minority Government fell. The vote was 311-310 on a censure motion brought by the Opposition that amounted to a vote of confidence. After his defeat Callaghan
went to Buckingham Palace to propose that Queen Elizabeth
dissolve Parliament as soon as the essential business was
finished and set the election of a new House of Commons for
May 3.

Although several biographies of Margaret Thatcher
are in print, none analyzes the rhetorical skill which she
had demonstrated throughout her career. The period of this
study is of particular interest to the critic; during the
four year period (1975-1978) Mrs. Thatcher rose in prominence
within her own party and gained a wider acceptance by the
public as a prospective Prime Minister. As leader of the
Conservative Party, Mrs. Thatcher became the voice and standard
bearer for a new conservatism. To a great extent she was
the one responsible for convincing the public that the Conser­
vatives were able to govern more effectively than Labor,
and most importantly, that they would do so as a result of
her leadership.

This study focuses on the party conference speeches
delivered by Mrs. Thatcher annually from 1975-1978. On these
occasions Margaret Thatcher spoke to both the members of the
Conservative Party in the immediate audience and to the
general public through the medium of television; thus on
these occasions, she spoke to considerably larger audiences
than she did on any other occasions during the period. Those
party conferences provided the leader of the Conservative
Party with an opportunity to outline an alternative course
for the nation and her party. The written transcripts of
the speeches reveal Margaret Thatcher's dominant theme to be the necessity in leading Britain out of socialism and re-establishing a free market economy.

These speeches offer the rhetorical critic an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a speaker whose goal for each speech was to depict the plight of Great Britain for a widely diversified audience. The intellectual and emotional make-up of the audiences presented the speaker with challenges unlike any she encountered on other speech occasions.

Margaret Thatcher's party conference speeches from 1975-1978 are likely to have contributed to her credibility as a future head of state. This study examines her goals as a speaker, the way in which she sought to achieve them and the general effectiveness of her party conference speeches from 1975-1978.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In February, 1975, Great Britain's Conservative and Unionist Party elected the Right Honorable Margaret Thatcher, M.P. to the position of Leader of the Party. The Conservative Party was at that time a minority party; thus Mrs. Thatcher became the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition. Mrs. Thatcher became the first woman in Britain ever to head a major political party. She emerged victorious after an intense ideological struggle within the Conservative Party in which she gained the reputation as the only person "man enough"\footnote{Tricia Murray, Margaret Thatcher (London: W. H. Allen and Co. Ltd., 1978), p. 112.} to stand against Edward Heath, the leader of the party and former Prime Minister. From the time of her election in February, 1975, until the defeat of the Government in April, 1979, Mrs. Thatcher, as the leader of the party, continued to rally strength and promote unity. She led a shift in the ideological focus of the Conservative Party from the left to the right; instead of a party in sympathy with the social democrats and what some regarded as "a palatable brand of British socialism", the Conservatives
under Margaret Thatcher became proponents of free enterprise and de-nationalization.

On Sunday, March 25, 1979, The New York Times reported the likelihood of Labor's failure to win in the forthcoming vote of confidence. The writer described a new Government lead by Margaret Thatcher in this way:

Presuming, for the moment, that she has a comfortable majority and that she moves toward her stated goals in a cool and calculated way, Britain can expect a slow but substantial turn to the right--not a dizzying lurch away from the postwar welfare state, but a determined attempt to rein it in. A large portion of North Sea oil revenues would be diverted into rebuilding the country's industrial plant. More nationalization would be shunned.²

On Wednesday, March 28, 1979, Prime Minister James Callaghan's minority Government fell. The vote was 311-310 on a censure motion brought by the Opposition that amounted to a vote of confidence. Although the Prime Minister is not bound by law to quit if he loses a confidence vote, there is a precedent which all previous Prime Ministers have followed. James Callaghan is the first Prime Minister ousted on a vote of confidence since Ramsay MacDonald, Britain's first Labor premier, was turned out 58 years ago. Callaghan went to Buckingham Palace to propose that Queen Elizabeth dissolve Parliament as soon as the essential business was finished and set the election of a new House of Commons for May 3.

I. Purpose of the Study

Although several biographies of Margaret Thatcher are in print, none analyzes the rhetorical skill which she has demonstrated throughout her career. The period of this study is of particular interest to the critic; during the four year period (1975-1978) Mrs. Thatcher rose in prominence within her own party and gained a wider acceptance by the public as a prospective Prime Minister. The victory of the Conservative party in the general election on May 3, 1979, depends largely on two factors: (1) the inability of Labor to persuade the public that in time they will be able to cope with the problems at hand and (2) the success of the Conservatives in convincing the voters that they are now able to govern effectively. As leader of the Conservative Party, Mrs. Thatcher became the voice and standard bearer for a new conservatism. To a great extent she was the one responsible for convincing the public that the Conservatives were able to govern more effectively than Labor and, most importantly, that they would do so as a result of her leadership.

This study focuses on the party conference speeches delivered by Mrs. Thatcher annually from 1975-1978. On these occasions Margaret Thatcher spoke to both the members of the Conservative Party in the immediate audience and to the general public through the medium of television; thus on these occasions, she spoke to considerably larger
audiences than she did on any other occasions during this period. Those party conferences provided the leader of the Conservative Party with an opportunity to outline an alternative course for the nation and her party. The written transcripts of the speeches reveal Margaret Thatcher's dominant theme to be the necessity in leading Britain out of socialism and re-establishing a free market economy.

These speeches offer the rhetorical critic an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of a speaker whose goal for each speech was to depict the plight of Great Britain for a widely diversified audience. The intellectual and emotional make-up of the audiences presented the speaker with challenges unlike any she encountered on other speech occasions. The party conferences provide the general public an opportunity to see and hear, via television, the leaders of the major political parties. As Leader of the Opposition Mrs. Thatcher presented herself and her policies each October to an audience with contrasting and conflicting needs.

Margaret Thatcher's party conference speeches from 1975-1978 are likely to have contributed to her effectiveness as leader of the Conservative Party, to her rise in prominence in Great Britain, and to her credibility as a future head of state. It is the purpose of this study to examine her goals as a speaker, the way in which she sought to achieve them and the general effectiveness of her party conference speeches from 1975-1978.
II. Contributory Studies

Parallel studies using techniques similar to this one are the following: Reta Alice Gilbert's *A Description and Evaluation of the Public Speaking of the Anti-Corn Law League, 1938-1846*, Jerry Allen Hendrix' *The Speaking of John Sharp Williams in the League of Nations Debates, 1918-1920*, Morris L. McCauley's *The Preaching of the Reverend Rowland Hill (1744-1833), Surrey Chapel, London*, and James Woodrow Parkerson's *Senator Henry Stuart Foote of Mississippi: A Rhetorical Analysis of His Speeches in Behalf of the Union, 1849-1852*. These works have aided the researcher in the organization of data and the division of chapters in the present study.

III. Plan of the Study

This dissertation is a rhetorical analysis of Margaret Thatcher's party conference speeches delivered between 1975-1978, a period which followed her election to the leadership of the party and which preceded the first general election in which she participated as leader of the conservative party. Chapter I, the introduction, provides the orientation necessary for understanding both the purpose of the study and the overall plan of the study.

Chapter II is an examination of the speaker's background, including a description of her childhood, formal education and professional experiences; and her delivery
which includes a description of her physical attributes, vocal quality, and bodily action.

Chapter III consists of an analysis of the immediate audiences and occasions with an emphasis on the historical events directly related to the character and conduct of the audiences.

Chapter IV presents a discussion of the way in which the speaker organized the speeches and an outline of the structure of each discourse.

Chapter V is an analysis of the speaker's use of the logical and emotional modes in the party conference speeches and an evaluation of their effectiveness.

Chapter VI is an analysis of the speaker's use of the ethical mode; relevant to this are: (1) a discussion of the speaker's image as it has evolved in the press; (2) an examination of her associations within the Conservative Party; and (3) an evaluation of her intrinsic ethical appeals and their effectiveness with her audiences.

Chapter VII evaluates the speaker's general effectiveness.

Chapter VIII constitutes a discussion of conclusions reached in each of the analyses of the elements in Margaret Thatcher's rhetoric.
IV. Institutions and Sources

The researcher interviewed many academicians, journalists, members of Parliament, party workers, and informed citizens during her visits to England in 1977 and 1978. The interviews which proved to be of particular relevance to this study were the following:

- Lord Blake; Provost, Queens College, Oxford, Historian, Scholar, Political Observer.
- Robert Rhodes James; M.P., Historian, Scholar.
- Lord Crowther-Hunt; Exeter College Oxford, Constitutional advisor under Sir Harold Wilson, Political Observer.
- Janet Brown; Television and stage performer, well-known for her impressions of Margaret Thatcher.

In September, 1977, the researcher heard Mrs. Thatcher speak at a dinner meeting of the English Speaking Union at the Houston Oaks Country Club in Houston, Texas. The writer met and conversed briefly with Mrs. Thatcher.

Conversations and correspondence with Richard Ryder, Margaret Thatcher's personal spokesman, were of special value to the researcher in gaining practical information about the Conservative Central Office on Smith Square, London; the Centre for Policy Studies on Wilfred Street, London; and the daily life and work habits of Mrs. Thatcher.

Periodicals

The researcher read over 2,400 newspaper articles relevant to this project during her visits to London.
Magazine and newspaper articles represent publishers throughout Great Britain.

Institutions

The researcher had a staff pass at Conservative Central Office on Smith Square and had complete access to the vast collection of press clippings at C.C.O. The audio and video tape facilities there were also made available to the researcher, enabling her to view Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches and the party political broadcasts.

V. Important Terms

The Government

The Government is comprised of the Prime Minister and his cabinet; therefore when the term is capitalized it refers to that particular body. The Government exists because it has a majority in the House of Commons. It is a party Government; thus in the general election the electorate chooses which party will govern. E.g., if it produces a Conservative majority, there will be a Conservative Government.

The major legislation enacted by Parliament is always that of the Government. The Government establishes the

external policy of the nation. The Government proposes and disposes, but always as the Government in Parliament. Parliament has no authority to govern, but only to criticize. Normally, "the two party system operates and the Government has homogeneous party majority." ⁴

**The Opposition⁵**

The Opposition is comprised of an alternative Government, the Leader of the Opposition and his/her Shadow Cabinet. When the term is capitalized it refers to that official group.

**The Shadow Cabinet**

The existence of a formal opposition in the British system elevates the role of the party not in power. For each member of the Cabinet, the Opposition has a counterpart, e.g. a Shadow Spokesman for Defense. The Shadow Cabinet provides an alternative to the Government in power.

**The Leader of the Opposition**

The Leader of the Opposition, as the alternative Prime Minister, has an official title, an office, and a salary. When the term is capitalized it refers to that official role.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 86.
CHAPTER II

THE AUDIENCE AND THE OCCASION

It is necessary to examine several aspects of British political history since World War II in order to understand the significance of recent Conservative Party conferences. The occasion of each annual conference (1975-1978) and the listeners in each audience can only be seen accurately within the context of past and present events in Great Britain. A survey of the social and political circumstances of the last several decades and an examination of the events of the past few years provide the means with which to understand the speaker's choice of subjects and ways of approaching each occasion.

Several topics important in reconstructing the audience and the occasion are:

Britain in the Post War Years
Political Events since 1974
Issues in the Present Election
The Tory Party and the "New Conservatism"

The Immediate Audience and Occasion

Some knowledge about each of these topics is essential in order to realize the context in which Mrs. Thatcher delivered her party conferences speeches (1975-1978).
The most difficult task is that of establishing a proper sense of historical development. Political and social events in Great Britain since World War II are interpreted very differently by academics and journalists alike. Perhaps the most important orientation for the reader is an awareness of the unique perspective from which each side views the other. If in fact a major political change is taking place in Britain today then there is perhaps great value in viewing the rival forces and in discerning the way in which they characterize one another. It is necessary to consider the accuracy of these perceptions and to evaluate the trends in sociological and political thought. If it is difficult for the "experts" to agree on where Great Britain has been and how she got there, it is seemingly impossible for them to reach any sort of consensus regarding where she is at present or where she is headed.

I. Great Britain in Post War Years

In a book entitled What's Wrong with Britain?, edited by Patrick Huber, City Editor of the Sunday Telegraph, a number of distinguished commentators give their views on the state of the nation. They discuss the nature and cause of "the British sickness". Three essays which trace the

---

6 "The British disease" is a term used to describe the economic and moral decline of Great Britain in the post war years. Opinion differs as to when it began and as to the exact nature of the malady, but there is general agreement as to the existence of what is called the
problems of the post war years indicate how widely opinions vary among historians seeking to explain the decline in Britain. Corelli Barnett, a distinguished military historian, has a reputation for rejecting the accepted version of events, i.e., pursuing a decided skepticism about national events. He believes in "total history", which he regards as an essential interlocking of political, military, social, economic, and technical facts. In his essay entitled "Obsolescence and Dr. Arnold" he suggests that the key to the present crisis lies in Britain's industrial incompetence:

Our real problem is "the English disease". And "the English disease" is not the novelty of the past 10 or even 20 years that even informed critics seem to support, but a phenomenon dating back more than a century. . .

Thus Dr. Barnett states that it is impossible to evaluate the postwar period without looking well into the nineteenth century. A summary of his case follows:

In the mid-1930's during the re-armament effort the Cabinet discovered that the British steel industry was totally inadequate. Armor for the new cruisers and air craft carriers had to be ordered from Czechoslovakia, America, and Germany who also supplied vast quantities of machine-tools because the British machine-tool industry was too

"British sickness" or the "English disease".

7"Obsolescence and Dr. Arnold," What's Wrong with Britain?, ed. Patrick Huber (Great Britain: Sphere Books Ltd., 1978), pp. 29-34.

8Ibid., p. 29.
small. Britain had to depend on foreign technology for the entire re-armament effort.9

Although the British still believed that Britain was "the workshop of the world" at the beginning of World War I, technology lagged far behind other industrialized countries. Exports consisted largely of coal and cotton goods. American steel and shells rescued Great Britain in the 1914-16 war effort.10

In the 1890's a "Wake up England!" campaign ran in several newspapers and the comparisons between British and foreign industry bear an uncanny resemblance to those made today. The problems cited then as now centered around the conservatism of British management, the lack of marketing skill, poor investment incentives, refusal to update plants and methods, and the "nihilistic opposition of British trade unions to technological strain."11 An 1884 Royal Commission on Technical Education reported that the Europeans had passed the British in applying science to industry and exhibiting efficiency in their industrial organization.

After visiting America in 1835 Richard Cobden reported that Britain's only hope for national prosperity lay "in the timely remodelling of our system, so as to put it as nearly as possible upon an equality with the improved

9Ibid., p. 30.
10Ibid., p. 30.
11Ibid., p. 31.
management of Americans".12

Thus, Corelli Barnett builds his case and dates the beginning of "the English disease" from the time when other nations became industrialized and British technology lost its world monopoly. Barnett considers the notion of a special British genius for technology to be one of the more indefensible British myths. He attributes the early industrial lead to chance historical factors. Only genius could have maintained that lead. Barnett is interested in why Britain did not respond to the advance of foreign technology in the 1860's by surpassing the competition.

The answers lie in the unique nature of our initial world technological monopoly, which bred a fatal complacency, even arrogance. We came to believe, like an army after a victorious war, that we had found the formula for success; and, as with such an army, faith in that formula quickly led to blinkered conservatism.13

According to Barnett the formula was based (1) on a belief in the "practical man" who learned on the job, "whether in the board room or on a work bench," and (2) on "a total disdain for the kind of thorough-going technical and scientific education to be found in rival countries by the 1860's".

In any case the individualistic doctrines of Victorian liberalism forbade the creation of an elaborate State education system on the European or American model. Right up to the Second World War, if not beyond, the British were to remain an ignorant and ill-trained nation compared with their competitors, for it was

12 Ibid., p. 31.
13 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
only between 1900 and 1944 that Britain belatedly and gradually built up a complete system of State education.\textsuperscript{14}

Victorian public schools produced men with a mission of governing the Empire. The ruling class held a contempt for Yankee professionalism and pushiness. Barnett sees the bias of the English middle-class and upper-class culture as one which has decided antipathy toward industry and industrial progress. This he regards as a major factor in Britain's decay.

If it is true that Britain has lacked both the necessary skills for technological advancement and the "requisite mental outlook"\textsuperscript{15} for nearly a century, then the dreams (voiced largely by the "new Conservatives")--of a thriving British economy based on free enterprise and a capitalism which causes more people to know a higher standard of living than the present system will allow--seem particularly farfetched.

Another cause of the "English disease" as Barnett diagnoses it also goes back to the industrial boom in the early 19th century; that cause is the alienation, embitterment, and hostility of the British urban working class. In the factory towns of the Industrial Revolution workers knew only ruthless exploitation and repression. That molded a segment of the nation.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 32.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 32.
Barnett sees this history of exploitation—and the lack of adequate housing, welfare, and education well into the twentieth century—coupled with 20 years of massive unemployment between the wars as the instruments which forged the special character of the British working class. "The cloth-cap mentality" as Barnett puts it contrasts sharply with the "middle-class outlook of German or Scandinavian workers".  

It is important to keep Barnett's thesis in mind throughout this study. If as he suggests the most powerful forces in British society have been resistant to technological adaptation and advancement, then we are bound to examine very carefully the existence of this "new climate" of which Lord Blake speaks and the impact of the "new Conservatism" which Paul Johnson, former editor of the New Statesman, sees as the bright hope and rising force of Britain today.

Barnett believes that the national character and outlook of Britain must be overhauled as well as the industrial system. Mrs. Thatcher maintains that the character of the British people is their greatest asset and given the strength of that resource she believes Britain has the capacity to become a nation which once again thrives economically and rejects socialism. It is essential to keep in mind historical perspectives and contrasting views of

16Ibid., p. 33.
Britain's national character when evaluating the audience and the occasion.

When Anthony Wedgwood Benn served as Minister of Technology he attributed Britain's slow rate of growth to the fragmentation of British industry. He saw the answer in giant corporations on the American pattern which would enable Britain to afford the necessary research to reorganize. He felt that a period of "construction and reform" began in 1964 and that industrial reconstruction was well underway: e.g., Rolls Royce, strengthened by a merger with Bristol Siddeley.

Sir Frank McFadzean, chairman of British Airways and Visiting Professor of Economics at Strathclyde University since 1967, counters Mr. Benn's position with evidence that successful invention is not dependent upon the size of operation; nor does he admit to a correlation between expenditure on research and economic growth.

Currently Mr. Wedgwood Benn views small business as the only true entrepreneurs. That seems to many to be ridiculous and Sir Frank characterizes those who lean toward that notion as "proponents of Galbraithian nonsense."

According to Sir Frank the unrealistic attitude

18 Ibid., pp. 29-40.
19 Ibid., p. 37.
toward the cost of government services and the false concept that they are in any way "free" are part of what is holding Britain back.

We have "free" education and "free" health service; we have subsidized milk, food, electricity, railways, coal and so forth. In fact these services are not free; all that can really be said is that the British government as taxpayers, or the victims of inflation, are financing the British public as consumers of the services provided by the government. . . . There is a growing weight of evidence that public expenditure over a considerable range at both national and local level is for all practical purposes out of control.

To the extent that the State cannot make costs go away there is a widespread hope that they will be carried by someone else; an attitude that finds a parallel in militant trade unionism when demands are made for massive wage increases unrelated to productivity. 20

The crucial point here is that there are those who suggest that Britain must accept the inflation rate in order to prevent unemployment. Sir Frank suggests that the choice is very different:

The choice is between a tightening of the money supply and a moderate degree of unemployment now or for us to progress into hyperinflation and eventually mass unemployment. 21

Lord Hailsham, a politician, political philosopher, and lawyer, describes the British plight as one of "moral betrayal, not economic failure". He seems to regard the search for "social justice" a poor excuse for the lack of patriotism, public spirit, and a desire to obey the law.

Certainly much of the criticism of the Labor Party

20Ibid., p. 39.
21Ibid., p. 40.
is rooted in the changing values within the party. Low wages and deplorable working conditions gave rise to a militancy that nearly everyone accepts as having been necessary. Today, the public sector is often the target of the trade union movement.

Lord Hailsham's analyses of the power structure and purposes of the trade union movement and the constitutional structure of the Labor Party are useful. Part of any discussion of postwar Britain must touch upon that body of opinion which credits Britain's decline to the socialistic policies of the Labor Party under the domination of the trade unions. The objective of the trade unions is to raise wages beyond the old surtax threshold, and, in other cases, where it is not overtly political, it is frequently to defeat some other, and supposedly weaker, union, or even, as in the London docks container dispute, another supposedly weaker, group within the same union.

The movement is more or less infiltrated at the top by the Marxists and fellow travellers of various hues, and so is the parliamentary Labor Party, which the trade union movement fairly effectively controls by its political funds, representing about four-fifths of the party's revenue, and its card votes which control about four-fifths of the votes in the party conference.

The Labor movement as a whole has more or less declared open war on the middle class, by seeking to abolish or restrict private medicine and education, to penalize
the self-employed, the investor, the small landlord, the farmer, the shopkeeper, by slanting the social services against them, and by new and destructive taxes like the Capital Transfer Tax and the wealth tax.

This description of the Labor Party illustrates the enormous change that both the country and the party have undergone since the early days of the British Labor Party. Heroes like Keir Hardie represented the courageous and abused who dared to change the world. Such men and the world they encountered no longer exist in quite the same way, but they engendered great waves of enthusiasm and compassion. Today's Labor Party is perhaps still riding the crest of such waves. Hardie's experiences as a young man illustrate the agony to which the early Labor Party responded.

The illegitimate son of a Scottish servant girl, Hardie had been raised in the most degrading poverty in the slums of the Patrik district of Glasgow. His mother later married, and the couple had eight children. At the age of seven Hardie obtained a job as a delivery boy, working twelve-and-one-half hours a day for fifty cents a week. . . . At a time when his mother was pregnant, his stepfather unemployed, a younger brother lay dying, and Hardie's wage constituted the entire family income Hardie arrived late for work one morning after tending his mother most of the night. His employer not only dismissed him, but fined the boy his previous weeks wages in order to make him more punctual in the future.

---


Such stories explain the moral commitment to Labor that transcended class divisions; against such injustice socialist ideology offered a new and better way for Great Britain. Both the villains and the victims have changed in the decades since Keir Hardie.

J. B. Priestly offers a somewhat sympathetic explanation of the current militancy in the trade union movement. He seeks to explain why--now that there is less luxury among the rich and far less discomfort at the other end--there is more bitterness and greater militancy than ever before. Two traditions live on: one which is struggling not to die states that one class is entitled to more benefits than another class; a second, more powerful force, feeds on the memory of past abuse, of overwork and underpay, and determines never to let it happen again. Priestly concludes that trade union officials are "haunted men carrying a large chip on the shoulder".24

Priestly also suggests that while the British might want the benefits derived from high pressure, industrialized society, the consuming interest in the gross national product, life dominated by production and booming trade cause most people to draw back. "We don't want that kind of Britain. We are at heart more civilized people than

our successful competitors."\(^{25}\)

Priestly talks of the central threat to the country—one which has developed gradually in postwar Britain.

We have done the best we can in this country to free people from the intolerable discipline of circumstances. (Example: "Do the job right or clear out!") But people freed from this discipline must move towards self-discipline, otherwise they become idle-minded, undependable, not fit to play a part in a liberal democracy. And at the moment there are too many of these people around, especially among the young.\(^{26}\)

But like Margaret Thatcher, Priestly believes that when all else fails that British people will rally with all of the greatness that is buried within them demonstrating courage and "a spirit, at once compassionate and valiant".\(^{27}\)

There are numerous explanations for the decline in Britain; controversy flourishes in nearly every area of discussion. Has the national character shaped the destiny of Great Britain? Is a disastrous monetary policy to blame for current economic troubles? Are the educational systems and the biases against technical training the reasons for the lack of productivity? For the present study the questions are more important than the answers; they allow us to sense the enormity of problems in Britain today and to view the answers from several perspectives. There is no single "Conservative view" of postwar Britain, but there is evidence that the majority of Conservative M.P.'s rally around their

\(^{25}\)Ibid., p. 78.

\(^{26}\)Ibid., p. 79.

\(^{27}\)Ibid., p. 80.
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leader and support her views. She has gained ground in the past four years. Her views are the ones which many in the party feel will change the course of British history. Thus, she not only carried a program to the party and the people in her party conference speeches; she has popularized an historical perspective.

II. Political Events Since 1974

The general election in 1979 will be the eleventh time that the British have gone to the polls since 1945. If the Conservatives win, Margaret Thatcher's position as the first woman Prime Minister will be of certain historical significance. A win for Labor would mark the first time that party has ever won a third election in succession. The Liberal Party faces an enormous challenge and with it the possibility that the Scottish Nationalists may emerge as the third largest party in Great Britain.²⁸

From the perspective of Labor sympathizers, Labor will go the country defending a solid list of achievements. Those who are not inclined to view the Labor party with much compassion feel that Labor's only hope for success lies in concealing the failures of the Government and, in doing so, promoting policies which are certain to hasten the ruin of Great Britain.

It would be impossible to understand the audience or the occasion for any speech delivered in Great Britain since 1974 without some knowledge of the important political events of the period. The circumstances which have shaped the thinking of the past few years warrant some discussion. This list itself indicates something of the flow of events:

The General Elections of 1974
The February Election
The Return of Harold Wilson
The October Election
The Economic Conditions, 1974-1976
Inflation
The 1975 Budget and the £6 a Week Pay Policy
The 1976 Sterling Crisis
The National Enterprise Board
Party Leadership 1974-1977
Margaret Thatcher's Leadership Victory
The Thorpe Affair
The Resignation of Harold Wilson
The Fight for Labor Leadership
The Lib-Lab Pact
Issues, 1977

Many of these events went unreported by the American press; thus, a simple explanation of the significance of the topics listed provide a basic orientation of the period.

The General Elections of 1974

The February Election

The general election of February 1974 was held during a state of emergency and the country was on a three day work week. The Arab oil embargo continued after the Arab-Israeli war; the miners dispute began in November, 1973; electrical engineers banned out-of-hours work; the Bank Rate rose to 13%. In December, 1973, a 63° F limit on office heating
was imposed together with a 50 miles per hour speed limit. The railwaymen's union, ASLEF, brought the nation to a crisis point when they banned overtime and began a policy of non-cooperation. On the 7th of February at 12:45 p.m. Prime Minister Edward Heath announced that the nation would go to the polls on February 28th.

**Firm Action for a Fair Britain**, the Conservative Party manifesto, proclaimed the need for strong government to overcome inflation, that government must win out over any group of worker, however powerful such groups became. Heath represented the Conservatives as the hope for those who had no union to protect them and who were suffering at the hands of those who had.

Labor sought to convince the country that they had got the country out of a mess in 1964-70 and left it financially strong. In their view they were the only ones ready to do that difficult job again.

The general election of February 1974 provided an excellent opportunity for the Liberal and Nationalist parties. Liberals rose higher in the opinion polls than they had ever been during an election. They emphasized a permanent prices and incomes policy that would be backed by penalties to those whose actions caused inflation.

The election campaign was, by all accounts, a bitter one. For the first time since 1929 the election gave no party an overall majority. Both Labor and Conservatives had a drop in support. The Liberals and Nationalists profited
greatly from the election, but the Liberals gained only 14 seats while they won 6 million votes. However, the votes polled for the Liberals marked a great personal triumph. A high percentage of the electorate, 78.7%, voted; that was still below the record polls in 1950 and 1951 (84.5% and 82.6% respectively).

The nature of the Conservative defeat affected the response of the party leader, Heath. Instead of offering an immediate resignation he entered into discussions with Jeremy Thorpe, the Liberal leader, to determine whether they could agree on a working arrangement. The failure of these talks weakened the Conservatives in 1974. Thus, Harold Wilson was assured of the unlikelihood of an anti-labor government.

The Return of Harold Wilson

The new government under Wilson had a balance of left-wing politicians and those who were more moderate. James Callaghan went to the foreign office; Roy Jenkins was at the Home Office and Denis Healey took the job of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Michael Foot became Secretary of State for employment and Wedgwood Benn, Secretary for Industry. The two women in the cabinet were Barbara Castle at Social Services and Shirley Williams in the new post of Secretary of State for Prices and Consumer Protection.

Harold Wilson ruled out a coalition with any other group and thus another election was inevitable. The 1974 Parliament lasted for six months—until October 1974—making
it the shortest Parliament in British history since 1681.

The social contract became the most significant plank of Labor's policy. The social contract is simply the relationship with the Trade Unions which Labor conceived in opposition and which they developed in the short Parliament of 1974.

A view of the social contract from the perspective of journalists who write for The Guardian, a newspaper in sympathy with Labor, describes the spirit of the social contract. It is important to pay particular attention to this view because Mrs. Thatcher has repudiated the success of the social contract again and again:

The Labor government would pursue a series of policies—the abolition of hated Conservative legislation, increases in subsidies and social benefits, the extension of public ownership—which they and the unions alike believed to be in the national interest. In return for that, the unions would moderate the bargaining power of wage negotiations. But the formula on which the Social Contract, in its role as arbiter of wage settlements, was based turned out to be ambiguous. The unions were entitled to such settlements as would enable them to keep pace with the rising cost of living. But was that supposed to compensate for the rise which had already taken place—or to shore them up against the rises which might take place in the future? "If settlements can be confined to what is needed to cover the increase in the cost of living," said Healey in his supplementary budget of 12 November 1974, "we can reasonably expect to see a decrease in the rate of inflation in the coming year." But the accumulation of settlements well above what was needed to compensate for past price rises quickly demonstrated that the Chancellor's was a minority interpretation of the deal.29

---

The October Election

The Parliament had lasted only 184 days and for the second time in the century, two general elections had occurred within the same year, the first such occasion being 1910.

Liberals contested every seat in England and Wales except for Lincoln. Labor urged the electorate to give it the mandate necessary to finish the programs it had begun. Labor's majority was not a great triumph, but the gain of a majority of 43 over the Conservatives.

Economic Conditions, 1974-1976

Inflation

The close victory left Labor with the possibility of a minority government in the near future. By-election defeats and defections could easily wipe out the narrow majority.

The four main political targets in Wilson's economic program all failed—adequate economic growth, full employment, a stable balance of payments, and stable prices. Unemployment rose by 140,000; over 700,000 were unemployed. The volume of consumer spending fell for the first time in 20 years. Clearly, the wages policy within the social contract appeared not to be working. Some wage settlements

\[30\] Ibid., p. 23.
rose to 30%.

The 1975 Budget and the £6 a Week Pay Policy

Denis Healey's "rough and tough budget"--as he called it, preceded a compulsory wages policy. £6 represented 10% of average earnings and the government determined that sum to be the ceiling on pay increases. No exceptions were to be allowed and those earning more than £8500 were to get nothing more. No firms could pass on in price rises any part of a pay settlement. Up until August 1976 the limit appears not to have been breached. Although there were no legal sanctions against individual unions, the price code mentioned operated as very powerful sanctions. The recession in the economy and the voluntary cooperation of the trade unions aided in upholding the wages policy. However, both the budget and the wages policy implemented during a serious world-wide recession led to a sharp rise in unemployment.

The 1976 Sterling Crisis

On the 1st of January 1976 the £ had stood at $2.024. By September 28th it had collapsed to $1.637. Neither the balance of payments deficit nor the high internal rate of inflation sufficiently explained the crisis. Everywhere people feared the future of the economy and the failure

31Ibid., p. 24.
of confidence in business. The Government appeared unable to contain public expenditure. Publication of a White Paper on Public Expenditure 1979-80 heightened the fears of the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement. The North Sea Oil aided Britain's recovery but not before the crisis had struck a nerve and an alarm had been sounded.

The National Enterprise Board

In November of 1975 Parliament enacted legislation which provided for a new National Enterprise Board. Even before the board came into operation the state rapidly made acquisitions in the private sector. By 1976 the companies partially or wholly owned by the State included Ferranti, Alfred Hebert, British Leyland, Rolls-Royce, Dunford and Elliot. The nationalization of the aerospace and shipbuilding industries occurred through the passing of the Aircraft and Shipbuilding Nationalization Bill. However, the Government had to agree to delete ship-repairing companies in order to pass legislation during the 1976-77 session. Conservatives and Liberals opposed the bill at all stages. The Lords defeated a private bill to enable the British Transport Docks Board to acquire Flexistone docks. Labor took no action on its long-standing commitment to nationalize all ports. In spite of pressure within the party to legislate to take banks and insurance companies

---
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into public ownership, the leadership resisted. The left wing of the party constantly sought to replace the mixed economy, but the Labor government chose to amend and adapt.

Party Leadership, 1974-1976

Margaret Thatcher's Leadership Victory

Heath, having lost two campaigns in quick succession, immediately faced the prospect of being replaced. The party had begun to realign itself and rethink political and economic ideology throughout the Heath administration; suddenly the shifts in thinking became visible and explosive. While members clamored for Heath's replacement, Heath held his ground, waiting for the report of the Home Committee which had been set up to consider the future method of choosing the party leader. The Committee recommended that when the party was in opposition, there should be an annual election by all M.P.s.

Margaret Thatcher came forward as a candidate only after Sir Keith Joseph made it clear that he would not run. Her friendship with Sir Keith; her zeal for free enterprise; her appreciation of monetarist policies; and what many termed as her middle-class values set Mrs. Thatcher apart from the other candidates. Some observers, such as Lord Crowther-Hunt, former Constitutional advisor to Wilson, still regard
her leadership victory as something of a fluke.  

Few M.P.s were willing to come out against Heath in the first ballot. Clearly it was a vote of confidence. Margaret Thatcher received 130 votes, Edward Heath 119, Hugh Fraser 16, and there were 11 abstentions.

For the second ballot four more former ministers declared their candidacy and Hugh Fraser withdrew. But after the second ballot on February 10, 1979, a third was unnecessary. Margaret Thatcher won 146 votes out of 271 cast giving her a clear over-all majority. William Whitelaw received 76 votes, Sir Jeffery Howe and James Prier 19 each, and John Peyton 11. Margaret Thatcher, like the others, had a great deal to lose in running on the first ballot, but her courage paid off. For the first time a major political party chose for its leader a woman.

The Guardian (pro-Labor) correspondents, like many others, characterized Mrs. Thatcher's victory as a swing to the right.

For the leadership vote had led not merely to defeat for Heath but also for such center moderates as Whitelaw and Howe. Margaret Thatcher's new team, however, was in most respects made up of a fair cross section of the party, although the dropping of such liberals as Robert Carr, Peter Walker and Nicholas Scott and the appointment of Sir Keith Joseph to take charge of policy and research rather disguised the fact.  

---


Under Margaret Thatcher the Conservatives won a series of by-election victories. In September of 1975 the Times [London] came out in support of her "new Conservatism" which gave credence to Margaret Thatcher's authority and documented the significance of the ideological struggle within the party.

The speeches which Margaret Thatcher delivered between February, 1975, and July, 1977, outlined a struggle, charted a strategy, and illustrate her rise from the position of elected leader to the role of undisputed head of her party. The rise was neither gradual nor constant. During the spring and summer of 1975, the British press waited for a personality to emerge from the calm that followed the clamor of leadership battle. For those who had expected her to break out of the starting gate chomping at the bit the morning after her election, she proved to be something of a disappointment until she delivered her speech in New York City on September 15, 1975. The anger and delight which are reflected in the mass of conflicting conclusions in the press reports indicate that her words drew the battle lines and established Margaret Thatcher as a controversial champion, an articulate and powerful voice. The speech was a major political victory for Mrs. Thatcher, and if the Conservative Party wins in the next general election it may well be viewed as the triumphant first step in the course of her becoming Prime Minister. The day after her New York speech the Evening News reported: "After seven months as Leader
of the Opposition, Mrs. Thatcher appears to have found her voice. A no-nonsense voice it is too, the voice of an alternative Prime Minister." The Washington Post outlined a wide range of responses back home, one of which was "The Times of London changing its generally disapproving editorial view of her as a result of the same New York speech, in which she voiced what the Times termed 'the new Conservatism'".

Mrs. Thatcher made a significant leap forward in July, 1977. Suddenly, she seemed to many observers to be moving rapidly toward No. 10 Downing Street. Paul Johnson, former editor of the New Statesman and a recent convert from socialism to the "new Conservatism" made this observation on July 24, 1977, in the Sunday Times.

For the first time since she was elected as Leader of the Opposition, she enjoyed an unqualified parliamentary triumph, and on a subject which is dearest to her heart and interests and which, indeed is absolutely essential to the future well-being of all of us--the conduct of the economy. These parliamentary triumphs are more important than they may seem to the outsider. For someone like Margaret Thatcher, who has never quite been accepted as a future Prime Minister, even by some on her own side, they are needed to establish the reservoir of self-confidence without which no one can get to the top in British politics.

---


This particular rhetorical triumph suggests the possibility of a casual relationship between Mrs. Thatcher's rhetorical and policy changes within the Government. Paul Johnson, who is both a respected and seasoned observer, also said this of her parliamentary success:

Oratorical victories do not spring out of thin parliamentary air. They reflect realities too. And the reality in this case is that the Government has now abandoned its own economic policy as a failure, and embraced Mrs. Thatcher's.\(^\text{38}\)

By 1977 Mrs. Thatcher had made enormous strides in refuting the claims of Keynesian economists and popularizing the monetarists' position. Her task seems to be that of convincing the people that a Conservative Government, under her leadership, will know how to make free enterprise work in Britain and to bring prosperity to a country on the verge of becoming a third rate power. Later chapters deal with the way in which Margaret Thatcher develops such ideas, but this chapter focuses on the way in which those ideas have become credible to the people of Great Britain. As an examination of the key political events since 1974 and the issues dominating the current election campaign provide the background necessary in order to understand Lord Blake's observations concerning the "changed climate" in British politics. Lord Blake perceives a new body of political thought and influence coming from the right, not the left. As Provost of Queens College, Oxford Robert Blake is in

\(^{38}\text{Ibid.}\)
constant contact with scholars, journalists, and students; from his vantage point "no one is listening to the socialists any more".  

The Thorpe Affair

Certainly the October 1974 election marked a distinct loss of momentum by the Liberals. In the by-elections up until the Lib-Lab "pact" of March, 1977, (discussed later in this chapter) the Liberals continued to lose strength.

By 1976, Thorpe had been party leader for nine years. His association with a collapsed secondary bank caused tremendous criticism. Amidst these circumstances a most unsavory affair surfaced in the press. Norman Scott, a former male model, alleged that he had a homosexual relationship with Thorpe. In spite of Thorpe's denials the affair caused a furor. Then on May 10 Thorpe resigned. The Liberals worked out a highly complex system to elect a new leader and David Steel, who had been the party's Chief Whip, emerged as leader. By December of 1978 Thorpe's private affairs dominated the news concerning the Liberal Party. As a result of the Scott affair Thorpe was charged with conspiracy to commit murder.

---

The Resignation of Harold Wilson

Harold Wilson announced on March 16, 1976, that he would resign as Prime Minister. The announcement came as a total surprise in spite of the rather sound reasons he put forward. Among his reasons were, first, his long career in Parliament; he had served on the front bench for thirty years, in the cabinet for eleven, and as Prime Minister for eight. Secondly, he felt that younger men should be given the opportunity to take his place; this proved ironic because at sixty Wilson was in his political prime and his eventual successor, James Callaghan, was older.

