

THATCHER AND THATCHERISM: ABSTRACTS AND BIOGRAPHIES

Institute of
Advanced
Study

SocialHistorySociety
Promoting the study of
social and cultural history



Abstracts

Kit Kowol (Oxford) “Thatcherism’s Imperial Origins?”

The first post-colonial British political ideology or a product of the trauma of the loss of Empire; the relationship between Thatcherism and Imperialism has long intrigued historians. Likewise, the link between Thatcher herself and the Empire remains uncertain. The enthusiasm the young Margaret Roberts showed for Imperial unity after WWII dismissed in her memoirs as a form of both personal and national ‘self-deception’. Yet, as Charles Moore’s biography suggests, Thatcher’s attachment to post-war Imperialism was perhaps deeper and more long lasting than she let on. It is an attempt to get to the bottom of this seeming paradox which is at the heart of this paper.

The paper does so by examining the political and economic thought of so-called ‘Constructive Imperialists’, like Leo Amery MP and David Gammans MP, who during and immediately after WWII put forward bold plans to reunite the British Empire. Sketching their approaches to issues such as inflation, European unity, and colonial development it suggests that the differences between them and later ‘market-liberal’ Conservatives have been exaggerated. Indeed, the paper argues that some of the quintessential policies associated with the Thatcher governments— including the ‘right to buy’ and privatization—were in fact first articulated by Imperialists. Finally, the paper argues that not only did the policies of the Thatcher governments often have imperial origins, but the self-presentation of Thatcherism as a crusading (but also uniting) creed had direct parallels with post-war Imperialist thought. As such, the paper argues that there was no necessary conflict between Thatcherism and post-war Imperialism; a fact that explains why quite so many Imperialists, including the lady herself, were attracted to it.

David Stewart (UCLAN) “Scottish ‘Civil Society’ and Thatcherism: A Reappraisal”

The scale of opposition to Margaret Thatcher’s governments in Scotland is well established. Under Thatcher’s leadership the Scottish Conservative Party fell from twenty-two to ten seats, accelerating a process of longer-term decline that would result in the loss of all of the party’s seats at the 1997 general election. Indeed, the unpopularity of Thatcher’s governments is widely perceived to have acted as a catalyst for the establishment of the devolved Scottish Parliament. Most research has presented Scottish civil society as the key vehicle in channelling hostility towards the Thatcher governments into support for devolution. However, recent work by Richard Finlay has sought to revise this interpretation by arguing that civil society was a ‘myth’ constructed to legitimise the 1997 devolution settlement and mask disintegrating social cohesion. This paper seeks to reappraise the historiographical debate by analysing the institutional character and social and political profile of Scottish civil society’s opposition to Thatcherism. In doing so it seeks to avoid the generalisations and oversimplifications prevalent in the existing literature by disentangling the institutional structure of civil society from the pursuit of a civil society. It will argue that by attacking the post-war consensus on a British-wide basis, Margaret Thatcher’s governments impinged upon the independence of Scottish civil society, which came to perceive devolution as offering the best prospect of reasserting its autonomy and authority in Scotland.

Ben Bland (RHUL) “‘A Gigantic Confidence Trick’: Thatcherism and the Far Right”

In Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques’ landmark 1983 collection *The Politics of Thatcherism*, the then Conservative Prime Minister’s political doctrine was famously characterised as being partially composed of a form of ‘reactionary and authoritarian populism’ (Jacques 1983: 22-23). In the same volume Eric Hobsbawm suggested that at times, especially during the Falklands Crisis, Thatcherism seemed ‘almost “semi-fascist”’ (Hobsbawm 1983: 53). These qualities of Thatcherism, alongside its consistently anti-immigration position, have widely been interpreted as having prevented the potential rise of Britain’s nascent far right, led by the National Front (Layton-Henry 1992: 94-97; Schofield 2012: 106-107). Given Thatcherism’s authoritarian and nationalist qualities, one might expect Thatcher to

have received some begrudging approval from senior figures on the far right. However, the Thatcher government received little but criticism from the far right during her time in office, with the British fascist periodical *Spearhead* branding her 1979 electoral victory as being the result of 'a gigantic confidence trick'. Largely because of her passion for the free market, Thatcher was all too readily considered by hysterical British far right ideologues as part of an international Jewish-led conspiracy against Britain. This paper shall use far right opposition to Thatcher as a means of assessing Thatcherism's authoritarian and nationalist tendencies. Fundamentally, it shall question the veracity of the widely accepted claim that Thatcher's leadership of the Conservative Party caused a period of prolonged decline for British far right organisations. It shall be argued that, whilst Thatcher's Conservative Party consciously attempted to occupy as much political space on the right as possible, Thatcherism nonetheless left plenty of opportunities open for the far right, and could just as easily have contributed to its growth.

Conor McFall (QUB) "Gurus of Thatcherism: The Influence of Keith Joseph and the Centre for Policy Studies"

Most histories of the Thatcherite period state that Keith Joseph was a major influence on and mentor to Margaret Thatcher. However, little detail is offered on the depth of this influence. This paper fills this lacuna with an investigation of the influence that Joseph had on the emergence and formation of Thatcherism, with particular attention to the work of the think-tank he established, the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) in 1974. Through his major speeches and the work of the CPS, Joseph became an influential political figure who laid the ideological groundwork for Thatcher's later successes. His public statements helped to shift the mainstream political conversation away from the Keynesian based consensus of that political era while his engagement with the CPS brought monetarist economists into the political mainstream under the Conservative umbrella, putting Thatcher in touch with many of her future advisors. Furthermore, reports carried out by the CPS would provide the policy basis for the Thatcherite revolution, ranging from trade union reform to privatisation.

