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Programme

Thursday 6th June

09.30 – 11.00 The Ideology of Thatcherism Revisited (Chair: Steve Farrall)
- Kevin Hickson (Liverpool)
- Anthony A.J. Williams (Manchester Met)
- Ben Williams (Salford)
- Nina Rogers (Liverpool Hope)

11.00 – 11.30 Refreshment break

- Nigel Fletcher (KCL)
- Emily Stacey (Oxford Brookes)
- Tom Hurst (Independent)
- Ruth Garland (Hertfordshire)

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch break

14.00 – 15.30 Exploring the Long-term Impacts of Thatcherism on Attitudes, Life Courses and Spaces (Chair: David Jeffery)
- Stephen Farrall (Derby)
- Emily Gray (Derby)
- Phil Jones (Derby)
- Thomas Guiney (Oxford Brookes)

15.30 – 16.00 Refreshment break

16.00 – 17.00 Thatcherism, Neoliberalism, and the Framing of British History Since 1979 (Chair: Martin Farr)
- Florence Sutcliffe-Braithwaite (UCL)
2019 Thatcher Network Conference

40 Years of Thatcherism?

Programme

Friday 7th June

10.30 – 12.00  Thatcherism and/on Film (Chair: Steve Farrall)

- Alex Adams (Independent)
- Benjamin Halligan (Wolverhampton)
- Joseph Oldham (Hull)
- Mark Curran (York)

12.00 – 13.00  Lunch break

13.00 – 14.30  Historical Re-evaluations (Chair: Antony Mullen)

- Ben Worthy (Birkbeck) and Jess Smith (Birkbeck)
- Stephen Kelly (Liverpool Hope)
- Sam Blaxland (Swansea)
- Martin Farr (Newcastle)

14.30 – 15.00  Refreshment break

15.00 – 16.30  Social and Economic Legacies (Chair: David Jeffery)

- Gillian Lamb (Oxford)
- Peter Kerr (Birmingham), Emma Foster (Birmingham) and Chris Byrne (Leeds Beckett)
- Ruth Davidson (KCL)
- Tom Kelsey (KCL)

16.30  Close of conference
Abstracts

The Ideology of Thatcherism

Kevin Hickson (Liverpool) “Thatcher and the Conservative Right”

This paper will examine Thatcher’s relationship to the Conservative Right. To a number of her critics Thatcher was a Nineteenth Century/classical liberal. The extent to which her ideas fitted with the traditional Conservative Right will be examined. Thatcher had a sometimes difficult relationship with commentators and opinion formers on the Right. Several of her critics at the time and subsequently came from the traditional right, both over specific developments during her premiership and also more generally such as her economic approach. Although some sought to defend Thatcher as consistent with the traditional right, others thought that she was alien to it. This paper draws on extensive research recently conducted - including extensive primary interviews - which will lead to the publication of a monograph in the near future.

Anthony A.J. Williams (Manchester Met/Liverpool) “Religious Foundations of Thatcherism”

This paper examines the religious arguments for and against Thatcherism. Examining Margaret Thatcher’s speeches at St Laurence Jewry next Guildhall (1978 and 1981) and to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1988) it will be shown that she made a case for her political project which drew very clearly on Christian ideas and concepts such as personal responsibility, justice and redemption. Thatcher’s religious argumentation was not, of course, uncontested; it aroused fierce opposition, particularly from within the Church of England. This Christian critique of and counter-argument to Thatcherism – most clearly articulated in the Faith in the City report of 1985 – will also be examined. It will be concluded that the religious foundation of Thatcherism relies on an interpretation of Christian concepts which is itself coloured by pre-existing political assumptions. This leads us to question whether Thatcher re-shaped Christianity to support her message rather than her message being shaped by Christianity.
Ben Williams (Salford) “Thatcherism and the Politics of Welfare”

This paper examines the relationship between the theory and practice of Thatcherism in relation to the key policy area of the welfare state. Thatcher claimed to believe in the ideas of Hayek and Friedman. Her approach to welfare differed from previous Conservative governments in theoretical terms, with her critique of social justice. The extent to which Thatcherism succeeded in implementing a new policy agenda, however, is more questionable. While Thatcherism restructured some key components of the established post-war welfare state in Britain during the 1980s, a more radical restructuring of core public services and reduction of welfare expenditure remained an uncompleted aspiration of the Thatcherite project during its decade of political ascendancy. The extent to which ‘Thatcherism’ has influenced successive Conservative Governments’ approaches to welfare reform will then be examined.


