

SPEECH

BY

THE RT HON MRS MARGARET THATCHER MP

AT

THE ANNUAL DINNER DANCE, FINCHLEY

SATURDAY 31 JANUARY 1976

Ladies and Gentlemen,
I stand before you tonight in my
^{Red / 16}
(green chiffon) evening gown,
my face softly made up,
my fair hair gently waved.....

The Iron Lady of the Western World!



~~Me?~~

A Cold War Warrior?

Answer: *Philosophy* ,

Well, yes - if that is how they wish to interpret my defence of values and freedoms fundamental to our way of life.

And by they, I mean that somewhat strange alliance between the comrades of the Russian Defence Ministry - and our (own) Defence Minister. *

They are welcome to call me
what they like if they believe we
should ignore the build-up of Russian
military strength, / that we should not
disturb their dreams of detente by
worrying over the communist presence
in Angola.

But I happen to believe that
what is at stake - ~~both in this~~
~~country and in the world~~ - is
important, and is crucial to our
future. *both in this country and in the*
*world . **

We are waging a battle on many fronts.

We must not forget the guns and
missiles aimed at us - but ^{equally} we must not
let them blind us to the ~~much more~~
insidious war on words which is going on.

It is not just a matter of hurling
insults - where he who hurls loudest,
hurls last - (that is the final resort of
the man who has already lost the argument,
and the first of the man who knows he has
no case).

limited resort.

that is the final resort of the man who has already lost the argument

No, this is not such a war.

The war is a true war of words,
where meanings get lost in a mist of
revolutionary fantasy; where accuracy
is slipped quietly under the carpet;
and where truth is twisted and bent
to suit the latest propagandist line.

That is what we are up against.

And we have to fight it if only
because we find it ^{alien} totally offensive
to our notions of freedom and truth.

Written by [unclear]
to make a [unclear]
book

To illustrate what I mean,
let us take that last sentence.

It contains in it two words
which, together, are among the most
abused in the language of the
struggle.

Freedom and Fight.

To ~~the~~ Marxist - (~~the man who,~~
~~we must never forget, believes in~~
~~total state domination of every~~
~~aspect of people's lives~~) ^{has} ^{applied the}
^{described} ^{idea} ^{to} ^{need the}
 freedom fighter is one who helps
 to bring about Marxism, a system
 which denies basic freedoms.

In other words, that so-called
freedom fighter is a man who helps
to destroy freedom.

Such is the corruption of the
language they use.

Necessary in their eyes because
they know freedom is an appealing word.

The men of the Khmer Rouge whose first act on "liberating" - as they put it - Cambodia last year, was brutally to drive a large part of the population out of the capital Phnom Penh. Yet they were called "freedom fighters".

The men who tried to reverse the clear wishes of the people of Portugal - as expressed through the ballot box - in Marxist vocabulary they were "freedom fighters" too.

This surely must have been one of the most blatant attempts at subversion we have seen in recent times.

*So do not let us be misled by their
blatant abuse of these words.*

But the fallacies of the present
propaganda war come nearer to home
than this.

Let us look at another word
being just a subtly corrupted in
the litany of the left.

The word is "Public". We
use it many times a day.

It is with us all the time
- because we are the public.

All of us.

the word has become distorted
Yet ~~it has~~ become ~~devalued~~
~~and~~ distorted.

Only when followed by the words
 "house" or "bar" do we instantly
 recognise its purpose.

Take for example the "Public Ownership"
 But when it is followed by the

~~word "ownership" - "Public Ownership"~~

- it has come to mean something
 totally different.

In theory,

We own the mines.

We own the railways.

We own the Post Office.

in practice
~~really~~

But ~~when it comes down to it,~~
we don't really own anything.

"Public ownership" should mean
that you and I own something, that
we have some say in how it is run,
that it is accountable to us.

But the fact is that the words
"public ownership" have come to mean
the very, very private world of decisions
taken behind closed doors, and of
accountability to no-one.

Yet what a cosy and democratic
~~sounding word it is.~~

How good for us all public
ownership is presented as being.

What a glimpse of socialist heaven
it offers.

The Socialists tell us that there are
massive profits in ^a ~~this~~ particular industry
and they should not go to the shareholders -
but that the public should reap the benefits.

Benefits?

What benefits?

When you take into public ownership
a profitable industry, the profits soon
disappear.

The goose that laid the golden eggs
goes broody.

State geese are not great layers

The steel industry was nationalised some years ago in the public interest - yet the only interest now left to the public is in witnessing the depressing spectacle of their money going down the drain at a rate of a million pounds a day.

Socialists ^{then} shift the ground for taking industries into "public ownership".

They then tell us that some industries cannot survive any longer unless they are taken into public ownership, allegedly to protect the public from the effects of their collapse.

It all sounds so cosy, so democratic.

But is it true?

No, of course it is not.

The moment ownership passes into the name of the public is the moment the public ceases to have any ownership or accountability, and often the moment when it ceases to get what it wants.

But
~~And~~ it is invariably the moment when the public starts to pay.

Pays to take the industry over.

