Andrew Marr: In a few weeks’ time you could be Home Secretary. Will you at that point tell Donald Trump he’s not welcome here for a state visit?

Emily Thornberry: No, because he’s been invited, and I don’t think it’s right for us to disinvite him. I think it was a mistake to invite him quite as quickly as he was invited. Frankly, Obama had to wait for years, I think it would have been better to see him settle down.

Andrew Marr: Some people will say so much for your radical change and the ethical foreign policy. Jeremy Corbyn himself said he was not welcome in Britain.

Emily Thornberry: Yeah. I mean, you take these things in stages. I think we have to welcome the American President to Britain. We have to work with him. The difference that I have is I will be prepared to stand up to him. I would be prepared to say, ‘I’m sorry Mr President, but you’re wrong about that. We are supposed to be good friends, and these values are not our values. You are doing the wrong thing.’

Andrew Marr: So you have him over here and then you give him a scolding. You don’t dislike him, he may well not want to come under those circumstances.

Emily Thornberry: Well, there we are. I mean, I also here that he doesn’t want to share a carriage with Prince Charles because he doesn’t agree with Prince Charles on climate change. It will be a bumpy ride if President Trump comes to Britain.
Andrew Marr: He still comes here this summer if you’re Foreign Secretary?

Emily Thornberry: We can’t disinvite him once he’s invited. I think that that would be a great mistake.

Andrew Marr: Why not?

Emily Thornberry: Because I think that it would be to the detriment of our country.

Andrew Marr: Right, let’s move on to the ethical foreign policy directly. You’ve said that Labour, unlike the Conservatives, would not turn a blind eye to human rights abuses in, for instance, China. What does that actually mean?

Emily Thornberry: I think that we should not be afraid to raise these issues. And we should not be afraid to raise these issues despite the fact that we may be going for a trade deal with a particular country, but we do have to be clear about the things that we disagree with the country with. And I am very worried, I’m very worried that when I see Theresa May going to, you know, the Gulf states for example, and desperately after trade deals and so on, she doesn’t raise the issue of Yemen, she doesn’t raise the fact that Saudi Arabia has been bombing weddings and funerals and civilian targets and so on.

Andrew Marr: Is your ethical foreign policy sufficiently ethical, that if you raised these issues and you get given a very dusty response or a hostile response – the Chinese hate this kind of thing being raised – and you actually stopped trade deals happening, you’d go as far as to endanger trade deals, endanger the involvement of the Chinese, for instance, in our nuclear industry?
Emily Thornberry: Don’t take this too far. I’m not saying that we’re going to boycott China, for heaven’s sake. But there is a middle way through, you know, the sort of fawning, frankly, which I think that we have seen Theresa May indulging in in relation to Donald Trump, and the way in which we would approach things.

Andrew Marr: Let me turn, if I might, to Trident, because it’s another issue. You don’t like the Trump administration and yet we rely on that administration for very close cooperation to make our Trident submarines work in terms of targeting and so forth. Would you withdraw that cooperation? Will our nuclear deterrent still depend upon the Americans under Labour?

Emily Thornberry: The most important part of our defence is NATO. And that is a partnership that we have with America and the rest of our NATO allies and we are committed to that, and we should be. And we have been committed to NATO for a number of years, and that continues. And so we need to work collectively with NATO.

Andrew Marr: So from your point of view NATO is very, very important and a crucial part of our international obligations?

Emily Thornberry: Yes.

Andrew Marr: I ask you that because Jeremy Corbyn clearly disagrees with that. I’m going to ask you to look at something he said very recently. Here’s Jeremy Corbyn talking directly about NATO, and the words are very important.

Jeremy Corbyn: We in the radical end of the left of the unions and the Labour Party have got to be realistic that NATO is a major problem and a major difficulty and we have to campaign against NATO’s power, its influence and its global reach because it is a danger to world peace and a danger to world security.
**Andrew Marr:** So there is it. Are you going to campaign against NATO’s world power or not?