Critics of Wilson argued that he had quit with three major crises threatening: the economic crisis; a widening left-right split within the party; and an ever-decreasing parliamentary majority which made another election seem imminent. Wilson did not accept a peerage, but on April 22nd the announcement was made that he had received the Order of the Garter.

The Fight for the Labor Leadership

In the first ballot of the contest for the Labor leadership, six contestants stood. Michael Foot and Tony Benn represented the left wing; James Callaghan and Roy Jenkins, the moderate camp. Foot polled 90 votes; Callaghan 84, Jenkins 56, Benn 37, Healey 30, and Crossland 17. In the second round Callaghan and Foot led the race with
Callaghan receiving 141 and Foot 133. In the third ballot most of Healey's support went to Callaghan who won 176 votes to Foot's 137.

Foot's amazing success in the contest indicated the substantial leftward movement within the party in one decade. Although Foot's personal magnetism accounted for some support it did not entirely explain his success.

Callaghan became Prime Minister on April 5, 1976. In contrast to Wilson's brilliant academic career at Oxford, Callaghan had only an elementary and secondary education. He made his career as a civil service tax officer. Under Wilson he served as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Home Secretary, and Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary.

The Lib-Lab Pact

The Callaghan administration succeeded in holding on for as long as it did as a result of the working arrangement it came to with the Liberals. Labor has managed to hold on for the full five years before necessarily calling an election. Time, in some respects, has worked in Callaghan's favor.

In March, 1977, Callaghan faced certain defeat in a Conservative vote of "no confidence". He was weakened by by-election losses and the Nationalists had stated that they would vote against Labor in the vote of confidence. Callaghan's only hope for remaining Prime Minister and avoiding an immediate general election was an agreement
with the Liberals.

In spite of the criticism that both Callaghan and Steel received the pact proved a sensible solution for the Labor and Liberal parties neither of which wanted an election.

**Issues, 1977**

In 1977 the North Sea Oil benefits began to transform the balance of payments showing an actual surplus. The pound gained strength, largely because of the weakness of the dollar. The sterling crisis of 1976 clearly marked the gravest period in the government's economic struggles. But the economy was still in recession during 1977 and critics of the Government voiced doubts in Labor's ability to lead Britain into a period of prosperity.

The Devolution Bill provided another delicate issue which divided the Labor Party. The Labor Party relied heavily on support from the Scottish National Party.

The most popular scheme which was advanced by the majority of the Royal Commission on the Constitution, appointed in 1969, proposed the creation of regional assemblies for Scotland and Wales elected on the basis of proportional representation. However, eventually Labor came to support devolution with elected assemblies for Scotland and Wales. By mid-1978 devolution had moved closer to being a reality; it only remained for Scotland and Wales to give the necessary assent in the referendums.
As to the question of Ulster troubles, little was resolved. Elections were held in May 1975 in order that a constitutional convention might come together and recommend how the province should be governed. On the 5th of March, 1976, the convention was finally dissolved and direct rule from Westminster continued.

Finally, Labor's domestic legislation made some noteworthy changes in the society. Conflicts in the Lords centered around two measures--the Dock Work Regulation Bill and the Aircraft and Shipbuilding Industries Bill; the latter became law in March 1977. The main legislation which Callaghan could cite included the following:

- **Police Act** (establishing a Police Complaints Board authorized to assist the police in investigating charges made against the police by the public.)

- **Health Services Act** (providing for the progressive withdrawal of private medicine from National Health Service hospitals.)

- **The Education Act** (requiring local education authorities to abolish selection in secondary education.)

- **Race Relations Act** (created a new Commission for Racial Equality.)

### III. Issues in the 1979 Election

#### The Management of the Economy

Clearly, the management of the economy is the single greatest issue in the 1979 general election. It is also the most difficult one to describe with unwavering objectivity. It is important to look at the explanations which
economists and journalists have made regarding both the Government's management of the British economy and current economic theory. In their Election Guide journalists from the Guardian present an assessment of the present Government in a light which would be acceptable to most social democrats. Although labels are hazardous they are essential in distinguishing factions within great political parties such as the Conservative and Labor parties in Britain. The Tory left and the Labor right are often said to be committed to the ideals of social democracy, choosing the mixed economy as the means to achieve their goals. Both the Labor left and the Conservative right aim to change the economic system drastically if given the power to do so, the former desiring more government control and the latter working toward a free market economy. Such necessary simplifications of the ideological differences between the two parties present a particular difficulty to the American reader. We must resist the tendency to equate their "left" and "right" with our own; the differences are great. If we place Barry Goldwater, Philip Crane, or Ronald Reagan on the right end of the Republican Party and George McGovern on the left end of the Democratic Party, the entire range of ideological diversity would fit within Britain's Conservative Party. We have no major political party which contains a block of members who are out to reconstruct the economic system and nationalize all industry as is the case with Britain's Labor Party. Among "moderate" Conservatives at least there
is some question as to whether Mrs. Thatcher is at the right of the Conservative Party or is instead a moderate calling for a new Conservatism; it is essential for the American reader to remember that the left-right continuum in British politics is much more inclusive than our own. The middle ground continues to shift toward the left in Britain; thus a "middle way" or "moderate course" must be viewed strictly within the context of the British system.

The following summary of the Government's management of the economy is that of the Guardian journalists to which we referred earlier:

Labor's left condemned the failure to break out of the old, tried, and in their view, discredited, system of orthodox deflationary policies, rather than their own "alternative strategy" of industrial reconstruction through extensive state intervention behind protectionist walls. The Liberals put special weight on the instability of British government, the chop and change for largely party purposes which had robbed industry of what it had always needed most of all to encourage investment and enhance productivity: a climate of continuity. The Conservatives said that Britain's troubles in these years had been substantially of the Government's manufacturing, chiefly because of the Chancellor's failure to read the writings on the wall, his reluctance to cut public spending, his inconsistent governing of the money supply. The Conservatives put their hope in an "enterprise package" of major cuts in direct taxation, balanced by increases in direct taxation where necessary, and most of all an attack by Government spending.40

Certainly it could be said, as the election approached, that the worst should now be over, and the decline in living standards arrested. . . . The question which the Opposition parties asked and the Government was

required to answer was whether Labor's management of the economy had exacerbated the inevitable problems—rather than saving us, as the government claimed, for still worse.41

In 1978 Penguin Books published a paperback by Trevor Russel, a dissident Tory. He joined the Conservative Party in 1969, having been a member of the Labor Party prior to that. As of December 1978 the bookstore at Conservative Central Office had decided not to continue stocking the book. It had obviously irritated those in control of the Party.

An article in the Daily Telegraph characterized Trevor Russel's account in this way:

Penguin's typical Tory has hysterics for about 170 pages about the Right-wing Terror apparently being conducted by Mrs. Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph and ends with a moving plea for moderation. . . . He falls for the antique "Keynesian" patter about one present unemployment being caused by lack of Government-induced "demand." But the evidence is clear that it is caused by such Government-induced distortions as wage fixing and union monopolies which price people out of jobs. Elsewhere, Mr. Russell (predictably) demands "the Middle-Way." His middle-way has become a left lane; no place for a Tory, only for Penguin's idea of one.42

Russel is quite outside the current power structure in the Conservative Party, but his opinion does reflect a side of the Tory Party. He enthusiastically supports Peter Walker, a cabinet member in the Heath Government.

Heath, Walker and others on the left of the Conservative Party have shown themselves much more perceptive about the future of capitalism than Mrs. Thatcher, Joseph and the Tory Powellites. Theirs is a realistic rather

---
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than a romantic view, a pragmatic, rather than an ideological one. Because there have been hiccups at times during the past thirty years does not mean that the postwar system of Keynesian economic management is suffering from an ulcer.

Mrs. Thatcher and Joseph deny that they believe in laissez-faire, but they do pay homage to the doctrines of Adam Smith and Milton Friedman. Not for many years has the leadership of the Conservative Party drawn its inspiration and ideology from sources like that.

Free enterprise has got to show that it can successfully attain its economic objectives without sacrificing the values which people hold dear.

Capitalism has changed, and must continue to change. Many of the reforms it has experienced have been imposed by government--and many more will doubtless have to be imposed in the future with the aim, as Walker says, of enhancing it. The alternative to change and reform is destruction, sooner or later. That could happen anyway, at the hands of a full-fledged Marxist Labor government--and there will be little any future Tory government or Tory party can do about that.43

Many on the Tory left are much closer to the social democrats within the Labor Party than to those who are at all sympathetic to monetarist views. Keynesian economics have dominated postwar Britain; monetarism originates in America in the "Chicago school" of economics associated with Milton Friedman; the two schools of economic thought are diametrically opposed to each other. In the 1970's monetarism became a contender for influence on policy in Britain.

The virtual unanimity of the financial press--and more especially, the stand taken by "The Times"--That the money supply must be brought under control

was possibly the most important single cause of the progress made by monetarism in public debate in those years [1973-75].

The disciples of John Maynard Keynes led the economic thinking in both Great Britain and the United States for more than a quarter century. The Keynesian formula worked well in the United States until the late 1960's. The U.S. Government stimulated the economy by increasing spending during the slumps and by cooling off the booms with cut backs.

But the recession-ridden 1970's [U.S.] have demolished the Keynesian notion that there is a tidy trade-off, controllable by government, between inflation and unemployment. Both, it turns out, can rise at the same time, frustrating fine-tuning attempts to maintain economic balance.

In the United States Newsweek magazine, June 26, 1978, published an article entitled "The New Economists". The shift in economic thinking is marked by economic theory which "out Friedmans Milton Friedman". The article suggests that "the best and the brightest of graduate students and young professors are leading the Conservative shift. But they are not necessarily conventional political conservatives".

While examining both attacks on and endorsements of the monetarist view it is important to keep in mind this shift among scholars and financial journalists in Great Britain.

---
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and the United States.

The new economists range in ideology from a variety of monetarism which spurns activitist government intervention in the economy to a pragmatic "neo-classicism" that accepts some government action but is profoundly critical of past policies. All of them endorse the view that markets work more efficiently when the government leaves them alone, and they are deeply suspicious of broad efforts to manipulate the economy. All charge that the old schools ignore the impact of government policies on real people and markets. The new conservatives claim that their research shows that government has actually strangled savings and investment—and they insist that private production mechanisms now need a respite from years of government intervention.47

The statement above refers to the United States economy. Of course the degree of government intervention in Great Britain is vastly greater.

Trevor Russel refers to a resistance to government intervention as "blinkered ideology". Since the war the Conservative and Labor parties alike have accepted increased government intervention as essential, differing largely as to degree. But the time has come when the Tory left and the Labor Party can no longer dismiss the monetarists' views as unenlightened and indefensible. Attacks such as the following abound in the pro-Keynesian, anti-monetarist literature:

Free enterprise has got to show that it can successfully attain its economic objectives without sacrificing the values which people hold dear.48

47 Ibid.

Such statements now appear trite, simplistic, and misleading in the face of new economic theory. There are now formidable opponents to Keynesian economics and such resistance cannot be dismissed by calling it "blinkered ideology".

Harvard Professor Martin Feldstein, the most prominent of the new market economists, has completed research which indicates that the pro-interventionists must defend their own position in terms of the way in which interventionist policies have actually benefited society. Past suppositions have been overturned. There appear to be problems of economic detail that Keynesians tend to ignore.

Whereas the Keynesians, for example, assumed that society as a whole would clearly gain by cutting unemployment through government stimulus, Feldstein's own studies conclude that the benefits have been less than the cost of the inflation generated by the stimulus. His analysis shows that high unemployment compensation predictably boosts the jobless rate by reducing the incentive to find work. But he also found that employers use unemployment benefits deliberately to lay off workers during slack periods and avoid building inventories. From both angles, Feldstein argues, unemployment benefits are actually a cause of unemployment—an effect that would be minimized if they were taxed as ordinary income.49

Public Spending

In the years from 1964-73 public spending doubled


in the United Kingdom. Although inflation accounts for much of the increase, the expansion in real terms was phenomenal. It must be said that Mrs. Thatcher at Education and Sir Keith Joseph at Housing were big spenders as well as the Labor governments of Harold Wilson and James Callaghan. Both Sir Keith and Margaret Thatcher have since repented for much of what they did not do as Conservatives and also for the policies which they did in fact support.

"After all," Keith once asked the Conservative Party, "we have held power for half of the last 30 years; how did we allow such things to come to pass?"\[^{51}\] But under Margaret Thatcher's leadership the Opposition has voiced a new Conservatism that denounces much of what the Conservative Party as well as the Labor Party has done in this century.

Sir Keith Joseph, like many of the monetarists, is a formidable intellectual. In rethinking public spending Sir Keith, who remains one of Mrs. Thatcher's most intimate advisors, does not feel tied to his former commitments. Both he and Mrs. Thatcher seem especially able to say "We missed the mark before, but we're on course now". In a profile of Sir Keith Joseph which appeared in the New Statesman\[^{52}\] he is both scorned and saluted. The opening lines in the article quoted Edward Heath's opinion of Joseph, "A good


\[^{52}\]Ibid.
man fallen among monetarists. They've robbed him of all his judgment, not that he had much in the first place." The final paragraph gets at the heart of and perhaps the justification for a new Conservative's views on public spending, views which demand radical change.

In risking the contempt and derision which British politics reserves for the man of ideas, Joseph had retrospectively abolished all the years he has spent as a Tory up to now. It would be interesting to know from what source he draws his burning conviction that the next time will be different. But prophets--armed or unarmed--are seldom so obliging.53

Everyone expected that Labor would go farther than a Conservative government in expanding public expenditure. Collective effort and a lack of faith in individual provisions is part of the historic Labor philosophy. In a classic Labor document, The Future of Socialism by Anthony Crossland, the revisionism of the social democratic wing of the party is spelled out; spending public money for public good is the basis of that ethic. But in the Labor governments of 1964-1966 the imposition of the ethic began to run amuck. Labor had to contract rather than expand and to adjust spending accordingly.

It became increasingly hard to see how Labor's plans could be paid for without additional demands on the public which--in the eyes of the Crosslandite wing of

53 Ibid.
the party--was already paying rather more tax than it could equably tolerate.\footnote{David McKie, Chris Cook, Melanie Philips, The Guardian/Quartet Election Guide (London: Quartet Books Ltd., 1978), p. 67.}

Throughout Denis Healey's term at the Treasury the conflict between insuring sound financial management of a mixed economy and remaining the great provider for the helpless and dependent created a tension that remained unresolved. The government trimmed the budget in an effort to make the counter-inflation policy work. Repeatedly they introduced subsidies and removed them; gave out reliefs and took them back.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 66-73.}

**Taxation**

Many have claimed that the British taxpayer now carries heavier burdens than his counterpart almost anywhere in the world. Others would insist that that is disputable. The level of direct taxation placed Britain at the top of the European league in 1977.

Liberals and Conservatives urged bigger cuts in taxation by switching more of the burden on the indirect taxes. The Prime Minister and the Chancellor went along with this in spite of Labor's historic commitment to direct taxes which are progressive (i.e. a systematic redistribution of the wealth by taking a higher proportion of income from...
the rich than from the poor). Increases in the VAT (value added tax) and duties on beer and cigarettes dropped behind the rate of inflation. Therefore, those items actually decreased in price in real terms after four years of Labor Government.

An American journalist, Jeffrey Hart, discussed the forthcoming election with Mrs. Thatcher in September, 1978. She considered taxes and productivity to be among the key issues.

Her view: British productivity must be reactivated, taxes must come down. She says that this point is beginning to sink in; and on taxes and productivity she sounds like a British version of Jack Kemp. She says that the Socialist doctrine of redistribution is dead, bankrupt. Without productivity, there's little to redistribute.

**Education, Law and Order, Race and Immigration**

The Labor and Conservative parties clashed vehemently on the subject of education. The Opposition charged that the Government pushed "doctrinaire" policies rather than improvement in teaching standards. The lowered standards in the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, as well as the problems of discipline, vandalism, and truancy, came under fire.

The Government denied full inflationary increases in government grants. Rage and indignation mounted when

## TABLE 1

TAXES AS % OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

at factor cost inclusive and exclusive of social security contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>40.7*</td>
<td>25.9*</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>33.4*</td>
<td>20.5*</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= 1970 Figures. Figures below line compiled on different accounting basis from those above.

### TABLE 2

HOW THE TAX THRESHOLD FELL

Income tax threshold as percentage of median earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Social Trends
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax</td>
<td>3,826.4</td>
<td>4,337.2</td>
<td>4,899.9</td>
<td>5,728.3</td>
<td>6,469.0</td>
<td>6,475.3</td>
<td>7,135.8</td>
<td>10,238.7</td>
<td>15,053.9</td>
<td>17,012.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surtax</td>
<td>241.9</td>
<td>224.2</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>240.3</td>
<td>349.1</td>
<td>340.9</td>
<td>307.3</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits Tax</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Tax</td>
<td>1,221.0</td>
<td>1,365.8</td>
<td>1,686.5</td>
<td>1,589.0</td>
<td>1,557.6</td>
<td>1,532.7</td>
<td>2,262.2</td>
<td>2,849.7</td>
<td>1,997.3</td>
<td>2,654.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gains</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>138.8</td>
<td>155.5</td>
<td>208.4</td>
<td>323.6</td>
<td>380.4</td>
<td>387.1</td>
<td>323.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Duty</td>
<td>331.3</td>
<td>379.2</td>
<td>365.3</td>
<td>356.3</td>
<td>452.6</td>
<td>458.5</td>
<td>412.2</td>
<td>377.8</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>124.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Transfer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>259.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp Duty</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>227.6</td>
<td>190.3</td>
<td>197.4</td>
<td>281.1</td>
<td>271.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Charges</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Land</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>390.2</td>
<td>405.8</td>
<td>650.5</td>
<td>466.9</td>
<td>480.9</td>
<td>491.7</td>
<td>365.1</td>
<td>450.1</td>
<td>651.1</td>
<td>807.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines, Spirits</td>
<td>358.1</td>
<td>372.2</td>
<td>413.2</td>
<td>464.2</td>
<td>524.0</td>
<td>581.8</td>
<td>588.3</td>
<td>682.9</td>
<td>909.5</td>
<td>1,137.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>1,044.7</td>
<td>1,105.0</td>
<td>1,143.0</td>
<td>1,139.8</td>
<td>1,126.0</td>
<td>1,182.6</td>
<td>1,084.9</td>
<td>1,337.4</td>
<td>1,676.8</td>
<td>1,873.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Duty</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>226.2</td>
<td>262.8</td>
<td>269.3</td>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>437.1</td>
<td>500.5</td>
<td>512.8</td>
<td>675.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betting</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>130.4</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>171.3</td>
<td>185.4</td>
<td>238.4</td>
<td>264.9</td>
<td>286.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Tax</td>
<td>746.5</td>
<td>972.1</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,270.7</td>
<td>1,429.0</td>
<td>1,307.4</td>
<td>379.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,447.4</td>
<td>2,496.5</td>
<td>3,395.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Duties</td>
<td>269.0</td>
<td>393.1</td>
<td>416.7</td>
<td>421.3</td>
<td>473.3</td>
<td>485.0</td>
<td>533.5</td>
<td>532.1</td>
<td>780.7</td>
<td>845.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>1,063.8</td>
<td>1,362.7</td>
<td>1,888.1</td>
<td>1,989.6</td>
<td>1,323.7</td>
<td>993.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax*</td>
<td>10,819.2</td>
<td>12,887.8</td>
<td>14,733.4</td>
<td>15,294.5</td>
<td>16,256.0</td>
<td>16,467.4</td>
<td>17,431.4</td>
<td>22,131.8</td>
<td>28,166.6</td>
<td>32,655.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including some minor categories not listed above.

SOURCE: Annual Abstract
TABLE 4

REDISTRIBUTIVE EFFORTS OF TAX AND BENEFITS 1971 AND 1976

This table shows the income, before and after all tax and benefits, of each of ten income groups. The main figures show income; the underlined figures beneath them show income as a proportion of the average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>2,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>3,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>4,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>121.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>5,683</td>
<td>4,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>145.3</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>143.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>10,066</td>
<td>6,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267.1</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>266.2</td>
<td>208.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Economic Trends, February 1978 (with additional calculations) which see for details of sampling and method.
Reg Prentice, then Education Secretary, suggested that they sell their treasures. The universities suspected that Labor held a bias against them and the Conservatives shared that suspicion.

In Jeffrey Hart's September, 1979, article on Mrs. Thatcher he reports his comments on education.

In its dying throes, the Labor government is trying to impose "comprehensive schools" as one mode of primary and secondary education. Labor opposes any special treatment for especially gifted students. Mrs. Thatcher thinks the voters are up in arms about this drastic egalitarianism.  

Law and order has become a critical issue in the mid-seventies in Britain. In the party conferences the Conservatives called for more police and more public support for them; they asked for stiffer penalties and a tougher approach to young offenders. Tories cited instances of workers being beaten up by pickets, of direct action by totalitarian Trotskyites, and of threats to the peace and order in communities by marches and demonstrations.

The Irish Republican Army carried out a sustained campaign of violence on the British mainland in 1974 which culminated in the worst terrorist incident in British history when 21 people died in bomb explosions in two public houses.

Conservatives pressed for the restoration of the death penalty. Many M.P.s who were not ideologically

57Ibid.
opposed to hanging considered it a threat to the stability of
the society, arguing that it might cause increased violence
and hostage taking if it were reintroduced.

In two debates—11 December 1974 and 11 December
1975—the Commons rejected the restoration of the death
penalty for terrorist crimes by votes of 269 to 217 and
361 to 232. On both occasions there was a "free vote", but the house divided along party lines.

Race and immigration became a major issue early in
1978. Both major parties agreed that strict immigration
control would promote good race relations. The Labor left
rejected this assumption and at the 1967 party conference
they called for a repeal of both the 1971 and the 1968
Immigration Acts. The Liberals at the 1976 party conference
called for all restrictions on the entry of United Kingdom
passport holders and unrestricted entry for dependents and
fiances of those already settled in the U.K.

Early in 1978 James Callaghan remarked to reporters
in Bangladesh that immigration was "a problem for us, not
for you". Soon after his remark immigration became a major
issue in the election campaign. Mrs. Thatcher's now infamous
remark on television that Britain would be swamped by
peoples of different culture and that Conservatives want
an end to immigration to maintain good race relations and

---

58 In a "free vote" party discipline is not enforced; the M.P.s are encouraged to vote their conscience.
to maintain the "fundamental British character" caused an enormous stir. The newspapers reported explosive reactions by Labor and Liberal M.P.s and other outraged observers who denounced Mrs. Thatcher as a racist and accused her of attempting to win the National Front vote.

In Jeffrey Hart's report of Mrs. Thatcher's stand on the issues he views the situation somewhat differently:

Labor is trying to portray the Conservatives as racist. Mrs. Thatcher stresses the point that she does not want and never has advocated expulsion of recent colored immigrants. She does think that Britain has absorbed about as much such immigration as it can, and that future immigration should be curtailed. On this I judge her to be in tune with popular feelings.  

IV. The Tory Party and the New Conservatism

In postwar Britain the Tories have been led by the progressive wing of the party and their views have not been totally out of step with those of the "social democrats" in the Labor camp. During previous Conservative Governments those at the right of the party were labeled reactionaries; the "best opinion" usually regarded them as being motivated by self interest, stubbornly resisting a fairer society. Assuming that there are always those motivated by self interest in every political party, an examination of the views of those who genuinely believed that Britain was pursuing a deadly course is useful. Such people have

---

### TABLE 5
VOTING FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE DEATH PENALTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>DNV</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>DNV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Speaker and 3 deputies</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>+ Speaker and 3 deputies</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DNV = Did not vote
*Totals include tellers

achieved recognition in recent years that would not have been possible a decade ago. There is evidence of "new climate" in Britain. The intellectual establishment can no longer decree that the "best intellectual thinking" must rise from the left.

First came broad based student support:

Part of the reason for this dramatic swing in the Conservatives among students is undoubtedly dissatisfaction with the antics of the extreme Left who dominated the student politics during the late sixties and early seventies. Over the past three years moderates of all kinds have been doing increasingly well in student elections.  

The popularity of intellectual opinion which dared to denounce socialism began gaining ground on campuses in the seventies. The defensive posture of those Conservatives to the right of the party changed and a new conservatism, not unlike Gladstonian liberalism, forged ahead calling for a new approach and urging another economic system.

This rallying of the moderates may not be the only reason for the headway that Conservatism is currently making among students. Michael Forsyth reckons that ideology could be an equally important factor. He points to the impact made by Sir Keith Joseph who spoke at more than 120 universities, polytechnics and colleges in the last academic year [1976]. Everywhere he went his uncompromising intellectual defense of free market economics won an interested and enthusiastic response from large student audiences. More than fifty people joined the Conservative Association of St. Andrews after debate between Sir Keith and Steve Parry, then Chairman of NUS. Forsyth [1976 Chairman of the Federation of Conservative Students] reckons that the Conservatives have done well in university and college elections when they have dropped the defensive,  

---

apologetic style of the moderates, and come out as unashamed supporters of free enterprise and capitalism. "In doing this," he says, "we have produced an argument" which is directly opposed to that which has been put to students for years; and when confronted with a choice between socialism and capitalism, many of them prefer capitalism.61

In an essay62 entitled "A Changed Climate" Lord Blake discusses the way in which a sort of "intellectual revolt" is taking place in Britain. Signs of an active resistance against the orthodoxies which have ruled public life since the early 1940's are emerging. He cites, first, the experiences of the New Zealand and Australian counterparts to the British Labor Party and, second, the dwindling credibility of Keynesian economics. In both New Zealand and Australia the parties committed to socialism and a controlled economy were driven out of office in 1975 even though they appeared to have solid trade union support. In Germany the socialists have moved to the right in order to build power. As to the shift in economic thought it is simply a matter of timing. For a quarter of a century deficit finance and high public expenditure reigned as the means of achieving full employment, and expanding economy and a stable currency. In recent years the pursuit of these policies has produced "a stagnant economy, the highest unemployment since the nineteen-thirties

61 Ibid.

and the worst inflation since the sixteenth century."  

Lord Blake, as Provost of Queens College, Oxford and active member of the Conservative Party remains in touch with academics, journalists, party workers, students, and ordinary citizens. As an historian he studies change and as a seasoned observer he senses it:

If the intellectual atmosphere is going to be the same at the next general election, whenever that may be, there would be little prospect of Conservative success, except in the event of a major economic crisis, some traumatic debacle such as a split in the Labor party in 1931. In fact, however, there are signs of one of those rare and profound changes in the intellectual climate which occur only once or twice in a hundred years, like the triumph of the entrepreneurial ethos in nineteenth century England, or the rise of Voltairian scepticism in eighteenth-century France, or the disappearance of Puritanism after 1660. There is a wind of change in Britain and much of the democratic world--and it comes from the right, not the left.  

There is, of course, another opinion within the Tory Party which still looks to the McMillan-Butler tradition as the strength of postwar Toryism. They cite Churchill and Rab Butler as the champions of a new Tory image, authors of the progressive alternative.

Butler produced a set of policies which were moderate, progressive, up-to-date and relevant: their basis was a rejection of laissez-faire economics, the endorsement of a Keynesian approach, i.e. direct and positive government intervention, to the management of the economy, and the acceptance of the Welfare State. All this was anathema to the old guard Tory Right, but the party embraced it--and so did the people. The

---

63 Ibid., p. 4.  
64 Ibid.
Conservatives regained power in 1951 and held office for thirteen unbroken years. But now the Tory Party is no longer led from its Left: Mrs. Thatcher comes from the Tory Right, as do her leading supporters. They reject the legacy they have inherited (from Disraeli, Baldwin, Macmillan, Butler and Heath), for they regard postwar Toryism as a failure, a pale carbon copy of Socialism. . . . Unfortunately for them, the progressive wing of the party is not prepared to see the reforms achieved by their predecessors jettisoned without a fight. Thus, the scene is set for a fierce struggle inside the Tory Party—-one which will not be resolved simply by winning the next general election. 65

IV. The Immediate Audience and Occasion

At present the party has rallied around Margaret Thatcher and divisions such as those just described by Trevor Russel remain neatly tucked below the surface. Career politicians like to win and at present Mrs. Thatcher is leading the party to victory. Ideological differences may rage below the surface but the party conferences 1975-1978 did not provide the forum for a denunciation of the sort in which Trevor Russel indulged in his book. However, that a body of opinion exists which is in sympathy with Russel is important in understanding Mrs. Thatcher's audiences at the annual party conferences.

Finally, a description of the British political party conferences themselves is necessary in order to fully appreciate the audiences and the occasion. Perhaps, it would be fair to say that they are more civilized than are national

conventions in America. Neither the Labor Party at Blackpool nor the Conservatives at Brighton have the elaborate, mediadominated spectacle that we witness in the United States. Delegates actually talk to each other face to face.

The National Union of Conservatives and Unionist Associations present the annual conference in Brighton each year. The speech delivered by the party leader closes the conference. The schedule of events for the 1976 Conference illustrates the way in which the conferences are conducted:

**First Session, 5th October: Morning**

Economic Policy and Taxation

Address by Chairman of the Party Organization

**Second Session, 5th October: Afternoon**

Education

Ulster

Immigration and Race Relations

**Third Session, 6th October: Morning**

Employment and Industrial Relations

Party Policy and Public Relations

**Fourth Session, 6th October: Afternoon**

European Community

Local Government and its Finance

Law and Order
Fifth Session, 7th October: Morning

Homes and Land
Defense and Overseas Affairs
People, Parliament and the Constitution

Sixth Session, 7th October: Afternoon

Industry, Small Business and the Self-Employed
Party Organization
Social Services and Health

Seventh Session, 8th October: Morning

Financial Appeal

Address by the Leader of the Party

The purpose of the conferences is to debate and clarify positions, set rules, and elect party officials. When Mrs. Thatcher speaks as Leader of the Opposition it is always with the understanding that "a vote for the Conservatives is a vote for me". It would be impossible to determine for certain to what extent the people vote for the leader or the party; public opinion polls shift constantly. One thing is certain; the party conferences provide the leader with an opportunity to tell the party and the nation, via television, what kind of policies and programs to expect.

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Voters of every persuasion seem to acknowledge that the Conservative Party under Heath and the Conservative Party under Thatcher are two different parties. The conferences are the chief means by which the party describes to the public just what those differences are. In the 1975-1978 party conference speeches the new leader had the task of first differentiating a Labor Government from a Conservative Government and secondly of contrasting the Conservatives in Opposition with Conservatism in the past. The audience is primed for such a discussion; the occasion demands it. All of this is done amidst a schedule of daily debates and black tie, invitation only dinner dances at night.

The 1975 Conservative Party Conference

The tasks which faced Margaret Thatcher at the Tory Party conference in Blackpool were twofold: 1) to consolidate her grip on the leadership and 2) to re-define the party's philosophy. In seeking the party's support for policy priorities she attempted to change the direction which had been pursued by Mr. Edward Heath.

The former leader did not speak at the conference proper, at fringe meetings or on television. Certainly that removed any threat of upstaging feared by Mrs. Thatcher's supporters. The Tory Reform Group led by Peter Walker, Robert

---

67 Financial Times, 6 October 1975.
Carr and Nicholas Scott—all Heath supporters—were active at Blackpool. It was the first conference appearance of the new group and it provided evidence of the division within the party. Other fringe groups also made themselves heard: 1) the right wing Seldson Group, circulated a pamphlet arguing for denationalization but were debarred from a stall at the Winter Gardens, the center for the 1975 party conference in Blackpool; 2) the Bow Group proclaimed that it embraced all wings of the party, "even though it has been largely taken over by the right".68

Unlike the Labor Party the Tories are not normally riven by doctrinal controversy. But in the last couple of years the party has nonetheless been enjoying the heady—and somewhat dubious—delights of personal and ideological disputation; and never more than at Blackpool this week.69

The Conservatives courteously gave Mr. Heath a standing ovation when he made his first appearance on the platform and again when he left accompanied by Mrs. Thatcher.

Heath seemed to regard his conference ovation as some positive demonstration of support for him whereas, as Ian Aitken of the Guardian put it, it was the only ovation ever seen at a funeral, the Tories cheering Heath not because they wanted him as leader, but precisely because they did not.70

The night before Heath denied reports at the Imperial Hotel that he had attacked Mrs. Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph as traitors. The charges were never convincingly

68 Spectator, 18 October 1975.
69 Ibid.
70 Spectator, 18 October 1975.
refuted and the bitterness grew.

Sir Keith Joseph warned the Conservatives of the danger of the "middle ground" in his reply to a wide ranging debate in which speakers were asked to advocate what policies the Conservative Party should adopt for the future:

The trouble with the middle ground is that we do not choose it or shape it. It is shaped for us by the extremists. The more extreme the Left, the more to the left is the middle ground.\(^1\)

The *Daily Telegraph* regarded the response to Sir Keith's speech as an indication that the conference did not have the division that political commentators had suggested. Sir Keith emphasized the point that Mrs. Thatcher and her supporters occupied the "middle ground" in British politics. An important consideration, the reaction of the delegates, often escaped the press; however, an editorial entitled "Back to Toryism" described the unity which transcended the ideological quarrels:

The truth is that the issue which occupied the political commentators—that between monetarists and dirigistes—is not even intelligible, let alone emotive, to the majority of delegates—a fact emphasized by the impartial enthusiasm by which demands for strong economic measures of any kind have been greeted.\(^2\)

The *Guardian* described the reaction of the delegates as a "shift in the party's center of gravity" evidenced by the succession of speakers, all well received, who "called

\(^1\) *Daily Telegraph*, 9 October 1975.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
for an all-out onslaught to halt the drift to the left and to end the fashionable talk about coalitions and proportional representation".\textsuperscript{73}

The 1975 conference was held in Blackpool at the Winter Gardens, an old vaudeville theatre which is referred to as the opera house. Blackpool itself has been described as a "garrish workingclass resort". The seating capacity at the Winter Gardens is 3000. Since nearly 1000 press people attended there was room for only about 2000 others in the main auditorium. Cameras were hung on the balcony opposite the stage and the lights were suspended from the ceiling and placed around the room. Both the 1975 and 1977 Conservative Party Conferences were held at the Winter Gardens and they were set up in this way.

Patrick Cosgrave, historian and journalist, commented on the style of dress at the Conservative conference compared to the Labor Party Conference. He regreted that since Mrs. Thatcher no longer wore hats the other Tory ladies seldom wore them either. He also commented on the appearance of more casual, rather than careful dress.

Of course, Conservatives, both men and women, remain streets ahead of their Labor counterparts, who get dowdier and scruffier year by year. It seems that it is "de rigueur" for middle-aged Labor women (except, and this is refreshing, Mrs. Castle) to be dowdy . . . and for the cohorts of the young to be untidy

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Guardian}, 9 October 1975.
where they are not unnoticeable and even, quite frequently, dirty.  

The description suggests a class distinction between the two parties which is undeniable. The look of a Conservative Conference like the sound is quite different from the Labor Conference.

It is frequently said that the purpose of the Labor Party is to "contain disunity while that of the Conservatives is to express unity". Certainly that determination to rally together must be taken into account when evaluating the immediate audience. "The desire of the party to express its unity was a powerful help to Margaret Thatcher at her first conference." Clearly the majority of the audience earnestly desired that the speaker represent them well.

The 1976 Conservative Party Conference

The 1976 Conservative Party conference was held in Brighton at the Metropole Hotel. The maximum seating in the auditorium is 5000; thus, the facilities for the 1976 conference afforded the greatest number of people to attend. Only about one-fifth of the total number of people in attendance were members of the press. But the hall was apparently most unsatisfactory for many in the audience. One writer

---

74 Spectator, 18 October 1975.
75 Ibid.
76 Ibid.
described the conference hall as "a cramped affair that hid nearly half the delegates behind vast pillars apologetically adorned with television monitors". 77

Alan Watkins described the tone of the Conservative conference:

Conservative delegates— I refuse to call them "representatives"—tended in the past to become pretty ferocious once inside the Conference hall. The party establishment would devote a lot of trouble to making them seem less so. It was not quite like this at Brighton. The Conservatives collectively appeared almost moderate. 78

Several key events leading up to the 1976 conference determined the attitude of the delegates. In the summer and early fall the speculation continued as to whether or not Edward Heath would make a public gesture of reconciliation to Mrs. Thatcher. The clash between Sir Keith Joseph and Edward Heath intensified in the summer of 1976. Early in July Heath charged that the Center for Policy Studies was set up when he was Conservative leader without his knowledge. The Center which was established by Mrs. Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph to educate public opinion in the importance of free enterprise and market policies "has caused resentment by some supporters of Mr. Heath who regard it as being the base for the party's monetarists". 79

Prior to the 1976 party conference and only 24 hours

77 Economist, 9 October 1976.
78 Observer, 10 October 1976.
before publication of the party's strategy document Sir Keith called a news conference to launch an anthology of speeches he had made over the past two years. The Center for Policy Studies published the book and the Conservative Central Office had no advance notice of its release. The views expressed in the book do not coincide with the strategy document which was released by the party. The Daily Telegraph described the repercussions:

His statement yesterday is regarded as an embarrassment to the party on the eve of the publication of the much-awaited strategy document and is bound to cause a flutter at the party conference at Brighton.\(^{80}\)

This kind of division within the party was overlooked amidst more compelling events. First the leaders were preoccupied with early poll chances. The Daily Express described the difference of opinion:

Mrs. Thatcher is surrounded by hawks, who believe an election is imminent . . . and doves who cannot see one in sight. Party Chairman, Lord Thornycroft is on the side of the hawks.\(^{81}\)

The political event of the greatest significance during the conference was Mr. Heath's speech in which he expressed support for Mrs. Thatcher.

His speech does show that the Tory Party has come together again. He is no longer the lost leader, with his own followers implicitly opposing the present leadership of the party.\(^{82}\)

\(^{80}\)Daily Telegraph, 2 October 1976.

\(^{81}\)Daily Express, 6 October 1976.

\(^{82}\)Daily Express, 7 October 1976.
Certainly everyone expected the old argument between the "free market" school and the "state interventionist school" to continue, but in different ways, perhaps.

The really important point, of which Mr. Heath's speech was a symbolic expression, is that in the present circumstances of the country this argument is less important than the practical necessity of providing a strong government.83

Against a background of "growing national apprehension, not say alarm, the Conservatives--in terms of their own cohesion--the Conservatives have done well this week."84 The Government announced a 15 per cent minimum lending rate which lead to demands from Mr. Michael Heseltine, Tory industry spokesman, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Healey) and the Government should resign immediately. Heseltine's speech won the biggest ovation of the conference.

His words coming after a week of restrained and subdued speeches from the platform acted like a tonic on the morale of the delegates.85 Thus, the crisis in the Government; Mr. Heath's gesture of reconciliation; Mrs. Thatcher's "assured and balanced call" the morning before her formal speech; and the statement of policy, The Right Approach, issued the week before all made contributions to the unity of the conference.86 The Times describes the significance of Heath's speech in this way:

83 Ibid.
84 Times [London], 9 October 1976.
85 Financial Times, 8 October 1976.
86 Times [London], 9 October 1976.
It has been a division both of policy and of personality, souring relations, weakening the opposition front bench, and importing an uncharacteristic element of dogma into the discussions of future policies. . . . So there were a great many prayers for the great reconciliation when Mr. Heath went to the rostrum at the party conference at Brighton yesterday.87

Finally, more than two hours prior to Mrs. Thatcher's speech lines formed for hundreds of yards around the back of the Metropole Hotel. The Guardian describes a somewhat amusing scene:

Half an hour before, the crush in the conference hall was so tight that the stewards would not even allow people out to the lavatory in case their places were taken: "You'll just have to tell them to hold their bladders," one central office steward said with weary politeness to a volunteer usher.

