

# AP EUROPEAN HISTORY

## UNIT 10

### *The Cold War Era and Contemporary Europe*



# Unit Plan

## and Pacing Guide

# Unit 10

## *The Cold War & Contemporary Europe*

<b>PART ONE</b> <i>The Cold War Era</i>	Kagan, 940-956, 964-973 OR WOOD, 488-502, 518-522 <a href="#">Document 10.#</a> (Pipes on Gorbachev's Reforms)
<b>PART TWO</b> <i>Contemporary Europe</i> Feminism, Religion, and Philosophy	Kagan, 993, 996-1001, 1006-1008 OR WOOD, 513-516 <a href="#">Document 10.#</a> (Simone de Beauvoir, <i>The Second Sex</i> )
<b>PART THREE</b> <i>Contemporary Europe</i> Politics, Diplomacy, and Demographics	Kagan, 988-993, 994-995 OR WOOD, 522-541 <a href="#">Document 10.#</a> (Thatcher, "The Lady's Not For Turning") <a href="#">Document 10.#</a> (Clegg on Thatcher)
<b>ASSESSMENT</b>	MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST DBQ

### KEY CONTENT:

Cold War, the Welfare State, Feminism, Immigration, Margaret Thatcher, the European Union, the Roman Catholic Church, War on Terror

# Document 10.#

## Interview with Richard Pipes (Professor Emeritus, Harvard University)

PBS: [http://www.pbs.org/heavenonearth/interviews\\_pipes.html](http://www.pbs.org/heavenonearth/interviews_pipes.html)

### **Did Gorbachev think communism could work in Russia if it were reformed?**

Gorbachev abandoned the idea of reforming Russia. I know this from one of his close assistants who told me that they tried to make reforms in 1985, 1986, 1987 and he told me that by 1988 they realized that the system is unreformable. You either take it as it is or demolish it. So he began slowly to demolish it by bringing the population into the process. By allowing *glasnost*, which is freedom of speech, and having elections. And that destroyed the system. I don't think he wanted it originally but he found that he could do it no other way.

He was at Harvard here last week or was it two weeks ago, he gave a speech in which he said, the *perestroika* which he launched is not in the past, it's in the future. Russia still has not gone through *perestroika* which he wanted for it.

Gorbachev probably believed in socialism, I mean he was raised by it and he could not have gotten where he was, membership in the Politburo and then chairmanship of it, if he hadn't. But he developed very profound doubts and he describes it in his memoirs when he says, when he traveled in Western Europe, he traveled definitely in France, I think also Belgium, and so on, he said he was astonished by what he saw. Not the wealth and the prosperity, but the way people talked and the way people behaved. How free they were. How freely they expressed their opinion. That had a shattering effect on him, in a very positive way. He came back to Russia he was a changed man.

### **What do you think the future holds for socialism? Is it dead and buried?**

Socialism is not dead and even communism is not completely dead because the idea of a truly egalitarian human society where nobody is richer than anybody else, everybody shares everything, is very deeply embedded in the human psyche. It goes back to the eighth century BC. You have it in Plato. Plato is of course later than eighth century, fourth century, but Plato spoke about that, about dissolving our personality in society and so on -- sharing our wives and sharing our children. I think this idea will always exist. Temporarily it has suffered a terrible setback but I wouldn't consider it buried forever.

### **What is the legacy of socialism, as you see it?**

The worst legacy of socialism is the destructiveness, which, if you consider communism part of socialism, the destructiveness which it caused in so many countries, which followed it. I mean, Russia today is far worse off than Russia was in 1913, 1914, before World War I. Cuba is much worse off. North Korea is a disaster area where children are malnourished and raised deformed. This is a horrible thing. Has it left any positive effect? I was at a conference in Switzerland ten years ago right after the collapse of the Soviet Union and it was the first time this was a World Economic Forum, the first time the Russian delegation came and we talked to them, and I said, "Do you see any positive effect of communism, any legacy that it left that is positive?" And they scratched their heads and they talked to each other and then said, "Yes one positive legacy -- the educational system. We have a better educational system than we've had in the past." That may be granted perhaps.

### **Why didn't the Soviet Union's social welfare system work?**

The social welfare system was not sustainable. Social welfare can only be sustainable where you have a high level of productivity, such as in our societies. You can then spend a lot of money on social welfare. But they couldn't, therefore the social welfare system even as it existed provided the bare, bare minimum. I think something like half the population under communism lived on less than \$10 a month. So if you want to have a good social welfare system, you first of all have to increase productivity and it cannot be done under socialism or communism.