Pays the losses. *by higher level*

Pays for inefficiencies in ^{higher} prices.
^

Outside many pits in the country
is a notice which says:

"Managed on behalf of the people".

But will the people ever get to know
who was responsible for the massive losses
sustained since the mining industry was
nationalised in 1947?

If these are public industries,
then surely the public has a right to
know?

The more so, because they are
monopoly industries.

In fact, publicly owned authorities
are usually the most private imaginable.

We need to revise our vocabulary
and call something public only when
ordinary members of the public are in
actual control.

The fact is that the British public more truly OWN firms like Marks & Spencer and others, than they do any of our nationalised industries.

Some of them directly own shares in M&S.

This gives them the right to ask questions about its management - its successes, its failures, and if they are not satisfied, they can sell their shares and invest their money elsewhere.

Many more have an indirect share in it through pension funds at their own work.

The managers of those funds are paid to ask the very questions which keep the company on its toes.

And millions of us use the option every year of voting with our feet on the success of St. Michael.

We can ^ocho^ose whether to buy there or somewhere else.

That is real public ownership
- and if the public ceased to benefit,
then M & S would cease to exist.

What is it, then, that keeps
them going?

It is their incentive to satisfy
their customers - you and me - the
public.

Despite what the Socialists would have you think, theirs is not an unusual story.

It is reflected in thousands of firms throughout the land.

Successful firms, proving by their results that today's crisis is not one of free enterprise, but one caused by Socialism.

Despite the handicaps imposed upon them, the taxation, the restrictions - they are still managing to give the public what it wants.

Alas, the same could not always be said of some of the nationalised industry services, as shown by the complaints received daily of rising costs and falling standards.

Accountability to the public
goes when its name is put to an
enterprise, and|because there can
be no competition to a state monopoly,|
incentive to efficiency goes too.

These are the fallacies in the
use of the word "public".

~~Re public in the~~

We must not let them get
away with the deceptions and the
half-truths which swarm around their
dogma.

Whenever we see the word "public"
we must question it.

~~Which public? - Theirs or ours?~~

~~How is it for the public?~~

How do the public benefit?

3

What choice does the public have?

Choice is crucial in this.

Where there is no feasible
alternative to the existing state
monopoly, we must make sure it is
run genuinely for the public.

But where choice is possible,
we must guarantee choice is available.

When a man moves his family into
a Council house, we must make sure he
has the chance of buying it.

The ambition to own the roof
 over your head is a totally natural
 one - and judging by the way the
 present Cabinet indulges in it -
 a pretty strong instinct it is, too. O

Why, then, do these so-called
 socialists work so actively to prevent
 home ownership ~~among the very people~~
~~they traditionally regard as their~~
~~supporters?~~

The answer is that if you give
 the ambitious man in the Council house
 the chance to buy it, you lose control
over him.

A socialist system which has penetrated so far in its control over people that it can dictate the colour of their front doors is a system which will never let go control of the whole house.

People might paint their doors a different colour, for a start.

We have always been the party
of home ownership.

Home ownership not only means
security for the individual, it
also means security and continuity
for society as well.

Security because people who work
hard to buy their own homes have learned
the responsibility of property/and have
a respect for other people's property
as well.

Continuity because the ownership of a house is not just for one generation - its value is in more ways than one passed on to the next, and the next.

*And as we have to - great point - what we show
is not what is possible - but for a great future.*

The only way for the majority of people to have any real say in where they live and how they live is by extending home ownership.

When we came to power in 1951, home ownership was only 29 per cent. In 1964 it was 45 per cent. By the time we had left Office in 1974 it was 52 per cent. And with our policies the figure will go even higher. Housing policy shows that the Conservative way really does work for the public in the true sense of the word.

When parents send their children to school, and I am talking about local authority schools - not fee paying schools we must also see that some choice is available.

In no field has the exclusion of the public been so severe as in the schools they nominally own, in whose name they are nominally run.

I do not wish to get embroiled here in the controversy currently raging about the running of William Tyndale School.

It would be quite wrong for me to comment while the inquiry is still sitting.

But there is one observation of fact about it, which can be made.

That is that matters came to a head when the numbers of ordinary parents withdrawing their children from the school reached alarming proportions.

That was the only way they
could make their views felt.

They voted with their feet/
- just as surely as people would vote
with their feet if Marks and Spencers
ceased to provide value for money.

Nobody wants to see a school
shut down - no more than they want
to see a firm put out of business.

That is why from the start we must make them more responsive to parents' wishes.

That is why there must be choice of the type of education our children are given.

It is true that

Some children flower quickly in the atmosphere of what is called the "progressive" classroom.

Others need the more organised structure of the traditional system.

But parents should not be told
which their children are going to get,
and denied any choice at all.

We believe people are not mere
cyphers to be ordered this way and that,
into this job or that, into this house
or that, their children sent to this
school or that.

Socialists believe people are not
to be trusted with choice.

I suppose because we might
learn to use it.

And enjoy it.

And then where would it all end?

Socialism is the denial of choice,
the denial of choice for ordinary people
in their everyday lives.

There is a will in Britain to
work and build up the future for
our children.

But Socialists dont trust
the people.

Churchill did.

We do.