Meanwhile, prankish Young Conservatives were gaily distributing label badges saying "Put a Woman on Top for a Change." Most of the recipients didn't realise they were meant to be risque; elderly matrons stalked about with the stickers on their tweed suits, oblivious of the double meaning.88

The 1977 Conservative Party Conference

The impact of Mrs. Thatcher's parliamentary triumph in July, 1977 must have had an effect on the 1977 party conference. The audience, like the general public, had been told through the press that suddenly Mrs. Thatcher looked like a real Prime Minister.

The conference was held in Blackpool again at the Winter Gardens. Instead of the 5000 seat capacity of the

87 Times [London], 7 October 1976.
88 Guardian, 9 October 1976.
Metropole Hotel they had 3000 seats in Blackpool, a third of which went to the press. However, there were decided advantages. The enormous columns which obstructed the view were gone.

The debates at the 1977 conference lacked excitement for the most part. The most significant debate was on the issue of the closed shop. Mr. Prior set forth a new compromise worked out by the Shadow Cabinet.

The week of events did not carry the tension or the drama of the 1976 conference. Mrs. Thatcher's role as leader of the party had been established. Ted Heath no longer posed a threat. The audience was ready to receive its leader and to support her.

The 1978 Conservative Party Conference

The 1978 Conservative Party Conference was held at the New Conference Center in Brighton. Although it did not have the seating capacity of the Metropole Exhibition Hall it did not have the columns obstructing the view. The seating capacity is 4000 at the New Conference Center; the hall was filled to overflowing and one-fourth of the people in the auditorium were members of the press.

The most significant aspect of the conference atmosphere was that the general election did not occur that fall.

The conference, normally the high point of the year for party activists, is an anti-climax, the second best option. They would rather have been someplace else. But nasty Jim Callaghan has thwarted them by not
playing along with the general expectation by calling a general election. 89

For nearly two years the Conservatives had been electioneering. The Prime Minister's startling decision not to hold an October election dealt a psychological blow to the Conservatives.

The evidence of the division within the Conservative Party was documented in Trevor Russel's book, The Tory Party—It's Policies, Divisions and Future released a few days before the conference. "Russel called on the 80 or so conservative M.P.s on the left of the party to stand up publicly against Mrs. Thatcher and the right-wing." 90 The book appeared to have made no perceivable impact within the party.

The big news of the week came when Edward Heath endorsed the Labor Government's 5 per cent pay limit—twenty-four hours after Mrs. Thatcher had passionately opposed it. "In an interview with Julian Haviland of ITN, Mr. Heath walked into the political wilderness." 91

The anger was both immediate and widespread within the conference:

He was widely accused in the conference corridors of spoiling a promising Tory festival. However, Mrs. Thatcher's reaction was that it always takes two to make a quarrel.

89 Birmingham Post, 5 October 1978.
90 Daily Mail, 12 October 1978.
91 Ibid.
She advised colleagues to resist the temptation to hit back vigorously at Mr. Heath. Sir Keith Joseph, in a loudly applauded speech, made his objections to Heath clear without mentioning his name.

Apart from the excitement which Heath stirred, the conference speeches were all designed not to "rock the boat", but rather to enable the party to "coast effortlessly home". The well tried Tory techniques of choosing for debate only the blandest resolutions on the agenda, and then refusing to allow critical amendments to be called, were much in evidence. Many delegates grumbled privately about this, but only during the Rhodesia debate was any attempt made to challenge the chairman's ruling—and even then it was half hearted.

Two days before her speech Mrs. Thatcher conducted talks with Northern Ireland Unionists. Those talks reportedly were effective in beginning to heal the deep division between the two parties which occurred after Mr. Heath sacked the Unionist Government in Stormont in March 1972.

When Mrs. Thatcher arrived to deliver her address on the 14th of October the conference was in "very cheerful spirits". The delegates gave her a standing ovation when she arrived. The mood among the delegates was one of celebration. Since the general election had been snatched from them, they were ready for an exhilarating occasion which
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94 Ibid.
95 *Daily Mail*, 14 October 1978.
would allow something of a catharsis. Speaking of Ted Heath, one reporter said:

And perhaps most happily of all, he was not there. He was not even in Brighton to cast a chill on everything. He was back in London or on his yacht or somewhere.96

Before they heard Mrs. Thatcher speak the audience was probably determined to let nothing interfere with a triumphant evening. It was to be a birthday celebration as well. The presentation of the Paddington bear and the iced birthday cake (with the key of No. 10) concluded what was certain to be a rousing speech; the audience was primed for a victory, a cause to celebrate.

VI. Summary

"The British Disease"

Although there is no consensus regarding the exact nature of "the British disease", there is complete agreement as to its existence. Both the Labor Party and the Conservative Party profess to be better prepared to administer the necessary cure. The most compelling argument that the Conservatives have appears to be that Labor has had five years in which to demonstrate its superior ability and has failed to do so. Labor's best argument is perhaps that the radical change for Britain which the Conservatives propose would cause an enormous upheaval throughout British society.

96Daily Mail, 19 October 1978.
The Labor Party cannot deny a record dotted with failures and the Conservative Party cannot deny the fact that their proposed changes would at least temporarily create something of a shake-up in the welfare state.

"The Changed Climate"

Another area of general agreement relates to "the changed climate". New waves appear to be forming throughout British Society. The 1979 general election in Great Britain will determine among other things who is riding those waves. The list of formidable intellectuals who have moved away from socialist ideology and who are now in support of the "new conservatism" is ever increasing. Many scholars such as Lord Blake believe that men of ideas have fore-shadowed a major change in the political climate and that in the seventies the shift from the left to right began to be felt throughout the society in general; the word had filtered down; assumptions about the welfare state had come into question.

"The New Conservatism"

The Conservative Party made a decided turn when they voted for Margaret Thatcher as leader. The controversy within the party is great, the diversity enormous. Russell Lewis discusses his party and its new leader in his book Margaret Thatcher:
Conservatives have a problem of identity. They cannot stand still. They must either join the trend to Socialism (which is arguably what pre-war Conservative Government tended to do) and try to show that they are better at Socialist administration than the Socialists, or they must try to put Socialism into reverse. Does it matter? What is at stake? To resort to a much abused word, it is freedom.97

In choosing Mrs. Thatcher the Party voted against more socialism and made a decided move toward reversing it. The "new conservatism" as opposed to the conservatism of post-war Britain looks toward Germany and others as having experienced the economic miracle of the "social market economy" (Professor Erhardt's term). Such an economy is characterized by free capitalism which serves the strong, able bodied and a compassionate state which caters to the weak. The Government serves in those capacities which private enterprise cannot conveniently supply: defense, maintaining law and order, administering justice, preserving a stable currency, and providing collective services.

As regards the nationalized industries, the major problem is the defeatist conviction among the public and even among Conservative politicians that they cannot be unscrambled. Well they can, and details are given in Goodbye to Nationalization (edited by Dr. Rhodes Boyson, Churchill Press, 1971).98

Mrs. Thatcher's major themes of self-reliance and personal independence have been reverberating since her election to leadership in 1975. That she is suggesting a very different

98 Ibid., p. 159.
kind of Conservatism has probably become clear to most of Mrs. Thatcher's audience. The television viewing audience and the immediate audience for Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches (1975-1978) surely understood something of the "English disease", "the new conservatism", and "the changing climate". To what extent the country accepts Margaret Thatcher's views on these topics can be but judged perhaps by the general election results. That she understood the nature and needs of the audience and the particular demands of the occasion were evidenced in the appeals she chose to use in her speeches.
CHAPTER III
THE SPEAKER'S BACKGROUND AND DELIVERY

I. Introduction

After Margaret Thatcher became Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition in February, 1975, details concerning her childhood, her student days at Oxford, her legal training, her marriage and children, and her parliamentary career began to emerge in a variety of newspaper accounts of her life. Three biographies appeared in book form shortly after Mrs. Thatcher became Leader of the Opposition, all written by Conservative Party supporters of Mrs. Thatcher; these volumes covered essentially the same territory. In 1978 three more books about Mrs. Thatcher appeared: each offered some new material and provided fresh ideas about her parliamentary background in particular. The majority of people in Britain probably

99 The books to which reference is made are: George Gardiner, Margaret Thatcher: From Childhood to Leadership (London: William Kimber, 1975); Russell Lewis, Margaret Thatcher: A Personal and Political Biography (London: Routledge, 1975); Ernie Money, Margaret Thatcher: First Lady of the House (London: Leslie Frewin, 1975).

remained unaware of the books altogether or else only were familiar with the press coverage of the manuscripts. Tricia Murray, whose book, *Margaret Thatcher*, came out in paperback, conducted a number of interviews with well-known Labor supporters who had not made previous "on the record" comments about Mrs. Thatcher. The description of Mrs. Thatcher's professional life which surfaced in that volume revealed that political opponents such as Sir Harold Wilson looked upon her with respect and admiration. Patrick Cosgrave wrote a political biography in which he detailed the leadership battle with some candor, not as a dissident Tory, but rather as her former speech writer. Cosgrave is a scholar, historian, and journalist who has all the necessary credentials to describe the "inside Right". Trevor Russel made a number of bristling attacks on Mrs. Thatcher, and urged the left wing of the Tory Party to come out publicly against her. Clearly, Russel's view of Mrs. Thatcher's parliamentary performance contrasts with that of Cosgrave's.

The newspaper journalists took note of each volume and speculated on the way the books were likely to affect the general public. Ernle Money's book, *Margaret Thatcher: First*


Lady of the House, was described as "the third in an inglorious line of panegyrics makes the Tory leader sound like a feminine version of one of the more superlative American comic strip characters. Like superman or batman she conquers all."\textsuperscript{104} The journalists expressed a longing for a flesh and blood figure to emerge in the biographies. Hugh Noyes at the \textit{Times} [London] expressed it this way: "Pro-Thatcher eulogies can go only so far, and after that they become somewhat tedious."\textsuperscript{105} The \textit{New Statesman} offered far more appreciative comments on the biographies by Russell Lewis and George Gardiner.

The authors, Russell Lewis, a former director of the Conservative Political Centre, and George Gardiner, political journalist turned Tory M.P., are exceedingly well disposed towards Mrs. Thatcher, as you might imagine from their anxiety to salute and celebrate their heroine so quickly, after seven short months. While both have written hurriedly, they are not, I think, either misleading in their appreciation of her qualities or crudely effusive. As partisans, they have naturally wished to place her in a good light--and are perfectly entitled to do so, by virtue of her accomplishments as well as their own sympathies.\textsuperscript{106}

Joe Haines wrote an article entitled "Adoration of St. Margaret" which appeared in the \textit{Daily Mirror} on 27 November 1978. Clearly, he had not enjoyed the biographies which had appeared since 1975, but he was even less impressed with Tricia Murray's account:

\textsuperscript{104}\textit{Times} [London], 4 December 1975.
\textsuperscript{105}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{106}\textit{New Statesman}, 6 September 1975.
If Mrs. Thatcher's admirers really want her to become Prime Minister they should stop writing books about her . . . . It (Tricia Murray's book) is so adoring it is embarrassing. Mrs. Thatcher is not Sr. Margaret. Nor is she a female Winston Churchill or a reborn Boadicea. She is able and intelligent and the best leader the Tories could get in a bad year for them. No more.107

The speaker's delivery has also been observed and interpreted by people with opposing tastes and opinions. An accent that sounds "educated" to one may sound "contrived" to another; and a pitch that is "grating" to one's ears may sound "interesting" to another. Since no definitive studies have been made measuring the number of people who respond in a particular way to Mrs. Thatcher's voice, the researcher must simply record the reactions which have been expressed.

II. The Speaker's Background

Competition is not new to Mrs. Thatcher. She began at an early age and continued to be a winning competitor throughout her life. At the age of ten she passed a scholarship examination and went to the Kesteven and Grantham Girls' Grammar School.108 Later she won a bursary to Somerville College, Oxford where she graduated with a Bachelor of Science in Natural Science (Chemistry). Despite the demands of chemistry and afternoons in the laboratory she was active in politics. The prestigious Union Society which held regular debates was


still closed to women, but she joined the University Conservative Club and became chairman in 1946. After leaving Oxford she did chemical research for four years and studied law in her spare time. As twenty-three year old Margaret Hilda Roberts, a research worker for a concern which manufactured plastics, she was chosen from a list of twenty-seven applicants to become the parliamentary candidate for the Dartford Division. In the 1950 and 1951 general elections she was defeated, but she had served her apprenticeship. By standing in a hopeless or marginal seat and by doing well, she was considered for a safe one. She was called to the Bar by Lincoln's Inn in 1954 and practiced as a barrister, specializing in taxation law. Her field of specialization was obviously an advantage when she later became Opposition spokesman on taxation matters. In 1959 a Conservative M.P. announced that he was retiring from his seat in Finchley where he had been returned at the previous election with a majority of twelve thousand. Margaret Thatcher was accepted as the candidate for Finchley from among nearly one hundred applicants. She had a legal background and she had demonstrated a confidence in speaking.

In her first parliamentary session she was fortunate

---

109 Essex County Standard, 4 February 1949.
in the ballot for leave to introduce a Private Members Bill. She introduced the Public Bodies (admission to meetings) Bill which reached the statute book in October, 1960. The bill gave the press and public a statutory right to admission to meetings of public bodies such as local authorities, education committees, and regional hospital boards. Before this time only the press had the statutory right to attend. The controversy over the question of admission to meetings had caused an enormous stir prior to this and had been the subject of earlier but unsuccessful Private Members' Bills.

Mrs. Thatcher's first ministerial appointment came in 1961 when she became Joint Parliamentary Secretary to the then Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance. She held this post until the government changed. When Edward Heath formed his Cabinet in 1970 she was appointed Secretary of State for Education and Science and was made a Privy Councillor. After the general election in February, 1974, she was appointed to shadow the Department of Environment for the Conservatives. Later that year she was appointed as Opposition Treasury spokesman. In February, 1975, the Conservative Party determined to take a decidedly different direction by choosing a new leader, and out of that process Margaret Thatcher emerged as the head of the party.

One of her biographers tells a frequently repeated story about the poetry reading prize she won at the local drama

---

festival at the age of nine. "Her head mistress said, 'You were lucky, Margaret!' To which Margaret replied, 'I wasn't lucky, I deserved it.'"\textsuperscript{112} Forty-one years later, at the age of fifty, Margaret Thatcher responded to her leadership victory in a very different way. If she believes she deserves it, the thrust of her message is that all those who work hard and achieve excellence also deserve the fruits of their labors. She stated it this way in the speech "Let the Children Grow Tall":

Let our children grow tall--and some grow taller than others, if they have it in them to do so. We must build a society in which each citizen can develop his full potential both for his own benefit and for the community as a whole; in which originality, skill, energy and thrift are rewarded; in which we encourage rather than restrict the variety and richness of human nature.\textsuperscript{113}

Margaret Thatcher's father, Alfred Roberts, played an important role in her speech education. Margaret collected arm loads of books for him every week and according to a local librarian he was the best read man in Grantham.\textsuperscript{114} Roberts was the owner of a grocer's shop, a Rotarian, and a leading citizen. His interest in politics, current affairs, and the welfare state must have made an impression on Margaret as a young girl.

\textsuperscript{112}Ibid., p. 11.

\textsuperscript{113}Margaret Thatcher, "Let the Children Grow Tall," Written Transcript of the Speech Delivered to the Institute of Socio-economic Studies, New York City, 15 September 1975.

He joined the Grantham Council two years after Margaret was born and served for twenty-five years. Eventually he became Mayor and later Alderman. The Roberts' household was a place of lively debates and perfect decorum. Mr. Roberts, a staunch Methodist and tee-totaler took his family to church three times on Sunday. He never took a Sunday paper.  

The family lived modestly in the flat above the store, which had no bath and no running water. It was a home abounding in exemplary Christian standards, in which she learned order and thrift and in which she acquired a zeal for learning and a desire to compete. Her childhood was scarcely one of idleness or frivolity. She learned at an early age to make life-changing decisions and to take an active part in the direction of her life. Clearly, her role as leader of a major political party with a goal of redirecting the course of British history exemplifies that early training. Perhaps nothing is more significant that her early associations. Margaret Thatcher's girlhood was very busy. She excelled at school, both academically and in extra curricular activities. After school she helped serve in the shop, learned to play the piano, and read omnivorously. It was war time and she had many restrictions and few opportunities for frivolity.

Margaret cared a great deal about her father's activities. According to numerous accounts he was at the center of

---
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everything of consequence going on in the town. He served as a lay preacher in addition to his numerous civic duties. Because her father was on the bench Margaret was able to meet leading people at the bar. One of the important meetings turned out to be with the recorder, Norman Winning, who turned out to have a physics degree from Cambridge. He advised her to continue her studies in science if she eventually wanted to go into law, reasoning that a scientific background would be useful should she want to specialize in the lucrative area of patent law.\footnote{Ibid., p. 22.}

Two societies must have shaped her character in those formative years: first, the town of Grantham, small and friendly, which even now numbers only about 28,000 inhabitants, probably contributed to her strength and stability; second, Oxford, still a closed society and decidedly a ticket to a wider world, contributed to her social awareness in perhaps a way only the "Oxbridge" institutions could. During the latter part of Margaret Thatcher's stay at Oxford most of the people there were ex-service people on grants, which made it less class conscious and more democratic than the Oxford of the 1930's attended by Edward Heath and Harold Wilson.

Margaret Thatcher's environment as a child at home and in school appears to have provided the stimuli necessary for her development as a leader and public speaker. Certainly, the route she took through Oxford, the bar, and political activities contributed to her speech education. It would be
difficult to imagine a better way in which she could have prepared herself. Margaret Thatcher's educational background; the popular description of her parents as solid citizens and fine Christians; her role as wife of an executive and the mother of twins (born just before she passed her bar examination); and her reputation in Parliament as a hard worker and an honest opponent with a first-rate mind are all significant factors in the speaker's background.

III. The Speaker's Delivery

In discussing the major elements of delivery, the chief concern of the critic focuses on the way in which key attributes add to the meaning and acceptability of the message, how those attributes serve as causal factors in gaining attention and stirring the desired response, and what role they played in the emerging image of the speaker. The four elements considered here are: (1) the mode of delivery, (2) general appearance, (3) bodily action, and (4) voice including articulation and pronunciation.  

The Mode of Delivery

First, as to the mode of delivery, Mrs. Thatcher delivered each of the party conference speeches from a carefully prepared manuscript which appears to be her usual mode

---

of delivery. Having viewed the video tapes of these speech events, this writer found that although the speaker tended to refer to the manuscript a great deal, she was at all times "comfortable" with the material; i.e., the words, phrases, concepts seemed to be her own. In a discussion with the writer in December, 1978, Robert Rhodes James, M.P., commented on Mrs. Thatcher's mode of delivery. 118

Robert Rhodes James is best known as a political historian. He left the academic life to seek a Tory seat in the House of Commons in October, 1976, and "frankly astonished some delegates" 119 at the Conservative party conference when the news of his short-listing appeared. In July of 1976, Professor Rhodes James resigned his position in Kurt Waldheim's office at the United Nations. He was responsible for all of Waldheim's public speeches during his time at the U.N. Professor Rhodes James met Margaret Thatcher in 1959 when she went into the House of Commons; he was then senior clerk at the House. "He was responsible for writing most of the speeches which Mrs. Thatcher delivered during her recent [1976] trip to Pakistan, India, Australia and New Zealand." 120 According to Professor Rhodes James, Mrs. Thatcher felt comfortable with the concepts and phraseology because they were her

119 Evening Standard, 7 October 1976.
120 Ibid.
concepts and phraseology, not those of her speech writers. She does not use speech writers to construct a text for her, but rather as resource people. "She has a very good instinct for choosing who will help at a particular time," he said. She often writes draft after draft, much to the chagrin of her staff, right up until the last moment.

Professor Rhodes James cited the 1976 Party Conference as an example of the way in which her staff and confidants find her a marvel, but also disconcerting and exasperating. The night before the 1976 Party Conference speech she sat up until 4 a.m. writing and rewriting. "As a result the speech was flat," James said. After delivering the speech she went into a room to address the overflow crowd. In that room, without notes, or the presence of cameras or sound tapes "she delivered a smashing speech" he said. Again her staff experienced enormous frustration.\textsuperscript{121}

Mrs. Thatcher herself is apparently dissatisfied with her skill in using a manuscript. Janet Brown, well known comedian and impressionist who is literally making a living by studying Mrs. Thatcher's delivery and impersonating her, recounted to this critic a conversation with Mrs. Thatcher in which she discussed the difficulties she encountered in using a manuscript.

\textit{JANET BROWN:} And she was very interested and she said, "This of course is my problem just now, because I find

\textsuperscript{121}Ibid.
it difficult reading from a script." And she said, "There aren't many people who have mastered the art of speaking from a script but," she was very honest, "Harold Wilson has. He's excellent at it." And she obviously set her mind to conquer that one as well, and the next interview I watched her on, she had made use of every little thing I'd spoken to her about and I thought, good for you! You know she didn't miss a trick.122

Throughout the party conference speeches there were segments, each year, in which she maintained a fluent, extem­poraneous quality. She did not read long portions of the speeches to her audience and consequently, she maintained good eye contact with them. Robert Rhodes James recalled the 1972 Party Conference when Mrs. Thatcher served as Secretary of State for Education under Heath. Many said it was the worst speech they had ever heard. "Dry. Monotone. She read it ... her voice trailed off at the ends of sentences," Professor Rhodes James said of that speech. A number of people said, "She's finished" afterward. It was that poor a performance. But she has come a long way since then and obviously has her mind set on learning how to be more effective.123

This critic viewed the 1978 party conference speech delivered by Mrs. Thatcher. It exemplified her development in speaking from a manuscript. She appeared confident, in control, and to be very much enjoying her delivery.

123 Ibid.
The Speaker's Appearance

Second, Mrs. Thatcher's appearance is likely to have made an impact on her audience: both positive and negative reactions must have resulted. For many in her audience the well-groomed hair, neat suit, and trim figure were irritating—or so it is frequently reported. On March 29, 1979, a writer for the Associated Press described Margaret Thatcher in this way to American readers:

Margaret Thatcher, who will become Britain's first woman prime minister if her Conservative Party wins the next election, has been called "a Tory glamour girl" by critics at home and "the iron maiden" by newspapers in the Soviet Union.

Her appearance is immaculate, her hair blonde, and her argument vigorous, especially when she attacked the Labor Party government's socialist policies and Soviet communism. Hence the nicknames.124

In general people enjoy looking at attractive people; certainly many people must find her style of dress appealing and her femininity refreshing. But Janet Brown explained why her looks are too stiff, too immaculate for some:

I think some people feel that a woman who looks as good as that may not be doing the work. Shirley Williams, the Labor minister, is someone with whom she is constantly compared. Shirley has a lovely voice and always rushes in as though she's just put herself together. But she looks busy, caught up in her work. She hustles in carrying her briefcase, hair tossed—well I don't think there's a need for that. . . . getting yourself together is a discipline.

. . . . I think possibly the ordinary woman may look at this immaculate image and perhaps feel that here is somebody who's not doing a day's work like I am and then,

this cultured voice, if you would call it that, comes out and to sum it up mildly, it got their backs up. 125

In four years Margaret Thatcher's looks have changed slightly. Her hair is softer; the lacquered look is gone. She appeared on television in 1978 in a political party broadcast. The commercial was filmed in the country, birds actually chirping behind her, not dubbed in later. She appeared relaxed, confident, something of a Mother Earth figure ready to make everything turn out all right. Gordon Reese, who co-ordinated the media at Conservative Central Office is credited with the change in her hair. Clearly her advisors have attempted to make her more appealing to the general public, to hush her critics, and to frustrate the cartoonists whose caricatures picture mounds of stiff hair and dress her in frumpy clothes.

Robert Rhodes James discussed the frequent comments in the press concerning her hair and clothes. Some of the remarks, he reported, were just nasty. But some of the abuse stems from real chauvinism, not articulated, simply understood. 126

In conducting interviews in and around London, the researcher observed that Margaret Thatcher was frequently compared to Labor Minister, Shirley Williams. The sentiments often expressed by both men and women in Britain are summarized in

an article which appeared in the *Liverpool Daily Post* on 27 October 1976.

As women politicians go, why do I warm to Shirley Williams much more readily than to Margaret Thatcher? Why was I dismally disappointed when she failed to make the deputy leadership of the Labor Party? Because she's human.

Her hair's a mess, she dresses badly, she always seems to be running everywhere, behind schedule, she's in the middle of an unhappy love affair refusing to re-marry because of her Roman Catholic principles . . .

How different from the impeccably coiffured Margaret Thatcher with her snappy two pieces, pearly teeth, pink and white complexion-- . . .

How different and how much more warmly refreshing . . .

---

**The Speaker's Bodily Action**

Third, Mrs. Thatcher's bodily action was probably the strongest element in her delivery. Her eye contact has already been mentioned in the discussion of Mrs. Thatcher's handling of the manuscript.

Other important factors are posture, gestures, movement, mannerisms, use of the microphone, type of facial expressions.

In each of the party conference speeches she stood erect, leaning over the podium or to the right or left side of it to emphasize a point. She did not move from behind the podium, but she did make graceful gestures which appeared "natural" and co-ordinated with her words.

Mrs. Thatcher has been accused of often having a "school marm" manner when she speaks. The description stuck, however

---
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accurate or inaccurate. It probably refers to the way in which she made points, very precisely, as though she were teaching a history or sociology class.

She appeared relaxed in using the microphone, maintaining an even level of volume. In none of the speeches did she seem uncomfortable with the equipment or inhibited by the stationary microphone.

In the 1975 party conference speech, Mrs. Thatcher remained sombre throughout the entire address. Consequently, she appeared stiff and uncomfortable much of the time. At the opening of the 1978 speech she told a joke and began on a lighter note. Her smiles and expressions of amusement made her appear relaxed and confident. The 1978 party conference speech differed from the three previous speeches especially in regard to her more relaxed facial expressions. In the 1975 speech the air of solemnity made her appear somewhat insecure as well as rigid.

The Speaker's Voice and Articulation

Finally, the audible characteristics of Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches changed significantly from 1975 to 1978. Here again, Janet Brown, who has made a business of imitating Mrs. Thatcher's voice, points out some of Margaret Thatcher's difficulties. She failed in the early period of her leadership to have vocal variety. She dropped the ends of sentences now and again, just as Professor James noted she had done in 1972. It was scarcely that pronounced in 1975-1976,
but still something to imitate. Janet Brown described her pitch pattern in this way:

If you were doing an interview on radio or television your voice would go up and down as mine is going up and down. It's maybe a lighter sound on the ear than this tone that's in her voice. This tone in her voice is one tone--she's breaking it. She's finding a way not to be as bad as she was. If you do an impression of her everybody knows what you're up to so that's something on the right side.128

After hearing Margaret Thatcher's 1976 party conference speech Janet Brown was struck by the change in the voice. She no longer spoke with the elaborate slowness to make her points. And the occasional high sounds no longer rose sharply to distract the listener. These problems were present in the 1975 party conference speech, but they are noticeably absent in the 1976-1978 speeches. Traces of the slowness appear as she used it to emphasize a point, but it does not pervade the other speeches.

Even Mrs. Thatcher's standard English dialect is something of a controversy. To American audiences it sounds refined and probably interesting. Janet Brown explained its effect on the British:

JANET BROWN: The thing is that it is a polite sounding voice that can be off-putting too. We talk about the middle class here and the upper classes. I don't think her voice bothers the middle class so much, but upper class women I know say, "I can't stand Margaret Thatcher, the way she speaks." You see because they in themselves think she is aping something or other. She's not. I'm

Thus, for some members of her audience, the very correctness with which she makes her sounds and her careful pronunciation were probably irritating. Others, no doubt, found her voice to be interesting and compelling.

The "Oxford" sound, as it is often called, must have underscored her educational background in the minds of many in her audience. The slow, slow pace which existed to a lesser degree each year probably annoyed some people and escaped others.

Perhaps her greatest problem vocally in the 1975 speech was a lack of variety. As Janet Brown, her most constant observer stated, that has changed. Her 1977 and 1978 speeches indicated improvement in her vocal variety.

Janet Brown also discussed the high pitch Mrs. Thatcher often had when she became nervous; on those occasions her voice grew suddenly shrill. She did not demonstrate the high pitch in any of the Party Conference speeches, but she did use the low pitch and speak in a very slow manner described by Janet Brown in the 1975 Party Conference speech in particular.

By the time she spoke at the 1977 Party Conference she had already begun working on her voice. Janet Brown had observed the improvements Mrs. Thatcher had made by the fall of 1976. Seeing and hearing someone imitate her and exaggerate

\[129\text{Ibid.}\]
her vocal characteristics probably gave Margaret Thatcher insight into her difficulties and an even greater incentive to make significant improvements.

Gordon Reece, who is now at Conservative Central Office and co-ordinates all of the media coverage for Mrs. Thatcher, not only advised her to change her hair, but worked on her voice as well. The following item appeared in the Evening News on the 21st of July 1977:

So how did Margaret Thatcher get rid of those too, too perfect vowels, that chilling shrillness, that school-marm manner?

After her recent TV triumph, I am still hearing approving comments about the new Thatcher--coupled with mounting curiosity about the way this particular swan changed back, at least partly, to the original duck.

Today I can reveal that it was all done with the help of an expensive video-tape machine installed at her home in Flood Street, Chelsea.

There, with the help of Gordon Reece--the astute image polisher now returned to the more lucrative pastures of the EMI sight-and-sound giant--she taped and watched herself again and again and again.

I gather it was not a painless process.

In November of 1978 Mrs. Thatcher discussed her voice with journalists. She said that her voice pitch got higher when she became nervous. One of her habits is to put a note on top of her manuscript which reminds her to "keep voice low and relax".

She denied she had ever tried to make her voice "posher" or taken elocution lessons. That was a myth, she said.

---


But she picked up dialects easily and had appeared in amateur dramatics.\textsuperscript{132}

When Mrs. Thatcher became Leader of the Opposition in February, 1975, and immediately began speaking to numerous audiences throughout Britain, her voice and manner caught the ears and eyes of the public and the press. Because her voice sounded so every odd to the ear, especially the slow, deliberate pace and the low pitch, she became the subject of imitation throughout Great Britain. Audiences are nearly as familiar with imitations of her voice as they are her actual voice. If imitation is in fact the highest form of flattery, then even the weaknesses in her delivery have served her well.

IV. Conclusion

Margaret Thatcher's background--including her childhood and family life, her academic training, her legal experience, and her parliamentary career--was probably familiar to those in the immediate audience and to many people in the television audience during the 1975 party conference speech: each year the details of her background would have become more widely known to the general public through the print medium. Her background clearly served her well in preparing her for a career in Parliament and her speech education from childhood on appears to have stirred in her a sense of mission and given her a desire to communicate as a speaker the messages which she deems to be of political

\textsuperscript{132}Ibid.
and sociological significance to her country.

Her delivery, even with the unpleasant vocal qualities which she demonstrated much of the time in 1975 and 1976, probably did not greatly weaken her overall effectiveness. In the party conference speeches her voice did not rise to a shrill as observers have noted that it has done in other speeches. She did speak with a rather low pitch pattern and with exaggerated slowness in the 1975 speech. Perhaps the most significant flaw in her delivery was her failure to smile and to appear relaxed and confident. In the 1978 speech she showed a remarkable improvement in several aspects of her delivery: her pitch pattern became more pleasing, she laughed and smiled; she appeared relaxed and comfortable before her audience.
CHAPTER IV

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SPEECHES

I. Introduction

Four areas of consideration reveal the way in which the speaker structured the party conference speeches. Often dispositio is limited in translation as "arrangement", but in the broad sense that the ancient rhetoricians used the term it referred to the selection, orderly arrangement, and proportioning of the parts of an address. Thus disposition properly includes several areas of analysis: (1) the emergence of the central theme, (2) the order in which the parts of the discourse occur, (3) the general method of arrangement used in the speech, (4) the proportioning of the material, and (5) the devices used to achieve unity.

II. Thematic Emergence

In each of the party conference speeches Margaret Thatcher's central themes on propositions are repeated throughout each address. Clearly, the nucleus-thought for
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each speech carried her message forward suggesting the scope of the subject and bringing it into focus.

The way in which Mrs. Thatcher developed her central theme is significant. In the 1977 party conference speech she most clearly stated her thesis in the closing moment of the speech, while in the 1975, 1976, and 1978 party conference speeches the thesis statement appeared in the first minutes of each address. Mrs. Thatcher's statements of purpose revealed her approach to the problems at hand and indicated the degree of her passion and involvement in the subject.

In the 1975 party conference speech Mrs. Thatcher stated her thesis with great intensity in the opening moments:

Britain and Socialism are not the same thing, and as long as I have health and strength they never will be.

The next year, in 1976, Mrs. Thatcher again spoke on the subject of the failures of socialism, but through her thesis statement she focused on the urgency of the crisis in Britain. Again, her central theme revealed her concern, intensity, and commitment. With this thesis statement she launched into her proof:

The very survival of our laws, our institutions, our national character--that is what is at stake today.

In the 1977 speech Mrs. Thatcher summarized her feelings about the role of the Conservative Party and clearly stated the central theme of her speech for the first time at the conclusion of the address:

I know how many hopes ride with us today--the hopes of millions who are Conservative, and millions who are not, but who look to us because they feel instinctively
that what is happening to their country threatens not only their freedom but everything that made it materially and moral.

Margaret Thatcher stated the central theme of the 1978 party conference speech early in the address. In her statement she emphasized the need for a new Government and again focused on the ideological differences between the Conservative and Labor parties:

Our party offers the nation nothing less than national revival, the deeply-needed, long-awaited and passionately longed for recovery of our country, a recovery that will depend on a decisive rejection of the Labor Party by the people and a renewed acceptance of the Conservative belief that the state is the servant not the master of this nation!

The subject was the same for each speech: the failure of socialism. The central theme focused on slightly different aspects of the crisis on each occasion. Also, the intensity of the crisis, as the speaker described it, appears to have risen with each passing year. In 1975 Margaret Thatcher stated the case against socialism. In 1976 she emphasized the threat to the very survival of all that is "British", as many know Britain. In the 1977 conference speech, the statement of her central theme revealed the mounting urgency of the crisis; and by 1978, with the assurance of an election sometime in 1979 she spoke of a decisive Labor defeat as the only way for the nation to recover.

III. Rhetorical Order

According to Aristotle the only essential parts of a
speech are the statement of the case and the proof.\textsuperscript{135} He added that if other parts were necessary they should not exceed four: the exordium, the exposition of statement of the case, the proof, and the peroration.

The Introduction

The introduction must arouse the interest of the listeners as well as prepare them for the speaker's message. Mrs. Thatcher did not use the introduction to outline her main points or to define terms in any of the party conference speeches, but rather to build her ethos or, in the case of the 1978 party conference speech, establish a mood.

In another chapter Mrs. Thatcher's ethical appeals are described. She established her character and goodwill in the opening of the 1975, 1976, and 1977 speeches by praising her audience and by indicating their virtue and hers. The central themes came forth during the introductions of the 1975 and 1976 speeches. The 1978 party conference speech marked a departure from her previous party conference speeches in that she opened with a joke and then leveled an attack on the Government as a means of getting into the body of the speech. Not until she got into the body did the central theme emerge. Although the opening bit of humor was

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
light, the audience responded enthusiastically: 136

I must first thank you, Madame Chairman, for the wonderful heartwarming welcome. I confess that this is the biggest birthday party that I have ever had. I just do not know whether my parents had in mind the timing of the party conference, but if that is what is meant by family planning, I am all for it.

Each of the four introductions was short. She set the tone, issued a challenge, and moved into the body of the speech.

The Body

Margaret Thatcher used the body of the speech to answer the challenges and elaborate upon the problems set forth in the opening of each speech. Here she set forth the details which would amplify her method of division, which is discussed in some detail later in the chapter. The logical, ethical, and emotional appeals were intertwined throughout the body of each speech.

The Conclusion

At the close of each of the party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher used a brief anecdote, a striking statement, or a quotation. She strengthened the "action step" at the close of each address by paying a "farewell compliment to the audience" on emphasizing the virtue of the cause.

136 Video taped recording of the 1978 Party Conference speech provided by Conservative Central Office in London.
The 1975 party conference speech:

We can go on as we have been going and continue down, or we can stop and, with a decisive act of will, say "Enough". [action step]

... Let us resolve to heal the wounds of a divided nation, and let that act of healing be the prelude to a lasting victory. [the virtue of the cause]

The 1976 party conference speech:

I call the Conservative Party now to a crusade. Not only the Conservative Party. I appeal to all those men and women of goodwill who do not want a Marxist future for themselves or their children or their children's children. [action step]

Let nothing narrow or vindictive or self-righteous be any part of our crusade. Rather let us say with humility: "We offer you hope and a new beginning. Together we shall meet the crisis of the country--and tomorrow the day will be ours." [the virtue of the cause]

The 1977 party conference speech:

Let us not forget--our first duty to freedom is to defend our own . . . . Two years ago I spoke of a man's right to work as he will, to spend what he earns, to own property, to have the state as servant and not as master. And today the threat to those democratic values has doubled and redoubled. [action step]

These are deeply anxious and disturbing days for those whose eyes are open, and who value freedom, but provided we are alert and alive to the danger, then the human will of the growing and quietly determined majority must prevail. [farewell and compliment]

The 1978 party conference speech:

Now, as the test draws near, I ask your help, and not only yours--I ask it of all men and women who look to us today, who share with us our longing for a new beginning. [action step]

Of course, we in the Conservative Party want to win, but let us win for the right reason--not power for ourselves, but that this country of ours, which we love so much, will find dignity and greatness and peace again. [the virtue of the cause]
Mrs. Thatcher rigorously followed the principle of economy of materials. In each conclusion she made an appeal to action, complimented the listeners on their cause, and concluded the message with a striking statement.

IV. Method of Division and Arrangement

Consciously or unconsciously the speaker decided upon a basis of division (analysis) of the subject or determined the most suitable major units. Each of the party conference speeches was developed around a proposition of policy (recommending a new course of action); therefore, they rely to some extent on the logical order. According to the logical method the arrangement of the materials is determined by the continuity of the reasoning process. Each segment of the speech serves as a link in the chain of thought. However, the speeches reveal the obvious influence of psychological considerations. The predisposition or inclination of the listeners determines the psychological order; the motivated sequence pattern advocated by Alan Monroe provides a useful basis for examining Mrs. Thatcher's methods of distribution.

Although the logical method served to give continuity to the reasoning process, the questions asked in Alan Monroe's
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formula is relevant to Mrs. Thatcher's treatment of her material in each of the speeches. Monroe's formula asks:

(1) What materials shall be used to gain attention?
(2) What factors in the situation create a need (or lack of it) for this proposal?
(3) What program or ways may provide (benefits) called for by this need?
(4) What application of the proposal can be visualized by the speaker and audience?
(5) What action should be taken to insure the application of the proposal (or to block such application)?

Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches, like Monroe's formula, are concerned with psychological appeals and reactions.

In accordance with Monroe's formula the speaker satisfied her five questions: first the speaker chose ethical appeals to gain the attention and favorable consideration of her audience; second, she issued a challenge and stated her central theme early in the address in order to create a need for her proposals; third, she established in each speech Conservative Party policies and programs which would satisfy the current needs which she described; fourth, the speaker sought to visualize the application of her plans and
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policies for her audience; fifth, Mrs. Thatcher ended each speech with a call for action, e.g. to fight socialism in every way possible, to support the Conservative Party in the next general election, to recognize the threat that Marxism posed to Britain, etc.

V. Outlines of the Party Conference Speeches

"Let Me Give You My Vision" (1975)

Introduction

Body

I. I could say nothing half as damaging about Britain as what Labor has done to Britain.
   A. Labor has caused prices to rise at a record rate of 26 per cent a year.
   B. It is the Labor Government whose past policies are forcing unemployment higher than it need ever have been.
   C. It is the Labor Government that brought the level of production below that of the three day week in 1974.
   D. It is the Labor Government that has brought us record peace-time taxation.
   E. It is the Labor Government that has pushed public spending to record levels.

II. There are those who seem anxious not to overcome our economic difficulties, but to exploit them to destroy
the free enterprise society.
A. Mr. Wilson has at last discovered that his own party is infiltrated by extreme left-wingers.
B. Our capitalist system produces a far higher standard of prosperity and happiness because it believes in incentive and opportunity, and because it is founded on human dignity and freedom.

III. What we face today is not a crisis of capitalism, but of socialism.
A. The cause of our shortcomings does not, therefore, lie in private enterprise.
B. We are witnessing a deliberate attack on our values, a deliberate attack on those who wish to promote merit and excellence, a deliberate attack on our heritage and great past.
C. Others, under the shelter of our educational system, are ruthlessly attacking the minds of the young.
D. These are the two great challenges of our time: the moral and political challenge and the economic challenge.

IV. Policies and programs should not be just a list of unrelated items, but rather a part of a total vision of the kind of life we want for our country and children.
A. A man has a right to work as he will, to spend what he earns, to own property, to have the state as servant not master.
B. We want a free economy, not only because it guarantees our liberties, but also because it is the best way of creating wealth and prosperity for the whole country.

C. By their attack on private enterprise the Labor Government has made certain that there will be next to nothing available for improvements in our social services over the next few years.

V. Government must learn to leave the companies with enough of their own profits to produce the goods and jobs for tomorrow.

A. If the socialists will not or cannot, there will be no profit making industry left to support the losses caused by fresh bouts of nationalism.

B. If anyone is murmuring that I am preaching laissez-faire, let me say I am not arguing and never have argued, that all we have to do is to let the economy run by itself.

C. The Labor Government has pursued a disastrous vendetta against small businesses and the self-employed which we will reverse.

VI. Government could not have destroyed the confidence of the industry more effectively if they had tried deliberately to do so, with their formula of empty promises and penal taxation.

A. Today the picture is one of depressed profits, low investment, no incentive and Government spending
far beyond the taxpayers' means.

VII. We believe that everyone has a right to be unequal, but to us every human being is important.
A. Those with special gifts should be given a chance.
B. The spirit of envy can destroy.
C. Freedom to choose is something we take for granted, until it is in danger of being taken away.
D. Opportunity and excellence in our state schools are being diminished under socialism.
E. Under Labor, private medicine is being squeezed out, and the result will be to add to the burden on the National Health Service without adding one penny to its income.

VIII. If we are to be told that a Conservative Government could not govern because certain extreme leaders would not let it, then general elections are a mockery, we have arrived at a one-party state, and parliamentary democracy in this country will have perished.
A. When the next Conservative Government comes to power, many trade unionists will have put it there.
B. Remember that if parliamentary democracy dies free trade unions die with it.

IX. The first duty of government is to uphold the law.
A. It is tragic that the socialist government shed its principles over the People's Republic of Clay Cross and that a group of the Labor Party
should have tried to turn the Shrewsbury pickets into martyrs.

B. The Conservative Party is pledged to support the unity of the United Kingdom, to preserve that unity and to protect the people, Catholic and Protestant alike.

"The Rebirth of a Nation" (1976)

Introduction

I. Economically Britain is on its knees.
   A. If the Labor Government is no longer able to act in the national interest, then the alternative is here in Brighton today.
   B. If the Conservative Party are to shoulder the responsibility of Government, to chart a fresh course for our country, then we must first understand what has happened to us, where we have gone wrong, and why.
      1. First, we have become the big spenders of Europe, spenders of other peoples' money.
      2. Second, increasing interference and direction of industry have stopped it doing its job properly.
      3. Third, the Labor Party has remained confused and divided over whether free enterprise should be allowed to survive.

II. The Labor Party is now committed to a program which is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
frankly and unashamedly Marxist, a program initiated by its national executive and now firmly endorsed by its official party conference.

A. In the House of Commons, the Labor left may still be outnumbered, but their votes are vital to the continuance of Labor in office, and that gives them strength out of proportion to their numbers.

B. The dividing line between the Labor Party program and communism is becoming harder and harder to detect.

C. Provided they know what is happening, the citizens will never surrender to extremists whether of the left or right.

III. Because the very nature of the Labor Party prevents a Labor Government from doing what some of its members realize at long last must be done, there is little chance that they'll change course.

A. We are told that to cut public spending further is impossible because the Labor Party wouldn't stand for it.

B. Between the pair of them, Sir Harold and Mr. Callaghan, their wretched Governments have impoverished and all but bankrupted Britain.

1. Government are going or taking stopgap measures to try to restore confidence in the £.

2. We have had national plans and pay pauses, price freezes, productivity awards, industrial
strategies, and growth targets which have left us with doubt and bewilderment.

IV. The right approach is a strategy statement which sets out the broad lines which stem from a clear, coherent political philosophy.

A. The only way to safety is to stop borrowing and stop borrowing soon.
B. To do that, the country must consume less than it produces.
C. Once we have taken emergency measures which are needed, we must chart the course for years ahead.
D. Either the Treasury can make us, the people economise by putting up taxes or it can concentrate all its economies on the government's own spending.

V. The almost total commitment to extravagant government expenditure is not borne solely of compassion.

A. It reflects a stubborn desire to regulate the day to day lives of the rich and poor alike.
B. It is a Labor Government that has doubled the numbers out of work and set a shameful post-war record.
C. The doubling of public spending led to a doubling of unemployment because they bled productive industry white of the resources it needed to provide jobs.

VI. We must break out of restraint if we are to have a
prosperous and successful future.
A. We shall do this by providing a stable economic background so that expansion and growth will pay and be seen to pay.
B. We shall do it by letting profits rise to a level which offers a real incentive to expand.
C. We shall do it by answering that men and women who invest their savings in their own business can earn a reasonable return.
D. We shall do it by following the example of other Conservative Governments and cutting taxes as soon as we can.
E. We shall encourage the production of wealth by spreading a share in its growth among those who have helped create it.

VII. We want to restore the right of unions and management to make the best bargain they can in circumstances they both know.
A. I agree with the speaker who said that if a trade union leader, or anyone else for that matter, wants to run the country he should stand for Parliament.
B. The next Conservative Government will look forward to discussion and consultation with the trade union movement about the policies which are needed to save the country.

VIII. Today the Conservative Party is truly a national party.
A. We want to offer the opportunity of home ownership to everyone.
B. We are the party that will emphatically not economise on the police force.
C. We are the party that wants to reduce taxation, while the socialists never stop trying to raise it.
D. We are the party that believes it should pay more to work than to remain idle.
E. We are the party that regards the defense of the realm as the overriding duty of any government.
F. The Conservatives, not the socialists, represent the true interests and hopes and aspirations of the working people.

"We Shall Not Fail Our Country" (1977)

Introduction

I. It is not the Tories who have wheeled and dealed and manoeuvred and manipulated to avoid one thing at all costs--facing the voters.

II. All of us are deeply thankful that the wealth of the North Sea started to flow; but the North Sea is not a socialistic sea and its oil is not socialist oil.
A. As the oil comes on stream, our balance of payments is going to look healthier.
B. The truth is that we are still grinding along in bottom gear, with our factories producing less
than they were when Labor came to power.

C. If Labor survives into the next year, prices will have doubled while they have been in power.

D. Labor wants to nationalize all the land, not just some of it.

E. They want higher taxes to pay for their plans.

II. From one election to the next, Labor's program gets meaner, more narrow, more Marxist.

A. Destroying the freedoms we have cherished and defended down the centuries doesn't worry the far left.

B. The party of Hugh Gaitskell has become a party fit for Andy Bevan and Peter Hain.

III. In the coming months you are going to see a carefully orchestrated campaign by Labor to portray me as "extremely this" or "extremely that".

A. I am extremely aware of the dangerous duplicity of socialism.

B. If it is reactionary to react against the politics of the last few years, which undermined our way of life and devastated our economy, then we are reactionary and so are a great majority of the British people.

IV. The best reply to full blooded socialism is not milk-and-water socialism, but genuine Conservatism.

A. Socialism has not made the society fairer; it has made it less fair.
B. If we confront reality, if we pin our trust on skill, the resource and the courage of our people, then this country can work out its salvation and regain its prosperity.

C. All elections are crucial, but this time the choice could be decisive for a generation, because, this time how the country votes will settle which party is entrusted with the immense benefits of North Sea oil.

V. The government dares not fight on its record or on any manifesto that would be acceptable both to its Marxist left and to the people of Britain.

A. A strong and responsible trade union movement is essential to this country, and its rights must be respected.

B. The belief that those rights take precedence over all other rights and even over the law itself, could be fatal to this country.

C. We in the Conservative Party look forward to a long and fruitful association with the unions, because a Conservative Britain will be as much in the interests of union members as the rest of the community.

VI. We shall cut income tax, so that once again it is worthwhile to work harder and to learn a skill.

A. Our aim is to make tax collecting a declining industry.
B. Government support for ailing industry will only produce an ailing economy unless it is selective, unless the circumstances are exceptional.

VII. We Conservatives are a family party.

A. That is why we will give council tenants the right in law to buy their home.

B. The main victims of Labor's recent attack on the direct grant schools have been able children from less well-off families.

C. Our aim in education is simple: it is to raise standards for all our children.

VIII. Law and order will be an issue, and it will be a vital issue at the election.

A. The next Conservative Government will give more resources to the police.

B. The Conservative Party stands rock firm for the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

C. Our armed forces are poorly paid and they are denied the equipment, the stores, the back-up and the training that they know are vital to do the job they do.

D. We have a government that neglects our defences, a government that lets down NATO so badly that our allies have rebuked it publicly.

Conclusion.
"1978 Conservative Party Conference Speech"

Introduction

I. The dying days of this administration may well see one last wretched round of manipulation and manoeuvre, of private deal or public pacts or cosy little understandings, always, of course, in the national interest—before the government are finally dragged kicking and screaming, to the polls.

A. I believe that the longer they wait the harder they will fall.

B. Our party offers the nation nothing less than national revival, the deeply-needed, long-awaited and passionately longed for recovery of our country.

C. The damage Labor has done to the country is immeasurable.

II. The first step in clearing your mind about where to go is to understand how you got where you are.

A. We have been ruled by men who live by illusions, the illusion you can spend money you haven't earned.

B. Things have not deteriorated so quickly since the crisis of 1976 when Denis Healey was put on probation to the International Monetary Fund.

III. Today the nation has a Prime Minister whose party has disowned his principal policy and destroyed the chief plank in his election strategy.

IV. The country is looking for a sign that we can succeed
where Labor has failed.

A. The idea that only Labor can talk to Labor drowned in the sea at Blackpool.

B. We Conservatives don't have a blue print for instant success, but at least we start with this advantage—we know what not to do.

V. Restrictive practices are encrusted like barnacles on our industrial life.

A. When two men insist on doing the work of one, there is only half as much for each.

B. The right way to attack unemployment is to produce more goods more cheaply then more people can afford to buy them.

VI. We shall do all that we can to rebuild a free and prosperous Britain.

A. We believe in realistic, responsible collective bargaining free from government interference.

B. We believe in encouraging competition, free enterprise, and profits in firms large and small.

C. We believe in making substantial cuts in the tax on your pay packet.

VII. Labor seems to stand too often for expediency, for greed, for privilege, for policies that set one half of society against the other.

A. The spirit of envy is seen in Labor's bias against men and women who seek to better themselves and their families.
B. Object to merit and distinction and you're setting your face against quality, independence, originality, genius, against all the richness and variety of life.

C. The political organization of hatred is wrong—always and everywhere.

D. Our determination to deal with the very real and difficult problems of immigration control has inspired Labor to a shameful attempt to frighten the colored population of Great Britain.

E. Many smears and charges will be thrown at us as election day comes nearer.

VIII. We have seen some of the symptoms of the breakdown of the rule of law—the growth in the number of unsolved and unpunished crimes, especially violent crimes, overcrowded courts, an underpaid and undermanned police force, judges insulted by senior ministers of the Crown.

A. We are 100 per cent behind the police, the courts, the judges, and not the least the law-abiding majority of citizens.

B. The Conservative Party stands for the defense of the realm.

C. So long as Ulster wishes to belong to the United Kingdom she will do so.

Conclusion.
V. The Proportioning of the Material

Proportion deals primarily with the position and space of the content. In each of the four party conference speeches Margaret Thatcher positioned the same topics at the opening and closing of each address. There are also similarities in the way she allotted more space to certain topics than to others.

First, as to Mrs. Thatcher's use of position, the most important concepts in the speeches appeared at the beginning of each address. She denounced the Labor Party as the cause of Britain's problems early in each of the party conference speeches. In each case she gave only a short introduction and moved immediately into the body of the speech by issuing a challenge to the country and to the Labor Government. The strong statements at the beginning of each speech made her major themes memorable throughout the speeches. The following statements illustrate the forceful way Mrs. Thatcher introduced each of her main themes:

Whatever could I say about Britain that is half as damaging as what this Labor Government has done to our country? [1975]

Economically, Britain is on its knees. It is not unpatriotic to say this. It is no secret. [1976]

Last week in Brighton we were accused of an insatiable lust for power. It is not the Tories who have wheeled and dealed and manoeuvred and manipulated to avoid one
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thing at all costs—facing the voters. [1977]

As soon as Parliament reassembles we shall do all we can as a responsible Opposition to end the present damaging uncertainty, to defeat the Government and to bring about a general election. But I must warn you that the dying days of this administration may well see one last wretched round of manipulation and manoeuvre, of private deals or public pacts or cosy little understandings—always of course, "in the national interest"—before the Government are dragged kicking and screaming to the polls. [1978]

At the conclusion of each speech she restated the major theme using impressive language to emphasize the significance of the message. However, just before she ended each speech she spoke briefly on two topics: (1) the need for stronger defense and (2) the determination of the Conservatives to protect Northern Ireland and/or to preserve the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Since Mrs. Thatcher positioned these topics at the end of each speech it seems certain that she understood the significance of such placement. Although she did not deal with the complexities of either topic she did make brief, specific pledges. Such brevity would have weakened the impact of those topics had it been expressed within the body of each address. However, the statements held greater significance having been made as they were at the close of each address.

Mrs. Thatcher did not use a summary or a restatement of major points at the close of any of the speeches. She restated the theme only. Thus, the position of the final topics leading into her conclusion had a decided affect on the tone of the conclusion.
Second, Margaret Thatcher's use of space probably served her purpose in each address. Clearly, she spent the largest amount of time in developing her case against socialism. She spoke most extensively in each speech on the mistakes made by the Labor Party in dealing with the economy. However, in the 1978 speech Mrs. Thatcher covered more topics at greater length, e.g. immigration, the breakdown of law and order, the defense of the realm, and the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. As a result the 1978 party conference speech lacked the unity she achieved in the other three.

VI. The Devices Used to Achieve Unity

As mentioned in the previous discussion Mrs. Thatcher used space as a means to achieve unity. Her chief unifying device, however, in each of the speeches was her use of transitions. The nature of the occasion probably demanded that she introduce more topics than she had time to discuss fully in order that she might indicate her position on a number of issues. Final summaries and internal summaries, and occasionally, transitions were noticeably absent in the speeches, probably because the speaker introduced such a great many topics.

The transitions were essential in providing the unity in these speeches, all of which were arranged by the logical method. Since each segment of the speech served as a link to the next, the transitions were crucial. One topic grew out of
the previous one as a result of such connecting devices. For example, the topics of law and order and the defense of the realm are distinctly different; and yet, one topic logically led to the next because she used appropriate transition:

I do not intend to sit on the sidelines wringing my hands while London, Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham and the rest of our cities go the way of New York. But if the violence in Britain is deeply disturbing, it is nothing to what has been endured by the people of Northern Ireland for nearly ten years. [1977]

The speaker moved from a discussion of the immigration policy into a defense of the various charges made against Conservatives with the sentence "Many other smears and charges will be thrown at us as election day comes nearer."

Compulsory repatriation is not, and never will be our policy and anyone who tells you differently is deliberately misrepresenting us for his own ends. Many other smears and charges will be thrown at us as election day comes nearer. But let us not be too concerned, however large the lie or absurd the charge . . . one moment the Shadow Ministers are said to be notorious villains . . . the next minute they are said to be unknown. [1978]

Another example of the kind of transitions the speaker used occurred in the 1977 speech. She spoke of the destruction in education with law and order by referring to the "destroyer":

That is not education, it is political propaganda, and I see no reason why you and I and every other taxpayer should pay for it. These destroyers would also destroy respect for our laws and the order on which civilized society is based. People have asked me whether I am going to make the fight against crime an issue at the next election. [1977]

Mrs. Thatcher at times shifted from one topic to the next without making an appropriate transition. In a discussion
of employees voting as shareholders at company meetings she defended the right of council tenants to own their own homes:

The Labor Party want union leaders on boards of directors. We want more employees voting as shareholders at company meetings. Under a Conservative Government we hope that more of them will own a stake in industry and that more of them will own their own homes.

We Conservatives are a family party. We believe that in a healthy society more and more people should be able to buy the roof over their own heads. That is why we will give council tenants the right in law to buy their own homes. [1977]

In the 1976 speech she spoke of the frustration of the people in regard to taxation and then darted from one topic to the next:

People are becoming increasingly frustrated by the crushing weight of personal taxation in Britain, where we now have the highest starting rate of income tax in the world. We are the party that wants to reduce taxation, while the socialists never stop trying to raise it.

And we are the party that believes it should pay more to work than to stay idle. A growing number of people are anxious about the strength of the armed services.

Thus, the lack of internal summaries as well as final summaries, coupled with the occasional lack of transitions prevented the speaker from achieving unity in the speeches.

VII. Conclusion

The choices Mrs. Thatcher made in structuring the party conference speeches indicate that she considered the demands of the occasion. Each area of analysis revealed that the speaker recognized the problems inherent in the material. First, the speaker introduced the central theme or thesis.
statement early in the speech; this enabled the audience to focus more clearly on the significant points in the material which followed.

Second, Mrs. Thatcher's speech contained the essential parts, an introduction, body, and a conclusion. In her introductions she gained the attention of the audience and used striking statements to prepare them for her message. The body of each speech contained the definition of the problem and presented solutions. The development of the body amplified the speaker's method of division.

Third, the speaker arranged the materials by using the logical method; however, the speeches reveal that psychological considerations also affected the division. Since the party conference speeches developed around a statement of policy they necessarily relied on the logical order. However, in accordance with Alan Monroe's formula the party conference speeches centered around psychological appeals and reactions.

Fourth, the speaker recognized the significance of proportions in the party conference speeches. She paid particular attention to the elements of space and position. She located her thesis statement, challenge, and major theme at the opening of each address. At the end of each speech she introduced particularly "hot" issues--law and order and the unity of Northern Ireland and Great Britain. This placement gave emphasis to those topics in spite of the brevity with
which she dealt with them. In regard to space Mrs. Thatcher spent the greatest amount of time on the topics which best developed her central theme; in each speech she detailed the failures of the Labor Government.

Fifth, Mrs. Thatcher used transitions to achieve unity. In accordance with the logical method of division one segment was linked to the other. However, by failing at times to use the transitions Mrs. Thatcher did not provide a logical step from one topic to the next.

The chief weakness lay in the lack of unity in the 1978 speech. In that address Mrs. Thatcher gave greater time to more topics and as a result the audience probably had difficulty focusing on her central theme. Also Mrs. Thatcher failed to provide smooth transitions between the many topics introduced in that speech.

All of the party conference speeches lacked final summaries and internal summaries. Each of these speeches contained a number of topics and lacked previews and reviews of major points; her failure to summarize was the major weakness in the structure of the party conference speeches.
CHAPTER V

THE LOGICAL AND EMOTIONAL MODES

I. Introduction

In each of the party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher framed her major topics in a deductive argument, relying on ethical, emotional and logical proof as the means of reinforcing her arguments. Throughout these speeches she outlined her themes, rather than her cases. Logical appeals did not dominate her proof as they did in other major speeches, e.g. "Let The Children Grow Tall", delivered on September 15, 1975, at the St. Regis Hotel in New York City to a group of one hundred opinion leaders at a meeting sponsored by the Institute for Socioeconomic studies and her highly lauded parliamentary triumph delivered on July 20, 1977, before the House of Commons. In the New York speech in September, 1975 and in an address before the House of Commons in July 20, 1977 Mrs. Thatcher established in the minds of many critics her competence in argumentation and her skill in presenting exhaustive evidence. And yet, in each of the party conference speeches she failed at times to satisfy the basic rules of evidence. Most often in the party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher
developed her points by using emotional appeals. The weakness of the logical proof lay not in her syllogisms, but rather in her failure to provide sufficient supporting evidence for her premises. Throughout the speeches she made numerous claims for which she often failed to provide valid arguments. Both the lack of supporting evidence and the failure to construct formal arguments weakened her logical appeals considerably.

The lack of evidence suggests that she assumed either that her audience agreed with her premises or that other appeals—emotional and ethical—would better serve her in reaching those to whom she needed to direct the available means of persuasion. The diversity of the audience presented an enormous challenge to the speaker; clearly, the various members had conflicting needs in the areas of logical and emotional proof. Careful adherence to the rules of argumentation may have proved tedious to some of the listeners. Others probably felt that her treatment of certain topics was superficial at best and irresponsible at the worst. The speaker stated her position on issues too numerous to discuss extensively. It seems likely that the emphasis on the logical mode and the failure to provide adequate supporting material was a deliberate strategy. In view of the nature of the occasion and the contrasting and conflicting demands that the diverse audience placed on the speaker Mrs. Thatcher's emphasis on emotional appeals was probably wise; however, giving weight to the emotional
proof did not necessitate weaknesses in the logical mode. An examination of her logical appeals reveals the way in which she failed to use the logical mode to her full advantage.

II. Logical Appeals

Mrs. Thatcher developed the following eleven issues in the party conference speeches; the first eight listed are ones she discussed in all of the speeches; the ninth issue she explored in the 1975, 1977, and 1978 speeches; and the tenth and eleventh issues emerged only in the 1978 speech. Each of the issues can be framed in hypothetical, disjunctive, and categorical syllogisms reflecting the deductions she made in her argumentation: (1) Is it of crucial importance that we understand what has happened to our country? (2) Is free enterprise superior to other economic systems? (3) To what extent is the Labor Party committed to Marxist programs? (4) What are the damaging effects of the Labor Government? (5) Is it essential that we revitalize Britain's economy? (6) Do we need to provide incentives to encourage the production of wealth? (7) What is the role of the trade union leaders and the definition of the social contract in a democracy? (8) Is the Conservative Party the last bastion between Britain and disaster? (9) Has the Labor Government failed to promote respect for and security under the law? (10) Should the Government deal with the very real problems of immigration? (11) Is it
crucial to maintain a strong national defense?

Understanding What Has Happened to Great Britain

Early in each speech Mrs. Thatcher commented on the importance in understanding the nature of events in Great Britain. She best framed her arguments in the opening minutes of the 1976 speech:

**Major Premise:** If the Conservative Party hopes to shoulder the responsibility of Government, to chart a fresh course for our country, then we must first understand what has happened to us--where things have gone wrong--and why.

**Minor Premise:** The Conservative Party does hope to shoulder the responsibility of Government and chart a fresh course for our country.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, we must first understand what has happened to us--where things have gone wrong--and why.

Certainly this hypothetical syllogism is valid. Also the premises are ones with which few in her party would argue; such hopes might well be the goals of any party. Mrs. Thatcher repeated the conclusion of this syllogism in each of the party conference speeches, but after establishing that need she failed to satisfy it. Although she has exhibited in other speeches a real facility for explaining what has happened and why in concise, comprehensive terms, she did not do so in these speeches. Given the amount of experience which she has in speech making and the consistent lack of evidence in her logical proof,
it is reasonable to assume that she deliberately chose to emphasize other appeals she deemed more effective. Although she told the audience in some detail "where things have gone wrong", she neglected to build a solid case in order to explain "why"; rather she relied on the pathetic mode to assure her listeners that a need did exist. Mrs. Thatcher's explanation of the "British sickness" (where things have gone wrong) easily introduced the issue of free enterprise and its superiority over other economic systems.

The Superiority of Free Enterprise

She made three major claims which were crucial to the support of her arguments, but she failed to support those claims with reliable data. (1) Great Britain has become the big spender of Europe--spender of borrowed money; (2) Increasing interference and direction of industry have prevented industry from doing its job properly; (3) The Labor Party remains confused and divided over whether free enterprise should be allowed to survive.

In each of the party conference speeches she framed arguments in support of free enterprise, but in each case she apparently assumed that the premises would stand, that her audience did not require exhaustive evidence.

Major Premise: If the socialist Government fails to leave companies with enough of their own profits to produce goods and jobs for tomorrow, then there will be no profit making industry left to support the losses caused by fresh bout of nationalization.
Minor Premise: Socialist governments have failed to leave companies with enough of their own profits to produce goods and jobs for tomorrow.

Conclusion: Therefore there will be no profit making industry left to support the losses caused by fresh bouts of nationalization.

(1975)

Both the major and minor premises offered challenges to members of the television viewing audience as well as to dissident Tories, but Mrs. Thatcher did not cite the instances in which companies had been stripped of profits or state losses caused by recent nationalization. In the 1976 party conference speech she introduced the issue in another argument which can be framed in a hypothetical syllogism:

Major Premise: If free enterprise has proved itself more efficient and better able to produce a good standard of living than either socialism or communism, then free enterprise should be allowed to survive.

Minor Premise: Free enterprise has proved itself more efficient and better able to produce a good standard of living than either socialism or communism.

Conclusion: Therefore, free enterprise should be allowed to survive.

The validity of the syllogism depends upon whether or not one accepts the minor premise. Since she did not present evidence in support of the premise its validity came into question. The degree to which free enterprise should flourish is a subject of real debate within the Conservative Party as well as between Conservative and Labor. She could not afford to let the premise stand unsupported.
by the data and statistics which she has abundantly used in other speeches. Consequently, the conclusion was weakened considerably.

In the 1977 party conference speech Mrs. Thatcher spent a bit more time developing the call for free enterprise. She cited the instances in which socialism had broken its promises and pointed to the way in which a free market economy would have remedied the situation. Her main argument followed the evidence:

**Major Premise:** If the Labor Government only moves forward when it abandons socialist policies and starts doing some of the things we suggest, then clearly the Conservatives are best able to promote a thriving economy.

**Minor Premise:** Labor only moves forward when it abandons socialist policies and starts doing some of the things Conservatives suggest.

**Conclusion:** Therefore the Conservatives are best able to promote a thriving economy.

In the 1978 party conference speech the topic of free enterprise was buried in a string of other subjects. Although her argument went unsupported as did a number of others, it can be framed in a hypothetical syllogism.

**Major Premise:** If we are ruled by men who live under the illusion that you can have freedom and enterprise without believing in free enterprise, then we can only expect the kind of failure that we have today.

**Minor Premise:** We are ruled by men who live under the illusion that you can have freedom and enterprise without believing in free enterprise.
Conclusion: Therefore, we can only expect the kind of failure that we have today.

The hypothetical syllogism used to frame Mrs. Thatcher's deductive arguments complies with the rules: i.e., the minor premise affirms the antecedent and the conclusion affirms the consequent. Mrs. Thatcher came to grips with the problems of free enterprise and the failures of socialism; she penetrated the compelling crises of the hour. But for this topic, as with most of the others, she did not offer an examination of the implications of her reasoning. She stated causes of problems without giving sufficient evidence of causation; she displayed a grasp of the possible solutions without building a case to support her theories.

As she developed each issue she followed this pattern. Again other appeals—ethical and emotional—were used in place of evidence to back up her logical appeals. Although her logical proof may not have satisfied many members of her audience, it is difficult to judge the extent to which she should have developed her logical proof without first examining her use of the other modes. Clearly, the speaker had to make a choice: either she could have covered fewer issues, giving lengthy evidence, perhaps at the risk of leaving vital topics untouched and alienating some listeners by using evidence they did not require or she could have done as she did--cover a number of issues, trusting her use of other appeals to give credence to her premises.
Mrs. Thatcher's third issue, the Labor Party's commitment to Marxist programs can be stated in a categorical syllogism:

Major Premise: All Marxists oppose democratic government and the liberty of the people.

Minor Premise: A powerful segment of the Labor Party is frankly and unashamedly Marxist.

Conclusion: A powerful segment of the Labor Party opposes democratic government and the liberty of the people. (1976)

The middle term has been distributed in at least one of the premises, but we cannot be certain that the facts stated in the premises are true. First, the label "Marxist" is vague. She did not define the term in her speeches or indicate those policies and principles which are both common to all Marxists and diametrically opposed to democratic government. Thus, the major premise required verification which she did not give. Second, if the Labor Party program is "frankly and unashamedly Marxist" the speaker could easily have cited policy statements and testimonies from Labor supporters to support her minor premise. In the 1977 speech she improved her use of evidence for this argument, citing "Labor Program for Britain, 1976"141 and listing a number of policies that the Labor Government endorsed. In the

1977 speech, as opposed to the 1976 speech, the argument was supported by evidence which undergirded her premises. Without such evidence the label "Marxist" is reduced to name calling, rather than a well-founded description of a dangerous group.

The Damaging Effects of the Labor Government

In the fourth issue she answered the question, what have been the damaging effects of the Labor Government? Mrs. Thatcher provided the careful analysis and necessary evidence with which she has distinguished herself in other major addresses. In the 1975 and 1976 speeches in particular she cited several instances in which Labor policies have failed:

Let us look at the record. It is the Labor Government that has caused prices to rise at a record rate of 26 per cent a year. . . . It is the Labor Government whose past policies are forcing unemployment higher than it need ever have been. . . . It is the Labor Government that brought the level of production below that of the three day week in 1974. (1975)


In the 1976 speech she built her case and then assessed the ability of Labor to change its course:

. . . The very nature of the Labor Party prevents a Labor Government from doing what some of its members at long last realize must be done. For example, we are told that to cut public spending further is impossible because the Labor Party would not stand for it.

Mrs. Thatcher carefully prepared her audience to accept the premises of her argument which followed, first
by providing evidence that a change in Government was essential, and, second, by giving reasons to believe that a change within the Labor Party was highly unlikely. Certainly the television audience would have required this support:

Major Premise: If the Government as it has functioned under Mr. Callaghan has impoverished and all but bankrupted Britain, then we must get rid of it before it does final damage.

Minor Premise: The Government as it has functioned under Mr. Callaghan has impoverished and all but bankrupted Britain.

Conclusion: Therefore, we must get rid of it before it does final damage.

The hypothetical syllogism is valid. The premises were grounded in evidence which Mrs. Thatcher used in support of this argument; the minor premise affirms the antecedent; and the conclusion affirms the consequent.

In the 1975 party conference speech she made a similar argument and provided sufficient evidence. In that speech she introduced the topic by answering her critics who said she had denounced Great Britain when she spoke in America.

Major Premise: If the record left by the Labor Government is as disastrous as it appears, then nothing I could say about Britain "is half as damaging as what this Labor government has done to our country."

Minor Premise: The record left by the Labor Government is as disastrous as it appears.

Conclusion: Therefore, nothing I could say about Britain "is half as damaging as what this Labor Government has done to our country."
The Revitalization of Britain's Economy

In her fifth major issue Mrs. Thatcher discussed the necessity of revitalizing Britain's economy. Her contentions did not rest on evidence. In discussing economic difficulties and the failures of the Labor Government, her line of reasoning was clear, but her assertions remained unsubstantiated.

Her arguments can be stated in valid syllogisms. In the hypothetical syllogism the minor premise affirms the antecedent and the conclusion affirms the consequent. The premises are based on verifiable evidence, and yet, Mrs. Thatcher did not present evidence to support her minor premise:

**Major Premise:** If the Government is spending £200 per year more than it is raising in taxes for each man, woman, and child in the country, then we must either raise taxes or cut government spending.

**Minor Premise:** The Government is spending £200 per year more than it is raising in taxes for each man, woman, and child.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, we must either raise taxes or cut government spending.

In her next argument relevant to the economy Mrs. Thatcher reasoned in a way best represented by what is probably an invalid syllogism. Most logicians say that one can draw a valid conclusion only if the minor premise affirms one of the disjuncts. According to this rule the argument is clearly invalid.
Major Premise: Either the Government must try to make us, the people, economise by putting up taxes or it must concentrate all its economies on the Government's own spending.

Minor Premise: The Government must not make us, the people, economise by putting up taxes.

Conclusion: Therefore, it must concentrate all its economies on the Government's own spending.

Throughout the 1978 speech in particular Mrs. Thatcher made one argument upon another, using one argument to reinforce the next often without first building her case. For example, the following syllogism represents an argument which occurs amidst a string of other arguments; the speaker showed little concern for substantiating her premises in the 1978 speech:

Major Premise: All governments which try year after year to level everyone down with totally rigid incomes policies destroy the incentives which are necessary in order for industry to survive.

Minor Premise: The Labor Party tries year after year to level everyone down with a totally rigid income policy.

Conclusion: Therefore, the Labor Party destroys incentives which are necessary in order for industry to survive.

She made similar arguments in the 1976 speech, but she introduced the topic of incentives by first describing the need to provide incentives to encourage the production of wealth. She systematically reviewed the cases in which incentives served as the means of revitalizing the economy.
We must break out of restraint if we are to have a prosperous and successful future.

We shall do this by providing a stable economic background so that expansion and growth will pay and be seen to pay.

We shall do it by letting profits rise to a level which offers a real incentive to expand.

We shall do it by ensuring that men and women who invest their savings in their own business or in someone else's business, can once more earn a reasonable return.

We shall do it by following the example of other Conservative Governments and cutting taxes as soon as we can.

We shall encourage the production of wealth by spreading a share in its growth among those who have helped create. (1976)

The Role of Trade Union Leaders and the Definition of the Social Contract

The seventh major question--what is the role of the trade union leaders and the definition of the social contract--presented a particular challenge to the speaker. Her opponents charged that she would not be able to handle the labor unions. In response to the attempts which may have been made to diminish her credibility in this area, she offered a carefully reasoned argument in the 1975 Party Conference speech:

Major Premise: If we allow the Labor Party to continue much of the nation that a Conservative Government could not govern because certain extreme leaders would not let it, then we are in danger of seeing general elections become a mockery and of living in a one-party state in which parliamentary democracy would have perished.

Minor Premise: We have allowed the Labor Party to convince much of the nation that a
Conservative Government could not govern because certain extreme leaders would not let it.

Conclusion: Therefore, we are in danger of seeing general elections become a mockery and of living in a one-party state in which parliamentary democracy would have perished.

In the 1976 speech Mrs. Thatcher defined her terms and presented the evidence on which she would rest her premises as she introduced the topic of trade unions. Most important, she took the time to develop her line of reasoning. She defined "social contract" as the term is used in democracies throughout the world; then she defined the way in which the Labor Party uses the term:

Major Premise: If a handful of trade union leaders dictate to the Government the level of public spending, the number of industries to be nationalized, what the tax system should be, the terms on which to borrow from the IMF, then our democracy is under attack by those who would seek a government of a section of the people, by a section of the people, for a section of the people.

Minor Premise: A handful of trade union leaders dictate to the Government the level of public spending, the number of industries to be nationalized, what the tax system should be, the terms on which to borrow from the IMF.

Conclusion: Therefore, our democracy is under attack by those who would seek a government of a section of the people, by a section of the people, for a section of the people.

Many members of the Labor Party itself would accept her major premise while others would not concede that...
democracy is under attack by the present trade union leadership. The speaker did not present data establishing the level of public spending or discuss the way in which trade union leaders were able to dictate policy. A number of people probably thought that to be true; however, the link between government policy and labor union demands was not clarified. If the union leaders "dictated" rather than influenced policy, it was incumbent upon the speaker to offer evidence; she did not.

The Last Bastion Between Great Britain and Disaster

In the last major issue common to each of the four party conference speeches, Mrs. Thatcher argued that the Conservative Party stood as the last bastion between Great Britain and disaster. The major and minor premises relied on the strength of the preceding arguments. Clearly, she must have already presented evidence of Labor's inability to deal with the task at hand and the Conservative Party's ability to cope with the situation. She stated her argument best, perhaps, in the 1976 party conference speech; it can be stated in a valid hypothetical syllogism:

Major Premise: If, as it has been said and I believe, the Conservative Party is the last bastion between Britain and disaster, then we must let that bastion be broad enough and large enough to accommodate all our people, Conservative and non-Conservative, trade unionist and non-trade unionist, those who have always been with us and those who have never been with us but who are prepared to support us now because they put
country before party.

Minor Premise: The Conservative Party is the last bastion between Great Britain and disaster.

Conclusion: Therefore, we must let that bastion be broad enough to accommodate all our people, Conservative and non-Conservative, trade unionist and non-trade unionist, those who have always been with us and those who have never been with us, but who are prepared to support us now because they put country before party.

This issue carried Mrs. Thatcher's central theme in each of the party conference speeches; the titles of the speeches bear this out: 1975--"Let Me Give You My Vision," 1976--"The Rebirth of the Nation," 1977--"We Shall not Fail Our Country." In the 1978 speech Mrs. Thatcher made numerous assertions concerning Labor's failure to lead effectively and the Conservative Party's ability and willingness to do so. She did not present—in any of the party conference speeches—a body of evidence to support the majority of her premises and conclusions.

Other Arguments

Mrs. Thatcher did not discuss the last three arguments in each of the speeches, but she did touch upon each of them in the 1978 party conference speech. In that speech she spent the greatest amount of time in discussing Labor's failure to govern properly. All of the other arguments were intwined in her development of that topic. In the speaker's discussion of the last three issues emotional
appeals dominated her proof. The following assertions represent the conclusions she reached in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh major issues:

(9) The Labor Government has failed to promote respect for and safety under the law.

(10) Only the Conservative Party is willing to deal openly and effectively with the real problems of immigration.

(11) It is crucial that we maintain a strong national defense.

In dealing with these issues in particular she did not choose to appeal to the reasoning process of her listeners, but rather to pathos.