### **Can socialism work anywhere today?**

I definitely feel the flaw lies embedded in socialism because people have certainly tried to enforce it by peaceful means, such as in Chile, in very violent means as in China or Cambodia, it always has failed... it's not a good idea that didn't work out, it was a bad idea, and it cannot work.

# Document 10.#

## Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (1949)

Source: <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/introduction.htm>

### Introduction

#### *Woman as Other*

FOR a long time I have hesitated to write a book on woman...

But first we must ask: what is a woman? 'Tota mulier in utero', says one, 'woman is a womb'. But in speaking of certain women, connoisseurs declare that they are not women, although they are equipped with a uterus like the rest. All agree in recognising the fact that females exist in the human species; today as always they make up about one half of humanity. And yet we are told that femininity is in danger; we are exhorted to be women, remain women, become women. It would appear, then, that every female human being is not necessarily a woman; to be so considered she must share in that mysterious and threatened reality known as femininity. Is this attribute something secreted by the ovaries? Or is it a Platonic essence, a product of the philosophic imagination? ...

... The biological and social sciences no longer admit the existence of unchangeably fixed entities that determine given characteristics, such as those ascribed to woman, the Jew, or the Negro. Science regards any characteristic as a reaction dependent in part upon a *situation*. If today femininity no longer exists, then it never existed. But does the word *woman*, then, have no specific content? This is stoutly affirmed by those who hold to the philosophy of the enlightenment, of rationalism, of nominalism; women, to them, are merely the human beings arbitrarily designated by the word *woman*. Many American women particularly are prepared to think that there is no longer any place for woman as such; if a backward individual still takes herself for a woman, her friends advise her to be psychoanalysed and thus get rid of this obsession. In regard to a work, *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex*, which in other respects has its irritating features, Dorothy Parker has written: 'I cannot be just to books which treat of woman as woman ... My idea is that all of us, men as well as women, should be regarded as human beings.' But nominalism is a rather inadequate doctrine, and the antifeminists have had no trouble in showing that women simply *are* not men. Surely woman is, like man, a human being; but such a declaration is abstract. The fact is that every concrete human being is always a singular, separate individual. To decline to accept such notions as the eternal feminine, the black soul, the Jewish character, is not to deny that Jews, Negroes, women exist today – this denial does not represent a liberation for those concerned, but rather a flight from reality. Some years ago a well-known woman writer refused to permit her portrait to appear in a series of photographs especially devoted to women writers; she wished to be counted among the men. But in order to gain this privilege she made use of her husband's influence! Women who assert that they are men lay claim none the less to masculine consideration and respect. I recall also a young Trotskyite standing on a platform at a boisterous meeting and getting ready to use her fists, in spite of her evident fragility. She was denying her feminine weakness; but it was for love of a militant male whose equal she wished to be. The attitude of defiance of many American women proves that they are haunted by a sense of their femininity. In truth, to go for a walk with one's eyes open is enough to demonstrate that humanity is divided into two classes of individuals whose clothes, faces, bodies, smiles, gaits, interests, and occupations are manifestly different. Perhaps these differences are superficial, perhaps they are destined to disappear. What is certain is that they do most obviously exist.

If her functioning as a female is not enough to define woman, if we decline also to explain her through 'the eternal feminine', and if nevertheless we admit, provisionally, that women do exist, then we must face the question "what is a woman"?

To state the question is, to me, to suggest, at once, a preliminary answer. The fact that I ask it is in itself significant. A man would never set out to write a book on the peculiar situation of the human male. But if I wish to define myself, I must first of all say: 'I am a woman'; on this truth must be based all further discussion. A man never begins by presenting himself as an individual of a certain sex; it goes without saying that he is a man. The terms *masculine* and *feminine* are used symmetrically only as a matter of form, as on legal papers. In actuality the relation of the two sexes is not quite like that of two electrical poles, for man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of *man* to designate human

beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, without reciprocity. In the midst of an abstract discussion it is vexing to hear a man say: 'You think thus and so because you are a woman'; but I know that my only defence is to reply: 'I think thus and so because it is true,' thereby removing my subjective self from the argument. It would be out of the question to reply: 'And you think the contrary because you are a man', for it is understood that the fact of being a man is no peculiarity. A man is in the right in being a man; it is the woman who is in the wrong. It amounts to this: just as for the ancients there was an absolute vertical with reference to which the oblique was defined, so there is an absolute human type, the masculine. Woman has ovaries, a uterus: these peculiarities imprison her in her subjectivity, circumscribe her within the limits of her own nature. It is often said that she thinks with her glands. Man superbly ignores the fact that his anatomy also includes glands, such as the testicles, and that they secrete hormones. He thinks of his body as a direct and normal connection with the world, which he believes he apprehends objectively, whereas he regards the body of woman as a hindrance, a prison, weighed down by everything peculiar to it. 'The female is a female by virtue of a certain lack of qualities,' said Aristotle; 'we should regard the female nature as afflicted with a natural defectiveness.' And St Thomas for his part pronounced woman to be an 'imperfect man', an 'incidental' being. This is symbolised in Genesis where Eve is depicted as made from what Bossuet called 'a supernumerary bone' of Adam.

Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. Michelet writes: 'Woman, the relative being ...' And Benda is most positive in his *Rapport d'Uriel*: 'The body of man makes sense in itself quite apart from that of woman, whereas the latter seems wanting in significance by itself ... Man can think of himself without woman. She cannot think of herself without man.' And she is simply what man decrees; thus she is called 'the sex', by which is meant that she appears essentially to the male as a sexual being. For him she is sex – absolute sex, no less. She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute – she is the Other.'

The category of the *Other* is as primordial as consciousness itself. In the most primitive societies, in the most ancient mythologies, one finds the expression of a duality – that of the Self and the Other... [for example,] the contrasts between Good and Evil, lucky and unlucky auspices, right and left, God and Lucifer. Otherness is a fundamental category of human thought.

Thus it is that no group ever sets itself up as the One without at once setting up the Other over against itself.

-----

Whence comes this submission in the case of woman?

There are, to be sure, other cases in which a certain category has been able to dominate another completely for a time. Very often this privilege depends upon inequality of numbers – the majority imposes its rule upon the minority or persecutes it. But women are not a minority, like the American Negroes or the Jews; there are as many women as men on earth. Again, the two groups concerned have often been originally independent; they may have been formerly unaware of each other's existence, or perhaps they recognized each other's autonomy. But a historical event has resulted in the subjugation of the weaker by the stronger. The scattering of the Jews, the introduction of slavery into America, the conquests of imperialism are examples in point. In these cases the oppressed retained at least the memory of former days; they possessed in common a past, a tradition, sometimes a religion or a culture.

The parallel drawn by Bebel between women and the proletariat is valid in that neither ever formed a minority or a separate collective unit of mankind. And instead of a single historical event it is in both cases a historical development that explains their status as a class and accounts for the membership of *particular individuals* in that class. But proletarians have not always existed, whereas there have always been women. They are women in virtue of their anatomy and physiology. Throughout history they have always been subordinated to men, and hence their dependency is not the result of a historical event or a social change – it was not something that *occurred*. The reason why otherness in this case seems to be an absolute is in part that it lacks the contingent or incidental nature of historical facts. A condition brought about at a certain time can be abolished at some other time, as the Negroes of Haiti and others have proved: but it might seem that natural condition is beyond the possibility of change. In truth, however, the nature of things is no more immutably given, once for all, than is historical reality. If woman seems to be the inessential which never becomes the essential, it is because she herself fails to bring about this change. Proletarians say 'We'; Negroes also. Regarding themselves as subjects, they transform the bourgeois, the whites, into 'others'. But women do

not say 'We', except at some congress of feminists or similar formal demonstration; men say 'women', and women use the same word in referring to themselves. They do not authentically assume a subjective attitude. The proletarians have accomplished the revolution in Russia, the Negroes in Haiti, the [Indo-Chinese](#) are battling for it in Indo-China; but the women's effort has never been anything more than a symbolic agitation. They have gained only what men have been willing to grant; they have taken nothing, they have only received.

The reason for this is that women lack concrete means for organizing themselves into a unit which can stand face to face with the correlative unit. They have no past, no history, no religion of their own; and they have no such solidarity of work and interest as that of the proletariat. They are not even promiscuously herded together in the way that creates community feeling among the American Negroes, the ghetto Jews, the workers of Saint-Denis, or the factory hands of Renault. They live dispersed among the males, attached through residence, housework, economic condition, and social standing to certain men – fathers or husbands – more firmly than they are to other women. If they belong to the bourgeoisie, they feel solidarity with men of that class, not with proletarian women; if they are white, their allegiance is to white men, not to Negro women. The proletariat can propose to massacre the ruling class, and a sufficiently fanatical Jew or Negro might dream of getting sole possession of the atomic bomb and making humanity wholly Jewish or black; but woman cannot even dream of exterminating the males. The bond that unites her to her oppressors is not comparable to any other. The division of the sexes is a biological fact, not an event in human history... The couple is a fundamental unity with its two halves riveted together, and the cleavage of society along the line of sex is impossible. Here is to be found the basic trait of woman: she is the Other in a totality of which the two components are necessary to one another.