This paper identifies the ideological underpinnings of the Thatcher and the Conservative Party as the leadership shifted to the right following their election defeats in 1974. This paper will engage with a plethora of primary material in the form of Joseph's landmark 1974 speeches which marked a break from the political mainstream, a rich array of papers and publications from the CPS archives, contemporary newspaper reports and recollections from the diaries and autobiographies of major political protagonists of the period. The work of Joseph and the CPS will also be placed into socio-political context, with investigations of the major themes in the historiography of this period; consensus and decline. Following an in-depth analysis of Joseph's major speeches and an examination of the CPS's work, the paper concludes with a brief look at Joseph's ministerial career in the Thatcher governments before assessing his wider political legacy and influence. There will also be assessments of other figures who were influential in the development of Thatcherite politics, including Alfred Sherman and John Hoskyns.

Edmund Neill (New College of the Humanities) "The Evolution of Thatcherism: Debates between Conservative Intellectuals in Britain in the 1970s"

This paper explores the diversity of conservative political thinking in the 1970s in Britain, with the aim of shedding light on the intellectual milieu from which Thatcherism emerged. Despite the uncertainty over the Conservative Party's future in the 1970s, often it is assumed that the only intellectual dispute worth commenting upon in those years is between 'neoliberals', such as Keith Joseph, and continuing advocates of a 'Keynesian consensus', like Jim Prior. Certainly such a division existed, but arguably so did other important ones. Thus conservative thinkers in the 1970s differed over how they believed British society could be morally reformed, and the effects of the permissive society combated, with authoritarians such as Roger Scruton and Peregrine Worsthorne laying much more stress on re-establishing the authority of the state, whilst libertarians (like Lord Coleraine) argued that individuals

would only take proper responsibility for their actions if the influence of the state was reduced, and the 'dependency culture' associated with the welfare state curtailed. And distinctive again was Angus Maude's position in *The Common Problem* (1969), since he clearly believed in reducing the role of the welfare state to increase freedom – but not because he thought it made individuals immoral. On a constitutional level too, it is argued, there were also important divisions, with arch-traditionalists like Enoch Powell confronted by 'modernizers' such as Lord Hailsham and Ian Gilmour, who were much more prepared to consider a written constitution, proportional representation, and devolution in view of the challenges posed by a 'government overload' and Celtic nationalism. Clearly not all of these approaches were equally influential on subsequent policy. But by clarifying the nature of such debates, it is argued, we can understand better how policy in Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Party developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Kevin Albertson (Manchester Met) & Paul Stepney (Tampere) “1979 and All That”

Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of the UK from 1979 to 1990, is often held either to be a far-sighted visionary whose policies revitalised the UK economy, or as an uncaring ideologue who favoured a political in-group (in practice, the financial services industry), at the expense of the interests of traditional industry, the socially disadvantaged and the vulnerable. To this day, the Thatcher legacy remains strong and continues to exert a divisive influence on the wider political and economic landscape.

In this presentation, we consider the main thrust of Thatcher's policies, from home ownership, emphasis on free-markets, social security, the legitimate role of unions, housing and globalisation to her role on the world stage, restructuring – reducing the role of – UK manufacturing and the boom in North Sea oil revenues that boosted the UK economy under her “watch”.

We consider the political-economic legacy of the Thatcher years, not only through the lens of the (so-called) left or right, but rather in the context of her stated aims. Drawing on Thatcher's speeches, interviews and statements to the media we consider not only the longevity, but also the social and economic value of the political-economic paradigm she championed.

In this context, we contend Thatcher fundamentally misunderstood the workings of the market economy and adopted policies which could never have achieved her supposed goals. Thatcher's stated intentions were to sow love where she found hatred and unity where she found discord, yet her policies were flawed in that they promoted individualism and social divisions. Neither was especially ideological; her supposed market-based approach to economics were insufficiently informed by the policies developed by the neo-liberal economists of the 1930s, 40s and 50s.

Ultimately, we suggest Thatcher's approach to government was inherently limited. Thatcher was not unconcerned for those less fortunate, but neither was she sufficiently insightful to implement policies that could achieve her stated aims or support the long-term interests of the British people. Notwithstanding, her role in overseeing the UK's winning a (relatively minor and arguably unnecessary) armed conflict, her role in the ending of the so-called “cold war” and the availability of North Sea oil and gas revenues underpinned her political and economic credibility.

Azriel Bermant (Tel Aviv) “The Impact of the Cold War on Mrs Thatcher's Middle East Policy”

Margaret Thatcher was in close agreement with the Foreign Office on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Thatcher's concerns over Soviet ambitions in the Middle East encouraged her to oppose the policies of Israel's Likud governments, and to work actively for an urgent resolution of the conflict. While it is undoubtedly true that she initially viewed Israel as a strategic asset against the Soviet threat and that this was arguably an important factor in her early support for the Jewish State, Thatcher's strong anti-

communist position actually encouraged her to adopt an increasingly critical stance towards Israel's government.

She was reinforced by Lord Carrington, who served as Foreign Secretary during her first term and also by Jordan's King Hussein. Both Carrington and Hussein argued that the failure to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict worked to the advantage of the Soviet Union which posed as a champion of the Palestinian cause. Thatcher agreed with the Foreign Office view that an active effort to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict would make it more difficult for the Soviets to build influence in the Middle East, while helping also to rally Arab opinion to the West over the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. From Britain's perspective, the landmark EEC declaration on Palestinian self-determination and the PLO was ultimately an attempt to rally the Arabs to the West and neutralize the influence of Moscow.

This also explains Thatcher's angry condemnation of Israel's bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor in June 1981. Israel's friends in the Conservative party believed that Thatcher's condemnation of Israel's bombing raid was a result of her over-reliance on Foreign Office advice. Yet Thatcher had taken a stronger line than the Foreign Office over the Israeli operation. This was related to her anxiety over Soviet ambitions in the Middle East and the threats to Britain's moderate Arab allies in the region.