Critics might insist that the nature of each of the eleven issues demanded precise reasoning and a careful adherence to the rules of evidence. Again the evaluation of the speaker's effective use of logical appeals and the over all effectiveness of the speeches are necessarily separate. In the discussions of Mrs. Thatcher's use of emotional and ethical appeals the possible reasons for her lack of reliance on logical proof are examined. After evaluating her use of the logical, ethical, and emotional modes a further evaluation of the sagacity of those decisions will be made.

Lack of evidence is the chief weakness in her logical appeals in each of the party conference speeches. The large number of issues she chose to discuss would necessarily have caused her to limit her use of evidence to some extent,
but it does not explain her repeated avoidance of crucial evidence. Frequently, she neglected evidence in favor of using other kinds of appeals to heighten her arguments. Many members of both the immediate audience and the television audience may not have accepted her premises and consequently could not have found her arguments compelling. Many members of the Conservative Party who were in the immediate audience probably considered themselves closer to the social democratic wing of the Labor Party than to Mrs. Thatcher's end of the Conservative Party. Certainly supporters of Ted Heath and other "dissident Tories" abounded at every conference; although the numbers who actively opposed Mrs. Thatcher are likely to have decreased greatly by the 1978 party conference speech. The television audience, however, represented people from every persuasion along the left-right continuum, many of whom would have required evidence in support of her premises.

In Mrs. Thatcher's well publicized New York speech in September, 1975, and in her highly lauded speech before the House of Commons in July, 1977, Mrs. Thatcher neglected to use emotional appeals and ethical appeals to her advantage, focusing entirely on exhaustive evidence to drive home her main arguments. It seems most likely that she made a deliberate decision to cover as many topics as possible in the 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1978 party conference speeches, taking advantage of the fact that the members of the live audience were quite familiar with the evidence on which
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she based her premises. As to the needs of the diverse television audience, clearly she decided that logical appeals should not override the use of other appeals in these party conference speeches. On whatever grounds she made the decision, whether it was a conscious decision or not, the speaker's frequent failure to provide minimal evidence in support of many arguments lowered the integrity of these speeches. Because Mrs. Thatcher has made a reputation for herself by demonstrating an ability to build a solid case, provide exhaustive evidence, and obey the rules of sound argumentation, the consistent lack of such a demonstration must be noted.

III. Emotional Appeals

Just as there is no clear cut dichotomy in the Aristotelian treatment of the three modes of proof, no discussion of the emotional appeals which Mrs. Thatcher used would be complete without some reference to the role of logic in the emotional mode. An examination of Mrs. Thatcher's use of logical appeals reveals that she did not rely upon this mode as her chief means of persuasion in the party conference speeches. Instead she used enthymemes, allowing those premises which she ascertained to be firmly in the minds of her listeners to stand

---
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without support. Her lines of argument were not supported with the exhaustive evidence which she used on other occasions. Clearly the persuasion in these speeches relied not on arguments which could be cast into valid syllogisms nor were they backed up by careful support for each premise. Instead she depended upon pathetic proof to give force to her premises.

Two particular areas of inquiry reveal the extent to which Mrs. Thatcher's reliance on the pathetic mode may or may not have been effective: (1) her adaptation to the audience; (2) her identification with the audience.

Adaptation to Her Audience

In an examination of the speaker's emotional proof the main consideration is the way in which the speaker puts the audience in a favorable frame of mind, inducing them to agree with her purpose.

Margaret Thatcher's audience for each of the party conference speeches was extremely diverse. The immediate audience, composed of members of the Conservative Party, offered the speaker an opportunity to expound with exacting detail upon her arguments; the members had both the background and interest to follow a carefully laid out case. The television viewing audience presented a greater challenge; the diversity demanded that the speaker keep a pace that would hold the interest of as many viewers as possible. No doubt the speaker sought to make herself
comprehensible to people of every age and socio-economic level; to consider both the intellectual achievements and limitations of her audience; to choose topics of particular interest to both sexes; to take into account the wide range of political and religious views; to anticipate prejudices and predispositions; to ascertain which topics were of the greatest interest to the most people; to capture the temper and tone of the occasion. The television audiences for the party conference speeches offered Mrs. Thatcher important opportunities to speak to the people of Great Britain. As leader she spoke at the conclusion of each party conference and the expectations of these occasions must have been high. As leader she had the responsibility to rally the troops.

Throughout each of the party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher adapted to the needs of her audience by appealing to the secondary motives which stimulate anger and fear. The most prominent appeals were to (1) the desire for economic security, (2) a sense of pride in the country and in democratic government, (3) the need for security under the law, (4) the concern for the defense of the realm, and (5) the desire to preserve the unity of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Each of these appeals crossed a wide range of ages, socio-economic levels, and needs.

**Identification with the Audience**

The speaker obviously hoped to arouse fear and anger toward her opponents when she appealed to the secondary
motives mentioned. By creating a sense of having an enemy in common with the audience she enabled her listeners to identify with her more closely. Kenneth Burke's doctrine of consubstantiality applies here. He views identification as key to persuasion. Whenever men have common sensations and attitudes they are together. Mrs. Thatcher assured her audiences that they held many needs, fears, hopes, and dreams in common. Thus, Mrs. Thatcher (1) adapted to her audience by limiting the logical mode and emphasizing the pathetic mode; and (2) she identified with her audience by appealing to the secondary motives which might arouse fear and anger in her audience.

Aristotle says in Book II, Chapter 1, of Rhetoric that emotions play a vital role in speaking because they affect the judgment of men. He draws these conclusions about anger:

Here we must discover (1) what the state of mind of angry people is, (2) who the people are with whom they usually get angry, and (3) on what grounds they get angry with them. It is not enough to know one or two of these points; unless we know all three, we shall be unable to arouse anger in any one.

An analysis of Mrs. Thatcher's appeals indicate that she had answers to those questions and that she applied them to the challenge inherent in speaking to the party conference audience.

A systematic look at the way in which Margaret Thatcher


appealed to the secondary motives is necessary to determine the effectiveness of her emotional proofs. However, it is important first to recognize two devices in particular which the speaker used in her emotional appeals; she used (1) loaded words and phrases and (2) lengthy descriptions of allegedly dangerous activities perpetrated by Labor.

**Loaded Words and Phrases**

The following words and phrases typify the way in which Mrs. Thatcher used language to ignite her arguments in the party conference speeches. She obviously used the conference occasions to fan the fires of controversy and to excite the audiences.

- . . . the **so-called** contract was a fraud
- . . . the **usual socialist disease**
- . . . ruthlessly attacking the minds of the young
- . . . bullied or brain washed out of our beliefs
- . . . a disastrous vendetta against small business

**Lengthy Descriptions**

The following example shows the way in which she used several enthymemes and trusted in the listeners to defend the implied premises:

It is the Labor Government whose past policies are foreshadowing unemployment higher than it need ever have been. Thousands more men and women are losing their jobs every day, and there are going to be men and women, many of them youngsters straight out of school, who will be without a job this winter because socialist ministers spent last year attacking us
instead of inflation. (1975)

Mrs. Thatcher obviously made an attempt to direct the anger that people felt about inflation toward the Labor Government. At least subconsciously the speaker must have asked Aristotle's questions: how do angry people feel, with whom do they get angry and why. Certainly it would be difficult for the speaker to establish that "socialist ministers spent last year attacking" the Conservatives "instead of inflation". It would have been more accurate to have said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Denis Healey, and the Prime Minister, James Callaghan, failed to make any real strides toward curbing inflation and could perhaps have better spent their time scrutinizing their own affairs rather than criticizing the Conservatives. But it was the exaggeration of the charge that made the impact.

In another long description Mrs. Thatcher depicts the left-wing of the Labor Party as a group of conspirators who have deceived and are deceiving the voters.

We all know the drill. In the run-up to each election the claws of Labor's extremists are not drawn; they are just withdrawn. The front men are paraded to talk quietly, moderately, almost sensibly. The left-wing just allows them their little outing until the voters are once more in the trap.

Now suppose the election is over. Make a supreme effort and imagine that Labor has won—only for a moment. What then? The trap is sprung and Labor's extremists resume the drive toward a Britain modeled on Eastern Europe. (1977)

The speaker made no attempt to verify the details of this account. Evidence and logical proof did not substantiate descriptions such as these. She simply asserted that the
power was great and the intentions sinister in the Left-wing of the Labor Party. As in the previous example she spoke as though she knew that the situation were precisely as she described. The severity of the portrait made the impact.

The Speaker's Appeal to the Secondary Motives of the Audience

The Desire for Economic Security

The discussion of the economic dilemma of Great Britain occupied more space in Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches than any of the other topics on which she spoke. Therefore, the appeals she made to the desire of her listeners for economic security were among the most significant in her emotional proof.

In the following examples she obviously hoped to arouse both fear of and anger toward the Labor Government. Indeed the value of her emotional proof depended upon the extent to which her audience experienced these emotions.

Our capitalist system produces a far higher standard of prosperity and happiness because it believes in incentive and opportunity, and because it is founded on human dignity and freedom. Even the Russians have to go to a capitalist country--America--to buy enough wheat to feed their people--and that after more than 50 years of a state-controlled economy. Yet they boast incessantly, while we who have so much more to boast about, forever criticise and decry.

Is it not time we spoke up for our way of life? After all, no Western nation has to build a wall to keep people in. (1975)

No profits mean no investment, and that means a dying
industry geared to yesterday's world, and that means fewer jobs tomorrow. (1975)

In the 1976 speech the speaker emphasized the increasing danger and the expressed fear for the survival of free enterprise in Great Britain:

Under Labor the land of hope and glory has become the land of beg and borrow. . . . The Government have chopped and changed policies; they have created confusion and uncertainty. They have added countless burdens. They have destroyed profits. They have raised the cost of borrowing to intolerable heights. And they have demoralised management and sapped the will to work. No wonder investment in industry has slowed to a crawl. . . . Even so, even against all that background the Labor Party remains confused and divided over whether free enterprise ought to be allowed to survive. Yet, in spite of everything it has survived—so far. Not only that, but taxed to the limit it has been the prop and stay of the public sector. Today that survival is in danger. (1976)

Later in the speech she discussed the incentives which industry required and again expressed a cause for fear:

Yet curiously enough they have neither the wit to acknowledge it nor the courage to change those policies. They doubled public spending. That led to a doubling of unemployment, because they bled productive industry white of the resources it needed to provide jobs.

Today their policies threaten the ultimate disaster. An economic earthquake that would ruin the livelihood of thousands of families. (1976)

In the 1978 speech, after having been depicted for four years as one who could not negotiate with the trade unions, Mrs. Thatcher appealed to the desire for economic security by making a frontal attack on the trade union leaders in an apparent effort to arouse anger toward them:

Now you trade union leaders have great power. You can use it well or you can use it badly. But look at the position of your members today, and compare it with the positions of workers in other free countries.
Can you really say, can anyone really say, you have used your power well? You want higher wages, better pensions, shorter hours, more government spending, more investment, more--more--more--more.

But where is this "more" to come from? There is no more. There can be, but there won't be unless we all produce it. You can no more separate pay from output than you can separate two blades of a pair of scissors and still have a sharp cutting edge.

Although the appeal was heightened by the use of analogy, the strong statement against the unions and directed to the union leaders again exemplified the way in which she used strong statements which would have seemed to her opponents gross overstatements to arouse emotions (in this case, anger). She probably succeeded in making a number of people angry or angrier at the union leaders; however, she must also have stirred much anger toward herself.

The Feelings of Pride in the Country and in Democratic Government

In the 1975 speech she appealed to the feelings of pride in the country in two different ways; in the first instance she sought to arouse anger against those who did not hold Britain (as she perceived her) in high esteem and in the second instance she encouraged the feeling of pride in the country by cataloguing Britain's achievements.

We are witnessing a deliberate attack on our values, a deliberate attack on those who wish to promote merit and excellence, a deliberate attack on our heritage and our great past. And there are those who gnaw away at our national self respect, rewriting British history as centuries of unrelieved gloom, oppression and failure--as days of hopelessness, not days of hope. (1975)

In the second appeal the speaker reinforced the sense of
pride in Great Britain:

What kind of people are we? We are the people that in the past made Great Britain the workshop of the world, the people who persuaded others to buy British, not by begging them to do so but because it was best. We are a people who have received more Nobel Prizes than any other nation except America, and, head for head, we have done better than America--twice as well, in fact.

We are people who, among other things, invented the computer, the refrigerator, the electric motor, the stethoscope, rayon, steam turbine, stainless steel, the tank, television, penicillin, radar, the jet engine, hovercraft, float glass and carbon fibres, etc.--oh, and the better half of Concorde.

We export more of what we produce than West Germany, France, Japan, or the United States, and well over 90 per cent of these exports came from private enterprise. . . .

With achievements like that, who can doubt that Britain can have a great future, and what our friends abroad want to know is whether that future is going to happen. (1975)

In 1976 she again reinforced the feelings of pride in the country by emphasizing Britain's potential:

We can overcome our doubts; we can rediscover our confidence; we can regain the respect of the rest of the world.

The Desire for Security under the Law

Near the conclusion of each of her party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher appealed to the desire for security under the law. In each case she apparently attempted to arouse in her listeners (1) fear, by reminding them of the immediate dangers, and (2) anger, by explaining how the present Government failed to respond to their needs.

The first duty of government is to uphold the law, and if it tries to bob, weave, and duck round that duty when it is inconvenient, the government will do exactly the same thing, and then nothing will be safe,
not home, not liberty, not life itself. (1975)

In the 1976 speech she warned of the Marxist threat to security under the law as well as to economic security:

I appeal to all those men and women of goodwill who do not want a Marxist future for themselves or their children or their children's children. This is not just a fight about national solvency. It is a fight about the very foundations of social order.

The appeals to security under the law grew more intense in the 1977 and 1978 party conference speeches. She detailed the nature of the threat by using illustrations of violence:

People have asked me whether I am going to make the fight against crime an issue in the next election. No, I am not going to make it an issue. The old people in our city centres, who are frightened to go out at night, are going to make it an issue. The taxpayers and ratepayers, who have to meet the bills for mindless vandalism— they are going to make it an issue. The parents worried sick when their children go out on their own— they are going to make it an issue. . .

I do not intend to sit wringing my hands while London, Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham and the rest of our cities go the way of New York. (1976)

When a rule of law breaks down, fear takes over. There is no security in the streets, families feel unsafe even in their own homes, children are at risk, criminals prosper, men of violence flourish, the nightmare world of a clockwork orange becomes a reality.

. . . We have seen some of the symptoms of the breakdown of the rule of law— the growth in the number of unsolved and unpunished crimes, especially violent crimes, overcrowded courts, an underpaid and undermanned police force, judges insulted by a senior Minister of the Crown . . .

To all those engaged in law enforcement we pledge not just our moral but our practical support. As for the law-breakers, whether they are professional criminals carrying firearms or political terrorists, or young thugs attacking the elderly, or those who think they can insult policemen with impunity, we say this: "You will find in the new Conservative Government a remorseless and implacable opponent." (1978)
The Concern for the Defense of the Realm

In the 1976, 1977, and 1978 party conference speeches Margaret Thatcher appealed to the concern for the defense of the realm. In the 1976 speech her appeal was brief; however in the next two years she spent a great deal more time developing her emotional proof for this topic.

A growing number of people are anxious about the strength of the armed forces. We are the Party that regards the defense of the Realm as the overriding duty of any Government. We want to see a defeat of terrorism, especially in Northern Ireland. (1976)

In the 1977 speech the appeal to concern for the defense of the realm was much stronger. The speaker attempted to arouse anger over the injustice of inadequate government funding:

What sort of Government is it that neglects the welfare of our Servicemen? What sort of Government forces front-line soldiers into claiming rent rebates, and makes many of them worse off than people who do not even try to work at all?

Our armed forces are poorly paid. They are denied the equipment, the stores, the back-up and training that they know are vital to the job they do. Worse, they are the anti-Western wing of the Labor Party calling for still more gigantic cuts in defense, which a former Labor Defense Secretary said would mean, at best, neutrality and, at worst, surrender.

We have a Government that neglects our defenses, a Government that lets down NATO so badly that our allies rebuked it publicly. What a disgrace! A government that spends money on nationalization while cutting spending on the defense of the realm. (1977)

In the 1978 party conference speech she emphasized the threat of the Soviet Union and justified her stand on the issue of defense:

The Conservative Party also stands for the defense of the realm. I am often told that there are no votes
to be won by talking about defense and foreign policy. Well, I intend to go on talking about them . . . .

It was nearly three years ago that I warned of the growing danger of Soviet expansion . . . . I was at once attacked by Labor's Defense Secretary and the Soviet leaders—strange company, you might think, for a British Cabinet Minister. What has happened since I made that speech?

The Soviet Union, through its Cuban mercenaries, has completed its Marxist takeover of Angola; Ethiopia has been turned into a Communist bastion in the Horn of Africa. . . . We now have only 74 fighter planes to defend our country. We lost twice as many as that during one week of the battle of Britain. . . .

There is a minimum level below which our defenses cannot safely be allowed to fall. They have fallen below that level. And I give you this pledge: to bring them back to that minimum level will be the first charge on our national resources under the Conservative Government. . . . Conservatives too will see that our Armed Forces are properly paid. (1978)

The Desire to Preserve the Unity of Northern Ireland

Finally, Mrs. Thatcher appealed to the desire to preserve the unity of Northern Ireland in the 1977 and 1978 speech. A number of secondary motives are perhaps bound up in this determination among many to preserve this unity; national pride and patriotism are probably important factors. As discussed in Chapter IV, the position of these appeals at the conclusion of the speech indicated the significance they held for the speaker and consequently the audience.

These appeals set the tone for the conclusions which followed:

But if the violence in Britain is disturbing, it is nothing to what has been endured by the people of Northern Ireland for nearly 10 years. What happened in Ulster touches us all; it is part of our country, our United Kingdom. So let the people of Ulster be assured of this: the Conservative Party stands rock firm for the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. (1977)
I spent three memorable and moving days in Northern Ireland in June. The constancy and patience of the men and women of the province who have endured so much pain through ten years of terror is something I shall never forget. I know that there are those who say "Leave them to solve their own problems and bring our boys back." To them I must reply: "If you wash your hands of Northern Ireland you wash them in blood." So long as Ulster wishes to belong to the United Kingdom she will do so. That is the policy of the Conservative Party and it will be the policy of the next Conservative Government. (1979)

IV. Conclusion

In each of the party conference speeches (1975-1978), Mrs. Thatcher demonstrated a clear preference for emotional proof over logical proof. The diversity of the audience presented an enormous challenge to the speaker; it would have been difficult for her to have satisfied the requirements of both those who demanded sound argumentation and those to whom such arguments would have been tedious. However, the speaker's failure to provide minimal evidence in support of many of her arguments lowered the integrity of the speeches.

Mrs. Thatcher's reliance on the emotional mode was probably highly effective in reaching many members of her television audience. Those viewers who were willing to line up with the speaker on the basis of her stand on "hot" issues such as immigration and law and order probably paid little attention to the quality of her arguments. Two particular areas of inquiry revealed that Mrs. Thatcher became "consubstantial" with her audience: (1) she
adapted to the needs of many in the audience and (2) she identified with her audience. It seems likely that the speech chose to rely on emotional appeals over logical ones in an effort to adapt to and identify with the largest number of people.
CHAPTER VI

THE SPEAKER'S IMAGE

I. Introduction

By the time the 1978 Party Conference took place, Mrs. Thatcher had spoken to a number of people throughout Great Britain. She constantly appeared in factories and stores and on the street. She talked. She asked questions. She had received extensive television and newspaper exposure for four years and the British press had made a persistent inquiry into her life-style, habits, make-up, and mannerisms.

In four years Margaret Thatcher's hair had gone from a rather tight wave, heavily lacquered, to a longer length loose wave with a little more bounce. The significant point is that her hair mattered to the press and hence to the public. Generally, people perceived her as stiff and unnatural. They knew she had graduated from Oxford and the image of her as a sort of middle-class school marm came across.

In the years from 1975-1978 the newspaper and television commentators covered many aspects of Mrs. Thatcher's life, her dress, her children, her husband. That she is a woman made a difference; Jim Callaghan's hair and suits were never discussed.
The way Mrs. Thatcher spoke, dressed, and styled her hair contributed to the way the public perceived her character. The degree of interest which the public expressed in such matters is revealed by examining the discussion of those topics in the press. Her carefully styled hair and calm manner suggested to many people that Mrs. Thatcher was cold, aloof, and, therefore, not really interested in the problems of others.

The descriptions of Mrs. Thatcher by friends, colleagues, and associates offer another view. Many of their opinions came to the attention of the general public after they had been solicited by reporters and journalists and subsequently released to the media.

Within the Conservative Party conflicting ideas about Mrs. Thatcher were keenly felt in the 1975 party conference. Wounds from the leadership battle had not yet healed. Such feelings appear to have gradually subsided each year as Mrs. Thatcher's role as leader grew more secure. However, within the immediate audience at each party conference were Mrs. Thatcher's political enemies, those who felt that her leadership meant disaster for the Conservative Party and, consequently, a hindrance to the progress of Great Britain.

Finally, the ethical appeals which Mrs. Thatcher made in her speeches contributed to her public image. The nature and number of those appeals did not change greatly in the party conference speeches.

Two major elements contributed to her ethos when she
delivered the party conference speeches: (1) The audience's prior knowledge of the speaker predisposed them to some extent regarding her character; and (2) the speaker's ethical appeals probably altered the way many perceived her character.

II. The Audience's Prior Knowledge of the Speaker

Reactions of Friends, Colleagues, and Associates

In 1978 a biography of Margaret Thatcher appeared that differed in style and content from the others. In Tricia Murray's account of Mrs. Thatcher she devotes a large amount of space to the opinions of Margaret Thatcher delivered by people expressing a wide variety of political views.¹⁴⁵ These statements, coming from many different personalities and representing various elements of British society, provide a sampling of the prior conceptions people had of Mrs. Thatcher before she delivered any of the speeches being studied.

Brian Walden, a former Labor M.P. for Birmingham, and current presenter for ITV's Weekend World, said this of Mrs. Thatcher:

I've never known anyone with quite as much aptitude for mastering detail . . . . She is not a genius, she is not staggeringly brilliant . . . . She took the pants off Healey and that's not easy to do but she did it by mastering detail, not by brilliant oratory. She's not a brilliant speaker, but she can command fact. Anything that can be done by effort Margaret

can do . . . . I think she typifies majority feeling in this country. She has a grip on people's imaginations because their beliefs are very much like her beliefs. She enshrines the majority view . . . . She's the only Tory leader I've known who has grasped the fact that the party image has changed and that today it's a people's party. 146

Tileri Bevan is a well-known producer of BBC Wales, based in Danduff, and has recently been promoted to editor. After doing a show with Jim Callaghan and Margaret Thatcher, she had this to say about her preference for Margaret Thatcher.

M.P.s depend so much on the media. She does have a rapport with people and it's a pity she can't do on mike what she does off mike . . . . I went back to the studio after the program [with Callaghan and Thatcher] and said, "Give me Margaret Thatcher any day," and everyone was horror struck. We are either strong Socialists in Wales or Nationalists. The whole ethos of Conservatism or Toryism is anathema to most people here. Margaret Thatcher is a Tory. She epitomises the Tory image: speaking in the way that she does and looking the way she does, just confirms to them what Toryism is all about. But when you meet her face to face and talk to her, she's not like that at all.

. . . . Margaret Thatcher undoubtedly has charisma but how she's going to get it over, I just don't know. I think maybe she should just let out a long breath and be herself! I don't think she's let out half a breath yet. 147

Monty Modly, a broadcast journalist based in London, had this to say about Mrs. Thatcher's walkabouts:

Until they actually meet her, I think many people do have the impression that she's rather la-di-da. But once they've seen and talked to her they have an entirely different view. They realize that she's a

146 Ibid., pp. 85-87.
147 Ibid., p. 98.
housewife as well as a politician, that she's a real mother who has warmth and feeling, who expresses herself beautifully and who genuinely enjoys mixing with people. They are struck by her energy, her spontaneous sense of humour and the way she has fun with everyone.148

Lcnd Pannel came into the House of Commons as a Labour M.P. for West Leeds in 1949. His specialty was history and procedure of the House. He held office as Minister of Works and entered the House of Lords in 1974. During his time in the House he and Margaret Thatcher were a pair for fifteen years. In the British parliamentary system a pair comprises two M.P.s from opposing parties who agree not to vote on a specific issue during an agreed space of time. Charles Pannel, then an experienced parliamentarian, advised Margaret Thatcher that since she wished to spend a great deal of time in her London constituency it was wise to have a pair. Based on his long association with Margaret Thatcher, he made these remarks:

During all that time she was what I would call a very fastidious pair. By fastidious, I mean she would never have thought of breaking a pair. She always stood by her word. She is a very honorable and straight forward person.149

The Right Honorable Sir Harold Wilson, former Labor Prime Minister of Great Britain, had never been out of Parliament since he first entered in 1945. He regards Margaret Thatcher's courage as one of her most valuable assets as leader:

148Ibid., p. 105.
149Ibid., p. 109.
A lot of people, who voted for Margaret, did so because they didn't want Ted for various reasons and lots of others voted for her because they admired her guts. I have no doubt at all that Margaret was elected because of her courage. I agree with Lord Shinwell's view that she stood because she was the only man in the Conservative Party.\textsuperscript{150}

Paul Johnson speaks of another side of Margaret Thatcher which has made a significant impact on the country and which reinforces her image as a person of virtue:

But whilst the Conservative Party is no longer the great sort of Anglican Party it used to be, there is still a very strong church element in it which she represents and speaks for. She says and fervently believes that the Conservative Party is there to uphold certain absolute moral standards such as it's wrong to steal; it's wrong to kill; ordinary ten commandments stuff. She says this with complete passionate intensity and conviction and I think it evokes a very definite response among ordinary people—not the sort you meet at West End dinner parties—but ordinary people throughout the country.\textsuperscript{151}

These aspects of Mrs. Thatcher's personality and countless others no doubt filtered through to the general public. It is impossible to know which impressions of her overpowered the others. To what extent a vote for or against the Conservatives in the general election will be a vote for or against Margaret Thatcher is impossible to determine.

Mixed Responses to Mrs. Thatcher within the Conservative Party

Ideological considerations dominated the minds of some

\textsuperscript{150}Ibid., p. 112.

\textsuperscript{151}Ibid., p. 78.
groups within the Conservative Party as the furor of the leadership battle grew. Abusive language characterized the weeks of fighting, all of which was reported in the press. By October of 1974 divisions which remained and deepened in the months that followed began to form. Many of the members of Mrs. Thatcher's immediate audiences for the Party Conference speeches had been affected by that battle. The conflict of opinion regarding Mrs. Thatcher are most realistically viewed within the context of that ideological struggle.

The division engendered at this stage of the battle remained to plague the party afterwards: at the Party Conference of 1975, when the new Leader presented herself for the first time to the massed ranks of her supporters, some indiscreet and widely publicized remarks made by Heath late at night to some journalists created a furor and revealed that he still considered his defeat as essentially in the nature of a take-over of the party by right-wing extremists, though nothing could, in fact, have been farther from the truth. In the long run, indeed, it may well prove that the partisans of both the so-called right and the so-called left were acute in their instincts. For, to the outside observer, it is clear that the struggle between Edward Heath and Margaret Thatcher was not merely a struggle between proved defeat and possible success, but between two wholly different visions of the future, for the country as well as Party.152

On the 17th of December the Home Committee released its report on the procedure for the leadership election. They devised the following sequence of events:

1) There should be an election within 28 days of every new session and three to six months after the start of each new Parliament.

2) Only Tory M.P.s were to vote.

3) To win outright first time a candidate would need an overall majority of all Tory M.P.s, not just those who voted. He (she) would also have to collect 15 per cent more votes than the runner-up. With 278 Tories in the House this meant that Mr. Heath would have to collect at least 140 votes and be 42 votes ahead of his nearest rival.

4) If no one qualified there would be a second ballot a week later and open to anyone, newcomers included. This time anyone with 140 votes or more would win.

5) If there was still no result, the top three names would go into a final ballot two days later. M.P.s would then vote for a first and second choice—and, by process of transferring votes, the winner would emerge.153

After the first ballot Margaret Thatcher had a clear advantage over those who had waited in the wings until they were certain that the curtain had actually come down on Heath's leadership. William Whitelaw, who seemed to many the natural heir to the leadership, lacked the ambition "to seek the kind of struggle on which he would have had to embark to gain the leadership". Whitelaw had had a long and intimate relationship with Heath, having served under him as Chief Whip. Had he declared his candidacy in the first ballot it would have produced greater division than was occasioned by the battle that occurred.

Politicians are either warriors or healers. Margaret Thatcher is a warrior. Enoch Powell is a warrior. But William Whitelaw and R. A. Butler are healers.\textsuperscript{154}

In the first ballot Margaret Thatcher received 130 votes, Heath 119, and sixteen for Hugh Fraser. Hugh Fraser is an aristocrat, brother of Lord Lovar and husband of writer, Antonia Fraser.

It is still not clear why he stood, unless it was to attract votes on the right, of male chauvinists and others, who could not possibly vote for Thatcher but wanted an alternative to Heath.\textsuperscript{155}

In the second ballot Mrs. Thatcher faced, in addition to William Whitelaw, James Prior (appointed to Shadow Cabinet as Opposition spokesman on home affairs, March, 1974), Sir Geoffrey Howe (Secretary of State for Prices and Consumer Affairs in Heath's government), and John Peyton, "Shadow Leader of the House, former Transport Minister and a politician of legendarily acid wit".\textsuperscript{156} The vote was decisive:

- Mrs. Margaret Thatcher: 146
- Mr. William Whitelaw: 79
- Sir Geoffrey Howe: 19
- Mr. James Prior: 19
- Mr. John Peyton: 11

In November Jean Rook had commented in the \textit{Daily Express} "She looks like angel cake, but God help Heath". She had been the one with the courage to step out first and she hung on throughout the bitter affair.


\textsuperscript{155}Ibid., p. 114.

\textsuperscript{156}Ibid., p. 72.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Although Lord Crowther-Hunt referred to the victory as a fluke, it appears to have been more than that.  

More clearly than any other organ of opinion the Daily Telegraph on Wednesday caught the mood that would finish Whitelaw. "Consider her Courage" was the title of the paper's first leading article.

But what is seen as courage in a man is often viewed in a different light when demonstrated by a woman. On February 5 in the Daily Mirror Marjorie Proops gave Margaret Thatcher a title which the Russians later snatched up and which the press has repeated on numerous occasions since; Mrs. Proops called Mrs. Thatcher "the iron maiden".

Mrs. Thatcher gained control of a party in the middle of an identity crisis, "confused and uncertain about policy, philosophy and power, as well as one that had been making itself over completely".

In the 1975 party conference the tensions of the fight had scarcely had time to ease. Mrs. Thatcher gained ground in the party as well as in the press with each passing month; her progress is documented in the press accounts of her leadership which follow.

---


III. Press Coverage of Mrs. Thatcher

1975

Mrs. Thatcher's credibility as a potential Prime Minister was not immediate. The press chided her throughout the spring and summer of 1975, for what they viewed as indecisive leadership and a real lack of force and direction. Her speech to the Institute of Socio-Economic Studies in New York changed that.

Tory anxiety at Mrs. Thatcher's low profile, somewhat redeemed by her present successful United States tour, coupled with worry about some shadow ministers performances, is reflected in the many unselected motions for the conference.159

With the October party conference approaching Mrs. Thatcher was viewed in September, 1975, as having "soft pedalled her right of center image and to have assembled a somewhat docile Shadow Cabinet team".160 In spite of the fact that she created an immediate explosion in the British Press, Mrs. Thatcher's New York speech rescued her from the charges of ineffectiveness in opposition. The Times [London] described the speech as her "most forthright declaration of the new Conservative philosophy--not yet policy--since she became leader of the party".161 The Sun said that the speech was likely to cause anger at Whitehall and Westminster

159Yorkshire Post, 19 September 1975.
160Ibid.
161Times [London], 17 September 1975.
because she attacked Britain while abroad. The Times responded to that criticism and exonerated her completely. She made a bold, offensive step with her New York speech and it vastly improved the image of her projected by the press. On September 16, 1975, the Daily Telegraph headlined the New York trip "I'll be the next Premier, says Mrs. Thatcher":

Poised and relaxed at the start of a fast-moving two week tour of the United States and Canada, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher met diplomats, bankers, scientists, economists and journalists yesterday, and left them with one dominant impression--she fully expects the next general election will put her into 10, Downing Street.  

By the time the October party conference arrived Mrs. Thatcher had established a more positive image in the press and created a sense of expectation toward her party conference speech.

Mrs. Thatcher has just returned from her triumphant American tour, bursting with new vitality and self confidence and with an enhanced personal prestige, as revealed by yesterday's Marplan Poll in the Sun which put her 16 per cent ahead of Mr. Wilson as the likeliest occupant of 10 Downing Street after the next election.  

The Marplan poll was conducted between September 25 and 29, after Mrs. Thatcher's American tour. The 1,200 electors interviewed were representative in terms of age, social class, and sex. The results showed that Mrs. Thatcher was gaining in popularity, especially among women and that she

---

162 Daily Telegraph, 16 September 1975.

was perceived as being more capable than Harold Wilson by both men and women. On all key issues, except Northern Ireland and trade union power, Mrs. Thatcher came out better than the others mentioned. The Sun published the following survey results on 6 October 1975:

### TABLE 6

**QUESTION: WHICH DESCRIPTIONS DO YOU THINK APPLY TO MRS. THATCHER AND HAROLD WILSON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Margaret Thatcher %</th>
<th>Harold Wilson %</th>
<th>Thatcher lead %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at his/her job</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares About Britain</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in equality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in the individual</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the Strong</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects the weak</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the man in the street</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

QUESTION: WHICH DESCRIPTIONS DO YOU THINK APPLY TO MRS. THATCHER AND EDWARD HEATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Margaret Thatcher</th>
<th>Edward Heath</th>
<th>Thatcher lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at his/her job</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+ 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about Britain</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in equality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in the individual</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the strong</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects the weak</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the man in the street</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**QUESTION: WHO DO YOU THINK WILL BECOME PRIME MINISTER AFTER THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All electors</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All voters interviewed</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who answered &quot;None of these&quot; or &quot;Don't know&quot;</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters who gave a name</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All electors</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Wilson</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Heath</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Whitelaw</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Jenkins</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Benn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 9
QUESTION: WHO WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE LEADING THE TORIES AT THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elections who intend to vote Conservative</th>
<th>All Conservatives</th>
<th>Conservative Men</th>
<th>Conservative Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electors who intend to vote Conservative</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Thatcher</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Heath</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Whitelaw</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch Powell</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10
QUESTION: WHO, IF PRIME MINISTER, WOULD BE MOST ABLE TO DEAL WITH EACH OF THESE PROBLEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Margaret Thatcher</th>
<th>Harold Wilson</th>
<th>Thatcher lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Order</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union power</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of taxation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of Government spending</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of exports</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11

**QUESTION: HOW SERIOUS DO YOU THINK IS EACH OF THESE PROBLEMS FACING BRITAIN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Saying each problem is &quot;very serious&quot;</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Conservative Supporters</th>
<th>Labour Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All electors</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Order</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union power</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of taxation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of Government spending</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of exports</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 12

**QUESTION: IF THERE WAS A GENERAL ELECTION TOMORROW, WHICH PARTY WOULD YOU VOTE FOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All electors giving a voting intention</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 13

QUESTION: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIPTIONS DO YOU THINK APPLY TO MRS. THATCHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>All electors</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good at her job</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about Britain</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in equality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes in the individual</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the strong</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects the weak</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the man in the street</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of the success in the polls some criticism within her party remained, but her triumphs in September probably defused most of the potential danger. The Guardian characterized the anti-Thatcher element in the Conservative Party in this way:

Thus the well advertised doubts of the little group of former Heathmen now gathered around Peter Walker are likely to get scant sympathy at Blackpool this week. They will be seen by some as no more than members of the sour grapes gang, engaged in a collective sulk-in because their leader has been ditched. . . .

---

164 Tables 6-13, Sun, 6 October 1975.
165 Guardian, 7 October 1975.
On the eve of her first party conference Mrs. Thatcher talked to Kenneth Harris, political journalist for the Observer, about herself. They discussed the aloof image which she had been accused of projecting:

Harris: Do you think that a person might display so much self control as to put people off? Seem to be a cold fish? Which could be a shortcoming in a political leader.

Thatcher: I don't think it would be self control that would put people off. I think people recognize the difference between a person who is self controlled and a person who is a cold fish. Cold-fish people put one off, and a cold fish would not be effective in politics, because politics--what I mean by politics--is helping people lead a better life.166

After the party conference speech an article appeared in the Morning Star which described the effort Mrs. Thatcher was making to soften her image:

Strenuous efforts were being made during last week's Tory Conference to turn Mrs. Thatcher into something other than a hard-as-nails backwoods gal with a heart of cast iron.167

The article suggests that Gordon Reece, former television producer and 43 years old at the time, masterminded the image changing operation:

His advice to Maggie has been to avoid fuss when on TV. Edges look good, but scoop necklines are out. Go easy on jewelry near the face and the ideal outfit is a tunic dress with a shirt underneath. . . . Tory cosmetics don't always wash. But we should not underestimate the importance of a politician's public appearance, manners and approach. Something, unfortunately, some on the left often do, to their loss.168

166 Observer, 5 October 1975.
167 Morning Star, 16 October 1975.
168 Morning Star, 16 October 1975.
On the 5th of October a biographical sketch and photograph of Mrs. Thatcher appeared in the Observer. The unsigned article was written in the style of an entry in Who's Who, except at the close of the piece which offered information of a more personal nature:

Face to face, she is charming, whichever way you vote. Answers spring beautifully tailored out of her head. Her pleasant, almost slow manner conceals a needle-sharp mind, but doesn't hide her impatience when she's had enough. Wears sweet, bland colors. Can be feminine or as steely as she chooses. A victim of much abuse from the Press and politicians: "Of course, it's unpleasant. But if you put yourself in the front line, you must expect to get shot at." 169

By the close of 1975 Mrs. Thatcher and her staff had begun to alter the way in which the nation perceived her. Whether it is reasonable or not, it appears likely that her hair, clothing, and jewelry had some effect on the conclusion the general public reached about her character and ability. The fact that she hired an executive with the wealthy EMI group to work on her image indicates that she understood the significance of the audiences' perception of her from the moment she became Leader of the Opposition.

1976

Prior to her 1976 party conference speech Ted Heath gave his speech at Brighton. A single sentence which he uttered bound him to loyalty to the Tories and must have strengthened the belief in Mrs. Thatcher as a leader who

169 Observer, 5 October 1975.
could marshall the support of the entire party. The press waited for the slightest sign of reconciliation between Heath and Thatcher and when it came headlines followed. The *Daily Telegraph* captioned an article, "Heath Declares Complete Confidence in Mrs. Thatcher," and the *Financial Times* called it "Reconciliation at Brighton".