One could suppose that this reciprocity might have facilitated the liberation of woman. When Hercules sat at the feet of Omphale and helped with her spinning, his desire for her held him captive; but why did she fail to gain a lasting power? To revenge herself on Jason, [Medea](#) killed their children; and this grim legend would seem to suggest that she might have obtained a formidable influence over him through his love for his offspring. In [Lysistrata](#) [Aristophanes](#) gaily depicts a band of women who joined forces to gain social ends through the sexual needs of their men; but this is only a play. In the legend of the Sabine women, the latter soon abandoned their plan of remaining sterile to punish their ravishers. In truth woman has not been socially emancipated through man's need – sexual desire and the desire for offspring – which makes the male dependent for satisfaction upon the female.

Master and slave, also, are united by a reciprocal need, in this case economic, which does not liberate the slave. In the relation of master to slave the master does not make a point of the need that he has for the other; he has in his grasp the power of satisfying this need through his own action; whereas the slave, in his dependent condition, his hope and fear, is quite conscious of the need he has for his master. Even if the need is at bottom equally urgent for both, it always works in favor of the oppressor and against the oppressed. That is why the liberation of the working class, for example, has been slow.

Now, woman has always been man's dependant, if not his slave; the two sexes have never shared the world in equality. And even today woman is heavily handicapped, though her situation is beginning to change. Almost nowhere is her legal status the same as man's, and frequently it is much to her disadvantage. Even when her rights are legally recognized in the abstract, long-standing custom prevents their full expression in the mores. In the economic sphere men and women can almost be said to make up two castes; other things being equal, the former hold the better jobs, get higher wages, and have more opportunity for success than their new competitors. In industry and politics men have a great many more positions and they monopolize the most important posts. In addition to all this, they enjoy a traditional prestige that the education of children tends in every way to support, for the present enshrines the past – and in the past all history has been made by men. At the present time, when women are beginning to take part in the affairs of the world, it is still a world that belongs to men – they have no doubt of it at all and women have scarcely any. To decline to be the Other, to refuse to be a party to the deal – this would be for women to renounce all the advantages conferred upon them by their alliance with the superior caste. Man-the-sovereign will provide woman-the-liege with material protection and will undertake the moral justification of her existence; thus she can evade at once both economic risk and the metaphysical risk of a liberty in which ends and aims must be contrived without assistance. Indeed, along with the ethical urge of each individual to affirm his subjective existence, there is also the temptation to forgo liberty and become a thing. This is an inauspicious road, for he who takes it – passive, lost, ruined – becomes henceforth the creature of another's will, frustrated in his transcendence and deprived of every value. But it is an easy road; on it one avoids the strain involved in undertaking an authentic

existence... Thus, woman may fail to lay claim to the status of subject because she lacks definite resources, because she feels the necessary bond that ties her to man regardless of reciprocity, and because she is often very well pleased with her role as the Other.

But it will be asked at once: how did all this begin? It is easy to see that the duality of the sexes, like any duality, gives rise to conflict. And doubtless the winner will assume the status of absolute. But why should man have won from the start? It seems possible that women could have won the victory; or that the outcome of the conflict might never have been decided. How is it that this world has always belonged to the men and that things have begun to change only recently? Is this change a good thing? Will it bring about an equal sharing of the world between men and women?

-----

Legislators, priests, philosophers, writers, and scientists have striven to show that the subordinate position of woman is willed in heaven and advantageous on earth. The religions invented by men reflect this wish for domination. In the legends of Eve and Pandora men have taken up arms against women. They have made use of philosophy and theology, as the quotations from Aristotle and St Thomas have shown. Since ancient times satirists and moralists have delighted in showing up the weaknesses of women... the Roman law limiting the rights of woman cited 'the imbecility, the instability of the sex' just when the weakening of family ties seemed to threaten the interests of male heirs. And in the effort to keep the married woman under guardianship, appeal was made in the sixteenth century to the authority of St Augustine, who declared that 'woman is a creature neither decisive nor constant', at a time when the single woman was thought capable of managing her property...

It was only later, in the eighteenth century, that genuinely democratic men began to view the matter objectively. Diderot, among others, strove to show that woman is, like man, a human being. Later John Stuart Mill came fervently to her defense. But these philosophers displayed unusual impartiality. In the nineteenth century the feminist quarrel became again a quarrel of partisans. One of the consequences of the industrial revolution was the entrance of women into productive labor, and it was just here that the claims of the feminists emerged from the realm of theory and acquired an economic basis, while their opponents became the more aggressive. Although landed property lost power to some extent, the bourgeoisie clung to the old morality that found the guarantee of private property in the solidity of the family. Woman was ordered back into the home the more harshly as her emancipation became a real menace. Even within the working class the men endeavored to restrain woman's liberation, because they began to see the women as dangerous competitors – the more so because they were accustomed to work for lower wages.