Rachel Utley (Leeds) "Questions of style and substance? Reinvestigating Margaret Thatcher's relations with France, 1979-1983"

For Thatcher, 'President Giscard d'Estaing was never someone to whom I warmed. I had the strong impression that the feeling was mutual.' She was perhaps correct: Giscard famously had limited regard for 'the grocer's daughter'. On the other hand, relations with Giscard's successor François Mitterrand held out more promise: it is widely asserted that she had a 'soft spot' for his 'Gallic charm', while he is said to have described her as having 'the eyes of Caligula but the mouth of Marilyn Monroe.' Still however, each found the other to be periodically difficult to work with, and a degree of personal warmth did not translate into political closeness.

Therefore, Britain's relations with France during Margaret Thatcher's first term of office were without doubt complex, at times challenging, and certainly multifaceted. Tensions were common, especially with regard to the EEC, the British budget question, and aspects of relations with the superpowers. But they were also often better than the headlines over 'getting Britain's money back' would suggest, with cooperation over residual issues of decolonisation, certain developments in the Cold War context, and with regard to the Falklands crisis.

This paper will seek to address UK-French relations in terms of their style and substance, during Thatcher's first term. It will do so on the one hand at the political level, comparing the adversarial nature of relations in the European framework most notably with significant cooperation in other aspects. But it will also raise questions about prominent assertions of UK-French relations in this period affected by personal factors and perceptions of gender. Running as a strong thread through French archival sources in particular, the paper will explore the dual aspects of 'style' and 'substance' in this context.

John Bagnall (Newcastle) "People She Could Work With: Thatcher, Personal Diplomacy and Europe through the Falklands Crisis, 1982-1990"

The 1982 Falklands Conflict came at a terrible time for the Thatcher government in its relations with Europe. Disputes over Britain's budget contribution and Common Agricultural Policy led to questions about Britain's membership of the EEC and Thatcher's leadership on the continent. The Argentine invasion brought these issues to the forefront of discussion as Britain sought European support in its effort to reclaim the islands. The resulting diplomatic effort highlighted the importance of Margaret Thatcher's own personal diplomacy in gaining concessions in negotiations during and after the conflict, a theme which this paper explores.

This research takes advantage of newly released documentation from government offices to give a fresh analysis of British international relations. Although the EEC imposed sanctions on Argentina, individually nations' opinions differed. Some analysis on the European reaction to the crisis has been published, however, these studies were not able to make use of the material that this work employs. Furthermore, this study examines specifically Thatcher's personal role in establishing British relations with Europe through the subsequent years. Biographers of Thatcher have touched on her relationships with other world leaders, but fail to explore the link with British European policy. This paper looks to evaluate this link in light of the new source material and highlight this important aspect of British contemporary history.

Adrian Williamson QC (Cambridge) "Thatcher and the European Monetary System: Chronicle of a Death Foretold"

This paper seeks to argue that Conservative divisions over Europe, which led to the fall of both Thatcher and Cameron, can be traced back to the 1970s and to the issue of the EMS. The then divisions were fundamental, albeit unacknowledged.

When Thatcher became Conservative Leader in 1975, most Tories strongly favoured immersing Britain in the European project. They also supported British membership of the EMS. In 1978, the Labour Government decided not to join the EMS. This decision was strongly criticised by the Conservative Leadership, including Howe and Lawson.

In the late 1980s, the Thatcher Government had to make the same decision. This proved highly divisive and led to Thatcher's fall. Thatcherites turned on each other over sterling's relationship to the DM, and whether Britain should join the EMS. The strongest advocates of 'shadowing' the DM, and joining the EMS, were those who had stood with Thatcher in earlier storms, in particular Howe and Lawson. Thatcher resisted these arguments, and denounced at Bruges 'a European super-state'.

Yet, on analysis, Thatcher had never been convinced of the case for the EMS. Within the Conservative camp, a fundamental, but largely unspoken, disagreement existed between domestic and international monetarists. This disagreement was itself symptomatic of a wider and more fundamental divide between Powellites, who believed in an independent free market country and most mainstream Conservatives who saw the UK's future in Europe.

Thatcher was, in truth, a Powellite all along, albeit that her closest colleagues seem not to have appreciated this. This schism underlay much that was to follow in the Conservative Party. The fall of Thatcher was a pyrrhic victory for the opposing forces. The Powellites regrouped until their final victory in 2016: all Conservatives are Powellites now.

Emily Stacey (Oxford Brookes) "'I feel I have been accepted as a leader in the international sphere': Margaret Thatcher's North American Tour, September 1975"

Previous studies of Margaret Thatcher have generally concentrated on her legacy as prime minister, particularly her close relationship with Ronald Reagan and of her political agenda during the 1980s. However, in order to gain a clearer understanding of Thatcherism there is now a new way of looking at Thatcher through her years as Leader of the Opposition. This area of Thatcher's career has been largely overlooked by historians and warrants further attention, particularly in light of her limited political awareness and competency as a relatively inexperienced politician. Indeed, aside from her tenure as Secretary of State for Education and Science, Thatcher possessed no major experience in government, or any obvious gravitas in foreign affairs. Nevertheless, after 1975 she was seeking to become prime minister. Therefore, in this paper I argue that Thatcher skilfully recognized that political advantages could be gained by utilizing international travel between 1975-79.