The deed has been done. Mr. Edward Heath stood up in public, before the Conservative Party conference, the television cameras, and the nation, and declared his support for his successor as leader of the party, Mrs. Thatcher. He has "complete confidence," he said at Brighton yesterday, that the difficult decisions that must be taken in the national interest will be taken by Mrs. Thatcher and her colleagues. 170

The *Daily Telegraph* reported:

Mr. Heath was loudly cheered at the Conservative party conference in Brighton yesterday when he declared his complete confidence that Mrs. Thatcher and the next Conservative Government would take the difficult decisions required to save the pound. 171

When Mrs. Thatcher rose to speak to the 1976 Conservative Party Conference the immediate audience and the television audience probably had a far more favorable impression of her character and abilities than they did in 1975. Heath's speech earlier in the week changed the political climate at Brighton and created enormous enthusiasm in response to this first major sign of party unity.

Concern among Mrs. Thatcher's intimates must have continued in regard to softening the "iron maiden" image.

In an article entitled "Stand up the real Maggie!" a journalist at the Liverpool Post discussed the attempts to "package" Mrs. Thatcher. She criticized the photographs which appeared during the week of the party conference in which Mrs. Thatcher appeared "wearing a straw boater, linking arms and doing a knees-up along Brighton's prom with a clutch of giggly girls."172

In the journalist's opinion Mrs. Thatcher's attempts to sell herself displayed "grotesque lapses of taste"; there is no evidence to suggest that the general public reacted that way, but it is probable that some of the efforts to change Mrs. Thatcher's image may have backfired:

"Maggie is jolly; Maggie is human; Maggie has the Common Touch" has been their message.
To drum it in we have seen her surrounded by tinned sardines in her pantry, up to her elbows in wallpaper paste in her front room . . . . Desperate to shed her "milk snatcher" and "iron maiden" labels, she's gone too far the other way, with the result that one can more easily imagine her now presiding over a suburban Tupperware party than over the Shadow Cabinet.
Perhaps her advisors reckon that when we see her with her rubber gloves on doing the washing up we'll rush out to vote for her because she's just like us. If so it's yet another example of politicians assuming the public is a great deal less astute than it really is. Do they really think we're taken in by the image, or that, even if we were it would sway the way we vote? 173

In answer to the journalist's question Mrs. Thatcher hired the "beer in the business" to advise her on such matters and shaping voter's opinions, like selling cornflakes, might

172 Liverpool Daily Post, 8 October 1976.
173 Ibid.
offend the sensibilities of some, but the effectiveness of packaging is measurable.

1977

On July 20, 1977 Mrs. Thatcher made another leap forward. "Wham! Mighty Maggie Floors Them All," headlined an article in the Sun; "Not Quite Disraeli" is the title of an article in the Economist. These articles appeared in response to a parliamentary triumph that immediately made her credible as a future Prime Minister:

Tory leader Margaret Thatcher smashed into the Government last night with the biggest, best speech she has ever made.174

Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, Britain's very probable next prime minister, has on four occasions in the past ten days cast herself as the Tory's philosopher queen. She is no Disraeli. There is an impression that an awful lot of learning is being crammed rather dangerously quickly into that handsome fair head. In raising the matter of fundamental political belief, however, Mrs. Thatcher is doing her party and her country a service.175

This victory was highly significant in removing any doubt as to her ability to be an effective prime minister. Earlier that same month an article appeared in the Spectator, a Conservative publication hardly bent on destroying Mrs. Thatcher, in which the writer discussed the effectiveness of Callaghan's "nonchalance" and the inability of Mrs. Thatcher to deal with it.

174 Sun, 21 July 1977.
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Callaghan evaded Mrs. Thatcher's questions by keeping the House amused and at times causing fits of laughter. The press wrote Mrs. Thatcher off and complimented the Prime Minister who demonstrated his evasive footwork. Samples of their reactions appear in the text of Ferdinand Mount's article (he quotes from a protest letter written to the Guardian):

"Michael White (Guardian, 6 July) found her argument 'melodramatic' and 'overruled by her lack of feeling for the mood of the Commons'; according to John O'Sullivan (Daily Telegraph) Mrs. Thatcher took "schoolgirl pluck to an unwise extreme"' Hugh Noyes (The Times) saw her in one of her "reds under the bed" phases with "much to learn about political repartee", and "rashly pursuing her point".183

Thus, her triumph later in July indicated a major reversal in the opinions of the political journalists in London. Having just dealt harshly with Mrs. Thatcher's parliamentary performances, the enthusiasm of the press indicated that Mrs. Thatcher's performance was exceptional.

A Gallup Poll in October revealed that the public considered Mrs. Thatcher to have a strong personality, to be a good speaker, and to know what she is talking about.

Between October 12 and 13 Gallup asked a national representative sample of 1009 electors: "Here are some things people have said about Mrs. Thatcher. For each of them will you tell me if you agree or disagree?"

The following table shows, in percentages, the number

---
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who agree with each statement. Separate tables indicate the total sample, Conservatives and non-Conservatives.

**TABLE 14**

**GALLUP POLL REVEALS MRS. THATCHER SEEN AS STRONG PERSONALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Non-Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She's trying hard in her job</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is a strong personality</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She speaks her mind</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She knows what she is talking about</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is a good speaker</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She knows about the problems of the cost of living</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She thinks a lot of herself</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She has good or new ideas</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is not in touch with the working class/ordinary people</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She talks a lot but doesn't do much</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She doesn't come over well</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer Mr. Heath</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is a snob, talks down to people</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's time we had a woman in power</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is too critical of Russia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She's catty/bitchy</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She divides the country</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like women leaders</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her ideas are destructive, not constructive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1978

As the general election loomed on the horizon the criticism of Mrs. Thatcher grew more intense. By the fall

---
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25% leads over Labor and seemed certain big winners in an election. The opinion polls in the fall of 1978 showed the Conservatives only slightly ahead, after trailing most of the summer.189

In October belittling and sometimes abusive remarks appeared in the press. The Daily Express listed her nicknames:

Margaret Thatcher has never had a shortage of nicknames among her cheeky young back benchers. "Mother," "Blessed Margaret" and "Harmony Hairspray" have now yielded to the most obvious of all . . . HILDA. Her second name.190

The Morning Star, a Labor paper, said that "Mrs. Thatcher's image as the next prime minister is diminishing every day she opens her mouth. With the article appeared "The Color-in Maggie Doll".191

A few days before the 1978 Conservative Party Conference the New Statesman made the following observations in regard to Mrs. Thatcher's image. Although the source is scarcely pro-Conservative the writer voices thoughts that are not rooted in political ideology, but the psychological characteristics of political activists.

Mrs. Thatcher herself is poised uneasily between two types. She may only have confessed recently that she sometimes has a cry when she gets home. But her behind-the-scenes explosions in Westminster and in City boardrooms—not so far reported to include tears--

189 Ibid.
190 Morning Star, 2 October 1978.
191 Ibid.
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have convinced her colleagues that there are volcanic conflicts beneath the Dresden china exterior and behind the elocution-teacher's speech. Her social ambiguities surface from time to time—as when, in an interview devoted to projecting her image as a simple housewife, she tells a journalist that she would not have touched any but an English speaking nanny for her twins. She is then apt to bridle at the interviewer's hostile response.193

The article then drifts toward some pettier stuff quoting a remark she supposedly made at Oxford to the effect that she was going to "marry a rich man and go into politics."194

When Margaret Thatcher delivered her speech to the 1978 Conservative party conference she appeared as a much debated, much discussed figure. Her credibility as a prime minister was no longer in question. She had established her abilities in the minds of her listeners. Many aspects of her character came under attack, but polls indicate that she made a steady rise from 1975 to 1978 in so far as winning the esteem of the voters.

III. Intrinsic Ethical Appeals

The role of ethos as a chief mode of persuasion can scarcely be overemphasized. Although Aristotle considered the logical proof to be the most important element in the speech he still maintained that nothing was so effective as the speaker's ethos, the audience's perception of his or her character.

193 New Statesman, 6 October 1978.
194 Ibid.
In Book II, Chapter 1 of *Rhetoric* Aristotle discusses three factors which inspire confidence in the speaker's character:

... the three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill. False statements and bad advice are due to one or more of the following three causes. Men either form a false opinion through want of good sense; or they form a true opinion, but because of their moral badness do not say what they really think; or finally, they are both sensible and upright, but not well disposed to their hearers...

Based on the Aristotelian description of ethos we can examine some of the constituents of ethical appeals and observe the way in which Margaret Thatcher used them. It would be impossible to provide an inclusive catalogue of ethical attributes, but Thonssen, Baird, and Braden provide a useful framework in which to explore the Aristotelian view of ethos. Character, sagacity, and good will, as Aristotle suggests, form the audience's apprehension of the speaker. In each of the party conference speeches Mrs. Thatcher demonstrated abundantly her awareness of the audience's evaluation of her character and goodwill. She appealed to the audience by creating throughout each speech a sense of her own virtue or character.

---

In general, a speaker focuses attention on the probity of his character if he (1) associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated; (2) bestows, with propriety, tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause; (3) links the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous; (4) removes or minimizes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience; and (6) creates the impression of being completely sincere in his undertaking.202

First Mrs. Thatcher frequently associated herself with the cause of good. Often she made this appeal in the opening moments of her speech, but in other instances she established such an impression to support her presentation of arguments. In the 1975 party conference speech she chose the opening moments as the proper time to place herself and her cause on the side of virtue:

I know you will understand the humility I feel at following in the footsteps of great men like our Leader in that year [1946], Winston Churchill, a man called by destiny to raise the name of Britain to supreme heights in the history of the free world. In the footsteps of Anthony Eden, who set us the goal of a property owning democracy—a goal we still pursue today; of Harold Macmillan, whose leadership brought so many ambitions within the grasp of every citizen; of Alec Douglas Home whose career of selfless public service earned the affection and admiration of us all; and of Edward Heath, who successfully led the party to victory in 1970 and brilliantly led the nation into Europe in 1973.

In the 1975 speech Mrs. Thatcher concluded with the same

kind of appeal:

Let all of us here today, and others far beyond this hall who believe in our cause, make that act of will. Let us proclaim our faith in a new and better future for our Party and our people. Let us resolve to heal the wounds of a divided nation, and let that act of healing be the prelude to a lasting victory.

Second, Mrs. Thatcher bestowed praise upon herself and her cause and most specially on the people to whom she spoke, which contributed to the audience's impression of her as a person of good will.

We are a people who have received more Nobel Prizes than any other nation except America, and, head for head, we have done better than America--twice as well, in fact.

We are people who, among other things, invented the computer, the refrigerator, the electric motor, the stethoscope, rayon, steam turbine, stainless steel, the tank, television, penicillin, radar, the jet engine, hovercraft, float glass and carbon fibres, etc.--oh, and the better half of Concorde . . . .

With achievements like that, who can doubt that Britain can have a great future, and what our friends abroad want to know is whether that future is going to happen.

Third, Mrs. Thatcher frequently linked her opponents' cause with what is not virtuous. Her speeches were peppered with reference to the damage done by those who opposed Conservative goals:

It was not Britain I was criticizing, it was socialism, and I will go on criticizing socialism and opposing socialism, because it is bad for Britain. (1975)

Socialist governments set out perpetually to restrict the area of choice and Conservative governments to increase it. (1975)

Today their policies threaten the ultimate disaster. An economic earthquake that would ruin the livelihood of thousands of families. (1976)

I look to the day when we throw off the socialist yoke
and turn together to the task of setting one country on the road to real and lasting recovery. (1977)

Whenever Labor wins an election, the Tribune Group grow stronger and stronger. From one election to the next, Labor's program gets meaner, more narrow, more Marxist. (1977)

Today, Labor's policies are at a dead end, economically and politically. This is not something to crow about. We do not hope for a country in ruins so that we can take over. We want to be elected so that we can do better, not because we could not possibly do worse. (1978)

Sometimes, members of the Labor Party give the impression that as between the law and the lawbreakers they are at best neutral. (1978)

Fourth, she answered the attacks made upon her, minimizing the unfavorable impression the opponents established:

Last week at Brighton we were accused of an insatiable lust for power. It was not the Tories who have wheeled and dealed and manoeuvred and manipulated to avoid one thing at all costs--facing the voters; it is Labor's limpet Government. (1977)

Mrs. Thatcher made a lengthy answer to attacks on her as an extremist:

And here let me make a personal prophecy. In the coming months you are going to see a carefully orchestrated campaign by the Labor Party and Labor Government to portray me as "extremely this" or "extremely that"

I am extremely aware of the dangerous duplicity of Socialism, and extremely determined to turn back the tide before it destroys everything we hold dear. I am extremely disinclined to be deceived by the mark of moderation that Labor adopts whenever an election is in the offing, a mask now being worn, as we saw last week, by all who would "keep the red flag flying here". Not if I can help it! The Conservative Party, now and always, flies the flag of one nation--and that flag is the Union Jack.

So much for my extremism. (1977)
In the 1978 party conference speech she answered attacks and again sought to minimize the effectiveness of future attacks:

Many other smears and charges will be thrown at us as election day comes nearer. But let us not be too concerned, however large the lie or absurd the charge. They are a sign of our opponents' desperation.

For instance, you may have noticed, and so, I suspect, has the public, how often these charges contradict one another. One moment it is said that we have no policy, the next that our policies would bring about every disaster known to man. One moment, Shadow Ministers are said to be notorious villains--well, here the "villains" are. The next minute they are said to be unknown. (1978)

Fifth, Mrs. Thatcher relied on the authority of her own personal experience when she commented on the situation in Northern Ireland:

I spent three memorable and moving days in Northern Ireland in June. The constancy and patience of the men and women of the province who have endured so much pain through 10 years of terror is something that I shall never forget. I know that there are those who say "Leave them to solve their own problems and bring our boys back," To them I must reply: "If you wash your hands of Northern Ireland you wash them in blood." So long as Ulster wishes to belong to the United Kingdom she will do so. That is the policy of the Conservative Party and it will be the policy of the next Conservative Government.

Sixth, Mrs. Thatcher gave the impression of a deep personal commitment and of absolute sincerity. The following passages from the written transcripts of the 1976 and 1977 speeches illustrate this. In both of the following instances she demonstrated her sincerity as she closed the speeches.

I am deeply conscious of the challenge to our Party and of the responsibility I face as its Leader, but I believe we shall be sustained by millions who are hoping and praying today that we shall rise to the level of events. We must not fail them, and we will
not fail them. As I look to our great history and then at our dismal present, I draw strength from the great and brave things this nation has achieved. I seem to see clearly, as a bright new day, the future that we can and must win back. As was said before another famous battle: "It is true that we are in great danger; the greater therefore should our courage be". (1976)

I know only too well, as I go about the country, the fears felt for our British way of life. I know it from the letters I receive. And I know how many hopes ride with us today--the hopes of millions who are Conservative, and millions who are not, but who look to us because they feel instinctively that what is happening to their country threatens not only their freedom but everything that made it materially and morally great. (1977)

Sagacity

Margaret Thatcher clearly met Aristotle's requirements in establishing a measure of sagacity in the discourse. She demonstrated intellectual integrity and wisdom. However, the weakness of many of her logical appeals because of her failure to provide sufficient supporting evidence may have damaged her ethos among the more critical and discerning members of her audience.

Although she frequently failed to use the logical mode effectively, the degree to which that damaged her overall effectiveness is difficult to determine. She clearly met the following criteria for establishing an impression of sagacity:

(1) uses what is popularly called common sense; (2) acts with tact and moderation; (3) displays a sense of good taste; (4) reveals a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; (5) shows through the way in which he handles speech materials that he is
possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom. It appears to this critic that Mrs. Thatcher established herself as a possessor of wisdom and intellectual fervor in the party conference speeches. Although she did not demonstrate brilliant argumentation or astound her audience with penetrating and exacting deductive arguments in the party conference speeches, that she created the impression of a person of intellectual integrity and wisdom seems clear.

Good Will

In order to establish good will the speaker must "be a friend to what they [the listeners] consider good, an enemy to what they consider evil". It is incumbent upon the speaker to understand what kinds of people "other people love and admire and what kinds of people many hate and despise, and the causes of these feelings."

The speaker creates an impression of good will in a variety of ways. Mrs. Thatcher revealed her good will in the following areas outlined by Thonssen, Baird, and Braden:

This good will is revealed by the speaker through his ability to (1) capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) proceed with candor and straightforwardness; (4) offer necessary rebukes with tact and

———
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consideration; (5) offset any personal reason he may have for giving the speech; and (6) reveal, without guile or exhibitionism, his personable qualities as a messenger of truth.205

First, Mrs. Thatcher probably captured a proper balance between too much and too little praise. In her first party conference speech she showed humility by praising the dignitaries:

The conference was held in this very hall, and the platform seemed a long way away, and I had not thought of joining the lofty and distinguished people sitting up there, but our Party is the Party of equality of opportunity, as you can see. (1975)

Biographical accounts of her college days indicate that she probably did imagine appearing with the dignitaries on such a platform; however, she spoke as though that would have seemed remote to her at the time.

Throughout the speeches she emphasized her belief that the people of Great Britain love liberty: In that way she praises them:

Ours is one of the oldest democracies in the world. Our citizens have a passion for liberty. They have fought for it, and died for it. (1976)

She reinforced her belief in the character of those in her audience:

We can overcome our doubts, we can rediscover our confidence; we can regain the respect of the rest of the world.

Second, Mrs. Thatcher demonstrated in the 1978 speech

that she understood the fears that the prospect of stream-lined production causes. Her statements exemplified the kind of "common sense" explanations with which she dealt well. It may have caused her listeners to like her because she conveyed understanding and compassion:

I understand your fears. You're afraid that producing more goods with fewer people will mean fewer jobs, and those fears are naturally stronger at a time of high unemployment. But you're wrong. The right way to attack unemployment is to produce more goods more cheaply and then more people can afford to buy them. Japan and Germany, mentioned several times this week--and rightly so--are doing precisely that and have been for years. (1978)

Third, she proceeded with candor and straightforwardness throughout her party conference speeches. Her introductions led right to her major assertions:

It was not Britain I was criticizing, it was socialism, and I will go on criticizing socialism. (1975)

Economically Britain is on its knees. It is not unpatriotic to say this. It is no secret. (1978)

It is the "meat" in her speeches, the willingness to lay out what she meant and where she stood that accounts for her straightforwardness. She consistently took positions and clarified her views in the party conference speeches.

Fourth, she sometimes offered the necessary rebukes with tact and consideration. At other times she resorted to sarcasm. Clearly, her most appealing and effective rebukes were those which gave her an air of reasonableness as in the following examples:

Does what has happened to Britain over the last four and a half years imply that we have been governed by remarkably foolish people? No, though you may be
able to think of one or two who would qualify under that heading. Is it the result of having been governed by unusually wicked people? No. There have been enough good intentions to pathe the well-worn path twice over. The root of the matter is this. We have been ruled by men who live by illusions, the illusion that you can spend money you haven't earned without eventually going bankrupt or falling into the hands of your creditors; . . . (1978)

Many of us remember the Labor Party as it used to be. In the old days it was at least a party of ideals. You didn't have to agree with Labor to understand its appeal and respect its concern for the underdog. Gradually over the years there has been a change. I have no doubt that those ideals, those principles, are still alive today in the hearts of traditional Labor supporters. But among those who lead the Labor movement something has gone seriously wrong. (1978)

Fifth, Mrs. Thatcher effectively answered any personal reasons she may have had for wanting to become part of the Government in power in the opening moments of the 1976 speech:

But for the Conservative Party politics has always been about something more than gaining power. It has been about serving the nation. We are above all a patriotic Party, a national Party; and so it is not we who have been obsessed this week with how to take party advantage of the present crisis. What's good for General Motors may be good for the U.S.A. But nothing that's bad for Britain can ever be good for Conservatives. What we have been concerned with is how we can tackle this crisis, how we can insure freedom--yes--and the honor of Britain. The very survival of our laws, our institutions, our national character--that is what is at stake today. (1976)

Mrs. Thatcher frequently reinforced that concept in the other party conference speeches. She indicated that she spoke out because it was her duty to help Britain survive.

Sixth, and perhaps most effectively, Margaret Thatcher revealed, "without guile or exhibitionism, her personal
qualities as a messenger of truth". Certainly, her appearance of sincerity and candor made her more acceptable as such a messenger. In the closing lines of the 1978 speech she displays a facility for taking on such a role without appearing pompous or ludicrous:

Of course, we in the Conservative Party want to win, but let us win for the right reason—not for the power for ourselves, but that this great country of ours, which we love so much, will find dignity and greatness and peace again.

Three years ago I said we must heal the wounds of a divided nation. I say it again today with greater urgency. There is a cause that brings us all together and binds us all together. We must learn again to be one nation or one day we shall be no nation. That is our Conservative faith. It is my personal faith and vision. As we move towards Government and service may it be our strength and inspiration. Then not only will victory be ours, but we shall be worthy of it.

IV. Summary

Margaret Thatcher's public image changed greatly between the years of 1975 and 1978. Public opinion was shaped to a great extent by the press coverage of Mrs. Thatcher.

Three main aspects of Mrs. Thatcher's ethos are of particular significance in understanding the extent to which her image affected the party conference speeches: (1) the view of Mrs. Thatcher presented by friends, colleagues and associates; (2) the conflicting portraits presented by the press; and (3) the intrinsic ethical appeals she made in all of her party conference speeches.

Public opinion polls indicate that she grew in popularity between 1975 and 1979. Advisors focused on her physical
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appearance: she changed her hair-do from a rather tight, fussy look to a loose, casual style. She appeared more relaxed and in command on television. Most aspects of Mrs. Thatcher's life—her dress, her children, her marriage, her personality—have been a source of controversy. However, even her sharpest critics credit her with a keen intelligence, physical stamina and an all-consuming interest in public affairs.

She made strong ethical appeals in each of the party conference speeches. She established her ethos before even speaking to the party conference audiences; however, she sought to build her ethos with the appeals she made in each speech.
CHAPTER VII

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Six measures of effectiveness are commonly used by rhetorical critics, two of which are of particular significance to this study. First, the test of readability can be of some interest, but its value is difficult to determine. It has been suggested that if the speech reads well after it has been put into print, it could not have been agreeable to the listener. The test of readability focuses on the significance of the language and neglects the impact of the ideas in the speech.

Second, the technical excellence of the speech is another accepted measure of merit. Although the structure, stylistic composition and unique conceptions exemplified in the speech are important, an emphasis on those qualities focuses on the speaker’s mastery of technique as evidenced by the printed page. Such a measure cannot satisfactorily determine the effectiveness of most speeches.

Third, speeches are often judged on the basis of the

---

"honesty and integrity of the orator and the social utility of his message." This calls for psychological evaluations and judgments of morality; it also presents the problem of analyzing good ideas of bad men and bad motives of good men. Such determinations are beyond the scope of rhetorical criticism.

Fourth, the surface response of the immediate audience can be observed and recorded as well as the reactions of the media to that surface response. Although this measure is not complete, it is often an accurate measure of the effectiveness of the speech.

Fifth, the orator's wisdom in anticipating future trends is a test of his vision:

With such a test, we link the concepts of statesmanship and oratory; we measure a man's greatness as a speaker in terms of his competence in gauging the effects of a contemporary action upon the destinies of men. Such a measure is mere speculation in the analysis of a contemporary speaker and therefore could only serve a prejudicial role in the rhetorical analysis.

Sixth, changes in beliefs, attitudes and actions are often significant measures of effectiveness. Such responses come days or months from a speech. In the present study the general election in May, 1979, could serve as a measure

---

207 Ibid., p. 542.
208 Ibid. 
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of Margaret Thatcher's effectiveness as a speaker. However, a vote for or against the Conservatives probably has a great number of implications which have no direct connection with the speaker's rhetorical skill.

It is the fourth measure of effectiveness that seems most relevant to the present study, i.e., (1) the response of the immediate audience and (2) the reactions of the press. Both of these areas contribute in some measure to the impact the speaker made on those who read the excerpts of the newspaper transcripts of the speeches or who read the press responses to the speeches.

I. The Response of the Immediate Audience

First, as to the response of the immediate audience and the television audience: The nature of the party conference dictates a fairly predictable outcome in response to the leader's speech. There is always wild applause, cheering, and a standing ovation. However, the degree of enthusiasm varied from year to year. The following description of the audience's reaction to Mrs. Thatcher indicates that the 1975 speech was an overwhelming success for the immediate audience:

An unqualified triumph said the chairman; and for once, even allowing for the traditional Tory weakness for the syrup-laden tribute he seemed to be right. The applause which punctuated Mrs. Thatcher's performance yesterday, the massive ovation at the end, went well beyond the observance of the conference convention. They represented the full hearted conviction of the rank and file that the party had got itself a leader.
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who can put Conservatism back into Conservative politics and then go out and sell it to the nation.\textsuperscript{209}

The \textit{Yorkshire Post} referred to the speech as "one of the best received major conference speeches by a political leader since the war".\textsuperscript{210} The \textit{Daily Mail} said that Mrs. Thatcher "electrified her supporters".\textsuperscript{211} Mrs. Thatcher had met the challenge and appeared in full command as leader of the party.

In 1976, on the same occasion, the audience did not respond with the same degree of enthusiasm:

To say that Mrs. Thatcher was given a standing ovation at the Tory conference yesterday is, of course, to say no more than she spoke. It was, as these things go, rather more standing than ovation.\textsuperscript{212}

Still, the \textit{Yorkshire Post} emphasized the length that the audience stood and drew much significance from that: "She was given a standing ovation lasting four and a half minutes--long even by conference standards".\textsuperscript{213}

Reports of the audience's reaction to Mrs. Thatcher's 1977 party conference speech conflicted. It was agreed that the audience was enthusiastic, but the reports concerning the length of the standing ovation varied.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{209} \textit{Guardian}, 11 October 1975.
  \item \textsuperscript{210} \textit{Yorkshire Post}, 11 October 1975.
  \item \textsuperscript{211} \textit{Daily Mail}, 11 October 1975.
  \item \textsuperscript{212} \textit{Daily Mail}, 9 October 1976.
  \item \textsuperscript{213} \textit{Yorkshire Post}, 10 October 1976.
\end{itemize}
The Tory Leader was given a tumultuous six-minute standing ovation—the best reception she has received from delegates since she addressed her first annual conference as leader of the party two years ago.\textsuperscript{214}

The reports seem to agree that the audience responded to Mrs. Thatcher in a way that they hadn't since her first appearance in 1975. The Eastern Daily Press captioned an article "Ten-minute ovation for Thatcher".\textsuperscript{215} The Sunday Mirror made no comment on the length of the ovation, but said that it "looked genuine and not stage managed".\textsuperscript{216}

The immediate audience behaved somewhat differently in 1978 but perhaps that was in response to the circumstances as well as to the speech; it was Mrs. Thatcher's birthday and the members were probably grateful for an excuse to celebrate after the let-down of not having a general election in October.

Triumphant Maggie Thatcher reached for the sky—to acknowledge the six-minute standing ovation that greeted her closing speech yesterday.\textsuperscript{217}

The Sun described her birthday as "probably her best, judging by the thunderous clapping, foot stomping and good-luck shouts as she left the platform."\textsuperscript{218} The Scotsman described the ovation as one of "genuine warmth as well as ritual

\begin{itemize}
\item[214] Financial Times, 15 October 1977.
\item[216] Sunday Mirror, 15 October 1977.
\item[217] Sun [London], 14 October 1978.
\item[218] Ibid.
\end{itemize}
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loyalty". The Daily Express said that she "captured the hearts and minds of the Tory conference at Brighton".

Other responses to the speech—planned and unplanned—were meaningful. The conference ended with Mrs. Thatcher, her Shadow Cabinet and delegates singing the national anthem.

And the party loyalists responded with an emotional explosion that reached beyond the delighted audience of 4,000.

People at home watching Mrs. Thatcher on TV phoned the Daily Express to praise her.

One excited admirer said: "You must call her the new Boadicea."

II. The Reactions of the Press

Reactions to Mrs. Thatcher's 1975 party conference speech were overwhelmingly positive. The press applauded her for "not selling out to the right". The Daily Express suggested that she had wisely looked at the "reality of political leadership and learned that, whatever a party may want, a country can only be led from slightly left or slightly right of center".

She was also applauded for having "stamped the seal of her own style of leadership on the Conservatives". The
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219 Scotsman, 14 October 1978.
220 Daily Express, 14 October 1978.
221 Ibid.
223 Daily Express, 11 October 1975.
security of her leadership was certain to be affected by the speech. Edward Heath and his supporters were waiting in the wings. Clearly, the moderation of her message won approval; the party had wounds and critics observed how carefully she attended to them:

In a speech which many believed comparable in force to the late and revered idol of Conservative moderation, Ian Macleod, there was not one phrase or sentence he would have been ashamed to utter. Or one which could embarrass any past or future member of the Shadow Cabinet--Mr. Heath included.225

The criticism of the content of her speech came from sources which generally sympathize with Labor. Critics cited her lack of evidence and weak arguments. Such attacks were carefully reasoned rebuttals.226 Other criticism was somewhat abusive and more subjective--again it came only from sources which are in sympathy with Labor.

Applause cannot disguise truth--and the truth is that, as an oration, Mrs. Thatcher's speech rarely rose above the competent.227

The article concluded with the conclusion that although the speech was mediocre it served to allay the fears of those who thought she was set to lurch to the right.

So for all the absence of real inspiration in her speech, it must be said Mrs. Thatcher did the best day's work that has been done in Blackpool all week.228

225Ibid.
227Ibid.
228Daily Express, 11 October 1975.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The press reactions to Mrs. Thatcher's 1976 party conference speech generally stressed the mediocrity of the speech. The most positive remarks about the speech described the effect of her image:

In a low-key speech deliberately designed to project her as a patriot not willing to exploit Britain's crisis for party advantage, Mrs. Thatcher still managed to put it across that she wants to be Prime Minister and the sooner the better.229

In everything, and the way she said it, during 45 crusading minutes there was an impression of authority, credibility and, above all, professionalism. . . . By the time she finished yesterday it took no stretch at all to visualize Mrs. Thatcher in the role of Prime Minister.230

Even the sources which are sympathetic to the Conservative Party felt obliged to admit that the speech was less than triumphant. The Daily Telegraph did not share the view that she projected the authority of a Prime Minister.

No speech is likely to satisfy all demands, Mrs. Thatcher's rhetoric was perhaps lacking in originality and grandeur; it was not delivered with the authority that apparently only a period of residence in Downing Street can confer.231

The Eastern Press suggested that although the speech wasn't notable or inspiring her position as leader was unlikely to suffer as a result. "A truly inspiring speech, opening fresh vistas, might have helped but might equally have jarred with the prevailing mood. Assuming she had such a speech
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229 Glasgow Herald, 9 October 1976.
230 Daily Express, 9 October 1976.
231 Daily Telegraph, 9 October 1976.
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in her, Mrs. Thatcher understandably played for safety."\(^{232}\)

The *Daily Telegraph*, again a newspaper in sympathy with the Conservatives, commented on the inferiority of her oral style, particularly her use of epistrophe, a figure which ends successive clauses with the same word. The writer referred to it as "bargain basement Churchillian".

"I want to speak to you today about the rebirth of a nation. Our nation. The British nation."

That clarified the position for those of us who might have thought she wanted to speak about the Tanzanian nation.

Later, she referred to "that wise French philosopher de Tocqueville," so that we would not confuse him with that unwise Burmese philosopher, de Tocqueville.\(^{233}\)

The writer described the speech as "stilted, overblown and contained quotations designed to show that she read books with long words in them". The same writer heard the impromptu speech which she delivered to the overflow meeting which had viewed the original speech on screens.

For the encore next door she spoke without notes unalteringly, and became a creature of flesh and blood alarmed at Gibbon's account of how civilization can fall, and genuinely hoped that she can prevent the fall of this one.

All of which suggests that Mrs. Thatcher is a good woman fallen among bad speech writers.

For the main performance in the hall was markedly inferior to her showing last year.\(^{234}\)

The press reaction to Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speech was generally that of admiration. It was hailed as


\(^{233}\) *Daily Telegraph*, 9 October 1976.

\(^{234}\) Ibid.
her most successful party conference speech and one which placed her firmly in control of her party.

Many people who were worried that she might not be able to deal effectively with the union leaders must have had their fears removed. She will be too clever to seek confrontation. But if there is one I would back her to be the winner.  

Other sources echoed the enthusiastic response to her remarks about the trade unions. The Daily Telegraph referred to the speech as unashamedly and splendidly populist. She was applauded for claiming new territory for the Conservatives, referring to her speech as a "triumph of her working class touch".

Mrs. Thatcher's speech marked a significant new departure in the political battle. It means that the middle-class Tory Party of Mr. Heath and the leafy suburbs is dead.

The Times [London] called her speech a "rousing conclusion" to a "less than exciting" conference.

The left-wing Morning Star heaped abuse on Mrs. Thatcher in retaliation:

Her plan is to raid schools, hospitals, housing programs, anything where public money is used for the people, so that she can stuff even more pound notes into the bulging pockets of the armament kings.

Mrs. Thatcher's 1978 party conference speech served to convince the press that she believed and the Conservatives
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235 Sunday Mirror, 16 October 1977.
237 Ibid.
238 Morning Star, 15 October 1977.
believed that she would soon be Prime Minister. Her attack on the Government and her warning to the trade unions made an impact.

Mrs. Margaret Thatcher made a powerful appeal to trade union leaders as she wound up the Tory Conference at Brighton today.239

Her image strengthened with the speech according to several journalists and the general press response confirms those observations.

As with the American Presidency, nearness to high office itself confers an aura of power and authority. In Mrs. Thatcher's case it has certainly lent her utterances greater weight—and it is beginning to remove the uncertainty from her voice and manner.

... Fair ladies with faint hearts never won anything. The most encouraging feature of the past year for those who want to see Mrs. Thatcher's policies put into practice is her own confidence, authority and determination.240

Peter Jenkins, political columnist for the Guardian, recognized the success of Mrs. Thatcher's speech and regarded it as the result of having "played it safe"241 with "no new policy announcements".

There would have been ecstatic reception for Mrs. Thatcher at the Conservative Party Conference yesterday had she read aloud from the Brighton and Hove telephone directory. Everybody was eager to hail the next Prime Minister. Her speech was a bit more exciting than the telephone book but low key stuff nevertheless;

it does not handsomely repay analysis.\textsuperscript{242} The \textit{Morning Star} told its readers that they had been warned and that no one who still votes Tory could have any cause for complaint.

III. Conclusion

The immediate audience gave Mrs. Thatcher an exuberant reception at the close of each of the four party conference speeches. Still, the difference in the degree of enthusiasm appear obvious in an examination of the press reports. The 1975 speech was an outstanding success; the 1976 speech received the dutiful accolades; the 1977 and 1978 speeches thrilled the majority of the delegates.

Reports of those responses had a certain effect on the general public. Also, the responses of the journalists themselves had a decided effect on the public. The press reaction to the 1975, 1977, and 1978 speeches was overwhelmingly enthusiastic; the responses to the 1976 speech, although not wholly positive, reported the speaker's triumph before the Conservative conference. Thus, the press coverage of Mrs. Thatcher's party conference speeches could only have had a positive influence on the general public, conveying an image of strength and success vital to Mrs. Thatcher's credibility as a future Prime Minister.
CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The rhetorical analysis of Margaret Thatcher's party conference speeches indicate the way in which those speeches are likely to have contributed to her effectiveness as leader of the Conservative Party, to her rise in prominence in Great Britain, and to her credibility as a future head of state. The analysis reveals her goals as a speaker, the way in which she achieved them and finally, the effect of her speaking on her audiences.

The audiences and occasions for these speeches must be viewed within the context of the social, political, and economic history of this century in Britain. Treatment for "the British disease" is the subject of great controversy, but there is general agreement that the malaise exists. The Conservative Party cites Labor's failure to govern effectively as evidence that the socialists have no "cure"; the Labor Party charges that the changes which the Conservative Party propose would create a shake-up in the welfare state which would cause great suffering.

An intellectual shift appears to be occurring in Great Britain. Socialist ideology is losing support. A "new conservatism" which looks to the Chicago school of economics
and the philosophy of Milton Friedman for answers to the current socio-economic dilemma is gaining support among the academicians, political journalists, and members of the Conservative Party. Lord Blake, Provost at Queen's College Oxford, refers to this re-thinking as evidence of a "changed climate" in Britain today.

Most members of the immediate audience for each of the party conference speeches probably had some understanding of the political history of Great Britain since the war. Delegates to the convention, members of Parliament and the media representatives attending the convention would each have had a more sophisticated knowledge of political events than did the general population. The diverse television audience represented a cross-section of British people. Mrs. Thatcher clearly recognized the conflicting demands made by such a diverse audience and decided which needs were the most widespread.

Margaret Thatcher's background served her well in preparing her for a career in Parliament. Her speech education from childhood appears to have given her an evangelical zeal and an absolute determination to carry the message which she feels Britain must hear in order to survive as a free nation.

Margaret Thatcher's delivery showed a marked improvement in 1977 and 1978. Her low and monotonous pitch pattern coupled with a tendency for her pitch to become suddenly high made her the favorite of leading impressionists and
television comedians throughout the 1975-1978 period. By 1978 she appeared far more relaxed and in control. She had greater vocal variety and was obviously in control of her pitch pattern. Her more frequent smiles, an air of confidence, and a more casual hairdo contributed to the increased effectiveness of her delivery.

The way in which she structured the party conference speeches indicates that she considered the demands of the occasion. Each of the party conference speeches was developed around a proposition of policy and thus relied to some extent on logical order. Although the logical method served to give continuity to the reasoning process, the speaker concerned herself with psychological appeals and reactions. The greatest weaknesses in the structure of each of the party conference speeches lay in her failure to provide (1) smooth transitions between the many topics she introduced in each speech and (2) final summaries and internal summaries. The party conference speeches lacked unity as a result of these weaknesses.

Margaret Thatcher demonstrated a clear preference for emotional proof over logical proof in the party conference speeches. The diversity of the audience created an enormous challenge for the speaker, and her reliance on the emotional mode was probably highly effective in reaching many members of her audience. However, her failure to provide minimal evidence in support of many of her arguments weakened her logical proof and lowered the integrity of her speeches.
Margaret Thatcher's public image changed greatly between the years of 1975 and 1978 as a result of a concerted effort on her part and the response to her from the press. Public opinion polls indicate that she grew in popularity between 1975 and 1979. Most aspects of her life, both private and public, were a source of controversy during those years. Although advisors have concentrated on her voice and appearance in order to make her more appealing to the public, even her sharpest critics credit her with an exceptional mind, physical stamina, and a determination to reach her goals for both herself and Britain.

The measure of effectiveness which seems most relevant to this study is the observation of the surface response of the immediate audience and the record of the media reactions to that surface response. The immediate audience at each of the party conferences gave Mrs. Thatcher an enthusiastic ovation at the conclusion of each of the party conference speeches. Although such ovations are a matter of ceremony at Conservative conferences, the difference in the degree of the enthusiasm is both noticeable and significant. The 1975 speech met with great approval; the 1976 speech was received dutifully; the 1977 and 1978 speeches created enormous enthusiasm. The press coverage of these events must have affected the general public. The journalists were much impressed with the 1975, 1977, and 1978 speeches; and although response to the 1976 speech was not wholly positive, the journalists reported that the immediate audience received
the speech with great enthusiasm. Certainly the press coverage of these speeches had a positive influence on the general public. The reports portrayed Mrs. Thatcher as a source of strength and vitality and clearly increased her credibility as a Prime Minister.