In proving woman's inferiority, the anti-feminists then began to draw not only upon religion, philosophy, and theology, as before, but also upon science – biology, experimental psychology, etc. At most they were willing to grant 'equality in difference' to the other sex. That profitable formula is most significant; it is precisely like the 'separate but equal' formula of the Jim Crow laws aimed at the North American Negroes. As is well known, this so-called equalitarian segregation has resulted only in the most extreme discrimination. The similarity just noted is in no way due to chance, for whether it is a race, a caste, a class, or a sex that is reduced to a position of inferiority, the methods of justification are the same. 'The eternal feminine' corresponds to 'the black soul' and to 'the Jewish character'. True, the Jewish problem is on the whole very different from the other two – to the anti-Semite the Jew is not so much an inferior as he is an enemy for whom there is to be granted no place on earth, for whom annihilation is the fate desired. But there are deep similarities between the situation of woman and that of the Negro. Both are being emancipated today from a like paternalism, and the former master class wishes to 'keep them in their place' – that is, the place chosen for them. In both cases the former masters lavish more or less sincere eulogies, either on the virtues of 'the good Negro' with his dormant, childish, merry soul – the submissive Negro – or on the merits of the woman who is 'truly feminine' – that is, frivolous, infantile, irresponsible the submissive woman. In both cases the dominant class bases its argument on a state of affairs that it has itself created. As George Bernard Shaw puts it, in substance, 'The American white relegates the black to the rank of shoeshine boy; and he concludes from this that the black is good for nothing but shining shoes.' This vicious circle is met with in all analogous circumstances; when an individual (or a group of individuals) is kept in a situation of inferiority, the fact is that he is inferior... Yes, women on the whole *are* today inferior to men; that is, their situation affords them fewer possibilities. The question is: should that state of affairs continue?

Many men hope that it will continue; not all have given up the battle. The conservative bourgeoisie still see in the emancipation of women a menace to their morality and their interests. Some men dread feminine competition. Recently a male student wrote in the *Hebdo-Latin*: 'Every woman student who goes into medicine or law robs us of a job.' He never questioned his rights in this world....

Here is a miraculous balm for those afflicted with an inferiority complex, and indeed no one is more arrogant towards women, more aggressive or scornful, than the man who is anxious about his virility. Those who are not fear-ridden in the presence of their fellow men are much more disposed to recognize a fellow creature in woman; but even to these the myth of Woman, the Other, is precious for many reasons. They cannot be blamed for not cheerfully relinquishing all the benefits they derive from the myth, for they realize what they would lose in relinquishing woman as they fancy her to be, while they fail to realize what they have to gain from the woman of tomorrow. Refusal to pose oneself as the Subject, unique and absolute, requires great self-denial. Furthermore, the vast majority of men make no such claim explicitly. They do not postulate woman as inferior, for today they are too thoroughly imbued with the ideal of democracy not to recognize all human beings as equals....

So it is that many men will affirm as if in good faith that women are the equals of man and that they have nothing to clamor for, while *at the same time* they will say that women can never be the equals of man and that their demands are in vain. It is, in point of fact, a difficult matter for man to realize the extreme importance of social discriminations which seem outwardly insignificant but which produce in woman moral and intellectual effects so profound that they appear to spring from her original nature. The most sympathetic of men never fully comprehend woman's concrete situation....

.... Then from woman's point of view I shall describe the world in which women must live; and thus we shall be able to envisage the difficulties in their way as, endeavoring to make their escape from the sphere hitherto assigned them, they aspire to full membership in the human race.



# Reading Guide 10.#

## Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (1949)

Source: <http://www2.cddc.vt.edu/marxists/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/introduction.htm>

**KEY TERMS:** Existentialism, Marxism, Woman, Female, Feminine, Subject, Object, “the Other”

Something to keep in mind as you read:

“Correlation does not imply causation.”

For an explanation of this principle, consult [Wikipedia](#).

# Document 10.#

## Margaret Thatcher, "The Lady's Not For Turning"

This speech was delivered to the Conservative party conference in Brighton on October 10 1980

*The Guardian:* <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2007/apr/30/conservatives.uk1>

Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen...

At our party conference last year I said that the task in which the government were engaged - to change the national attitude of mind - was the most challenging to face any British administration since the war. Challenge is exhilarating. This week we Conservatives have been taking stock, discussing the achievements, the setbacks and the work that lies ahead as we enter our second parliamentary year...