**Emily Thornberry:** I think that’s a quote from six years ago, and Jeremy has been on a journey, to coin a phrase, and there have been a number of discussions and it has been made – you know, it is quite clear that the predominance of opinion within the Labour Party is that we are committed to NATO. And the reality is that we have been relying on our partnership in NATO and the way that we have been buying things, the way in which we’ve been committing things, if we were to pull out of NATO our forces would be – for example, how we would get our forces off Salisbury Plain at the moment without the assistance of NATO? We don’t have enough frigates to be able to move them onto the continent of Europe if necessary, if the Russians were to come rolling over the hill.

**Andrew Marr:** Have you made these points to Jeremy Corbyn?

**Emily Thornberry:** Yes, I have.

**Andrew Marr:** And so you’ve put him back in his box compared with what he was saying, because he repeated those kind of sentiments during his first leadership campaign?

**Emily Thornberry:** You will see from the manifesto that our commitment to NATO is a clear one.

**Andrew Marr:** And you repudiate what Jeremy Corbyn was saying there in 2011?

**Emily Thornberry:** I’m not fighting with anybody, I’m telling you that the Labour Party’s position is a clear one, and I am Shadow Foreign Secretary.
**Andrew Marr:** So somebody who’s going to be Prime Minister, if you win the election, and he is saying that NATO is a major international problem and that the Labour Party should campaign against it.

**Emily Thornberry:** It’s not fair, if you heard what he said at Chatham House, he did not say this. He did not say this. You know, he’s clear that we have a commitment to NATO and that is that.

**Andrew Marr:** So you can unsay these kind of things?

**Emily Thornberry:** You can change your mind.

**Andrew Marr:** A very clear –

**Emily Thornberry:** You can change your mind. You’ll find that lots of politicians change their minds.

**Andrew Marr:** Let’s move on to the United Nations generally speaking.

**Emily Thornberry:** Yes.

**Andrew Marr:** Will a Labour government if Britain engage in military operations without the support of the UN ever?

**Emily Thornberry:** We don’t think that it is right for there to be interventions in other countries without it being done on a multilateral basis. We do not think that it was right for Theresa May to give unconditional support to Donald Trump in bombing Syria. We don’t think that was right. We don’t think he should be encouraged to think that it’s right for him to behave unilaterally. We think that that undermines the security of the world, and the
best way for the international community to proceed is by way of agreement. It makes it difficult –

Andrew Marr: Which means the UN Security Council?

Emily Thornberry: It means the UN Security Council.

Andrew Marr: Because my question therefore is: is it right to give countries like China, whose human rights record you’ve attacked, and Russia a veto over any possibility of us using military action ever, which is really what you’re saying?

Emily Thornberry: I think it is very difficult. I mean, I think, for example, Kosovo for example, which is a historic example, the Russians were vetoing the use of military force in relation to Kosovo, but there was international agreement that there should be some action in Kosovo, with the exception of the Russians. And there was the development of the doctrine of responsibility to protect, and so under that doctrine it was legal at that point for there to be an involvement in Kosovo.

Andrew Marr: And Robin Cook led the charge for that. You’ve cited him. He was in charge on that and he voted for that. And your view was –

Emily Thornberry: And he was developing a ‘responsibility to protect’ doctrine.

Andrew Marr: And Jeremy Corbyn voted and spoke against that involvement. Who was right, do you think, Robin Cook or Jeremy Corbyn?

Emily Thornberry: I think that Robin was right.
Andrew Marr: Robin was right, Jeremy Corbyn was wrong about that. So looking ahead to other possible areas of tension, do you think a future Labour government would send a task force against the Falklands if there was a crisis there?

Emily Thornberry: Yes.

Andrew Marr: They would. So under those circumstances, because again Jeremy Corbyn has said he wants to settle down and negotiate with the Argentine government about the future of the Falklands, was wondering if you would be part of that negotiation?

Emily Thornberry: I think as a matter of last resort if British citizens are being attacked, we defend them. But we don’t want to get into a position whereby – unlike the Conservatives, who seem to be so gung-ho, who seem to be so kind of, ‘we’ll send in a task force, we’ll bomb this, we’ll do that,’ no, that you have to look at the alternatives first. You have try – I mean, in the end there is no settlement to international disputes without there being international agreement. And it’s a question of how do you get there fastest. If we are under attack we defend ourselves.