Specifically, Thatcher's tour of North America in September 1975 – her first major trip abroad as Conservative Leader - demonstrates her desire to reaffirm the importance of the 'special relationship' and strengthen Britain's Commonwealth ties. More significantly, however, trips abroad in opposition

gave Thatcher the opportunity to present her political vision on the world stage and highlight herself as a credible alternative prime minister. In doing so, she gained experience in foreign affairs and absorbed policy ideas that could later be implemented into Conservative policy. Having been classed as an outsider in the Conservative leadership election in February 1975, I argue that Thatcher recognized that frequent travel abroad was an incisive way of expanding her knowledge and experience as a political leader, which enabled her to portray herself as a prime minister in waiting.

Matthew Francis (Birmingham) “‘A Surge of Graveyard Optimism’: The Affect of the Winter of Discontent”

The Winter of Discontent continues to exercise a powerful hold over the historical imagination, and over many historians. While traditional histories portray the strikes of 1978-79 as the terminal crisis of a postwar ‘consensus’, many more recent interpretations have questioned the way in which the Winter of Discontent has come to be understood in these terms. Colin Hay, in particular, has argued at some length (1996, 2009, 2010) that the Winter of Discontent was a constructed crisis, an episode which demonstrates ‘the importance of media narratives in the constitution of crisis’ (1996: 273), the way in which particular events or series of events can be mediated in such a way as to acquire political meaning and, further, become key ‘strategic moment[s]’ in the transformation of the British state. However, for all that Hay’s work reveals much about how the events of the winter of 1978-79 were bent into particular political shapes, it reveals little about the way in which those events were *experienced* by the ordinary people or the elite actors who lived through them. This paper applies insights derived from the history of emotions to the study of political events as a means of re-interrogating the Winter of Discontent from a fresh perspective, exploring the way in which elite actors in both parties responded to the ‘crisis’. The paper thereby attempts to shed fresh light on the way in which those present experienced the events of the Winter of Discontent, and more broadly on how ‘crisis’ might be conceptualised and understood.

Aled Davies, James Freeman & Hugh Pemberton (Bristol) “‘Everyman a capitalist?’ or ‘Free to Choose’? Exploring the Tensions within Thatcherite Individualism”

It is widely recognised that ‘the individual’ was prioritised by the Thatcher governments. However there has been little analysis by historians of exactly how the Thatcher government conceptualised ‘the individual’. In this paper we attempt to remedy this deficiency by undertaking a case study of a key Thatcherite social and economic policy reform: the introduction of ‘Personal Pensions’. This approach allows us to understand the position of ‘the individual’ on the functional level of Thatcherite policymaking. In doing so we argue that there was no coherent or fixed Thatcherite concept of the individual. Instead we identify three fundamental tensions: (i) should individuals be capitalists or consumers; (ii) were they rational or irrational; and (iii) should they be risk-taking entrepreneurs or prudent savers? These tensions themselves reflected, in part, conflicts within the diverse tapestry of post-war neoliberal thought. Ultimately we demonstrate that the ideal of creating a society of entrepreneurial investor capitalists was discarded when faced with practical constraints, and that this cemented the Thatcherite preference for giving individuals the freedom to choose investment products within a competitive market. This paper provides a critical new perspective which challenges the notion that Thatcherism was an ideologically coherent project. Furthermore, it deepens our understanding of the relationship between ‘neoliberalism’ and Thatcherism in practice.

Steve Farrall (Sheffield) “‘What was the Legacy of Thatcherism for the Criminal Justice System in England and Wales?’”

The presentation will explore the findings of an ESRC-funded project which investigated the impact of Thatcherism on crime and the criminal justice system in England and Wales. I will argue that the social and economic policies of Margaret Thatcher (British Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990) had long-term effects on crime. Four policy areas will be focused on: the economy, housing, social security and education. Although Thatcherism did little to the Criminal Justice System directly, the rises in crime

associated with the above four policy arena fuelled demands for a 'tougher' response, which was delivered on by John Major (1990-1997) and Tony Blair's (1997-2007) administrations.

Takao Teriu (Warwick) “Re-evaluating the Thatcher Government’s Film Policies and their Consequences”

This paper aims to elucidate the background factors behind the transformation of British film policies in the 1980s and to identify the consequences of Thatcherite policies on the British film industry. In the 1980s, the governmental supports for the British film were abolished and it was evaluated as a consequence of the application of the Thatcherite free-market ideology to the British film industry. However, in the 1980s, the expected roles and characteristics of film itself dramatically changed and the abolishment of the British film policies was the reflection of such a shift. When the British film policies started to be implemented in the 1920s, British film was expected to contribute to establishing the identity of the British Empire, promoting British products, and spreading its political message toward international and domestic audiences. However, when the Thatcher government abolished film policies, film was not recognized as such a useful and meaningful medium because of the end of the British Empire, the emergence of the TV as a new form of entertainment and appearance of new generations of the British filmmakers who showed ambivalent attitudes towards national traditions and authority. After all, the Thatcher government denied the cultural and political value of film and recognized it as an economic commodity, which was reflected on the discourse in the White paper named Film Policy and Parliamentary discussion in Hansard.

Furthermore, even though governmental support shrunk and the number of British films decreased in the 1980s, it cannot be said that the quality and variety of British film in 1980s was poor because of the Thatcherite governmental policies, as Channel 4 encouraged the production of both artistic and popular film. The irony is that Channel 4's activities were totally against free-market competition and the negative reactions of filmmakers against Thatcherite ideology enhanced their creativity.

Sean Richardson (Nottingham Trent) “Wrioting: The Brixton Uprisings and the Literary Impact of Thatcherism”

This paper will consider the literary impact of Thatcherism through examining the Brixton Uprisings of 1981 and 1985. Reaching their 35th anniversary in 2016, the legacy of the Uprisings has begun to be revaluated, with a renewed interest in representing the riots outside of a purely historical framework. In particular, fiction has become an important resource when considering the Uprisings, providing an alternate remembering of the riots that conflicts with state sanctioned narratives. As writer and activist Alex Wheatle asserts, 'literature has a crucial part to play in the 1981 Brixton Uprising. What's important is that those who lived through it are able to relate their own stories and experiences and not allow any other to tell the [story] for them.' In light of this however, there has been a marked lack of criticism analysing the relationship between the Uprisings and the thriving literary scene of Brixton throughout the Thatcher years.