When I am asked for a detailed forecast of what will happen in the coming months or years, I remember Sam Goldwyn's advice: "Never prophesy, especially about the future." ([Interruption from the floor](#)) Never mind, it is wet outside. I expect that they wanted to come in. You cannot blame them; it is always better where the Tories are...

This week at Brighton we have heard a good deal about last week at Blackpool.<sup>1</sup> I will have a little more to say about that strange assembly later, but for the moment I want to say just this. Because of what happened at that conference, there has been, behind all our deliberations this week, a heightened awareness that now, more than ever, our Conservative government must succeed. We just must, because now there is even more at stake than some had realised.

There are many things to be done to set this nation on the road to recovery, and I do not mean economic recovery alone, but a new independence of spirit and zest for achievement....

In its first 17 months, this government have laid the foundations for recovery. We have undertaken a heavy load of legislation, a load we do not intend to repeat because we do not share the socialist fantasy that achievement is measured by the number of laws you pass. But there was a formidable barricade of obstacles that we had to sweep aside. For a start, in his first budget Geoffrey Howe began to rest incentives to stimulate the abilities and inventive genius of our people. Prosperity comes not from grand conferences of economists but by countless acts of personal self-confidence and self-reliance.

Under Geoffrey's stewardship, Britain has repaid \$3,600m of international debt, debt which had been run up by our predecessors. And we paid quite a lot of it before it was due. In the past 12 months Geoffrey has abolished exchange controls over which British governments have dithered for decades... We have made the first crucial changes in trade union law to remove the worst abuses of the **closed shop**,<sup>2</sup> to restrict picketing to the place of work of the parties in dispute, and to encourage secret ballots.

Jim Prior has carried all these measures through with the support of the vast majority of trade union members ... British Aerospace will soon be open to **private investment**. The monopoly of the Post Office and British Telecommunications is being diminished. The barriers to private generation of electricity for sale have been lifted. For the first time nationalised industries and public utilities can be investigated by the monopolies commission - a long overdue reform ...<sup>3</sup>

Michael Heseltine has given to millions - yes, millions - of council tenants the right to buy their own homes. It was Anthony Eden who chose for us the goal of "a property-owning democracy". But for all the time that I have been in public affairs, that has been beyond the reach of so many, who were denied

---

<sup>1</sup> The opposition Labour Party had held its conference the week before, at which its leaders unveiled an anti-Thatcher agenda.

<sup>2</sup> A provision requiring all employees at an establishment to join a labor union

<sup>3</sup> Thatcher's government privatized many sectors of the British economy that had previously been operated by the government.

the right to the most basic ownership of all - the homes in which they live. They wanted to buy. Many could afford to buy. But they happened to live under the jurisdiction of a socialist council, which would not sell and did not believe in the independence that comes with ownership. Now Michael Heseltine has given them the chance to turn a dream into reality. And all this and a lot more in 17 months.

The left continues to refer with relish to the death of capitalism. Well, if this is the death of capitalism, I must say that it is quite a way to go.

But all this will avail us little unless we achieve our prime economic objective - the defeat of inflation. Inflation destroys nations and societies as surely as invading armies do. Inflation is the parent of unemployment. It is the unseen robber of those who have saved. No policy which puts at risk the defeat of inflation - however great its short-term attraction - can be right....

Meanwhile, we are not heedless of the hardships and worries that accompany the conquest of inflation. Foremost among these is unemployment. Today our country has more than 2 million unemployed....

...The level of unemployment in our country today is a human tragedy. Let me make it clear beyond doubt. I am profoundly concerned about unemployment. Human dignity and self-respect are undermined when men and women are condemned to idleness. The waste of a country's most precious assets - the talent and energy of its people - makes it the bounden duty of government to seek a real and lasting cure....

I know that there is another real worry affecting many of our people. Although they accept that our policies are right, they feel deeply that the burden of carrying them out is falling much more heavily on the private than on the public sector. They say that the public sector is enjoying advantages but the private sector is taking the knocks and at the same time maintaining those in the public sector with better pay and pensions than they enjoy.

I must tell you that I share this concern and understand the resentment. That is why I and my colleagues say that to add to public spending takes away the very money and resources that industry needs to stay in business, let alone to expand. Higher public spending, far from curing unemployment, can be the very vehicle that loses jobs and causes bankruptcies in trade and commerce. That is why we warned local authorities that since rates are frequently the biggest tax that industry now faces, increases in them can cripple local businesses. Councils must, therefore, learn to cut costs in the same way that companies have to....