Nigel Fletcher (King's College London) “In the Shadow of Downing Street: Mrs Thatcher’s Private Office, 1975-1979”

The paper will consider the immediate institutional factors affecting preparations for government by Margaret Thatcher in the years preceding her victory at the 1979 General Election. It will do so by a close examination of the organisation of her private office during her time as Leader of the Opposition from 1975 to 1979. Drawing on material from the Thatcher archive as well as the papers of Airey Neave, who acted as the head of her private office, the paper will consider the adequacy of available resources, including the introduction of new state-funded financial assistance (“Short money”), and the allocation of physical office space. It will consider how these resources were deployed and what impact the arrangements in opposition had on the transition to government. It will also seek to draw more thematic conclusions on what the private office arrangements tell us about the role and status of the Leader of the Opposition during this period, how it may have changed, and Margaret Thatcher’s priorities in fulfilling the role. Finally, it will seek to suggest how systematic analysis of institutions and their significance in political studies should be extended beyond the current restricted focus on government to encompass that of the “shadow government”, the Official Opposition and its leader.
John Hoskyns, Head of Margaret Thatcher’s Policy Unit, 1979-82, has been viewed by many as a key figure in establishing Thatcherism. Hoskyns regularly appears in accounts of Thatcher’s first government and is understood to have played an important role in reinforcing her convictions at a time when her government, and Thatcherism itself, looked anything but secure. No wonder Thatcher herself recalled that Hoskyns’ contribution, both in opposition and government, had been ‘invaluable’. Despite this assumed significance, little scholarly attention has been paid solely to Hoskyns.

This, in part, was a result of the impact that Hoskyns, and others who identified as early ‘Thatcherites,’ had on transforming the Conservatives into a Party who took ideas seriously. As a result, the conservative (often Conservative) historians who were suspicious of ideology, and who valued pragmatism and tactics, began to vacate the study of the Conservative Party, making way for the political scientists of the Left, keen to understand the electoral success of ‘Thatcherism.’ The growing interest in a study of ‘discourse’ has only continued this tendency to marginalise the archive. However, the archive offers scholars a fresh opportunity not only to assess individuals who have been overlooked – such as Hoskyns - but also to consider Thatcher’s Premiership from a fresh vantage point.

In assessing Hoskyns’ papers alongside Thatcher’s, it becomes clear that his political influence was, at best, episodic. The rudeness with which he was willing to address Thatcher and his insistence on offering strategic, rather than practical advice, combined to ensure his exclusion from a position of significant political influence. Perhaps most interesting of all is the fact that his Thatcherite convictions limited rather than enhanced his ability to influence the policy-agenda the Prime Minister pursued. An analysis of Hoskyns’ relationship with Thatcher thus offers an insight not only into his true political significance, but also raises interesting questions regarding the degree to which Thatcher was, as she claimed, a ‘conviction politician.’

The 1982 Falklands victory is often credited with restoring the fortunes of the government of Margaret Thatcher, previously the most unpopular Prime Minister since records began. A recession had led to historically high unemployment, inflation and industrial unrest, and 1983 opened with an invigorated mass movement against the deployment of US Cruise Missiles.
This paper presents the findings of an archival analysis of the period leading up to the election of June 1983 to consider the role of government presentation in returning Mrs Thatcher to power with a 144-seat majority and a huge mandate for change. It examines how the Thatcher administration deployed the resources of the ostensibly impartial Government Information Service to exploit the opportunities of a new multi-channel environment, and a sycophantic tabloid press, in order to ‘sell’ an initially deeply unpopular neoliberal policy of economic and social transformation. The Conservative party had already successfully applied political marketing techniques during the 1979 election, and, as contemporary documents and memoirs show, once in power the party in government sought to implement a more integrated and persuasive style of communication that later become known as ‘political spin’ and was heavily identified with Tony Blair. Documents dating from 1979 to 1986 present a picture of the Government Information Service in flux; increasingly orienting itself within the Thatcherite belief system and changing the ‘rules of the game’ subtly and steadily to isolate resistance and embed a dominant narrative that, while under challenge today, still holds sway over the popular political imagination.

Exploring the Long-term Effects of Thatcherism on Attitudes, Life Courses and Spaces

Stephen Farrall (Derby) “Are we all Thatcherites now?”