Interrogating said lacuna, this paper will examine the work of writers Linton Kwesi Johnson and Benjamin Zephaniah, arguing that their fiction is born out of the same political climate as the riots, responding to the pressures of neoliberalism and the One Nation State. In turn, the paper will further assert that the cultural output and political climate of Brixton in the 1980s have a mutually reflexive relationship, whereby the racial tensions that lead to the Uprisings affected a politicized subjectivity in many artists, who in turn strengthened these tensions by rearticulating them throughout their work.

Following this, the paper will close by exploring how Johnson and Zephaniah reconstructed the riots, utilising their fiction as a means of (re)writing the Uprisings, actively challenging the narrative provided by the state-sanctioned Scarman Report and the Murdoch press. The paper will draw on original interview material with artists and activists involved in the riots that so far remains unpublished.

Raluca Iliou (Brunel) “A String of Pearls a Thatcher Does Not Make: An Analysis of Theresa May’s and Margaret Thatcher’s Discursive Patterns”

When Theresa May became Prime Minister in July 2016 after a dramatic vote that decided whether the United Kingdom wanted to remain part of the European Union or not, ink started flowing, stimulated by the tantalizing perspective of looking at Margaret Thatcher’s resurrection. Given the multitude of vehement anti-Thatcherite movements that characterized both her period in power and afterwards (including her death), Theresa May’s election ignited controversies and brought about the same well-known feeling of segregation.

Nearly 40 years from the historical election of Europe’s first woman Prime Minister and in a world where women assume the most important positions of power (Angela Merkel as Chancellor of Germany, Hilary Clinton as Presidential Election Candidate, etc.), the UK chose to bring forward what is claimed to be a copy of the Iron Lady. Boasting the religious dedication, the steady commitment to one man, the Oxford education, the determination to pursue her political ambition, even the “right” views on sex, immigration, marriages, etc. May has been proclaimed the new “pure, vintage Maggie” (Patrick Kidd, *The Times*).

But if their background and their gender-determined sexualised image that Thatcher and May are what they have in common, it is their discursive patterns that place them in opposition. The paper aims at analysing the acceptance speeches of both politicians, placing emphasis on the power narratives they both employ. For this, the author will be using John Searle’s performativity principle and constitutive principle (as described in *The Construction of Social Reality* and *Making the Social World*), as well as Teun Van Dijk’s political discourse constitutive principle (*What is Political Discourse Analysis*) and Norman Fairclough’s concept of discourse as/in crisis. The analysis will try to bring forward the main discursive denominators that differentiate the two women politician and that made the Margaret Thatcher phenomenon an unrepeatable historical event.

Sebastian Averill (Loughborough) “‘What we need today is a Thatcher of the left’: Slavoj Žižek’s Explanation of the Thatcher Phenomenon”

On the 17th of April, 2013 in the *New Statesman* magazine, Slavoj Žižek, the erstwhile – if unorthodox – champion of the leftist political position extolled the historical example of Margaret Thatcher, going so far as to call for 'a Thatcher of the left: a leader who would repeat Thatcher's gesture in the opposite direction, transforming the entire field of presuppositions shared by today's political elite'. This narrative of transformation, this idea of Thatcher as someone whose ultimate legacy was to have changed the landscape of British politics more than anyone in the Twentieth Century, aside for Clement Attlee perhaps, dominated obituaries of Thatcher immediately after her death. Anne Perkins in *The Guardian* wrote of someone 'whose three terms broke the pattern of postwar politics'. Simon Heffer in *The Daily Mail* credited her with 'dragging Britain into the late 20th century'. 'By 1983, when she faced re-election ... she had', Heffer said, 'won her richly deserved accolade as a transformative prime minister.' Žižek's own obituary to Thatcher, published a week after her death, jarred with the prevailing atmosphere of celebration on the left that Thatcher had died. On the 9th of April, 2013, *The Daily Mail* had reported on the 'Thatcher Death Parties' spontaneously springing up all over Britain, the biggest ones being held in South London, Liverpool and Glasgow where crowds toasted 80's music with cans of beer and pints of milk. This paper elaborates on Žižek's obituary of Thatcher to re-describe her transformation of the landscape of British politics in the language of Critical Theory. The recent year-long rise of Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn has proved to be something of jeremiad on the left that Thatcher's transformative impact should be emulated, not scorned. The transformative impact of eleven years of Thatcher's administration on the British political landscape is as comprehensible through the models of the Critical Theory tradition as it is through the normative tradition of what might be considered Thatcher's usual constituency.

Jess Prestidge (Durham) “The best man in the cabinet’: Margaret Thatcher and Gender Dynamics as Spectacle”

Thatcher’s gender is the subject of a rich body of analysis. Her femininity was integral to way that she presented her political authority, largely because ‘political authority’ was conceived in masculine terms. Thatcher’s aggressive political style and decisive stance on key issues served to encourage both celebrations and accusations of her ‘manliness’. She was ‘the best man in the cabinet’; her Spitting Image puppet wore a pinstripe suit and used urinals. She was, of course, the ‘iron lady’, and it was the interaction between the ‘iron’ and the ‘lady’ that created the captured the popular imagination.