If spending money like water was the answer to our country's problems, we would have no problems now. If ever a nation has spent, spent, spent and spent again, ours has. Today that dream is over. All of that money has got us nowhere, but it still has to come from somewhere....

Of course, our vision and our aims go far beyond the complex arguments of economics, but unless we get the economy right we shall deny our people the opportunity to share that vision and to see beyond the narrow horizons of economic necessity. Without a healthy economy we cannot have a healthy society. Without a healthy society the economy will not stay healthy for long.

But it is not the state that creates a healthy society. When the state grows too powerful, people feel that they count for less and less. The state drains society, not only of its wealth but of initiative, of energy, the will to improve and innovate as well as to preserve what is best. Our aim is to let people feel that they count for more and more. If we cannot trust the deepest instincts of our people, we should not be in politics at all. Some aspects of our present society really do offend those instincts.

Decent people do want to do a proper job at work, not to be restrained or intimidated from giving value for money. They believe that honesty should be respected, not derided. They see crime and violence as a threat, not just to society but to their own orderly way of life. They want to be allowed to bring up their children in these beliefs, without the fear that their efforts will be daily frustrated in the name of progress or free expression. Indeed, that is what family life is all about.

There is not a generation gap in a happy and united family. People yearn to be able to rely on some generally accepted standards. Without them you have not got a society at all, you have purposeless anarchy. A healthy society is not created by its institutions, either. Great schools and universities do not make a great nation any more than great armies do. Only a great nation can create and involve great institutions - of learning, of healing, of scientific advance. And a great nation is the voluntary creation of its people - a people composed of men and women whose pride in themselves is founded on the knowledge of what they can give to a community of which they in turn can be proud.

If our people feel that they are part of a great nation and they are prepared to will the means to keep it great, a great nation we shall be, and shall remain. So, what can stop us from achieving this? What then stands in our way? The prospect of another [winter of discontent](#)?<sup>4</sup> I suppose it might. But I prefer to believe that certain lessons have been learned from experience, that we are coming, slowly, painfully, to an autumn of understanding. And I hope that it will be followed by a winter of common sense. If it is not, we shall not be diverted from our course.

**To those waiting with bated breath for that favourite media catchphrase, the "U" turn, I have only one thing to say. "You turn if you want to. The lady's not for turning." I say that not only to you but to our friends overseas and also to those who are not our friends.**

In foreign affairs we have pursued our national interest robustly while remaining alive to the needs and interests of others. Long before we came into office, and therefore long before the invasion of Afghanistan, I was pointing to the threat from the east. I was accused of scaremongering. But events have more than justified my words. Soviet Marxism is ideologically, politically and morally bankrupt. But militarily the Soviet Union is a powerful and growing threat.

Yet it was Mr Kosygin who said, "No peace loving country, no person of integrity, should remain indifferent when an aggressor holds human life and world opinion in insolent contempt." We agree. The British government are not indifferent to the occupation of Afghanistan. We shall not allow it to be forgotten. Unless and until the Soviet troops are withdrawn, other nations are bound to wonder which of them may be next. Of course there are those who say that by speaking out we are complicating east-west relations, that we are endangering *detente*.<sup>5</sup> But the real danger would lie in keeping silent. Detente is indivisible and it is a two-way process.

The Soviet Union cannot conduct wars by proxy in south-east Asia and Africa, foment trouble in the Middle East and Caribbean and invade neighbouring countries and still expect to conduct business as usual. Unless detente is pursued by both sides it can be pursued by neither, and it is a delusion to suppose otherwise....

The workers of Poland in their millions have signalled their determination to participate in the shaping of their destiny.<sup>6</sup> We salute them. Marxists claim that the capitalist system is in crisis. But the Polish workers have shown that it is the communist system that is in crisis. The Polish people should be left to work out their own future without external interference....

---

<sup>4</sup> The unusually cold winter of 1978-1979 was made worse by a massive wave of strikes by public employees. The Labour government's inability to control the strikes paved the way for Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Party to win a majority in the 1979 general election.

<sup>5</sup> *Détente* refers to the lessening of tensions between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies during the 1970s. Margaret Thatcher, along with her U.S. counterpart, Ronald Reagan, believed that the Soviets had made the continuation of *détente* impossible and that the West would need to take a hard-line stance when it came to Soviet communism.

<sup>6</sup> In 1980, Lech Walesa founded the Solidarity trade union, which was the first labor union in the Eastern Bloc to operate independently from the Communist Party. Thatcher saluted Solidarity in the midst of an attempt to repress the movement by the Soviet-backed communist government of Poland. Solidarity, which enjoyed the support of the new Polish-born Pope, John Paul II, finally won control of the government in 1989, as the Soviets withdrew from the Eastern Bloc.

