

W

The Proceedings of

MEET THE PRESS

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

Metropolitan Press Service, Room 2111, Washington, D. C. 20015
(Division of Publishers Co., Inc.)

MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from the NBC Studios in Washington, D. C.

Television Broadcast 1:00 P.M. EDT
Radio Broadcast 6:30 P.M. EDT



The National Broadcasting Company Presents



MEET THE PRESS

America's Press Conference of the Star

Produced by LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

Guest:
EDWARD HEATH
Leader of the Conservative Party of Great Britain

VOLUME 10 JUNE 5, 1966 NUMBER 23

Metropolitan Press Service
Division of Publishers Co., Inc.
Printers and Periodical Publishers
Room 2111, Washington, D. C. 20015
10 cents per copy

Panel:

HENRY BRANDON, *London Sunday Times*
MAX FRANKEL, *The New York Times*
EDWIN NEWMAN, *NBC News*
LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK, *Permanent Panel Member*

Moderator:

BRYSON RASH, *NBC News*

M E E T T H E P R E S S

MR. RASH: Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is Edward Heath—on his first visit to this country since he became leader of Great Britain's Conservative Party. He has been conferring with top American officials, including President Johnson. We will have the first questions now from Mr. Lawrence E. Spivak, the permanent member of the MEET THE PRESS Panel.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Heath, after the defeat of the Conservative Party in the last election, you are quoted as saying, "The Tory Party is changing and will continue to change."
Has there been any big change yet?

MR. HEATH: Yes, I think there have been considerable developments. As far as policy is concerned, we have already developed policy a great deal since the election defeat of 1964. In the House of Commons, I have reorganized the shadow Cabinet and made it much smaller. We had 70 members altogether on our front bench. I have now brought them down to 23, and we are now starting to reorganize the panel of candidates for the future and also the constituency organization, that is, the voting areas for our members.

MR. SPIVAK: In terms of policy, what do you consider the most significant change that has taken place in the Tory Party?

MR. HEATH: In questions of policy, we have really set out five major points:

The first is on the economy, to emphasize much more high wage-low cost economy in which we do away with restrictions in trade unions;

Secondly, ways of dealing with wildcat strikes;

Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.

Thirdly, the social services, that as we become more affluent, people should contribute more themselves;
Fourthly, a great housing program and;

Fifthly, the clear declaration that we want to become a member of the European economic community, the Common Market.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Heath, General de Gaulle seems to believe that Europe is too dependent upon the United States. Do you think England is too?

MR. HEATH: We have criticized the present British Government for becoming too dependent on the United States. I want to make this absolutely plain. This is not in any way anti-American. For us to say in Britain that we think that Britain ought to stand as much as possible on its own feet inside the Western Alliance is really something which I believe is not only healthy for Britain, but also, healthy for the United States, who are our best friends.

MR. SPIVAK: You think then Great Britain today is too dependent on America. Would you tell us in what way?

MR. HEATH: I think, for example, the last few months, in which we have become more dependent on the United States for aircraft supply and production, is one particular example.

MR. SPIVAK: Would you say that Harold Wilson's Government is any more dependent upon America than Winston Churchill's or Harold Macmillan's or Alec Douglas-Home's?

MR. HEATH: We have a tradition that when we are abroad we don't criticize our government as such. I have stated what we said during the election, but I think as a matter of fact, yes, that is the case.

MR. SPIVAK: I am not asking for criticism, just the facts.

MR. HEATH: Yes, that is a fact.

MR. SPIVAK: There has been criticism in Great Britain of our policy in Vietnam. Would you say that the British Government agrees with our policy today?

MR. HEATH: My understanding of the British Government is that they fully support American policy in Vietnam. There has been some criticism in their left wing. As far as we are concerned in the Conservative Party, we also have given general support to the American policy.

MR. SPIVAK: Will you give us your own opinion of our policy in Vietnam?

MR. HEATH: That is a very wide question, indeed, isn't it?