In an article in The Times on the 10th June 2002, Peter Mandelson, one of the architects of the New Labour project declared that “we’re all Thatcherites now”. This paper, presents the results of a nationally-representative survey of residents in England, Wales and Scotland, which asked respondents about their beliefs about politics and society. The survey asked people about their values in general, as well as those which can be thought of as ‘Thatcherite’, and their political affiliation and beliefs about Thatcher and her period in office. The results which we will present will largely be ‘headline findings’ from the survey. The survey (the fieldwork for which ran from mid-January to mid-February 2019) was funded by the ESRC, and was one part of a wider project exploring the impact of Thatcherism on UK life and the life-courses of ‘Thatcher’s Children’.
Emily Gray (Derby) “A contemporary retrospective of Thatcherism: what was the impact of Thatcherite social and economic policy on crime into the 21st century?”

This paper will summarise what we have learnt about how Thatcherism shaped a generation of citizens and cast an enduring influence over their families via radical changes in social and economic policy. Analysing data from two British Cohort Studies (The National Child Development Survey 1958 and the British Cohort Study 1970) this paper demonstrates the extent to which Thatcherite policies in the domains of social security, housing and education influenced a generation of young people who were growing up in this political landscape. We detail precisely how structural forces in these areas resulted in greater levels of crime and the intensification of public concerns about crime. In sum, we test if Thatcherism represented a significant period of social change (Mannheim, 1928). Underlining these dynamics, we demonstrate how political socialisation is a ‘slow-moving’ (Pierson, 2004) process, the consequences of which may not become fully realised for several decades.

Phil Jones (Derby) “Prisons, coal, and accumulative disadvantage: enduring inequality in former areas of heavy industry”

The wide-scale closure of coal mines in the UK between the 1970s--1990s was followed by a significant expansion of new prisons in these areas compared to non-coal mining areas, after accounting for population changes. We argue this is evidence of accumulative disadvantage faced by these communities as workers and their families had their source of income, identity, and purpose dismantled. We identify former coal-mining areas based on the methodology used by Beatty and Fothergill (1996) and test if more prisons were opened in former coal mining areas than non-coal mining areas per capita after the industry closures. Using Poisson regression we identified that coal mining counties are 90% more likely (95% CI: 27%--184%) to have a prison than non-coal mining counties in 2001. By contrast a similar model of the number of prisons in 1961 is not statistically significant, suggesting prisons were built and expanded in areas of radical economic change during the 1980s. We find evidence of continued social inequality and division between the ‘north’ and ‘south’, with important implications for the recovery of these and similar areas in light of contemporary austerity.

Thomas Guiney (Oxford Brookes) “‘It was not what they wanted’: Thatcherism, law and order, and the legacy of the 1981 Conservative Party Conference.”

In October 1981, the Conservative Party Conference law and order motion was defeated by a ‘substantial majority’ of delegates for the first time in living memory. The Home Secretary,
William Whitelaw, was left ‘visibly shaken’ by this experience. It was later reported that, as he left the podium, Whitelaw was approached by the former Prime Minister, and staunch Thatcher critic, Edward Heath, who remarked, ‘that was a very good speech Willie’, before noting dryly that ‘it was not what they wanted of course…’. This exchange captures something of the changing contours of law and order politics after the landmark 1979 General Election. Drawing upon extant historical sources this paper offers a detailed historical case-study of the 1981 Conservative Party Conference. It will draw attention to internal power dynamics within the Conservative Party as Thatcher sought to consolidate her position within the party and promote close political allies to key positions within Cabinet. It will go on to demonstrate how these internal forces coalesced within a turbulent socio-economic context, defined by civil disturbances in Toxeth and Brixton, to isolate Whitelaw and derail his fledgling penal reform programme. The paper concludes that these events had a profound effect upon the ‘collective consciousness’ of the Conservative Party and therefore offer a promising point of departure to reflect upon the uneven development of law and order politics under Thatcher, and the apparent disconnect between the rhetoric and reality of criminal justice policy at this time.

Thatcherism and/on Film


Across the 1970s, the Conservative Party retained two positions on the “Permissive Society”: libertarian and patrician. Margaret Thatcher seems to have shifted from the former (in relation to, for example, abortion rights) to the latter (looking to the “moral majority”). This shift culminated in the idea of a declared return to “Victorian values” at the point of the first few years in power, and consequently a new censoriousness in relation to cultural matters.