Thatcher’s (complex) femininity is often studied independently of the masculinities around which her public image developed, despite the fact that ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’ are otherwise recognised as contingent concepts. That Thatcher was ‘the best man in the cabinet’ reflected upon the inadequate masculinities of her colleagues, as much as it suggested the Prime Minister’s (masculine) strengths. In analysing Thatcher’s public image, it is therefore important to consider the media narratives that surrounded Thatcher’s relationships with men. Thatcher’s relationships with men are collectively significant because it was through these relationships that her distinctive style of femininity was developed, relayed and mythologised. As Beatrix Campbell has argued, women ‘relished Thatcher’s performance as a woman’. Pleasure, however, was not derived from her political representation of women, but ‘her ability to outwit men’.

The paper will first consider the media narratives that surrounded Thatcher’s relationships with her Cabinet colleagues, before exploring her public relationships with Denis Thatcher and Ronald Reagan more closely. I will argue that while presentations of Thatcher’s marital relationship were characterised by comedy, her relationship with Reagan was presented as a pseudo-romance. Both relationships were used to shape Thatcher’s public image in distinctly gendered terms, providing narrative ‘hooks’ upon which future stories could be hung.

Scott Anthony (Nanyang Tech) “When Maggie Met Harry: The Rise of Asia, Narratives of British Decline and the Birth of ‘Thatcherism’”

‘Thatcherism’ has usually been understood as a crisis of confidence in the post-war settlement and/or part of a wider Anglo-American resurgence of liberalism. What has been missing so far, this paper suggests, is an appreciation of the Asian influence on Thatcher. Her admiration for entrepreneurship, science and strong families found an important analogue in what was observed to be the rapid economic development of Asia in the second half of the century.

Manifestations of this Asian influence include Thatcher’s meetings with Deng Xiaoping, a lionisation of the ‘real’ British entrepreneurial spirit of Hong Kong, the wooing of Japanese manufacturing and an influential visit to Suharto’s Indonesia.

My paper focuses on Thatcher’s relationship with Singapore’s Lee Kuan Yew, a relationship apparently cemented by a mutual admiration of their approach to education. On the one hand we could see Lee Kuan Yew’s trajectory from Wilsonite Fabian to Thatcherite (of sorts) as an interesting mirror to many of the policy advisors that surrounded Thatcher in the UK. Certainly Lee Kuan Yew would serve as a trusted confidant and advisor on geopolitical developments – an advisor and confidant that would encourage her to face down the Foreign Office, for example.

However, as proponents of social discipline, sobriety and meritocracy there is a sense that there was a degree of mutual influence taking place. Understanding Thatcher’s interest in and interaction with ‘the Asian model’ adds cultural depth to Andrew Gamble’s famous description of Thatcherism as ‘a free economy and a strong state.’ It also helps us understand the pro-Asian direction of travel in the Conservative Party, an influence that has been much discussed recently in the political media.

In the late 1960s Ted Heath gave several speeches identifying the rise of China as the most important geopolitical development of the late twentieth century. Under Margaret Thatcher Britain began the (to

use a contemporary term) 'pivot to Asia': this paper examines that pivot in the context of the iterative process of creating 'Thatcherism'.

Helene von Bismarck (Independent) "Thatcherism on a European Scale? Margaret Thatcher, Jacques Delors and the Making of the Single European Act"

In her memoirs and her treatise 'Statecraft', published in 2003, Margaret Thatcher liked to present herself as a fervent critic of the European Community and a tireless fighter for Britain's national interest, dealing with a bunch of irrational 'Euroenthusiasts'. While her abrasive negotiating style and robust rhetoric during her premiership may indeed have gained her few friends among her continental counterparts, Thatcher nevertheless made a crucial contribution to the re-launch of the European integration process during the mid- and late 1980s. This paper will analyse her role in the making of the Single European Act of 1987, which formed the basis for a whole series of steps towards European unity during the mid- and late 1980s. It will also shed light on the strategy of European Commission President Jacques Delors during this process, as well as the role of Lord Cockfield, the British commissioner who worked under him. The paper will argue that Thatcher's dedication to the completion of the Single Market was so great because it was rooted in her desire to promote 'Thatcherism on a European Scale'. Delors and Cockfield were very much aware of Thatcher's dedication to free trade, and used this knowledge to formulate their European project in a way that would not only be acceptable to her, but also induce her to make considerable concessions in order to bring it about.

Biographies

Conference Organiser

Antony Mullen (Durham University)

@AntonyMullen

Keynote Speakers

Dr Martin Farr (Newcastle University)

@MartinJohnFarr

Martin Farr is Senior Lecturer in Modern and Contemporary British History at Newcastle University. He has published widely on 20th- and 21st-century British history, including on leaders of the Labour Party, the First World War, the decline of coastal resorts, and David Cameron's relationship with Barack Obama. With Xavier Guégan, he is co-editor of the multi-volume collection *The British Abroad Since the Eighteenth Century*.

He has made numerous national and international TV and radio appearances, including on BBC 1 & 2, ITN, BBC Radio 4, BBC World Service, More4, and Al Jazeera, and has written for *The Guardian* and *The Times* among others. He also chairs INSIGHTS, Newcastle University's public lecture series. His talk is entitled "Margaret Thatcher's World".

Dr Madsen Pirie (Adam Smith Institute)

@MadsenPirie

Madsen Pirie is the President of the Adam Smith Institute. He studied for a PhD at the University of St Andrews and was a Distinguished Visiting Professor of Philosophy at Hillsdale College, Michigan. Madsen founded the Adam Smith Institute in 1977 and was influential in advocating privatisation and free market policies throughout Margaret Thatcher's time in office. He was appointed to Prime Minister John Major's Advisory Panel from 1991-95. In 2010 he was appointed a Senior Visiting Fellow at the University of Cambridge.