MR. SPIVAK: Do you yourself support our policy?

MR. HEATH: I do as leader of the Conservative Party. I said we give general support to the American administration, therefore, their policy in Vietnam.

MR. BRANDON: Not long ago you advocated a meeting between General de Gaulle and President Johnson. Now, you have talked to both of them. Do you still think that it would be useful and desirable?

MR. HEATH: Yes, I do, but, of course, one has got to choose the right moment for it. I fully understand the preoccupations of the President. I was asked at a press conference during the election whether I thought this would be a good thing, and I always think that meetings between the heads of states is a good thing, providing you do it at the right time.

MR. BRANDON: Do you think that the integrated NATO which General de Gaulle now opposes is a hindrance, or would it help towards the unity of Europe?

MR. HEATH: I think that the integration of NATO is necessary in order to deal with the conditions of modern warfare. You can, of course, have a debate about this, but I think one has to be careful not to over-exaggerate the degree of integration which exists in NATO. I don't know about here in the United States, but certainly in Britain some people imagine it is integrated down to almost the lowest form of command. This, of course, is not the case. It is integrated at the highest echelons, and, as far as helping the unity of Europe is concerned, I don't think it is necessarily connected with economic developments.

MR. BRANDON: Would you more define what you mean by integration of the higher and lower level?

MR. HEATH: I am thinking of integration in that you have a commander of one country with very high level commanders directly under him, but it doesn't go down to regimental level, brigade level, even divisional level.

MR. FRANKEL: Mr. Heath, there is an impression here that President de Gaulle's basic ambition is simply to drive the United States out of Europe. Do you think that is a correct impression?

MR. HEATH: I don't think that is a correct impression, no, but certainly as far as we are concerned in Britain, it isn't the case.

MR. FRANKEL: Could you tell us what you think he is up to?

MR. HEATH: President de Gaulle?

MR. FRANKEL: Yes, sir.

MR. HEATH: Well, I think that he has first of all in mind the

status of the French forces. I think he is greatly concerned about that, and I think his philosophy is that a nation's forces don't really respond to the nation's needs unless they feel they are responsible for the state of the nation and its defense. I think that is his first objective.

MR. FRANKEL: Though there are some differences between Britain and France clearly on NATO questions, you both are seeking a kind of independence from the United States in having your own nuclear forces. Do you think it is wrong of the United States to look in the long-range to driving all of the European countries out of the nuclear business?

MR. HEATH: My belief is that we were right at Nassau, the arrangement which Mr. Macmillan negotiated with President Kennedy, that we would contribute our nuclear forces to the general NATO defense. We would only keep them in case of dire national peril, and I think that is justifiable. And I perfectly understand if General de Gaulle wants to do that with the French force.

MR. FRANKEL: Why do you need any nuclear weapons? Why do you or France or the Germans conceivably need nuclear weapons; is it that you do not trust American support in case of emergency?

MR. HEATH: I think we have all had experience in times of war—you find yourself in emergencies which may not have been foreseen, and every nation has really got the right to take necessary measures to deal with that sort of emergency. Of course I always look at it in a rather wider sense which is that we have got the Atlantic Alliance and that in it we ought to have two major partners, the United States and a united Europe. I believe that this would be a healthy balance between the two sides of the Atlantic.

If you are going to do that then you would have some development in nuclear weapons in a united Europe.

MR. FRANKEL: Why doesn't Europe spend more time and energy on creating this union and then worry about giving it the nuclear strength of which you speak? Why should France and Britain and conceivably Germany head off in their own directions with nuclear programs?

MR. HEATH: There are two answers to that. First of all, Europe has spent a tremendous amount of time and energy in trying to become united. I spent some two years myself in trying to negotiate Britain into the Common Market in order that we should have a wider European unity. And secondly, as far as Britain is concerned, of course, the nuclear already exists. Therefore it is not a question of first of all getting a European unity and then moving to the nuclear.

As far as we are concerned, we were one of the original participants.