Thatcher’s base was understood to include, crucially, the non-aligned “Essex man” – as representing that strata of the newly wealthy who ditched traditional working class allegiance to Labour in favour of voting Conservative in 1979. This paper seeks to understand the aspirations of this figure, in terms of how someone of limited education sought to tap into the pleasures on offer in a secular society, through a consideration of pornographic films from this time. Mary Millington’s True Blue Confessions and Paul Raymond’s Erotica lend themselves to readings as Thatcherite visions of a free Britain for the 1980s.
Millington was, in various films, associated with a (fanciful) stockbroker-belt lifestyle: models, Jacuzzis, erotic dancers, and shame-free sexual possibilities. This pornographic vista seemed to suggest both the horizon of possibility, and an education – for the Essex man – in how to spend money. This vista, I argue, was that of the bounty of deregulation and of the meritocratic society, awaiting and motivating those vulgar entrepreneurs who had capitalised on the opportunities afforded by Thatcher.

**Joseph Oldham (Hull)** “‘A fastidious stepping-aside from patriotism’: Thatcher’s Britain and the Legacy of the Cambridge Spies”

On 15 November 1979, Margaret Thatcher revealed to the House of Commons that Sir Anthony Blunt, Keeper of the Queen’s Pictures, had been ‘fourth man’ of the Cambridge spy ring, having been granted anonymity in return for a full confession in 1964. Thatcher’s voiding of this arrangement was symbolic in contradictory ways, violating her hawkish attitude towards state secrecy and whilst also epitomising her suspicion of entrenched elite bureaucracies.

The subsequent decade of Thatcher’s premiership saw several plays and films explore issues revived by Blunt’s exposure. Julian Mitchell’s *Another Country* (1981) and Alan Bennett’s *An Englishman Abroad* (1983) focused on Guy Burgess, one of Blunt’s fellow Cambridge spies – Burgess and Blunt being the two openly homosexual members of the ring. Then, following Blunt’s death in 1983, the ‘fourth man’ himself emerged as the subject of Robin Chapman’s *Blunt* (1987) and Bennett’s *A Question of Attribution* (1988).

This paper will argue that the dramatisation of past events in these works often contains coded critiques of Thatcher’s Britain. Their recurrent interest in elite buildings, clothes and painting aligns them with concurrent trends in the heritage film and, by extension, Thatcher’s ‘project of bringing back national pride and other old values back to the country’. Yet they subvert this through their qualified sympathy towards political deviance (especially against the Falklands War) and towards homosexuality in the context of the Thatcherite backlash against gay rights.

**Mark Curran (York)** “Mrs T for ‘Generation Z’”

This paper will look at the impact of Margaret Thatcher on the generation that were born and grew up after her premiership ended. Why is it that I, born in 1996, and other people my age have such an interest in Thatcher when we were not alive during her premiership?
Margaret Thatcher’s premiership dramatically shaped the world in which “Generation Z” (roughly defined as those born between the mid-1990s and mid-2000s) grew up in. The areas that will be analysed to show the impact of Thatcher are: housing, education and popular culture. Housing will be consulted as many of this generation, myself included, grew up in council housing. Mrs. Thatcher dramatically changed attitudes towards council housing in the 1980s through her “Right to Buy Scheme”. In terms of education, Mrs. Thatcher introduced the foundations for the school curriculum which “generation z” experienced, more precisely, Thatcher’s desire to introduce computers into the classroom. Lastly, popular culture will be analysed through films which depict her premiership. These films include *Billy Elliot* (2000) and *Pride* (2014).

The impact of these films and popular culture will form a bridge to the second part of the analysis in this paper, which will look at the role that elder generations and contemporary narrative played in shaping the attitudes of “generation z” to Mrs. Thatcher. The strong willed attitudes of my generation must have emanated from somewhere and in my opinion, the inheritance of the attitudes of elder generations and the influence of popular narrative are responsible.

**Historical Re-evaluations**

*Ben Worthy (Birkbeck) and Jess Smith (Birkbeck) “Remind You of Anyone? Comparing Theresa May and Margaret Thatcher” [via Skype]*

Theresa May branded as ‘lazy’ any comparisons with her female predecessor. However, there are parallels. May, like her predecessor, styled herself as a radical outsider in the premiership, and found herself with the same challenge of striving to somehow balance femininity with masculinity and stability with change.

