PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

2nd October 1985

Some thoughts about vision

We have had to do some tough things to build prosperity for now and in the future. We will have to do more tough things to adapt and adjust to change and to compete successfully. The object is to secure a better standard of life for everyone. But improving material benefits, while important in itself, is part of a larger aim.

That aim is to enlarge the freedom of the human spirit. A family which owns its own house and is not subordinate to a council is immediately more independent and faces the world on better terms.

An employee of a nationalised industry becomes freer and more his own person if that nationalised concern is privatised. The anonymity of the nationalised employee is transformed in many cases \mathcal{U}_{λ} , \mathcal{V} into the sturdier status of a shareholder and certainly of a participant in an enterprise with which he or she can identify. It is far more satisfactory to belong to an organisation which exists on its own profits and not on the dole handed out to it by other tax payers.

A trade union member with the right to a secret ballot to elect his leaders and choose whether or not to go on strike is infinitely freeer than a trade union member who is ordered about by unrepresentative leaders. Government has a role in protecting the weak and shielding them from the worst effects of misfortune. But only the strong can help the weak.

We do not believe in punishing the strong by excessive taxation which discourages them from making the wealth on which the nation depends. Of course they must pay a fair taxation towards the revenues the nation needs but we do not believe in the type of taxation advocated by our opponents which is designed as **a** tax on enterprise and iniative with the irresistible result of stifling both ithat significantly adding the name allotted of the states

Of course we believe in better medical care. That's why we have spent more on the National Health Service in real terms than any other government. But we also believe that if we can cut out more of the waste which goes on in the National Health Service there would be far more money available to look after the patients. That will enhance the feeling of security which each individual has that if he gets ill he will have the best possible treatment.

The more freedom of enterprise there is the more individual talents flourish, and the more freedom there is. Socialism, whether in terms of the Marxists who dominate leaders policy or the more moderate the variety inspired by the Alliance, feeds upon government interference and control. Every form filling diminishes freedom. It also prevents the flowing of the abilities needed to make the whole nation more profitable.

Reb

hor

. >

I am striving for a Britain in which more people have independence and control over their own destinies. Certainly there will always be large numbers working in the central and local government services but they can only get a higher standard of living if free enterprise is strong enough to pay for it. *Luchum* Diminish free enterprise and everyone is diminished.

We are on course towards a Britain whose citizens are becoming more independent, less controlled by the State, and with growing freedom to exercise a freedom of opportunity and choice which benefit not only themselves but everyone else.

XXXX

* Undoubtedly Kinnock has temporarily gained some appreciation from the people from the Bournemouth Conference in standing up to the Irotskyists in the Labour Party. But he has heightened the outward signs of split in the Labour Party which we must emphasise. The Liverpool Militants are Trotskyists. But those who control Labour Party policies are Marxists often with a Communist tinge. That is why pro-orthodox Communists in the Labour Party supported Kinnock over the Liverpool Militants as they don't like Trotskyists. Kinnock is still committed to very left wing policies and to the abolition of our nuclear weapons and American nuclear bases. Nothing has changed in who has influence in the creation of Labour Party policies. It is ridiculous to compare him with Gaitskell who was fighting to stop the Labour Party getting rid of the nuclear deterent which Kinnock wants to do.