MR. NEWMAN: You said in answer to a question of Mr. Spivak's that as leader of the Conservative Party you gave general support to the United States administration and therefore to the American position in Vietnam, which seemed to me a rather lukewarm and rather grudging support.

Is that the impression you intended to leave?

MR. HEATH: Not in the least, no. When I say "general support," what I am saying is that there may be particular tactical matters on which there can well be justifiable debate between military experts in both countries. That is what I had in mind, but as far as—when I say general and broad support, that means on the policies as a whole.

MR. NEWMAN: You are not disquieted by the position in which the United States finds itself in Vietnam?

MR. HEATH: This is a horrible war, everybody recognizes that and, I think, nobody more than the people of the United States and the members of the Administration; and the problems—I think this is the most difficult problem which any country has had to handle or any government has had to handle since the end of World War II in 1945. Of course with a problem of that scale and difficulty, you will have some differences of opinion about the way it is handled. But that doesn't in any way alter the general approach.

MR. NEWMAN: Are you aware of any disruptive effect on the Atlantic Alliance by the Vietnam war, by the American part in it?

MR. HEATH: I don't think so, no.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Heath, one of your leading papers, the Manchester Guardian, in a front page story the other day said, and I quote "If uninhibited, the Prime Minister would probably say that American policy on Vietnam has been wrong on almost every count."

Is that a fair statement, or is that just the Manchester Guardian's—

MR. HEATH: You are asking me two things there, first of all, exactly what is the Prime Minister's private view, which I don't know, and secondly, is the Manchester Guardian right in describing it in this way and saying that that is a general approach.

It certainly doesn't apply as far as we in the Conservative Party are concerned, and I don't think it applies to the great majority of the people in Britain.

MR. SPIVAK: There have been press reports in this country,

too, that a majority of both Labor and Conservative members of Parliament have basic misgivings about American policy.

MR. HEATH: No, I don't accept that.

MR. SPIVAK: You don't accept that at all?

MR. HEATH: I don't even accept it for the Labor Party. I don't think there is a majority of the Labor Party which has got misgivings.

MR. SPIVAK: After your return from a trip to South Asia and Southeast Asia you favored taking every possible step to secure a negotiated settlement, and this should be the basis, you said, of British policy.

Is there anything you think that Great Britain can do to help bring about a negotiated settlement now?

MR. HEATH: I don't believe that a negotiated settlement is possible, whether it is negotiated directly by the administration or with help from outside, through the United Nations, whatever means may be adopted, until the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese realize that they can not win. Then I think there will be a situation in which a negotiation in some form or other will be possible.

What we in Britain can do when that moment arises is to work with the other co-chairman, the Soviet Union, in order to bring about a conference in which those concerned can take part to get the settlement.

MR. SPIVAK: You are saying that at the present time you think that your government can do very little to bring the parties to the conference table?

MR. HEATH: I think that is so, yes.

MR. BRANDON: There have been indications lately that anti-Americanism is arising among British businessmen and industrialists, due to the dominance of American economic power. They are quite an influential segment of the Conservative Party. I was wondering how it affects your Party and your own policies?

MR. HEATH: I don't believe there is any anti-Americanism in our Party, and I wouldn't have said that there was very much in British business. What they do realize is that it is a tremendous task competing with the industrial power of the United States. The economy is so much larger than ours, has very high quality of management, it is an entirely free enterprise economy with immense drive. It has all the resources of modern technology. We haven't got that, and that, of course, is one of the reasons why I want to have a larger European market. That will then give us the base on which, given a bit of time, we can develop our own technology.

MR. BRANDON: But how would you develop the bigger com-

petitive units in Europe that could compete with the United States?

MR. HEATH: It is beginning to happen in the Common Market itself, of course, that has a market of a 160 or 175 million people. If we were in it, and if other countries of the European Free Trade Association were in it or associated with it that would give us a market of around about 250 million people. Assuming you have a market of that size without any tariff barriers in it—for example, here there are no tariff barriers within the states, but just one large market—then you will find industry itself forced by the pressure of events to move towards larger units. Once they get the larger units they get the larger resources for research and development, and then, they can get to work on the new technology.