**Significance of the Study**

Margaret Thatcher's party conference speeches represent those occasions on which she spoke to the largest and most diverse audiences in Great Britain. Mrs. Thatcher made a reputation for herself after becoming Leader of the Opposition by demonstrating an ability to build a solid case, to provide exhaustive evidence, and to obey the rules of sound argumentation. The party conference speeches consistently lacked just such a reliance on the logical mode, the result being that integrity of the speeches suffered. Rhetorical analysis of these speeches reveals the way in which Margaret Thatcher chose to communicate with her widest and most diverse audience; the study of the party conference speeches is of special significance because of this diversity. Any aspect of Margaret Thatcher's speaking during the 1975-1978 period can probably be better understood after having examined a rhetorical analysis of her party conference speeches.
Suggestions for Further Study

Numerous studies could be done not only on Margaret Thatcher's public speaking, but also on other political events during this period. The following topics seem to the writer to be of particular value: Margaret Thatcher's Occasional Speeches 1975-1978; Margaret Thatcher's Speeches in the House of Commons; A Comparative Study of the Speeches of Margaret Thatcher and James Callaghan during the General Election of 1979; A Comparative Study of the Conservative, Labor, and Liberal Party Conference Speeches; A Comparative Study of the Speeches at the American Political Conventions and the British Party Conferences.
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APPENDIX A

'LET ME GIVE YOU MY VISION'

THE LEADER'S ADDRESS TO THE CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE, AT BLACKPOOL, ON FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1975:

The first Conservative Party Conference I ever attended was in 1946, and I came to it as an undergraduate representing Oxford University Conservative Association (I know our Cambridge supporters will not mind). That Conference was held in this very hall, and the platform then seemed a long way away, and I had no thought of joining the lofty and distinguished people sitting up there, but our Party is the Party of equality of opportunity, as you can see.

I know you will understand the humility I feel at following in the footsteps of great men like our Leader in that year, Winston Churchill, a man called by destiny to raise the name of Britain to supreme heights in the history of the free world. In the footsteps of Anthony Eden, who set us the goal of a property-owning democracy--a goal we still pursue today; of Harold Macmillan, whose leadership brought so many ambitions within the grasp of every citizen; of Alec Douglas-Home, whose career of selfless public service earned the affection and admiration of us all; and of Edward Heath, who successfully led the Party to victory in 1970 and brilliantly led the nation into Europe in 1973.

During my lifetime, all the Leaders of the Conservative Party have served as Prime Minister, and I hope the habit will continue. Our leaders have been different men with different qualities and different styles, but they all had one thing in common: each met the challenge of his time. Now, what is the challenge of our time? I believe there are two challenges: to overcome the country's economic and financial problems and to regain our confidence in Britain and ourselves.

The economic challenge has been debated at length this week in this hall. Last week, it gave rise to the usual scenes of cordial brotherly strife. Day after day, the comrades called one another far from comradely names and, occasionally, when they remembered, they called us names, too. Some of them, for example, suggested that I criticised Britain when I was overseas. They are wrong. It was not Britain I was
criticising, it was Socialism, and I will go on criticising Socialism and opposing Socialism, because it is bad for Britain. Britain and Socialism are not the same thing, and as long as I have health and strength they never will be.

COST OF SOCIALIST FRAUD

Whatever could I say about Britain that is half as damaging as what this Labour Government has done to our country? Let us look at the record. It is the Labour Government that has caused prices to rise at a record rate of 26 per cent a year. They told us the 'Social Contract' would solve everything, but now everyone can see that the so-called 'contract' was a fraud—a fraud for which the people of this country have to pay a very high price.

It is the Labour Government whose past policies are forcing unemployment higher than it need ever have been. Thousands more men and women are losing their jobs every day, and there are going to be men and women, many of them youngsters straight out of school, who will be without a job this winter because Socialist Ministers spent last year attacking us instead of attacking inflation.

It is the Labour Government that brought the level of production below that of the three-day week in 1974. We have really got a three-day week now, only it takes five days to do it. It is the Labour Government that has brought us record peace-time taxation. They have the usual Socialist disease: they have run out of other people's money. It is the Labour Government that has pushed public spending to record levels. How have they done it? By borrowing and borrowing. Never in the field of human credit has so much been owed!

Serious as the economic challenge is, the political and moral challenge is just as grave, and perhaps even more so, because economic problems never start with economics. They have much deeper roots in human nature and roots in politics, and they do not finish at economics either. Labour's failure to cope, to look at the nation's problems from the viewpoint of the whole nation, and not just one section of it, has led to a loss of confidence, and to a sense of helplessness, and with it goes a feeling that Parliament, which ought to be in charge, is not in charge, and that the actions and decisions are taken elsewhere.

ADVOCATES OF MARXIST SYSTEM

It goes even deeper than that, to the voices that seem anxious not to overcome our economic difficulties, but to exploit them to destroy the free-enterprise society and put a Marxist system in its place. Today, those voices form a sizable
chorus in the parliamentary Labour Party, a chorus which, aided and abetted by the many constituency Labour Parties, seems to be growing in numbers. Mind you, anyone who says this openly is promptly accused of seeing Reds Under the Beds, but look who is seeing them now, on his own admission. Mr. Wilson has at last discovered that his own party is infiltrated by extreme Left-wingers, or, to use his own words, it is infested with them. When even Mr. Wilson gets scared about their success in capturing key positions in the Labour Party, should not the rest of us be? Should not the rest of us ask him: "Where have you been while all this has been going on, and what are you doing about it?" The answer is: "Nothing".

I sometimes think the Labour Party is like a pub where the mild is running out. If someone does not do something soon, all that is left will be bitter, and all that is bitter will be Left.

Whenever I visit Communist countries their politicians never hesitate to boast about their achievements. They know them all by heart; they reel off the facts and figures, claiming this is the rich harvest of the Communist system. Yet they are not as prosperous as we in the West are prosperous, and they are not free as we in the West are free.

Our capitalist system produces a far higher standard of prosperity and happiness because it believes in incentive and opportunity, and because it is founded on human dignity and freedom. Even the Russians have to go to a capitalist country--America--to buy enough wheat to feed their people--and that after more than 50 years of a State-controlled economy. Yet they boast incessantly, while we, who have so much more to boast about, forever criticise and decry.

Is it not time we spoke up for our way of life? After all, no Western nation has to build a wall around itself to keep people in.

CRISIS LIES IN SOCIALISM

So let us have no truck with those who say the free-enterprise system has failed. What we face today is not a crisis of capitalism, but of Socialism. No country can flourish if its economic and social life is dominated by nationalisation and State control.

The cause of our shortcomings does not, therefore, lie in private enterprise. Our problem is not that we have too little Socialism. It is that we have too much. If only the Labour Party in this country would act like Social Democrats in West Germany! If only they would stop trying to prove their
Socialist virility by relentlessly nationalising one industry after another!

Of course, a halt to further State control will not, on its own, restore our belief in ourselves, because something else is happening to this country. We are witnessing a deliberate attack on our values, a deliberate attack on those who wish to promote merit and excellence, a deliberate attack on our heritage and our great past. And there are those who gnaw away at our national self-respect, rewriting British history as centuries of unrelieved gloom, oppression and failure—as days of hopelessness, not days of hope.

And others, under the shelter of our education system, are ruthlessly attacking the minds of the young. Everyone who believes in freedom must be appalled at the tactics employed by the far-Left in the systematic destruction of the North London Polytechnic—blatant tactics of intimidation designed to undermine the fundamental beliefs and values of every student, tactics pursued by people who are the first to insist on their own civil rights while seeking to deny them to the rest of us.

We must not be bullied or brainwashed out of our beliefs. No wonder so many of our people, some of the best and the brightest, are depressed and talking of emigrating. Even so, I think they are wrong.

They are giving up too soon. Many of the things we hold dear are threatened as never before, but none has yet been lost. So stay here, stay and help us defeat Socialism, so that the Britain you have known may be the Britain your children will know.

These are the two great challenges of our time—the moral and political challenge, and the economic challenge. They have to be faced together and we have to master them both.

What are our chances of success? It depends on what kind of people we are. What kind of people are we? We are the people that in the past made Great Britain the workshop of the world, the people who persuaded others to buy British, not by begging them to do so but because it was best.

We are a people who have received more Nobel Prizes than any other nation except America, and head for head, we have done better than America—twice as well, in fact.

We are a people who, among other things, invented the computer, the refrigerator, the electric motor, the stethoscope, rayon, steam turbine, stainless steel, the tank, television, penicillin, radar, the jet engine, hovercraft, float glass and carbon fibers, etc.—oh, and the better half of the Concorde.
We export more of what we produce than West Germany, France, Japan, or the United States, and well over 90 per cent of these exports come from private enterprise. It is a triumph for the private sector and all who work in it, and let us say so loud and clear.

With achievements like that, who can doubt that Britain can have a great future, and what our friends abroad want to know is whether that future is going to happen.

THESE--THE BRITISH INHERITANCE

Well, how can we Conservatives make it happen? Many of the details have already been dealt with in the Conference debates. But policies and programmes should not just be a list of unrelated items. They are part of a total vision of the kind of life we want for our country and our children.

Let me give you my vision: a man's right to work as he will, to spend what he earns, to own property, to have the State as servant and not as master--these are the British inheritance. They are the essence of a free country, and on that freedom all our other freedoms depend.

But we want a free economy, not only because it guarantees our liberties, but also because it is the best way of creating wealth and prosperity for the whole country, and it is this prosperity alone which can give us the resources for better services for the community, better services for those in need.

By their attack on private enterprise, the Labour Government has made certain that there will be next-to-nothing available for improvements in our social services over the next few years. We must get private enterprise back on the road to recovery, not merely to give people more of their own money to spend as they choose, but to have more money to help the old and the sick and the handicapped. And the way to recovery is through profits, good profits today leading to high investment, leading to well-paid jobs, leading to a better standard of living tomorrow. No profits mean no investment, and that means a dying industry geared to yesterday's world, and that means fewer jobs tomorrow. Other nations have recognized that for years now and, because they have recognized it, they are going ahead faster than we are; and the gap between us will continue to increase unless we change our ways, and the trouble here is that for years the Labour Party have made people feel that profits are guilty unless proved innocent.
WHAT GOVERNMENTS MUST LEARN

When I visit factories and companies I do not find that those who actually work in them are against profits; on the contrary, they want to work for a prosperous concern, a concern with a future--their future. Governments must learn to leave these companies with enough of their own profits to produce the goods and jobs for tomorrow. If the Socialists will not or cannot, there will be no profit-making industry left to support the losses caused by fresh bouts of nationalisation.

If anyone should murmur that I am preaching laissez-faire, let me say that I am not arguing, and have never argued, that all we have to do is to let the economy run by itself.

I believe that, just as each of us has an obligation to make the best of his talents, so Governments have an obligation to create the framework within which we can do so. Not only individual people, but individual firms and particularly small firms.

If they concentrate on doing that, they would do a lot better than they are doing now. Some of the small firms will stay small, but others will expand and become the great companies of the future.

The Labour Government has pursued a disastrous vendetta against small business and the self-employed. We will reverse their damaging policies.

EMPTY PROMISES, PENAL TAXATION

Nowhere is this more important than in agriculture, one of our most successful industries, made up almost entirely of small businesses. We live in a world in which food is no longer cheap or plentiful. Everything we cannot produce here must be imported at a high price. Yet the Government could not have destroyed the confidence of the industry more effectively if they had tried deliberately to do so, with their formula of empty promises and penal taxation. So, today, what is the picture? Depressed profits, low investment, no incentive, and, overshadowing everything, Government spending, spending, spending, spending, far beyond the taxpayers' means.

To recover, to get from where we are to where we want to be--and I admit we would rather not be here--will take time. "Economic policy", wrote Maynard Keynes, "should not be a matter of tearing up by the roots, but of slowly training a plant to grow in a different direction." It will take time to reduce public spending, to rebuild profits and incentives, and to benefit from the investments which must
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be made. But the sooner that time starts, the better it will be for Britain's unemployed and for Britain as a whole.

One of the reasons why this Labour Government has incurred more unemployment than any Conservative Government since the War is because they have concentrated too much on distributing what we have, and too little on seeing that we have more.

We Conservatives hate unemployment. We hate the idea of men and women not being able to use their abilities. We deplore the waste of natural resources, and the deep affront to people's dignity from being out of work through no fault of their own. It is ironic that we should be accused of wanting unemployment to solve our economic problems, by the very Government which has produced a record post-war unemployment and is expecting more.

The record of Mr. Wilson and his colleagues on this is unparalleled in the history of political hypocrisy. We are now seeing the full consequences of nearly 20 months of Labour Government. They have done the wrong things at the wrong time in the wrong way, and they have been a disaster for this country.

ALL ARE EQUALLY IMPORTANT

Now, let me turn to something I spoke about in America. Some Socialists seem to believe that people should be numbers in a State Computer. We believe they should be individuals. We are all unequal. No one, thank heavens, is quite like anyone else, however much the Socialists may pretend otherwise. We believe that everyone has the right to be unequal. But to us, every human being is equally important.

Engineers, miners, manual workers, shop assistants, farm-workers, postmen, housewives—these are the essential foundations of our society, and without them there would be no nation. But there are others with special gifts who should also have their chance, because if the adventurers who strike out in new directions in science, technology, medicine, commerce, and industry are hobbled, there can be no advance. The spirit of envy can destroy; it can never build. Everyone must be allowed to develop the abilities he knows he has within him, and she knows she has within her, in the way he or she chooses.

Freedom to choose is something we take for granted, until it is in danger of being taken away. Socialist Governments set out perpetually to restrict the area of choice, and Conservative Governments to increase it. We believe that you
become a responsible citizen by making decisions yourself, not by having them made for you. But they are made for you by Labour.

'LET US EXTEND CHOICE'

Take education: our education system used to serve us well. A child from an ordinary family, as I was, could use it as a ladder, as an advancement, but the Socialists, better at demolition than reconstruction, are destroying many good grammar schools. Now this is nothing to do with private education. It is opportunity and excellence in our State schools that are being diminished under Socialism. Naturally enough, parents do not like this, but in a Socialist society parents should be seen and not heard.

Another denial of choice is being applied to health. The private sector helps to keep some of our best doctors here, and so available, part-time, to the National Health Service. It also helps to bring in more money for the general health of the nation; but under Labour, private medicine is being squeezed out, and the result will be to add to the burden on the National Health Service without adding one penny to its income.

Let me make this absolutely clear: when we return to power, we shall reverse Mrs. Castle's stupid and spiteful attack on hospital pay-beds. We Conservatives do not accept that because some people have no choice, no one should have it. Every family should have the right to spend their money, after tax, as they wish, and not as the Government dictates. Let us extend choice, extend the will to choose and the chance to choose.

AN ARGUMENT AGAINST DEMOCRACY

I want to come now to the argument which Mr. Wilson is trying to put across the country: namely, that the Labour Party is the natural party of Government, because it is the only one that the trade unions will accept. From what I saw on television last week, the Labour Party did not look like a party of Government at all, let alone a natural one.

But let us examine the argument, because it is important. If we are to be told that a Conservative Government could not govern because certain extreme leaders would not let it, then General Elections are a mockery, we have arrived at the one-party State, and parliamentary democracy in this country will have perished. The democracy for which our fathers fought and died is not to be laid to rest as lightly as that.
When the next Conservative Government comes to power, many trade unionists will have put it there. Millions of them vote for us at every election. I want to say this to them and to all of our supporters in industry: go out and join in the work of your unions; go to their meetings and stay to the end, and learn the union rules as well as the far-Left knows them. Remember that if parliamentary democracy dies, free trade unions die with it.

FIRST DUTY OF GOVERNMENT

I come last to what many would put first: the rule of law. The first people to uphold the law should be Government, and it is tragic that the Socialist Government, to its lasting shame, should have lost its nerve and shed its principles over the People's Republic of Clay Cross, and that a group of the Labour Party should have tried to turn the Shrewsbury pickets into martyrs. On both occasions, the law was broken and, on one, violence was done. No decent society can live like that, and no responsible party should condone it.

The first duty of government is to uphold the law, and if it tries to bob, weave and duck round that duty when it is inconvenient, the governed will do exactly the same thing, and then nothing will be safe, not home, not liberty, not life itself.

There is one part of this country where, tragically, defiance of the law is costing life day after day. In Northern Ireland our troops have the dangerous and thankless task of trying to keep the peace and hold a balance. We are proud of the way they have discharged their duty.

This party is pledged to support the unity of the United Kingdom, to preserve that unity and to protect the people, Catholic and Protestant alike. We believe our Armed Forces must remain until a genuine peace is made. Our thoughts are with them and our pride is with them, too.

I have spoken of the challenges which face us here in Britain--the challenge to recover economically, and the challenge to recover our belief in ourselves--and I have shown our potential for recovery. I have dealt with some aspects of our strength and approach, and I have tried to tell you something of my personal vision and my belief in the standards on which this nation was greatly built, on which it greatly thrived, and from which in recent years it has greatly fallen away. I believe we are coming to yet another turning point in our long history. We can go on as we have been going and continue down, or we can stop and, with a decisive act of will, say, "Enough".
Let all of us here today, and others far beyond this hall who believe in our cause, make that act of will. Let us proclaim our faith in a new and better fortune for our Party and our people. Let us resolve to heal the wounds of a divided nation, and let that act of healing be the prelude to a lasting victory.
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I want to speak to you today about the rebirth of a nation. Our nation. The British nation.

It is customary at Conferences to talk mainly about winning elections, to concentrate on the Party interest. There is nothing dishonourable about that. I am not against winning elections. On the contrary, I think that one of the problems facing this country is that our Party has not won enough of them lately. A situation we propose to remedy.

But for the Conservative Party politics has always been about something more than gaining power. It has been about serving the nation. We are above all a patriotic Party, a national Party; and so it is not we who have been obsessed this week with how to take party advantage of the present crisis. What's good for General Motors may be good for the USA. But nothing that's bad for Britain can ever be good for Conservatives. What we have been concerned with is how we can tackle this crisis, how we can ensure the prosperity, the freedom - yes - and the honour of Britain. The very survival of our laws, our institutions, our national character - that is what is at stake today.

CLOSE TO MIDNIGHT

Economically, Britain is on its knees. It is not patriotic to say this. It is no secret.

It is known by people of all ages. By those old enough to remember the sacrifices of the war and who now ask what ever happened to the fruits of victory; by the young, born since the war, who have seen too much national failure; by those who leave this country in increasing numbers for other lands. For them, hope has withered
and faith gone sour. And for we who remain it is close to midnight. As Ted Heath said with such force on Wednesday, Britain is at the end of the road. As we all know, he is a man who never sold the truth to serve the hour. I am indeed grateful for what he said. Let us all have his courage.

The situation of our country grows daily, almost hourly, worse. As the bailiff's approach, can nothing be done?

If the Labour Government is no longer able to act in the national interest, is there no alternative to the ruin of Britain? Yes, indeed there is - and that alternative is here at Brighton today.

**BEG AND BORROW**

But if we in the Conservative Party are to shoulder the responsibility of Government, to chart a fresh course for our country, then we must first understand what has happened to us - where things have gone wrong - and why.

I believe there are several reasons for what is known as "the British sickness" - and they are not a criticism of the people of this country. They are a criticism of the Government of this country.

First, we have become the big spenders of Europe - spenders of other countries' money.

The Labour Governments of Harold Wilson and James Callaghan have spent and spent and spent again with unbridled extravagance. And they have exhausted the means to pay for it. They have nearly exhausted the patience and tolerance and respect of our friends.

Under Labour the land of hope and glory has become the land of beg and borrow.

Today, the Government are back once more at the money lenders for what may well be their last chance - and ours. For this time they are about to pledge the nation's credit to the hilt.

Secondly, increasing interference and direction of industry have stopped it doing its job properly.

The Government have chopped and changed policies; they have created confusion and uncertainty. They have added countless burdens. They have destroyed profits. They have raised the cost of borrowing to intolerable heights.
And they have demoralised management and they have sapped the will to work.

No wonder investment in industry has slowed to a crawl.

The third reason - and it goes hand-in-glove with the second reason - is political rather than economic. It's the Labour Party's chronic schizophrenia about the future of free enterprise - although the world over, free enterprise has proved itself more efficient, and better able to produce a good standard of living than either Socialism or Communism; and although wherever free enterprise is strangled, freedom is strangled too.

Even so, even against all that background, the Labour Party has remained confused and divided over whether free enterprise should be allowed to survive. Yet, in spite of everything, it has survived - so far. Not only that, but, taxed to the limit, it has been the prop and stay of the public sector.

Today that survival is in danger.

As everyone saw on their television screens last week, the Labour Party has now been taken over by extremists. After years of gnawing and burrowing away in the background, they have at last crept out of the woodwork - at of all places the Winter Gardens, Blackpool. It was a sight the country is unlikely ever to forget.

THE RED FLAG

The Labour Party is now committed to a programme which is frankly and unashamedly Marxist, a programme initiated by its National Executive and now firmly endorsed by its official Party Conference.

In the House of Commons the Labour Left may still be outnumbered, but their votes are vital to the continuance of Labour in office, and that gives them a strength out of proportion to their numbers. And make no mistake, that strength, those numbers, are growing.

In the constituency Labour parties, in the Parliamentary Labour Party, in Transport House, in the Cabinet Room itself, the Marxists call an increasing number of tunes - in addition to "The Red Flag".

With the Labour Party more bitterly divided than ever, let no-one imagine that this country will be protected
by Mr. Callaghan's avuncular umbrella any more than it was protected by Sir Harold Wilson's raincoat. That umbrella was blown inside out at Blackpool.

Let's not mince words. The dividing line between the Labour Party programming and Communism is becoming harder and harder to detect. Indeed, in many respects Labour's programme is more extreme than those of many Communist parties of Western Europe.

So I hope that anyone who votes Labour in future will be aware both of the people and the ideas they are in fact supporting. It is not surprising that after the events of last week Mr. Callaghan should speak about a totalitarian threat. He should know all about that. He faces it in his own party. But it is arrogant and utterly wrong of him to suggest that the only alternative to his Government is dictatorship. He should have a higher opinion of the British people.

Ours is one of the oldest democracies in the world. Our citizens have a passion for liberty. They have fought for it, and died for it.

Provided they know what is happening, they will never surrender to the extremists, whether of the Left or Right. We are made of sterner stuff than the Labour Party. The trouble about the Socialist leader is that he talks tough but he never acts tough - until it's too late. He talked tough last week. He condemned the pawn-shop philosophy of his supporters.

STRAIGHT FOR ROCKS

He even spoke of the need to earn wealth before it's distributed. He even mentioned profits - and at a Labour conference!

Apart from reading our speeches, where have Mr. Callaghan and his colleagues been for the last few years? After the energy crisis 3 years ago, who was attacking us for cutting public spending and tightening the money supply? Callaghan and Co.

Who fought the October 1974 Election saying that inflation was under control? Who said that there would be no great rise in unemployment? Who claimed that the Social Contract would take care of all our troubles? Callaghan and Co.

Who said "Steady as she goes" - and then steered straight for the rocks? You've guessed it. Callaghan and Co.

Now half the Cabinet are beginning to tell half the truth. So what are the chances they'll change course? Nil, I'm afraid. Because the very nature of the Labour Party prevents a Labour Government from doing what some of its members at long last realise must be done.

For example, we are told that to cut public spending further is impossible because the Labour Party wouldn't stand for it. What an appalling admission! If the country's economy is bleeding to death, the Labour Party must stand for it. We must all stand for it. This brings us, not for the first time, to the question: "Which comes first with the Labour leaders - party or country?" Don't tell me. It's too depressing.

With their approach it's hardly surprising that Labour's record over the last 2½ years has been so disastrous. First, there was Harold Wilson's administration. There's no secret why he resigned. He took to the hills while the going was bad but before it got worse. Now we understand he's been found and brought back to the City. A plunging pound and Wilson found. There's no end to our troubles. And now we have Mr. Callaghan.

Between the pair of them, Sir Harold and Mr. Callaghan and their wretched Governments have impoverished and all but bankrupted Britain. Socialism has failed our nation. Away with it, before it does the final damage.

A FORMIDABLE TASK

Yesterday we heard that the bank rate had been raised to an unprecedented 15%. You will remember in your time, Mr. Chairman, 7% was a crisis measure. Now 15%. The Government are going on taking stopgap measures to try to restore confidence in the £. They still won't or can't change course and take the painful steps that are needed.

What would be the attitude of the Conservative Party if the Government did at last lay the right measures before Parliament for its approval? That is an important question for us all. In our response to it, we must be careful not to fall into a trap; a trap in which the
Government look to us to support them over difficult decisions, knowing full well they can then buy off their own Left wing by putting through further Socialist measures which the Left will demand.

It is no part of Conservative philosophy to help build a Socialist Britain. I have already said that the Conservative Party puts the national interest before short term party advantage. But the national interest now requires not only that the Government should cut back their expenditures to reduce their borrowing, but also that they should drop the divisive legislation which they are steamrolling through Parliament: bills like the Dockwork Regulation Bill; like the nationalisation of aircraft and shipbuilding; like the controversial Education and Health Bills.

These Bills have nothing to do with saving the British economy. Indeed, they can only make that task much more difficult. We must distinguish clearly between Governments and the measures they introduce. A few good measures dictated by events cannot redeem the appalling record and intentions of this Labour administration. We do not oppose good measures but we will fight ceaselessly against bad Government.

Because the Britain we are seeking is a Britain which could never be founded on Socialism.

The task of the next Conservative Government will be formidable. The sooner we start the better. We have two great obstacles to overcome - doubt and bewilderment. First, bewilderment about what should be done, because we seem to have tried every trick in the book. We have had National Plans and Pay Pauses, Price Freezes, Productivity Awards, Industrial Strategies and Growth Targets.

THE RIGHT APPROACH

We have been promised that the next bright ploy will hit the bullseye: that blue skies are just around the corner; that we will soon turn the corner; that the light is about to appear at the end of the tunnel - I quote from Mr. Callaghan's speeches in the past - that we are emerging from the valley of gloom; that we are heading for an economic miracle.

We have had whole regiments of cliches marching into the sunset; but the problems just go on getting worse.
So it's not surprising that people are bewildered. It's not surprising that they are uncertain.

Uncertain whether the task of doing what needs to be done - whatever that may be - is possible for a Government of any party. For the Labour Party. Or for the Conservative Party. They are cynical about politics and politicians. They fear that a free future cannot be saved.

It can be saved.

We can overcome our doubts, we can rediscover our confidence, we can regain the respect of the rest of the world.

The policies which are needed are dictated by common-sense. That is the right approach. We have set out the broad lines in our Strategy Statement and we have shown how they stem from a clear, coherent political philosophy.

We have first to put our finances in order. We must live within our means. The Government must do so. And we must do so as a country. We can't go on like this.

LOANS BRIDGE CRUMBLING

We are paying ourselves more than the value of what we produce. We are spending more than we earn. The gap has to be bridged. It can only be bridged at present by borrowing from overseas. But it cannot be bridged that way forever.

And at any moment, if we forfeit the confidence of those who lend to us, that bridge can collapse.

It is crumbling now.

The only way to safety is to stop borrowing, and stop borrowing soon; and, moreover, to show that we can and will repay our debts in a strong currency and on time. That is usually the task of a Conservative Government.

To do that, the country must consume less than it produces. That means a drastic change in policies and in attitudes. But we shall have to proclaim openly that this is our purpose.

Once we have taken the immediate emergency measures which are needed, we must chart the course for years ahead.

There, the country faces a choice. Who is to spend less? At one extreme the Treasury can try to make us, the
people, economise by putting up taxes. At the other it can concentrate all its economies on the Government's own spending. There is not much doubt about the right decision.

The Government is spending about £200 a year more than it is raising in taxes, for each man, woman and child in the country.

Surely no-one, (that is no-one outside the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party), can believe in the long-term that taxes should go up still more.

COMMON-SENSE ANSWER

So the only common-sense answer is to reduce Government spending.

That is our answer.

Economies started as a matter of urgency must be sustained deliberately, carefully and humanely over the period of a full Parliament.

They won't be easy. They will not be popular, and we shall have to defer some of our hopes.

We have indicated in The Right Approach those areas where cuts must be made.

By getting rid of Socialist programmes. By removing indiscriminate subsidies. By rooting out waste and extravagance. By applying cash limits. By economies in most major spending programmes other than Defence, the Police and those on which the needy must depend.

That is a very similar strategy to that which the Australian Liberal Party, our counterparts, fought their election upon. They are now doing it. That shows it can be carried out in practice; and the people are supporting them because they knew the measures must be taken.

In opposition we cannot write our own public expenditure White Paper; it would be foolish to do so. But we may not be in opposition that much longer. So let me pledge that once we are the Government, what we have said we will do about public expenditure, we will do; and we will keep our word just as those other Conservative Governments that I have seen in action recently in Australia and New Zealand have kept theirs.
If the present Government have no stomach for the fight, let them depart.

 INCENTIVE - THE DYNAMO

Let us realise that their almost total commitment to extravagant Government expenditure is not borne solely of compassion. Not a bit of it! It reflects a stubborn desire to regulate the day-to-day lives of rich and poor alike. The more a family has of its own money to spend, the more independent it is of the State. The more that is taken away from that family by taxation, the more that family are under the heel of the State; and that is where Socialism wants them.

The Socialists' battle cry is always the same; we hear it in Parliament. "The Conservatives", they say "want unemployment. Conservative cuts" they claim, "would double or treble those out of work".

Now this is nonsense. And we must recognise it as nonsense.

No Party deliberately seeks the misery and waste of unemployment. But what is the history of the last two-and-a-half years? It is a Labour Government that has doubled the numbers out of work and set a shameful post-war record. And however well intentioned it is Labour's policies that have brought this about.

Yet curiously enough they have neither the wit to acknowledge it nor the courage to change those policies. They doubled public spending. That led to a doubling of unemployment, because they bled productive industry white of the resources it needed to provide jobs.

Today their policies threaten the ultimate disaster. An economic earthquake that would ruin the livelihood of thousands of families.

Of course we're not going to solve our problems just by cuts, just by restraint. Sometimes I think I have had enough of hearing of restraint. It was not restraint that brought us the achievements of Elizabethan England; it was not restraint that started the Industrial Revolution; it was not restraint that led Lord Nuffield to start building cars in a bicycle shop in Oxford.

It wasn't restraint that inspired us to explore for oil in the North Sea and bring it ashore.
It was incentive. Positive, vital, driving individual incentive. The incentive that was once the dynamo of this country but which today our youth are denied. Incentive that has been snuffed out by the Socialist State.

BREAKING OUT OF RESTRAINT

We Conservatives have to re-create the conditions, cited by that wise French philosopher de Tocqueville - conditions which "give men the courage to seek prosperity, the freedom to follow it up, the sense and habits to find it, and the assurance of reaping the benefits". That says it all; everything that is not being done now but which we must do. We must break out of restraint if we are to have a prosperous and successful future.

We shall do this by providing a stable economic background so that expansion and growth will pay and be seen to pay.

We shall do it by letting profits rise to a level which offers a real incentive to expand.

We shall do it by ensuring that men and women who invest their savings in their own business, or in someone else's business, can once more earn a reasonable return.

We shall do it by following the example of other Conservative Governments and cutting taxes as soon as we can.

We shall encourage the production of wealth by spreading a share in its growth among those who have helped to create it.

That is the programme which will lead to expansion - picking up speed over the years. Expansion - leading to more jobs. Expansion - leading to higher wages. Expansion - leading eventually to more resources for the nation, so that we can have the same standards of social services as our more successful competitors enjoy. That is a realistic strategy, and it is one which offers hope to our nation.

These, then, are some of the guidelines of our strategy - prudent financial management and soundly based expansion. But there are many who will say: "We agree, broadly, with what you want to do. But we are frightened that the trade unions won't let you do it".

This does less than justice both to us and to the trade unions.
One of the best debates that we have had here was on industrial relations. During that debate one speaker after another, Conservative trade unionists, Conservative negotiators and shop stewards, distinguished the role of trade unions from that of Parliament. What shone through was the difference between what we understand by a social contract and what the Socialists mean.

If the phrase social contract means that the job of the trade union negotiator in a factory or office is to secure good pay for good work, to secure good terms and conditions of service; to secure extra rewards for extra skill and responsibility, then we support the social contract wholeheartedly.

JOB FOR PARLIAMENT

We want to restore the right of unions and management to make the best bargain they can in circumstances they both know. So do most union leaders. But we believe that ideally there should first be a generally agreed basis for wage bargaining. This is a system which has worked elsewhere for years - in countries which have inflation rates far lower than ours. So, the first meaning of social contract presents us with no problem.

But Labour's social contract is not like that. It apparently allows a handful of trade union leaders to dictate to the Government the level of public spending, the number of industries to be nationalised, what the tax system should be, the terms on which we can borrow from the IMF - and so on and so on.

I am bound to say to them: "With great respect, that is not your job. It is Parliament's."

Parliament is the only body which represents all the people. The most famous definition of democracy is government of the people, by the people, for the people. Not government of a section of the people, by a section of the people, for a section of the people.

I agree with the speaker who said that if a trade union leader, or anyone else for that matter, wants to run the country, he or she should stand for Parliament. In the Conservative Party we would welcome some more of them as candidates, although I should warn them that Selection Committees are a law unto themselves, as many non-trade
unionists have discovered. But those who believe in good jobs, in raising their standard of living by their own efforts, in working hard for themselves and their families - all of those people, whether they are trade union leaders or shop stewards or ordinary union members, whether they belong to a union or do not belong to any union at all - all of them should welcome the return of a Conservative Government.

CONSULTATION WITH UNIONS

Let me make it absolutely clear that the next Conservative Government will look forward to discussion and consultation with the trade union movement about the policies that are needed to save our country. As for confrontation, the confrontation that matters to us is confrontation with rising prices, with rising unemployment, with rising debts and with the grave threat to Britain's future.

So nobody should allow the Labour Party to frighten them into thinking that there can be no domestic peace if we do what has to be done to save our economy. Common-sense policies must and will prevail if we fight hard enough.

And those who share our commonsense views are not a small, beleaguered minority. We are a Party of ordinary people with ordinary hopes and beliefs, but with extraordinary qualities of tenacity and purpose. Not for nothing are we privileged to belong to probably the oldest and certainly the most successful democratic party in the world over.

But in recent years we have had more than our share of disappointments at the polls. We have all too often won the argument, but lost in the ballot box. We have won minds - but we must now win hearts. This I believe we can do. Because today the Conservative Party is the truly national Party. On matters that concern ordinary men and women, it is we who represent the majority view, and the Socialists the minority.

People are increasingly concerned about the quality of their children's education, but we are the Party that puts standards as our first priority. People want to buy rather than rent their homes. It is we, not the Socialists, who want to offer the opportunity of home
ownership to everyone. People want protection from crime and vandalism in particular and it is we who are the Party that will emphatically not economise on the Police Force.

FRUSTRATION OF THE PEOPLE

People are becoming increasingly frustrated by the crushing weight of personal taxation in Britain, where we now have the highest starting rate of income tax in the world. We are the Party that wants to reduce taxation, while the Socialists never stop trying to raise it.

And we are the Party that believes it should pay more to work than to stay idle. A growing number of people are anxious about the strength of our Armed Forces. We are the Party that regards the defence of the Realm as the overriding duty of any Government. We want to see a defeat of terrorism, especially in Northern Ireland.

But what a distortion, what a travesty of the truth it is for the Socialists to call themselves the party of the working people. Today we are all working people. Today it is the Conservatives and not the Socialists who represent the true interests and hopes and aspirations of the working people. Above all else, let us get that message into every corner of the United Kingdom.

We are nearing the end of one of the best Conferences we have had since the War. Speaker after speaker, from every walk of life, has come forward to join in debates that have not only been of high quality but have reflected the grave position in which our country finds itself.

Today I have tried to speak the truth to you as I see it - and through you to the nation - and beyond the nation to those who wait and watch from abroad, asking anxiously "Where are the British going? What will they do?"

FIGHT FOR SOCIAL ORDER

I call the Conservative Party now to a crusade. Not only the Conservative Party. I appeal to all those men and women of goodwill who do not want a Marxist future for themselves or their children or their children's children. This is not just a fight about national solvency. It is a fight about the very foundations of the social order. It is a crusade not merely to put a temporary brake on Socialism, but to stop its onward march once and for all.
To do that we must reach out not only to the minds but to the hearts and feelings and to the deepest instincts of our people.

Let us be clear in our thinking. Let us be confident in our approach. But above all, let us be generous in our understanding. If, as has been said and I believe, the Conservative Party is the last bastion between Britain and disaster, then let that bastion be broad enough and large enough to accommodate all our people, Conservative and non-Conservative, trade unionists and non-trade unionists, those who have always been with us and those who have never been with us but who are prepared to support us now because they put country before Party. Let no-one be excluded from our crusade and let no-one exclude himself. We are one nation. We may not know it with our brains but we know it with our roots.

I am deeply conscious of the challenge to our Party and of the responsibility I face as its Leader, but I believe we shall be sustained by millions who are hoping and praying today that we shall rise to the level of events. We must not fail them, and we will not fail them. As I look to our great history and then at our dismal present, I draw strength from the great and brave things this nation has achieved. I seem to see clearly, as a bright new day, the future that we can and must win back. As was said before another famous battle: "It is true that we are in great danger; the greater therefore should our courage be".

'WE ARE NOT ALONE'

So let us be in good heart. We are not alone. Across the world, from Australia to Sweden, from New Zealand to West Germany, Socialism is on the way out. The tide is turning. Be in good heart and we will give this nation back a sense of pride and purpose. Be in good heart and we will give our people back their self-respect. Let nothing narrow or vindictive or self-righteous be any part of our crusade. Rather let us say with humility: "We offer you hope and a new beginning. Together we shall meet the crisis of this country - and tomorrow the day will be ours".
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I want to begin with a confession. I do not greatly care for being in Opposition, but we have certain plans to deal with that situation. I believe the essence of politics is not what you say, it is what you do, so I look to the day when we put Conservative principles into practice in government.

I look to the day when we throw off the Socialist yoke and turn together to the task of setting our country on the road to a real and lasting recovery. That day can be postponed but it cannot be put off forever. One Thursday - it will be a day just like any other Thursday, and yet I believe it will be a day that will prove the turning point of our time - one Thursday the Labour Party will have to keep their appointment with the voters. It is a prospect I relish.

"Either back us or sack us", says Mr. Callaghan. Just give the people the chance, Jim, just give 'em the chance. He will not of course, until he must. He dare not, which is why instead of having Government with steel in its backbone, we have got one with Steel in its pocket.

LABOUR'S LIMPET GOVERNMENT

Last week at Brighton we were accused of an insatiable lust for power. It is not the Tories who have wheeled and dealt and manœuvred and manipulated to avoid one thing at all costs - facing the voters; it is Labour's limpet Government. Hence the Lib-Lab pact. So much for Labour's political principle. So much for the Liberals' genuine conviction, and so much for the courage to stand by what you believe in, even if by standing by it you lose your seat. Better to lose your seat than your self-respect.
Just what is it that the Liberals have kept in office?
A Government that for two-and-a-half years overspent,
over-taxed, interfered, nationalised, debased our cur-
rency and all but bankrupted Britain; in short, that
acted like a Labour Government.

Mr. Healey blandly refers to the horrors of 1974-75 but
who was Chancellor of the Exchequer then? You have
guessed - they were Healey's horrors. After him the
deluge? No, because of him the deluge.