His work has been published in *The Telegraph*, *The Times* and *The Spectator* and he has made appearances on Sky News and the BBC. He is the author of *How to Win Every Argument*, *Think Tank: The Story of the Adam Smith Institute* and *Trial and Error and the Idea of Progress*. Most recently, he starred in *Brexit: The Movie* and correctly predicted the outcome of the EU referendum and the US Presidential Election. His paper is entitled "Seeing the World Through Neoliberal Eyes".

Speakers

Adrian Williamson QC (University of Cambridge)

Adrian Williamson was called to the Bar in 1983 and has been a practising barrister in Keating Chambers since 1989. He specialises in construction, engineering and technology disputes. He was appointed QC in 2002. He has been appointed a Recorder (Civil 2004 and Criminal 2009) and Deputy High Court Judge for TCC cases (2010). He is an Associate at the Centre for Financial History at the University of Cambridge and is the author of *Conservative Economic Policymaking and the Birth of Thatcherism, 1964-1979* (2015).

Aled Davies (University of Bristol)

Aled Davies is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the University of Bristol. His research examines the transition from social democracy to neoliberalism in the political economy of post-war Britain. His forthcoming book, *The City of London and Social Democracy: the political economy of finance in post-war Britain*, will be published by Oxford University Press in 2017.

Azriel Bermant (Tel Aviv University)

@AzrielB

Azriel Bermant was awarded his PhD from UCL in January 2012. The title of his thesis was: 'A Triumph of Pragmatism over Principle: Margaret Thatcher and the Arab-Israel Conflict'. He is currently an adjunct lecturer at Tel Aviv University. He writes for various publications, including Foreign Affairs, National Interest, The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph and Haaretz. His book, 'Margaret Thatcher and the Middle East' was published by Cambridge University Press in September.

Ben Bland (Royal Holloway, University of London)

@Benjamin_Bland

Benjamin Bland is an AHRC-funded PhD student in the Department of History at Royal Holloway, University of London. His research focuses on the influence of fascism on various forms of popular culture in Britain since the 1970s. He has wider research interests in the evolution of the political right in post-war Europe, as well as in the more general history of cultural and political extremism in the post-war period.

Conor McFall (Queens University Belfast)

Conor McFall recently completed a Masters in History at Queens University Belfast, for which he achieved a distinction. He also attained an undergraduate degree in the same institution. His research interests include British politics and society, political parties and ideological developments. This abstract is based on his MA thesis on Joseph and the introduction of neoliberal economics into the British political mainstream.

David Stewart (University of Central Lancashire)

David Stewart is a senior lecturer in History at the University of Central Lancashire, Preston. His research interests focus on modern British social and political history with particular reference to the labour movement and Thatcherism. His publications include: *The Path to*

Devolution and Change: A Political History of Scotland under Margaret Thatcher, 1979-1990, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009).

Edmund Neill (New College of the Humanities)

Edmund Neill has been Lecturer in Modern British History at the New College of the Humanities, London, since September 2013. Previously, after completing his doctorate under the supervision of Professor Michael Freeden at Oxford University, he had temporary lectureships in modern history at a number of Oxford colleges, including Magdalen, St. Peter's, and Harris Manchester, and has also been a visiting lecturer in Victorian history at Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author of a book on Michael Oakeshott (New York: Continuum Bloomsbury, 2010), as well as a number of articles and reviews on modern British history and the history of political thought for journals including the *History of European Ideas* and *Twentieth Century British History*. He is currently writing a second book on the history of conservatism. His first article was on 'British Political Thought in the 1990s: Thatcherism, Citizenship, and Social Democracy', and he has recently completed a book chapter on 'Conservative Intellectuals and the Post-War State' for a Festschrift in honour of Professor Jose Harris. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

Emily Stacey (Oxford Brookes University)

@EmilyJStacey1

Emily Stacey is a PhD student at Oxford Brookes University currently researching a thesis on Margaret Thatcher's years as Leader of the Opposition. Specifically, her research focuses on Thatcher's trips abroad between 1975 and 1979, and analyses how she utilized international travel as a way of expanding her knowledge of foreign affairs. Her thesis also seeks to demonstrate the internationalization of politics and domestic policy through Thatcher's foreign visits, which is particularly apparent in her trips to the United States. In the first year of her doctorate, Emily visited Washington D.C. to gain an insight into how Thatcher was perceived by Americans between 1975 and 1979. During this trip she researched material at the Library of Congress and conducted interviews with George Will (*Washington Post*), Stuart Butler (Brookings Institute) and Dr Nile Gardiner (Director of The Heritage Foundation). She is in the process of publishing her first journal article entitled: 'From hectoring, dogmatic woman to a special relationship: Margaret Thatcher and Jimmy Carter, 1977-1979,' which includes personal contributions from President Carter and former Vice-President Walter Mondale.

Helene von Bismarck (Independent)

@HeleneBismarck

Helene von Bismarck is a historian and author based in Hamburg, Germany. She received her PhD in Contemporary History from Humboldt-University in Berlin in 2011. She is currently working on a book about the relationship between the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and European Commission President Jacques Delors. Her first book, *British Policy in the Persian Gulf, 1961-1968. Conceptions of Informal Empire* was published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2013. Dr. von Bismarck has presented her work in talks in Germany, Britain, the USA, Turkey, Italy and France. She is the author of a number of essays, putting current events into historical perspective, as well as an op-ed column about Britain's role in 20th Century international history. She has also worked as a commentator on German television for the Zweite Deutsche Fernsehen (ZDF). On the day following the EU Referendum, the German

newspaper Der Spiegel published a detailed interview with her about the reasons and possible repercussions of the Brexit vote.