MR. BRANDON: You are not thinking of common projects like the Concord?

MR. HEATH: The common projects help, but you see a common project produces a particular problem of decision-making. You have two separate firms, and at each level they have to operate in order to make decisions, and if there is a difference of view, it comes finally to the board of the two companies and then finally becomes a political one between the two governments.

This at least means using up precious time. If you are really going to have effective decision-making with the latest technology, I think you have to do it really through a unity, and that only comes about when you have a unified market.

MR. FRANKEL: We hear much here these days that Europe is becoming isolationist, that she is not as concerned as the United States with the worldwide commitments in the Far East and other parts of the world. Britain of course has been an exception to that. Is Britain, in moving closer to Europe, also becoming more isolationist in this sense?

MR. HEATH: I don't believe that Europe is isolationist, and I don't believe that Britain in its broad outlook is isolationist. I may sometimes at home criticize my own government by saying they are taking steps which I think reflect an insular approach, but I don't think as a country we are isolationist in that sense.

I just say this, that the European powers have had to go through a period of very great contraction of world responsibilities because of the development of independence of so many countries. This has been a long and hard and painful road for everybody to follow, and I think it is quite natural that some of them should have a period of revival, of regaining strength in their balance and so on. This is true I think of The Netherlands and the Dutch Empire, certainly of the French and the French

Empire, the Belgians and the Belgian Empire and true also of ourselves to a considerable extent. But if you have come to take the criteria of aid in the rest of the world, for example, well the French are doing more in aid in various forms than we are in Britain or you are in the United States proportionately.

MR. FRANKEL: If it is not to be isolationist, what do you think Europe's interests in world beyond will be, primarily in rapprochement with the Soviet Union and the Communist part of Europe or new forms of economic interests in the former colonial areas? What do you think will be the primary thrust of European world interest?

MR. HEATH: One of the main thrusts at the moment is economic, in the developing countries, but the primary thrust must always be the maintenance of the freedom and the independence of Europe itself. If this means at the same time that we can work along with the Soviet Union and the Eastern Socialist bloc, so much the better, and I am sure that nobody wants it more than the American people as well. We don't want to continue a state of cold war so long as we can reach a settlement.

MR. FRANKEL: Do you see anything on the agenda of conceivable negotiations with Moscow to stabilize Europe finally?

MR. HEATH: I don't on the immediate agenda, no. I must be quite frank about that. I think that while the Vietnamese war is going on, it is very difficult to make further progress in that direction.

MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Heath, you said a few minutes ago that you would like to see Britain stand on her own feet within the Alliance. I lived in England for eight years, and I used to hear that from British politicians, if I may say so, at least three times a week, and I think it is still going on. What do you mean by that? The last time Britain stood on her own feet within the Alliance was Suez, which didn't work out very well, so what do you really have in mind?

MR. HEATH: As a matter of historical accuracy, we weren't on our own feet. It was a Franco-British action.

What I mean is, as I have explained, that we should work in a wider European context to make our economy more efficient and more effective. We should try and develop our own technology and not rely solely on the United States for the supply of technological information as a result of all the original work done over here.

Now, of course, this affects so many different spheres. It affects the normal industrial sphere. It also affects space. We have been taking part in ELDO, which we created—the European Launcher Organization—and ESRO, which is the space research organization.

I hear now that the British Government is to withdraw from the European Launcher Organization. This to me and to my colleagues who created it is a matter for regret, and, of course, there is much fallout in different spheres in space as well, all sorts of development of electronics, miniaturization, medicine. If we rely solely on the United States, we have no part in it ourselves, we have no incentive for the people we train in the sciences and the technology to stay and work with us.