This article compares May with Thatcher through three lenses: their ideology and style, their inner court and their image in the media. May’s ideology and style resembled late Thatcherism, while she also sought to dominate Cabinet with a ‘parallel control system’ and portray a powerful image in the media, bound up in the same archetypes that defined Thatcher. There were differences: May did explicitly push a feminist policy agenda and was unable as Thatcher was, to use her feminine side to communicate. After the snap election, these Thatcher-esque approaches backfired.
Thatcher’s slow rise carved a space, finely balancing her femininity with a highly individualist, heroic style (Lovenduski 2005). May, by contrast, hoped to short-circuit the process in 2016 and undid it in 2017 and after. May borrowed too quickly, lacking Thatcher’s ‘deliberateness’ or ‘sense of timing’, arriving in power as an all-conquering transformer rather than slowly carving agency and influence. Thatcher’s supposed inflexibility and ideology hid pragmatism and caution while May’s was the opposite. While Thatcher used her outsider to gradually carve out room for manoeuvre, May was less able to strike the right balance and undid her authority.

Sam Blaxland (Swansea) “Wales’ most popular post-war Prime Minister? Reactions and attitudes to Thatcher and Thatcherism in the 1980s.”

On a trip to Cardiff in 1984, Mrs Thatcher was met by booing crowds, unhappy representatives from heavy industry and flying eggs – which she narrowly dodged. She apparently told the minister accompanying her, Wyn Roberts, that the Welsh were ‘awful people’. There can be no doubt that Thatcher had little personal sympathy for the ‘Celtic fringes’ of the United Kingdom, but the people of Wales were much warmer to her in return than popular images of these kinds of protests tend to portray. In the 1979 general election, the party performed well and in 1983 it gained a post-war record of fourteen MPs, including in some seats most thought unwinnable. At the 1987 general election – after the miner’s strike had taken place – she and the Conservative Party won more votes than they had done in 1983. This paper will discuss how the Party’s specific - and relatively popular - approach to Wales from 1979 was actually compatible with the politics and the personality of Mrs Thatcher (despite her hostilities to the nation). Their approach chimed with both grass-roots Tories as well as other members of Welsh society. It will cover the popularity of aspirational politics, the social and cultural conservatism of many voters, and the hostility – in some quarters – to trade unionism. In the process it will encourage the need for fresh thinking about such catch-all terms as ‘Welsh politics’, which prove too broad and unwieldy when discussing things like the history of, or reaction to, Thatcherism. It will also touch upon how, with certain parts of the UK forging their own anti-Conservative and anti-Thatcher political identities throughout the 1980s, Wales was, on the whole, much more aligned to English voting patterns and behaviours than most historians or political scientists acknowledge.
Testament to the enduring significance of Thatcherism in the place where it was conceived and first practised has been its applicability. The person and the -ism have remained more prominent in public discourse than has any other historical figure or eponymized set of values from the past. Taking as its starting point the eulogies or denunciations from public actors on Margaret Thatcher’s death in 2013, this paper will consider the meanings Thatcherism has had by those who appropriate the term – or aspects of it – and those who attribute. Appropriators are generally sympathetic to the diagnoses or prescriptions of Thatcherism in general – or in specific areas of public policy – was held to have made or advocated. Attributers tend to do so from a position of seeking to tar opponents with the usual adjectival litany. The interventions of the public actors – parliamentarians, representatives of capital and labour, academics, opinion-formers – can be seen both in terms of intention and its absence. The paper is not concerned with counter-factuals – how Thatcher would have dealt with the consequences of the 2008 crash, for instance, voted over Brexit, or responded to Trump – but with the extent to which ‘austerity’, Brexit, or Trump, were informed by, or could be interpreted through, Thatcherism. Sources include parliamentary debates, speeches, broadcasts, and discourse in print and online. It will show both how protean and how specific was the phenomenon, and how fidelity to Thatcherism has been used to the ends of approbation and opprobrium.

Social and Economic Legacies

Peter Kerr (Birmingham), Emma Foster (Birmingham) and Chris Byrne (Leeds Beckett)

“Thatcherism, ‘post-Thatcherism’ and what comes after: Is the Thatcherite consensus collapsing?”