Andrew Marr: Do you think there is an available compromise over the Falklands to be done?

Emily Thornberry: Well, I think that so long as the people of the Falklands wish to remain British they remain British. So that’s not going to be compromised. I think that there needs to be a future in terms of talking to neighbours of the Falklands and I think that it is to the economic advantage of both that they are able to work more closely that they are at the moment. But certainly not undermining the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands.

Andrew Marr: Again, you see, this doesn’t seem to be what
Jeremy Corbyn thinks. 'It seems to me ridiculous that in the 21st century we’d be getting into some enormous conflict with Argentina about the islands just off it. Yes, of course, the islanders have an enormous say, but let’s bring about some sensible dialogue,’ he says. So in a sense he is saying let’s talk about the future of the islands.

**Emily Thornberry:** I don’t disagree –

**Andrew Marr:** I’m being very fair to Jeremy Corbyn, I’m quoting Jeremy Corbyn.

**Emily Thornberry:** No, no, no. It’s fine, it’s fine. What Jeremy just said, why do I disagree with that? I don’t see why I should disagree with that. I mean, you say this is what he says and in effect therefore he’s saying something. I don’t agree with you. I think what I’ve said is entirely in line with what Jeremy’s just said.

**Andrew Marr:** Let’s ask you about the big policy announcement in the last couple of days from the Labour Party, the Robin Hood tax. Now, Sadiq Khan who’s in charge of London has called this madness and says if you proceed without international agreement on a tax like this companies just leave the UK, at a time when we’re leaving the EU already, and that it’s a really, really dangerous policy.

**Emily Thornberry:** Well, I don’t think that’s – again I don’t think that’s an exact quote from Sadiq. But the truth is that at the moment we have a tax which applies when you buy stocks and shares. And at the moment some people, who are called market makers, who are hedge funds and so on, if they buy these shares they don’t pay the tax. I don’t really understand why that is. That seems to be a development. And then the other thing is that we also think that we should extend the tax to different types of financial instruments such as derivatives, because actually that’s a
kind of betting on the stock market and it will help to stabilise the stock market. Many other countries do it. Hillary Clinton wanted to do it if she was elected as President. No one’s saying that she’s trying to undermine Wall Street. The European Union are looking into developing a policy in relation to it.

**Andrew Marr:** Would you agree it should be done in coordination with other countries? To avoid hedge fund managers simply moving to Paris or moving to Dublin or wherever they want to move to. I mean you want to keep the businesses in Britain?

**Emily Thornberry:** Well, I think that actually the House of Lords committee on this was very interesting, and they looked at any changes of behaviour and they said that they didn’t think that it would be as drastic as some of the doomsayers say that it will. And in the end it is a question of just, I think, of just tidying this tax up. It doesn’t seem to me to be right that you can bet on the stock market, bet on a company’s debts, and not have to pay tax. Whereas if you want to invest in the company you have to pay tax.

**Andrew Marr:** Okay, one final question: what do you say to your colleagues like Ben Bradshaw who are going around telling voters in their local constituencies, ‘vote for me, that doesn’t mean a Labour government’?

**Emily Thornberry:** I think that everyone wishes to have – there is a choice. We will either get a Conservative government or a Labour government, and that is the choice that the people have coming up in front of them. And there is an entirely different vision. You know, our vision for Britain is an entirely different one to the Tories’ one and people need to accept that. We want to do –
Andrew Marr: So those Labour candidates who say, ‘vote for me, that does not affect the future of the government,’ are being defeatist?

Emily Thornberry: Well, I think that - we have another three weeks to go, I think that everything is to play for and I think that we can see the way in which we, on a day to day basis are attracting more support. I think that the things that we came out with in the manifesto are enormously popular. Actually we’re talking to the public. We’re giving them answers to their day to day problems. And people need to look at what choice they have. You know, not Theresa May’s hair, not whether or not Jeremy Corbyn should shave or anything like that. It’s about which politicians could offer you more? What is the two different futures that Britain has? And the Labour one is a much more positive one and it’s much more in line with what people want. There is all to play for, and I don’t want them to be quite so defeatist.

Andrew Marr: And as to whether Jeremy Corbyn should shave, we can discuss that later on.

(ends)