The irresponsibility of the left on defence increases as the dangers which we face loom larger. We, for our part ... have chosen a defence policy which potential foes will respect. We are acquiring, with the cooperation of the United States government, the [Trident missile](#) system. This will ensure the credibility of our strategic deterrent until the end of the century and beyond, and it was very important for the reputation of Britain abroad that we should keep our independent nuclear deterrent as well as for our citizens here.

We have agreed to the stationing of cruise missiles in this country. The unilateralists object, but the recent willingness of the Soviet government to open a new round of arms control negotiations shows the wisdom of our firmness. We intend to maintain and, where possible, to improve our conventional forces so as to pull our weight in the alliance. We have no wish to seek a free ride at the expense of our allies. We will play our full part.

**In Europe we have shown that it is possible to combine a vigorous defence of our own interests with a deep commitment to the idea and to the ideals of the community....**

With each day it becomes clearer that in the wider world we face darkening horizons... Europe and North America are centres of stability in an increasingly anxious world. The community and the alliance are the guarantee to other countries that democracy and freedom of choice are still possible. They stand for order and the rule of law in an age when disorder and lawlessness are ever more widespread.

The British government intend to stand by both these great institutions, the community and NATO. We will not betray them. The restoration of Britain's place in the world and of the west's confidence in its own destiny are two aspects of the same process. No doubt there will be unexpected twists in the road, but with wisdom and resolution we can reach our goal. I believe we will show the wisdom and you may be certain that we will show the resolution.

In his warm-hearted and generous speech, Peter Thorneycroft said that when people are called upon to lead great nations, they must look into the hearts and minds of the people whom they seek to govern. I would add that those who seek to govern must, in turn, be willing to allow their hearts and minds to lie open to the people.

This afternoon I have tried to set before you some of my most deeply held convictions and beliefs. This party, which I am privileged to serve, and this government, which I am proud to lead, are engaged in the massive task of restoring confidence and stability to our people.

I have always known that that task was vital. Since last week it has become even more vital than ever. We close our conference in the aftermath of that sinister utopia unveiled at Blackpool. Let Labour's Orwellian nightmare of the left be the spur for us to dedicate, with a new urgency, our every ounce of energy and moral strength to rebuild the fortunes of this free nation.

If we were to fail, that freedom could be imperilled. So let us resist the blandishments of the faint hearts; let us ignore the howls and threats of the extremists; let us stand together and do our duty, and we shall not fail.

## Document 10.#

### **“Nick Clegg: How Margaret Thatcher Inspires Me”**

*Nick Clegg, the Liberal Democrat leader, has spoken of his admiration for Baroness Thatcher and her Conservative government.*

By James Kirkup, Political Correspondent (5:39PM GMT 10 Mar 2010)

**The Telegraph:** <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics...Nick-Clegg-how-Margaret-Thatcher-inspires-me.html>

In an attempt to appeal to Tory voters, Mr Clegg said that his party's economic policies are more representative of Thatcherite free-market principles than those of David Cameron.

Many of Britain's current economic problems, Mr Clegg said, could be explained by a failure to enact the pro-competition policies put forward by Lady Thatcher.

He also said his party's tax policies were similar to those of Lord Lawson, the Conservative chancellor during the 1980s. The Lib Dem plan to raise the starting threshold for income tax to £10,000 is a “Lawson policy”, Mr Clegg said.

Mr Clegg's praise for Conservative figures may fuel speculation that he would be prepared to co-operate with the Tories in the event of a hung parliament after the election.

In an interview with *The Spectator* magazine, Mr Clegg said that he had campaigned against many of Lady Thatcher's policies during the 1980s. But, he said, he now realised that she had been right about many things.

‘I'm 43 now. I was at university at the height of the Thatcher revolution and I recognise now something I did not at the time: that her victory over a vested interest, the trade unions, was immensely significant. I don't want to be churlish: that was an immensely important visceral battle for how Britain is governed.

He added: “And what has now happened to the British economy? It has gone belly-up because, once again, we have allowed a vested interest to run riot.’

That “vested interest” is the banking sector, Mr Clegg said.

Mr Clegg said that Mr Cameron, the Tory leader, and George Osborne, the shadow chancellor, were unwilling to tackle the “vested interest” of the bankers.

He said: “A real liberal believes in genuine competition, a genuine level playing field and he is unremittingly hostile to vested interests.”

The Lib Dems are facing a strong challenge from the Conservatives at the general election. Tory strategists believe they can capture more than ten parliamentary seats currently held by Lib Dem MPs, most of them in the south and south-west of England.