Hugh Pemberton (University of Bristol)

@Hugh_Pemberton

Hugh Pemberton is Reader in Contemporary British History at the University of Bristol. He is a social science historian whose central interest is the history of postwar British governance and the way in which it has shaped, and been shaped by, economic and social policy and performance and by political ideology. His research has always been explicitly interdisciplinary: he is a contemporary historian but one who engages in particular with politics, economics, and social policy. His work aims to provide historical context to current policy and thus explicitly engages with non-academics in the political arena and in wider society.

James Freeman (University of Bristol)

@JGFreeman

James Freeman is Lecturer in the Digital Humanities (History) at the University of Bristol. His research examines the relationships between political concepts, policy, and rhetoric in post-war British politics. He has a particular interest in combining methodologies from political science, corpus linguistics, and rhetorical theory in order to examine twentieth-century rhetorical cultures at macro and micro scales. Drawing upon both innovative digital techniques and close-readings of archival materials, his doctoral thesis bifurcated the history of Tory freedom rhetoric from the history of neoliberalism.

Jess Prestidge (Durham University)

Jess Prestidge is a History PhD student at Durham University soon to submit a thesis which explores the gendering of Margaret Thatcher's political authority. She is supervised by Ludmilla Jordanova and Philip William, and studied previously at UCL and King's College London.

John Bagnall (Newcastle University)

@JuanEddy1

John Bagnall is currently in the second year of his PhD at Newcastle University under the supervision of Martin Farr. His thesis aims to examine how the Falklands Conflict influenced world perspectives of Britain and the subsequent effect on international relations. John is currently working on articles for publication on American and European reflections on the Conflict and has spoken at a range of conferences and seminars including the *British Scholar Society* Britain and the World Conference held at Kings College last June.

Kevin Albertson (Manchester Metropolitan University)

Professor Kevin Albertson is Professor of Economics at MMU Business School. He is an eclectic economist with a background in statistics and economics, but has escaped (to some extent) from the numerical world of Econometrics into the applied worlds of: Behavioural Economics; social policy and social innovation; economics and crime; and the application of classical and behavioural economics to socio-political issues. Kevin is co-author of four books, including the Haynes Guide 'How to Run the Country'

Kit Kowol (University of Oxford)
@KitKowol

Kit Kowol is Lecturer in History at Christ Church, University of Oxford. His work examines the history of the Conservative Party in the twentieth century in particular during the Second World War. He has published in *Twentieth Century British History* and has an article forthcoming in the *Journal of British Studies* on 'conservative modernism' in the 1930s.

Matthew Francis (University of Birmingham)
@DrMJFrancis

Matthew Francis (m.j.francis@bham.ac.uk) is a Birmingham Fellow (Teaching) in the School of History and Cultures at the University of Birmingham. His research has focused on postwar British political history, and has addressed issues such as party leadership, political ideologies, and the politics of race. He also teaches a third-year Special Subject on the politics of the 1980s, *Where There Is Discord: Making Thatcher's Britain* (#ThatcherBham).

Paul Stepney (University of Tampere)

Dr. Paul Stepney is currently an Adjunct Professor of Social Work at the University of Tampere in Finland. Prior to this he has taught at universities in the UK including Hull, Manchester, Exeter and more recently Wolverhampton. He is a qualified social worker and has worked in generic fieldwork teams and in the 1990s combined university teaching with a hospital social work post. Paul's current research interests are in the area of critical practice and prevention. This includes a critical realist model of practice combining critical theory, policy analysis and integrated methods in the fields of mental health, child protection and adult care.

Rachel Utley (University of Leeds)

Rachel Utley is Lecturer in International History at the University of Leeds, where she specialises in questions of French defence and security policy in the Fifth Republic, and UK-French relations in the period since the 1970s.

Raluca Iliou (Brunel University)

Raluca Iliou is a PhD candidate at Brunel University, London.

Scott Anthony (Nanyang Technological University)

Scott Anthony is an Assistant Professor in History at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. His first book – *Public Relations and the Making of Modern Britain (MUP)* – examined the long history of what is now known as 'soft power'. He has also published on art, technological change and the long tail of British imperialism. He is currently working on two interrelated projects: about Thatcherism in Asia and about visualisations of the economy in the 1970s.

Sean Richardson (Nottingham Trent University)
@SouthLdnTabby

Sean Richardson is a first year PhD researcher in the School of English Literature at Nottingham Trent University, funded by the Vice Chancellor's scholarship scheme. His research considers the intersection between space, place and identity in modern fiction, with a particular focus on how race, gender and sexuality influence and construct the metropolis.

Sebastian Averill (Loughborough)
@PinkBlackAttack

Sebastian Averill is a final-year PhD student at the University of Loughborough in History, Politics & International Relations. I study Critical Theory and specifically the work of Slavoj Žižek, with whom I'm publishing an edited book next summer on materiality.

Steve Farrall (University of Sheffield)
@Thatcher_Legacy

Professor Steve Farrall is Deputy Head of the Law School and Professor of Criminology at the University of Sheffield. His research has focused on the fear of crime (especially how best to measure it), why people stop offending, middle-class crimes, and crime histories. He has recently completed a 5th sweep of interviews with a cohort of probationers who were originally supervised in 1997-98. His other research interests include the long-term impact of Thatcherite social and economic policies on Crime, and cognitive interviewing to improve survey questions.

Takao Terui (Warwick University)

After graduating from the undergraduate course of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Takao Terui is studying as a graduate student both at the Centre for the Cultural Policy in the University of Warwick and the British Studies Course in the University of Tokyo. His academic interest lies in the research of film policies and film industry in the UK. He has made oral presentations about historical analysis of British film policies in international conferences held in the University of Tokyo, the University of Virginia Tech and the University of Jyväskylä. Furthermore, he published articles and essays about cultural policies of not only the UK but also of several regions including the United States and the Middle East. Currently, he is carrying out comparative analysis of the relationship between states and national cinema by focusing on governmental documents and film archives.