"The financial position has been reversed 180 degrees",
says the Chancellor with a flourish. Quite so, because
his policies have been reversed 180 degrees - by order
of the IMF. Twelve months ago the four-budget-a-year
man all but took the country over the cliff with him,
until at the eleventh hour he turned back from Heathrow
in a panic and headed for home to take out the most mas-
sive mortgage in our history. The prescription the IMF
forced his Government to swallow is the prescription we
have long been advocating - a good, sound, sensible
Conservative prescription.

So my message to Moses is this: keep taking the tablets.

If Labour wants an election slogan, I suggest - it is
just a thought but one likes to be helpful: "You know IMF
Government works".

Some of the commentators are saying that the Prime Minis-
ter is stealing our clothes. Well, it is true that he
has lost his own, but he is going to look pretty ridi-
culous walking around in mine!

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE OIL

Of course, all of us are deeply thankful that the wealth
of the North Sea started to flow; but the North Sea is
not a Socialist sea and its oil is not Socialist oil. It
was found by private enterprise; it was drilled by pri-
vate enterprise; and it is being brought ashore by private
enterprise. So let us put the picture in perspective.

As the oil comes on stream, our balance of payments is
going to look healthier. That is good news for Britain.
Sterling should be safe from another Socialist slide.
That is good news for Britain. The standard of living
of our people might rise again, if only a little, after
its catastrophic fall. That would be good news for
Britain, too. As I have said before, good news for Britain
is good news for the Conservative Party. But look closer.
The truth is that we are still grinding along in bottom gear, with our factories producing less than they were when Labour came to power. Real profits, and therefore investment, are still abysmally low; the number of men and women without a job is the highest since the War. And that is bad news for Britain.

Now take prices, if you can catch them! The Government boasts of its success in bringing down the rate of inflation. But even if it falls as far as Mr. Healey predicts - and today not even his own No. 2 believes him - prices in Britain will still be going up faster than in other countries.

If Labour survives into next year, prices will have doubled while they have been in power. Doubled! That is not an economic miracle. It is an economic and personal disaster.

BEWARE THE LEOPARD

At Brighton last week we saw Socialism wearing its pre-election face. Beware the leopard when it is quiet. It has not changed its spots; it just does not want its victim to know that it is there. Why was it so quiet last week at Brighton? Because it wants the people to believe that it is a gentle, well-behaved, social democratic pussy-cat.

We all know the drill. In the run-up to each election the claws of Labour's extremists are not drawn; they are just withdrawn. The front men are paraded to talk quietly, moderately, almost sensibly. The Left-wing just allows them their little outing until the voters are once more in the trap.

Now suppose the election is over. Make a supreme effort and imagine that Labour has won - only for a moment. What then? The trap is sprung and Labour's extremists resume the drive towards a Britain modeled on Eastern Europe.

"It cannot happen here", you say. But at Brighton the annual election to Labour's National Executive produced the same line-up as before; not a single Left-winger lost out. It is the same executive which produced Labour's Programme for Britain, 1976, and that programme remains official Labour Party policy, 1977. Mr. Benn was frank enough to say so, perhaps hoping the public was not listening.
Nationalise the banks and insurance companies! That is Labour policy. Do you like the idea of their hands on your savings? How do you fancy Mr. Healey or Mr. Benn as your friendly neighbourhood bank manager?

They want to nationalise all the land, not just some of it. All of it! They demand a free hand to take over almost any firm, big or small, the building industry, the food industry, fishing, forestry, ports, and many more. That is their policy, too. They want the power to make every business obey them. They want to cut tax relief for home-buyers. They want higher Income Tax to pay for their plans. They want an immediate Wealth Tax on top of Capital Gains Tax, on top of Capital Transfer Tax.

SIGNPOST TO MARXISM

What is the point of building up your savings or your business if they are going to take it all away from you? But it's all there in their little red book. It's all official Labour Party policy. And to make it easier to ram through this frightening Socialist programme, they have just voted to abolish the House of Lords. There, behind the cosy Brighton front, you have the reality of Labour.

Although, Mr. President, I rather agree with you about the House of Lords, they will not find it easy to abolish it, because while half the Labour Party are trying to abolish it, the other half are trying to get in!

When the election comes, will this actually appear in their manifesto? Some of it will, and if they were to win, sooner or later they will do it all. Because, whenever Labour win an election, the Tribune Group grow stronger and stronger and stronger. From one election to the next, Labour's programme gets meaner, more narrow, more Marxist.

Britain, beware! The signpost reads: "This way to the total Socialist State". Destroying freedoms we have cherished and defended down the centuries doesn't worry the Far-Left. They like everything about Eastern Europe - except, alas, going to live there - because, after all, the living standards there are very low for them.

So let no-one say today there is no true difference between the parties, no real choice before the nation. That is not what the people think. Many men and women who had voted Labour all their lives turned to us in
Ashfield, Stechford, Workington and Walsall. They know the Labour Party they used to vote for is not the Labour Party of today. The Party of Hugh Gaitskell has become a Party fit for Andy Bevan and Peter Hain. The disillusioned, the disenchanted, the courageous, the converted, we welcome them, one and all, to our cause. But the job of cleaning up Labour, the job of ditching the extremists, is not in our hands. It's in the hands of the people on that special Thursday for which we watch and wait and work.

OUSTING THE TRIBUNITES

If just five or six out of every 100 voters switch from Labour to Conservative at the election, they will slash the size of the Tribune Group by about a third - and on a swing of that size 25 Tribunites will lose their seats. And Britain will have a Conservative Government, a truly moderate Government, moderate not by order of our foreign creditors, but by genuine conviction, a Government in touch and in tune with the people, carrying out the sort of sensible, prudent policies that work so well in other countries.

Of course, that is not the picture our opponents are going to paint. And here let me make a personal prophecy. In the coming months you are going to see a carefully orchestrated campaign by the Labour Party and Labour Government to portray me as "extremely this" or "extremely that" - not to mention "extremely the other". A whole battery of extremist labels are going to be bandied about. Indeed, they are being bandied about already; and the closer the election looms, the faster and more furious will the bandying come. So just let me tell you a little about my "extremism".

I am extremely careful never to be extreme.

I am extremely aware of the dangerous duplicity of Socialism, and extremely determined to turn back the tide before it destroys everything we hold dear.

I am extremely disinclined to be deceived by the mask of moderation that Labour adopts whenever an election is in the offing, a mask now being worn, as we saw last week, by all who would "keep the red flag flying here". Not if I can help it! The Conservative Party, now and always, flies the flag of one nation - and that flag is the Union Jack.

So much for my so-called "extremism".
There is another word our opponents like. The word is "reactionary". They say that a Thatcher Government - and I must say that I like the sound of that; I like it a little more each time I hear it, and they use it quite a lot, so they must believe it - they say that a Thatcher Government would be reactionary. If to react against the politics of the last few years, which undermined our way of life and devastated our economy - if that is reactionary, then we are reactionary - and so are the vast majority of the British people.

PEOPLE BELIEVE THIS...

They believe, as we do, that Government is far too big - indeed, the next generation were telling us so earlier in the week. They believe, as we do, that Government does not know all the answers, that it has downgraded the individual and upgraded the State.

We do not believe that if you cut back what Government does, you diminish its authority. On the contrary, a Government that did less, and therefore did it better, would strengthen its authority. Our approach was put very simply by a Chinese philosopher centuries ago: "Govern a great nation", he counselled, "as you would cook a small fish. Don't overdo it".

If you ask whether the next Conservative Government will cut controls and regulations, and keep interference in people's lives to a minimum, my answer is: "Yes, that is exactly what we shall do." The best reply to full-blooded Socialism is not milk-and-water Socialism, it is genuine Conservatism.

For 13 years, from 1951, we curbed the powers of the State. Ask those who remember which they preferred: the steady increase in prosperity of the 13 Tory years or the white-hot Socialist stagnation of Messrs. Wilson and Callaghan? By their fruits ye shall know them. What are the fruits of Socialism? Where is the prosperity? Where are the new jobs, the stable prices, the low taxes? Where is the money created by a thriving economy, to spend on our schools, our hospitals, on the pensioners, on the sick and the disabled?

Today we know Socialism by its broken promises; above all, by the broken promise of a fairer and more prosperous society. Socialism has not made society fairer, it had made it less fair. It has not made Britain richer, it has made it poorer. It has not distributed
the rewards of achievement more widely, it has deci-
mated them.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTION

Just let us ask, and keep on asking, the question Labour

can never answer: "If your policies are right, why do

they never work? And why is it only when you start do-
ing some of the things we have told you to do, that you

ever take a few steps forward?" But a few steps are not

enough.

If I have one message above all else, it is this: I am

not prepared to settle for the second, third or fourth

best for Britain. I do not believe that our decline was

inevitable, any more than I believe that an accident of

nature off our coasts has made our recovery automatic.

I believe that if we confront - and, yes, "confront"

is the word I use - if we confront reality, if we pin

our trust on the skill, the resource and the courage of

our people, then this country can work out its salvation

and regain its prosperity, regain the respect of others

and its own self-respect.

Some people regard this as dangerous talk: "The Tories",

they say, "want change; they want to challenge the rules

and ideas and policies that govern Socialist society".

"Risky," they murmur. "Right, of course, but risky -
might upset Arthur Scargill or Jack Jones - better not
do it, better not do it."

And there you have the root and heart of the choice fac-
ing our nation. What worries Jack Jones is that the

leaders of his Party are living too well. What worries

us is that ordinary people are not living well enough.

That is why the next election will be so crucial. All
elections are crucial, but this time the choice could

be decisive for a generation, because, this time, how the
country votes will settle which party is entrusted with
the immense benefits of North Sea oil. If it is the

Socialists, then the profits of free enterprise will be

used to purchase Socialism and to take more powers for
the State. If it is the Conservatives, they will be

used to give power back to the people.

The choice is the classic choice. Labour will do what

it has been doing for the last three years, only more

so. We shall do what we have said we will do - Set the
people free.
The key question I am asked over and over again is: "But will a Conservative Government be free? How will you get on with the trade unions, and will the trade unions allow a Conservative Government to govern?" Yes, the word is "allow".

People who ask that question are already half-way into Labour's trap. They have swallowed the bait and they are ripe for the catch. Here is the position: The Government dares not fight on its record or on any manifesto that would be acceptable both to its Marxist Left and to the people of Britain. So, like an unimaginative parrot, they keep on repeating: "The Tories won't be able to work with the unions".

When the time comes, Jack Jones will be expected to mutter it, Hugh Scanlon to go along with it, David Basset may actually say it, and Clive Jenkins ... he will almost certainly shout it.

And it will not be true, unless the union leaders are determined to make it true.

Now let us take and face a hypothetical situation. Suppose they are so determined. Suppose they have already made up their minds to make the task of an elected Conservative Government impossible. Then we would face a situation in which an unelected minority was intent on getting rid of a Government that it could not control and replacing it with one that it could.

Is this what the union leaders seriously intend, to use their industrial muscle for political ends? I do not believe it. But people are asking: If it were so, what would happen? Could a handful of men with great power hold the nation to ransom?

The answer is, it is possible.

Should such a situation arise, for example, in a vital nationalised industry, it would be presented as a conflict between Government and trade union. This would be false. The real conflict would be between union and people, because it would be the people who suffer. It always is. In that case the duty of the Government, any Government, would be to act through Parliament on behalf of the nation as a whole. In a vital issue such as this, in which Government had to take decisive
action on a single specific matter, it would be important for the Government to know that it had the support of the majority of the people.

It is in that context, and that context only, that I have suggested a referendum to test public opinion. In those circumstances - in those special circumstances - I say: "Let the people speak". But I hope, and believe, the situation will never arise.

OUR POSITIVE APPROACH

I would like to make two final points about the unions. First, a strong and responsible trade union movement is essential to this country, and its rights must be respected. Second, the belief that those rights take precedence over all other rights, and even over the law itself, could be fatal to this country. Happily, the great majority of trade unionists know this as well as, if not better than, some of their leaders. They know that while their leaders represent them at work, we represent them in Parliament.

We in the Conservative Party look forward to a long and fruitful association with the unions, because a Conservative Britain will be as much in the interests of union members as of the rest of the community. They know that taxes today are too high, that they torpedo talent, and that they must be cut; and that is what we Conservatives will do.

We shall cut Income Tax, so that once again it is worthwhile to work harder and to learn a skill. We want to keep our best brains in Britain. We want to bring home some of those who have been driven abroad. We want to hold out to the enterprising businessman a reward which matches the risks of building up a firm. We want to renew the spark of incentive in our economy, because, without that, new jobs cannot and will not be created. We want to leave everyone with more of his own money in his own pocket to spend as he pleases.

Our aim is to make tax collecting a declining industry. There are more civil servants in the Inland Revenue than there are sailors in the British Navy. If Governments do not cut what they spend, we have to cut what we spend. There is one hand-out that the people really want today. That is the Government's hand out of their pocket.
This is the positive approach, and it is the key to getting industry going again. We do not believe that Government can run industry better than the people who work there. It cannot. Countries that are more successful than we are owe their economic achievements, above all, to free enterprise, and the benefits are not confined to a few of their citizens. They are spread among the many. The whole community benefits, because, when the tide comes in, all the boats rise.

Of course, no Government in a modern industrial society, and certainly no sensible Conservative Government, can wholly withdraw from the market place, but Government support for ailing industry will only produce an ailing economy unless it is selective, unless the circumstances are exceptional, and unless that support is directed to two overriding aims: moving the firm out of the red into the black, and then back to independence as quickly as possible.

WINSTON SAID IT

A sure recipe for industrial blight is a Government that gives what amounts to a blanket guarantee that virtually any firm will be saved from the consequences of its own mistakes. No firm and no nation can behave indefinitely as though there is little difference between profit and loss, high production and low, success and failure.

In this, as in so much else, Winston put his finger on it. "It is a Socialist idea", he said, "that making profits is a vice. The real vice is making losses."

Now, we would like to see the workers who help to create the profits sharing them. The Labour Party want union leaders on boards of directors. We want more employees voting as shareholders at company meetings. Under a Conservative Government we hope that more of them will own a stake in industry and that more of them will own their own homes.

A FAMILY PARTY

We Conservatives are a family Party. We believe that in a healthy society more and more people should be able to buy the roof over their own heads. That is why we will give council tenants the right in law to buy their homes.
That legislation, I promise you, will be announced in the first Queen's Speech of the next Conservative Government.

Let the Labour Party go on offering newly-weds a place on the waiting list for a house on a council estate which they can never call their own. We offer them a place that belongs to them, their own home in which to start life together and later to bring up their children.

What happens when the children go to school? We have got to stop destroying good schools in the name of equality. The main victims of Labour's recent attack on the direct grant schools have been able children from less well-off families. People from my sort of background needed grammar schools to compete with children from privileged homes, like Shirley Williams and Anthony Wedgwood Benn.

Our aim in education is simple: it is to raise standards for all our children. That means fighting far more vigorously against that small minority which believes that the principal purpose of education is to instil contempt for democratic institutions. That is not education, it is political propaganda, and I see no reason why you and I and every other taxpayer should pay for it. These destroyers would also destroy respect for our laws and the order on which a civilised society is based.

BACKING FOR POLICE

People have asked me whether I am going to make a fight against crime an issue at the next election. No, I am not going to make it an issue. It is the people of Britain who are going to make it an issue. The old people in our city centres, who are frightened to go out at night, are going to make it an issue. The taxpayers and rate-payers, who have to meet the bills for mindless vandalism ... they are going to make it an issue. The parents worried sick when their children go out on their own ... they are going to make it an issue.

Yes, law and order will be an issue, and it will be a vital issue, at the election. If anyone thinks that is Right-wing, they should talk to the workers in the factories and the women in the supermarket.

The next Conservative Government will give more resources to the police. They are under-manned and poorly paid. We will bring them up to strength. We will give them the money to do the job.
I do not intend to sit on the sidelines wringing my hands while London, Glasgow, Manchester, Birmingham and the rest of our cities go the way of New York.

But if the violence in Britain is deeply disturbing, it is nothing to what has been endured by the people of Northern Ireland for nearly 10 years. What happens in Ulster touches us all; it is part of our country, our United Kingdom. So let the people of Ulster be assured of this: the Conservative Party stands rock firm for the union of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Today I would like to express our deep and lasting admiration for Betty Williams and Mairead Corrigan, the Belfast Peace Women, who have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Their courage symbolises to us and to the whole Western World the yearning of the people of Ulster for peace.

HELP FOR SERVICEMEN

We honour with them the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the Ulster Defence Regiment, and our Servicemen in Northern Ireland. I only wish that all the members of our Armed Forces who defend freedom there, and in other parts of the world, had a higher place in Socialist priorities. The Labour Party have cut present and future spending on defence by the staggering figure of £8½ billion.

What sort of Government is it that so neglects the welfare of our Servicemen? What sort of Government forces front-line soldiers into claiming rent rebates, and makes many of them worse off than people who do not even try to work at all?

Our Armed Forces are poorly paid. They are denied the equipment, the stores, the back-up and the training that they know are vital to the job they do. Worse, they see the anti-Western wing of the Labour Party calling for still more gigantic cuts in defence, which a former Labour Defence Secretary said would mean, at best, neutrality and, at worst, surrender.

We have a Government that neglects our defences, a Government that lets down NATO so badly that our Allies have rebuked it publicly. What a disgrace! A Government which spends money on nationalism while cutting spending on the defence of the Realm.
As I promised President Carter last month, the next Conservative Government will give defence the high priority that it demands. The Conservative Government will see that our troops are properly paid, increase defence spending so that we can meet our obligations to our Allies, and by strengthening the defence of the West, restore the morale of our fighting Services.

DEFENCE OF FREEDOM

Let us not forget - our first duty to freedom is to defend our own. It was to that end and purpose that I entered politics, and two years ago, in this hall, from this platform, I spoke to you for the first time as Leader of our Party. I remember well my nervousness, and pride, as I tried to tell you something of my personal vision and my hopes for our country and our people. I felt deeply my responsibility then.

Today I feel it even more deeply. For much has happened between those two Octobers. Two years ago I spoke of a man's right to work as he will, to spend what he earns, to own property, to have the State as servant and not as master. And today the threat to those democratic values has doubled and redoubled.

I know only too well, as I go about the country, the fears felt for our British way of life. I know it from the letters I receive. And I know how many hopes ride with us today - the hopes of millions who are Conservative, and millions who are not, but who look to us because they feel instinctively that what is happening to their country threatens not only their freedom but everything that made it materially and morally great.

Paul Johnson expressed it movingly, and with a writer's clarity, the other day, when he resigned from the Labour Party. "I have come to appreciate, perhaps for the first time in my life", he wrote, "the overwhelming strength of my attachment to the individual spirit. The paramount need to keep it alive, I now see, is so great as to override any other principle whatever."

WE SHALL NOT FAIL

These are deeply anxious and disturbing days for those whose eyes are open, and who value freedom, but provided we are alert and alive to the danger, then the human will of the growing and quietly determined majority must prevail.
The responsibility that rests upon the Conservative Party is huge and humbling. But as autumn moves toward winter, and we brace ourselves for the great task that lies ahead, let us make this promise to the British people: We will discharge the task with all our strength and all our faith.

WE SHALL NOT FAIL OUR COUNTRY.
I must first thank you, Madame Chairman, for the wonderful heartwarming welcome. I confess that this is the biggest birthday party that I have ever had. I just do not know whether my parents had in mind the timing of the party conference, but if that is what is meant by family planning I am all for it.

One of the distinguished members of my shadow Cabinet sent me a birthday card today and said "Don't think of it as another birthday; think of it as another year spent mastering the intricacies of a rewarding and demanding life." That seemed to me a pretty fair description of the job.

Let us turn to the nation's business. Political life may be unpredictable. Dull it isn't. Last month the nation was privileged to watch on television the first broadcast ever to present a chronic case of cold feet as a noble act of patriotism. "Let's see it through together," said the Prime Minister in his now notorious announcement that there would be no election - "in the national interest."

Of course by seeing it through together he meant seeing it through with Labour. I am inclined to think that the people of this country will reject that invitation the moment that they are given the opportunity. Whenever the moment comes we are ready. As soon as Parliament reassembles we shall do all we can as a responsible Opposition to end the present damaging uncertainty, to defeat the Government and to bring about a general election.

But I must warn you that the dying days of this administration may well see one last wretched round of manipulation and manoeuvre, of private deals or public pacts or cosy little undertakings - always, of course "in the national interest" - before the Government are finally
dragged, kicking and screaming, to the polls. If that should be the case, so be it. I believe that the longer they wait the harder they will fall. But the harder, too, will be our task of halting and reversing the decline of Britain. Our party offers the nation nothing less than national revival, the deeply-needed, long-awaited and passionately longed-for recovery of our country. That recovery will depend on a decisive rejection of the Labour Party by the people and a renewed acceptance of the Conservative belief that the State is the servant, not the master of this nation.

But the problems we shall face are daunting. After nearly five years of Labour Government living standards have just got back to where they were when they took office. The Wilson-Callaghan years have left Britain close to the bottom of every international league table in terms of prices, in terms of jobs, and, above all, in terms of what we produce and what we owe to the rest of the world. Where they have left our country in terms of self-reliance and in terms of self respect, in terms of national security I hardly have to tell you.

That is the legacy of Labour, and no amount of whistling in the dark by the Prime Minister or the Chancellor can change it. There is only one service they can do the nation now. It is to stand not upon the order of their going, but go. The damage that they have done to Britain is immeasurable. Our ancestors built a land of pride and hope and confidence in the future, a land whose influence grew out of all proportion to her size, whose constitution guaranteed a balance between freedom and order which used to be the British hallmark and became a model for the world. That was the heritage they handed down to us.

What would they think of Labour Britain today. A country in which people ask: "Why work if you can get it without?"; "Why save if your savings are taxed away, or inflated away or both?"; "Why do a good job when you will probably make out just as well if you do a bad one?"; "Why bother to get extra qualifications when differentials and earnings so often depend on political muscle, not personal merit?"

At home we are a country profoundly ill at ease with ourselves, while abroad a darkening and dangerous world scene confronts us. This is not just a Conservative analysis, it is a view shared here and overseas, not least by those who love this land and wish it well. In
their franker moments even some Labour Ministers subscribe to it. "Land of hope and glory, mother of the free" sounds as stirring and moving as ever, but it is less and less like the land we live in today. Why is that? What has happened to this country of ours that we thought we knew? It is not just a question of pinning down who is responsible, important though that is. The first step in clearing your mind about where to go is to understand how you got where you are.

Does what has happened to Britain over the last four and a half years imply that we have been governed by remarkably foolish people? No, though you may be able to think of one or two who would qualify under that heading. Is it the result of having been governed by unusually wicked people? No. There have been enough good intentions to pave the well-worn path twice over. The root of the matter is this: we have been ruled by men who live by illusions, the illusion that you can spend money you haven't earned without eventually going bankrupt or falling into the hands of your creditors; the illusion that real jobs can be conjured into existence by Government decree like rabbits out of a hat; the illusion that there is some other way of creating work and wealth than by hard work and satisfying your customers; the illusion that you can have freedom and enterprise without believing in free enterprise; the illusion that you can have an effective foreign policy without a strong defence force and a peaceful and orderly society without absolute respect for the law.

It is these and many other Labour fallacies that have brought Britain to where we are today. Of course it is true that things have not deteriorated quite so quickly since the crisis of 1976. It was then, you will remember, that Dennis Healey was put on probation to the International Monetary Fund. A strange man, Mr. Healey. He seems to think that being put on probation is some sort of achievement demanding recognition. Someone ought to tell him that you do not give the man who sets fire to your house a medal just because he phones for the fire brigade.

Last week at Blackpool he was boasting again about his success. He could see growing confidence throughout the economy. We are poised, he said, for another "great leap forward". But, he told the assembled comrades, there were two conditions which Labour had to fulfill to win the election. First, and I quote him again "we have got to keep inflation under control." Agreed. "And we have got to strengthen, not weaken the authority of Jim Callaghan in this movement and in this country." Disagreed.
"Those," said Mr. Healey, "are the things you have got to ponder before you cast your votes." Well, the brothers pondered and then they voted. They voted overwhelmingly to throw overboard the Government's whole economic strategy, and with it, according to the Chancellor, the Prime Minister's authority.

The following day Mr. Callaghan tried to restore it by speaking of the Government's "inescapable responsibility" to deal with the present situation. He said nothing about his own inescapable responsibility for bringing that situation about. That is the charge against Mr. Callaghan. Ask Sir Harold Wilson and Barbara Castle what they thought of his "responsibility" nearly 10 years ago when he fought tooth and nail against their plan for re-forming the trade unions, for making them - yes - more responsible. "In Place of Strife" they called it. The unions did not like it. Mr. Callaghan saw it straight into the waste paper basket. The road to Blackpool 1978 was opened in 1969 by Mr. Callaghan. He cut the tape and so long as it suited him he travelled steadily down the road he had himself opened without so much as a backward glance.

In 1974 during the dispute with the miners how did he define responsibility then? I will tell you how. He went to Wales and said to the miners: "I am here as chairman of the British Labour Party because I wanted to come into the mining valleys to place the Labour Party firmly behind the miners' claim for just and honest wage." What would he say, what would the people of this country say, if the chairman of our party had gone down to East London and announced: "I am here as chairman of the British Conservative Party because I wanted to come to Dagenham to place the Conservative Party firmly behind the Ford workers' claim for a just and honest wage."?

Well, now that the boot is on the other foot, what will the Conservatives do to him? Let me put his mind at rest. We are not going to follow in his footsteps. We won't accuse him of union bashing. We won't support a strike in breach of an agreement. We won't act irresponsibly, and he knows it. Nor do we rejoice at his discomfiture, for his problems are the country's problems. But a man who whets the tiger's appetite cannot expect much sympathy when it turns and bites him.

Today the nation has a Prime Minister whose party has disowned his principal policy and destroyed the chief plank in his election strategy. Until last week that strategy was simple. Labour would play its union card, the one called "special relationship". The idea was this.
A group of union leaders would try to persuade the country that if they were not allowed to call the tune there would be no music. Mind you, no union leader ever said: "I shall overturn a Conservative Government". It was always the union next door that was going to do that. For Labour this device would have had one splendid virtue. It would have made it possible for every Labour candidate to say in effect: "Suppose Labour has created more unemployment than any Government since 1945; suppose it has produced a stagnant economy; suppose it has doubled prices; suppose it has nothing to offer but more and more nationalisation, more and more State control. The fact remains that only it can keep the unions happy and without this the economy will grind to a halt".

That, in a nutshell, was to be the Labour case when the election came. But the election did not come. Blackpool came - and with it, the great illumination.

Today, Labour's policies are at a dead end, economically and politically. This is not something to crow about. We do not hope for a country in ruins so that we can take over. We want to be elected so that we can do better, not because we could not possibly do worse.

The country is looking for a sign that we can succeed where Socialism has failed. Labour's dead end has to be our beginning. The idea that only Labour can talk to labour drowned in the sea at Blackpool. Let me now at our Conservative Conference start the Conservative dialogue.

Here are the facts as I see them - and I am talking now straight to the union leaders.

"We Conservatives don't have a blue-print for instant success. There isn't one.
"But at least we start with this advantage.
"We know what not do do. That path has been clearly sign-posted.
"If a government takes too much in tax, everyone wants higher wages.
"If a government bails out those who bargain irresponsibly, where does the money come from? The pockets of those who bargain responsibly.
"If a government tries to level everyone down, with year after year of totally rigid income policies, it destroys incentive.
"If a government enforces those policies with the underworld sanctions of blackmail and blacklist, it undermines its own authority and Parliament's.
"For years the British disease has been the 'us' and 'them' philosophy. Many in industry are still infected with this virus. They still treat the factory not as a workplace but as a battlefield. When that happens the idea of a common interest between employers and employed flies out of the window and so does the truth that if your company prospers, you will too.

"Now, you the trade union leaders have great power. You can use it well or you can use it badly. But look at the position of your members today, and compare it with the position of workers in other free countries. Can you really say, can anyone really say, you have used your power well? You want higher wages, better pensions, shorter hours, more government spending, more investment, more - more - more - more.

"But where is this 'more' to come from? There is no more. There can be but there won't be unless we all produce it. You can no more separate pay from output than you can separate two blades of a pair of scissors and still have a sharp cutting edge.

"And here let me say plainly to the trade union leaders, you are often your own worst enemies. Why isn't there more? Because too often restrictive practices rob you of the one thing you have to sell - your productivity. Restrictive practices are encrusted like barnacles on our industrial life. They've been there for almost a century. They were designed to protect you from being exploited, but they have become the chief obstacle to your prosperity. How can it be otherwise? When two men insist on doing the work of one, there is only half as much for each.

"I understand your fears. You're afraid that producing more goods with fewer people will mean fewer jobs, and those fears are naturally stronger at a time of high unemployment. But you're wrong. The right way to attack unemployment is to produce more goods more cheaply and then more people can afford to buy them. Japan and Germany, mentioned several times this week - and rightly so - are doing precisely that and have been for years. Both have a large and growing share of our markets. Both are winning your customers and taking your jobs. "Of course, we in Britain see the German success and want it here - the same living standards, the same output, the same low rate of inflation. But remember, what they have also had in Germany is strict control of the money supply, no rigid incomes policy, less state control than we have, lower personal tax and unions which are on the side of the future, not refighting the battles of the past.
"We shall do all that a government can to rebuild a free and prosperous Britain. We believe in realistic, responsible collective bargaining, free from government interference. Labour doesn't. "We believe in encouraging competition, free enterprise, and profits in firms large and small. Labour doesn't. "We believe in making substantial cuts in the tax on your pay packet. Labour doesn't. We will create conditions in which the value of the money you earn and the money you save can be protected. "We will do these things. That I promise you. We'll play our part, if you, the trade union leaders, play yours, responsibly. "Responsibility can't be defined by the government setting a fixed percentage for everyone, because the circumstances are different in every concern in the country, whether nationalised or free. It's up to you, the trade union leaders, to act realistically in the light of all the facts, as the government must do. If you demand too much you will bargain your firm into bankruptcy and your mem­bers on the dole. And no one wants that. "Our approach works in other countries which are doing far better than we are. It worked here during 13 years of Conservative government. You did better, Britain did better - infinitely better than today under Labour. "Let's make it work again."

That is our message to the unions.

You can hear the same message in country after country. You can hear distant echoes of it even from Labour Minis­ters. It would be nice to think that this was due to an irreversible shift in the distribution of common sense. But it's really due to the nearness of an election and a swelling tide of protest from every taxpayer, every home owner, every parent in the land.

I look forward to Labour's continuing conversion to good sense, and after the election, to their becoming a help­ful Opposition in the new House of Commons.

So far I have spoken mainly of the practical and material failure of the last four Labour years and how we shall start to put things right. Let me turn now to something deeply damaging to this country.

Many of us remember the Labour Party as it used to be. In the old days it was at least a party of ideals. You didn't have to agree with Labour to understand its appeal and
respect its concern for the underdog. Gradually over the years there has been a change. I have no doubt that those ideals, those principles, are still alive today in the hearts of traditional Labour supporters. But among those who lead the Labour movement something has gone seriously wrong.

Just compare the years of Clement Attlee and Hugh Gaitskell with those of Harold Wilson and James Callaghan. Today, instead of the voice of compassion, the croak of the Quango is heard in the land. There may not be enough jobs for the workers, but there are certainly plenty of jobs for the boys.

That is the house that Harold built, to which his successor has not been slow to add a wing or two of his own.

Many in the Labour Party wonder what has happened to it. Socialism has gone sour. Today Labour seems to stand too often for expediency, for greed, for privilege, for policies that set one half of society against the other.

There are many reasons for this. One stems from that least attractive of emotions, envy. This spirit of envy is aimed not only at those privileged by birth and inherited wealth, like Mr. Wedgwood Benn. It is also directed against those who have got on by ability and effort.

It is seen in Labour's bias against men and women who seek to better themselves and their families. Ordinary people - small businessmen, the self-employed - are not to be allowed to rise on their own. They must rise collectively or not at all.

Object to merit and distinction and you're setting your face against quality, independence, originality, genius, against all the richness and variety of life.

You are pinning down the swift and the sure and the strong, as Gulliver was pinned down by the little people of Lilliput.

A society like that cannot advance. Our civilisation has been built by generation after generation of men and women inspired by the will to excel. Without them we should still be living in the Stone Age. Without the strong who would provide for the weak? When you hold back the successful, you penalise those who need help.

Envy is dangerous, destructive, divisive - and revealing. It exposes the falsity of Labour's great claim that
they're the party of care and compassion. It is the worst possible emotion to inspire a political party supposedly dedicated to improving the lot of ordinary working people.

From there it is but a short step to the doctrine of class warfare. The Marxists in the Labour Party preach that this is not only just but necessary and inevitable.

But let me put this thought to you. If it is wrong to preach race hatred - and it is - why is it right to preach class hatred? If it is a crime to incite the public against a man simply because of the colour of his skin - and it is - why is it virtuous to do so just because of his position?

The political organisation of hatred is wrong - always and everywhere. Class warfare is immoral, a poisonous relic of the past. Conservatives are as fallible, as human and therefore as given to making mistakes as the next man. But we don't preach hatred and we are not a party of envy.

Those who claim that we are a class party are standing the truth on its head. So, too, are those who claim that we are racists. Our determination to deal with the very real and difficult problems of immigration control has inspired Labour to a shameful attempt to frighten the coloured population of Britain.

Last month the Liberal leader added his voice to the chorus. No doubt in an effort to distract attention from his many deep and pressing problems, he too did his best - or worst - to pin the label of 'racialism' on the Conservative Party.

I realise that a drowning man will clutch at any straw. But let me remind young Mr. Steel, millions of Conservatives were among those who spent five years of their lives fighting a war against racialism when he was still in short trousers.

It is true that Conservatives are going to cut the number of new immigrants coming into this country, and cut it substantially, because racial harmony is inseparable from control of the numbers coming in.

But let me say a word to those who are permanently and legally settled here, who have made their homes with us. Your responsibilities are the same as those of every other British citizen, and your opportunities ought to be.
Compulsory repatriation is not, and never will be, our policy and anyone who tells you differently is deliberately misrepresenting us for his own ends.

Many other smears and charges will be thrown at us as election day comes nearer. But let us not be too concerned, however large the lie or absurd the charge. They are a sign of our opponents' desperation. For instance, you may have noticed, and so, I suspect, has the public, how often these charges contradict one another. One moment it is said that we have no policy, the next that our policies would bring about every disaster known to man. One moment, Shadow Ministers are said to be notorious villains - well, here the 'villains' are. The next minute they are said to be unknown. Unknown? There's a charge from a party with household names like - let me see, now - Stanley Ormer, not to mention Albert Booth. But then, no one does, do they?

Well, Mr. Prime Minister, if there are any unknowns in the Shadow Cabinet we are all looking forward to becoming a lot better known at your earliest convenience.

Until then, national uncertainty continues, and with it the continued weakening of one of our most ancient and deep-rooted traditions - respect for and safety under the law. When a rule of law breaks down, fear takes over. There is no security in the streets, families feel unsafe even in their own homes, children are at risk, criminals prosper, men of violence flourish, the nightmare world of "A Clockwork Orange" becomes a reality.

Here in Britain in the last few years that world has become visibly nearer. We have seen some of the symptoms of the breakdown of the rule of law - the growth in the number of unsolved and unpunished crimes, especially violent crimes, overcrowded courts, an underpaid and undermanned police force, judges insulted by a senior Minister of the Crown. Sometimes, members of the Labour Party give the impression that as between the law and the lawbreakers they are at best neutral.

We Conservatives are not neutral. We believe that to keep society free the law must be upheld. We are 100 percent behind the police, the courts, the judges, and not least the law-abiding majority of citizens.

To all those engaged in law enforcement we pledge not just our moral but our practical support. As for the lawbreakers, whether they are professional criminals carrying
firearms or political terrorists, or young thugs attacking the elderly, or those who think they can assault policemen with impunity, we say this: "You will find in the new Conservative Government a remorseless and implacable opponent."

The Conservative Party also stands for the defence of our realm. I am often told that there are no votes to be won by talking about defence and foreign policy. Well, I intend to go on talking about them, especially with elections to the European Parliament approaching. And, unlike Labour, we shall work to make a success of our place in the Community, and we shall not need to be prompted to honour our obligations to our NATO allies.

It was nearly three years ago that I warned of the growing danger of Soviet expansion. I was at once attacked by Labour's Defence Secretary and the Soviet leaders - strange company, you might think, for a British Cabinet Minister. What has happened since I made that speech?

The Soviet Union, through its Cuban mercenaries, has completed its Marxist takeover of Angola; Ethiopia has been turned into a Communist bastion in the Horn of Africa; there are now perhaps 40,000 Cubans in that continent, a deadly threat to the whole of Southern Africa. And as the Soviet threat becomes stronger, so the Labour Government have made Britain weaker. It has cut our forces time and again. We now have only 74 fighter planes to defend our country. We lost twice as many as that during one week of the Battle of Britain.

I am well aware that modern Phantoms have many times the firepower of the Spitfire or Hurricane, but how does that help if you run out of Phantoms? There is a minimum level below which our defences cannot safely be allowed to fall. They have fallen below that level. And I give you this pledge: to bring them back to that minimum level will be the first charge on our national resources under the Conservative Government.

It will not be easy, but there are no short cuts to security. There are only short cuts to defeat.

Conservatives too will see that our Armed Forces are properly paid. They do an indispensable job abroad and at home, not least in Northern Ireland.

I spent three memorable and moving days in Northern Ireland in June. The constancy and patience of the men and women of the Province who have endured so much pain through 10 years of terror is something that I shall never forget. I know that there are those who say "Leave them
to solve their own problems and bring our boys back." To them I must reply: "If you wash your hands of Northern Ireland you wash them in blood." So long as Ulster wishes to belong to the United Kingdom she will do so. That is the policy of the Conservative Party and it will be the policy of the next Conservative Government.

The next Conservative Government! I have spoken of what four years of Labour Government have done to Britain, materially and morally, at home and abroad. I hope that after this afternoon it will not be possible for anyone to say again that there is really not much difference between the parties. There is all the difference in the world and if it is the will of the country we will show the country and the world what the difference is.

May I end on a personal note? Long ago I learned two lessons of political life - to have faith and to take nothing for granted. When we meet again the election will be over. I would not take the result for granted, but I have faith that our time is coming and I pray that when it comes we use it well, for the task of restoring the unity and good name of our nation is immense.

I look back at the great figures who led our party in the past and after more than three years I still feel a little astonished that it has fallen to me to stand in their place. Now, as the test draws near, I ask your help, and not only yours - I ask it of all men and women who look to us today, who share with us our longing for a new beginning.

Of course, we in the Conservative Party want to win, but let us win for the right reason - not power for ourselves, but that this country of ours, which we love so much, will find dignity and greatness and peace again.

Three years ago I said that we must heal the wounds of a divided nation. I say it again today with even greater urgency. There is a cause that brings us all together and binds us all together. We must learn again to be one nation or one day we shall be no nation. That is our Conservative faith. It is my personal faith and vision. As we move towards Government and service may it be our strength and inspiration. Then not only will victory be ours, but we shall be worthy of it.
VITA
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