This paper aims to explore the wider, lasting legacy of the Thatcher project. In particular, it spotlights the role of Thatcherism in forging a neoliberal consensus in British politics which is beginning to suffer a number of serious contemporary challenges. It outlines a conception of neoliberalism as a governmental rationality that coalesced in the Thatcher years, and which has three defining features: a tendency to depoliticise ever-wider areas of public policy as a reaction to a perceived crisis of governability in the 1970s; a constant striving to expand the scope of economic measurement so as to generate new forms of competition in markets,
quasi-markets and elsewhere; and, persistent attempts to create citizens more amenable to a Thatcherite or neoliberal style of government, most notably in the case of 'workfare'. The beginnings of each of these trends are located in the Thatcher years, before the argument is presented that this style of government has persisted far beyond the Thatcher years but has more recently come under unprecedented strain since the 2016 EU referendum. Developments such as the rise of rival populisms of the left and right, shifts in public opinion on a range of social issues, and a major transformation of Britain's party system, have all combined to ensure that the continued viability of the Thatcherite settlement in British politics has to be considered to be in some doubt. Overall, the paper aims to contribute to the rich field of already existing theoretical interpretations of Thatcherism and to link these to wider scholarship on the development of neo-liberalism in the UK through the Thatcher period and beyond.

Ruth Davidson (King’s College London) “Thatcher’s Legacy and Social Security”

The British social security system has undergone many changes since 1948. In part this is unsurprising, demographic, social and economic changes have created a society that is very different from that of 1948 and successive governments have struggled with complexity and cost. However, arguably, 1979 represents a key disjuncture. The Thatcher government with its emphasis on ‘vigoruous virtues’ such as self-reliance and responsibility sought to roll back a system that they believed encouraged dependency. This paper will explore the degree to which the Thatcher administration achieved this. In assessing the legacy of Thatcher this paper will also contend that we need to look before 1979 to see the roots of this approach. It will acknowledge the limitations of her administration in delivering on the radicalism of her rhetoric and that the most fundamental process of restructuring came in the period after Thatcher. But will emphasise that this latter process was underpinned by some profound shifts in public responses to social security that were fuelled by Thatcher’s more strident language. The governments that followed Thatcher did not blindly follow her mandate, they had their own priorities and concerns which inflected their policy decisions. However, in broad terms, the history of social security is that of the gradual accretion of the safety net. This paper outlines this process and in doing so points to the on-going influence of the Thatcherite legacy at play in the justification for these changes.
It is well-known that Mrs. Thatcher was a nationalist and a war leader, but few historians have reflected on her economic strategy in defence. This paper reveals how throughout Thatcher’s premiership, the government consistently sought to maintain a powerful military-industrial complex in Britain and Europe. Moreover, this militaristic techno-nationalism frustrated the economic liberalism of the British state, going against the advice of the Policy Unit, the Treasury and at times also the Ministry of Defence and armed forces who urged buying American military machines. In defence procurement, we see a desire for free markets was not imposed by Margaret Thatcher, but blocked by her. The liberal right offered some rare public criticism of these policies. Crucially, though, there arguments did not narrowly focus around market economics, but were more concerned with interest groups and state secrecy. These ‘neo-liberals’ had a greater concern for democracy than much of the recent literature would allow us to appreciate. This paper reflects on how using ‘neo-liberalism’ as a historical framework obscures not only Thatcher’s economic nationalism and its critics, but also masks critical questions about state power and economic nationalism in twentieth century British history more generally.
Margaret Thatcher: 40 Years On

Somerville College, Oxford | Saturday 15th June 2019

A day of talks to mark the 40th anniversary of Margaret Thatcher becoming Prime Minister, held at her Oxford college and co-organised with the Margaret Thatcher Centre. Features Conservative parliamentarians, advisors to Thatcher and academics, including:

**Rev’d Jonathan Aitken**
Author of *Margaret Thatcher: Power and Personality* and former Conservative MP

**Rt Hon Sir John Redwood**
Margaret Thatcher’s Chief of Policy, 1982-87; Conservative MP for Wokingham

**John O’Sullivan CBE**
Speechwriter to Margaret Thatcher; author of *The President, the Pope, and the Prime Minister*

**Caroline Slocock**
Margaret Thatcher’s Private Secretary; author of *People Like Us: Margaret Thatcher and Me*

**Professor Tim Bale**
Professor of Politics at Queen Mary, University of London; author of *The Conservative Party from Thatcher to Cameron*

Tickets are still available via the Eventbrite page with a discount for attendees at this conference. More information is available from David and Antony.