MR. NEWMAN: Are you not given considerable difficulty by the fact that you require American support of financial matters to protect the pound which imposes restrictions on your policies elsewhere, especially foreign policy?

MR. HEATH: The state of the pound, if the pound has to be supported that, of course, in any case is bound to impose restrictions on domestic policy.

If the IFM helps any country, then, of course, that is the case.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Heath, there has been concern in some quarters that President de Gaulle may sign a non-aggression pact with Russia on his coming visit. Do you see that as a possibility?

MR. HEATH: Do you mean a non-aggression pact between France and the Soviet?

If it is, I suppose, a possibility, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: What effect do you think something of that kind would have upon the NATO military organization?

MR. HEATH: I don't think it will have any effect on the 14.

MR. SPIVAK: You don't think it would really lead to NATO's complete disintegration?

MR. HEATH: I don't think so, no.

MR. SPIVAK: With France completely out?

MR. HEATH: I don't think so, no.

MR. BRANDON: Do you think that General de Gaulle's concept of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals is a realistic one?

MR. HEATH: It is a vision of General de Gaulle's that Europe should go forward again to the sort of unity it once had in which the barriers are broken down. I don't think that in the immediate future this is likely to come about.

MR. BRANDON: But you think it might come about; you as the foremost European in England today, do you think that this is a possibility?

MR. HEATH: If one thinks in the very long term, it is possible to conceive that the Eastern Socialist States would move

away from a state-controlled economy into a more liberal economy. There are signs—Poland, wanting to become a member of the GATT, or take part in the GATT, or signs in Rumania. But this has come about after nearly 20 years, and it is still a very gradual development. One has to look quite a long way in the future before you can see a unity of that kind economically or defense-wise or politically.

MR. FRANKEL: Mr. Heath, given the present government of France and Britain, what is a good bet? What are the odds that Britain will join the Common Market in the next five years?

MR. HEATH: Of course, in the next five years we shall have another election in Britain, and we shall be back in power. Then the situation will have changed.

MR. FRANKEL: May I ask you, up to that election what are the odds?

MR. HEATH: Up to that election?

MR. FRANKEL: Yes.

MR. HEATH: I am not a betting man myself, but I think the situation is really this: if we are to become a member of the Common Market, Britain has to accept the Common Market as it is. It is much too late for us to try to alter the make-up of the Common Market itself, or its rules and regulations, broadly speaking, or its principles.

If we had taken part in the Coal and Steel Community, the Schuman Plan in 1950, we'd all have grown up together and developed together, and we would have all had our part in influencing it, so this is the first thing to accept it as it is.

MR. NEWMAN: Is it also a sign of change within Britain, than France?

MR. HEATH: That stage depends entirely on Britain. The next stage depends on the community as a whole. I don't believe they want to start negotiating until they have got the Common Market set up completely, and that means the first of July, 1968, which is now two years away. So that part depends on them. And the third part depends on the President of France, as to whether he is prepared to have Britain as a member of the Common Market, and I believe that before we reach that position the French want to see the question of the sterling indebtedness sorted out, because when we become a member of the community the other members undertake certain obligations towards us in case of balance of payments troubles, and so on. And he wants to know about future defense and political arrangement for Europe.

MR. FRANKEL: It sounds like long odds.

MR. HEATH: Yes.

MR. RASH: We have just about two minutes. Mr. Newman.

MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Heath, there has lately been great British influence among young people in Europe and in the United States in such things as clothes, music, length of hair, general outlook. Is that a superficial thing, or is it a sign of something deeper the British are bringing about?

MR. HEATH: I think it is a sign of immense vitality. Of course, it hasn't all started from Britain. The Italians introduced a good many styles themselves which were then taken up by the young British. As far as "beat" is concerned, I suppose we started it very largely, and it spread into Europe, but surely what is interesting about it is that the youth of Europe is now mixing so much.

I mean, when I was young—I was born by the coast—I always looked across the Channel, just by Dover, and I used to go across during holidays from school. I used to hitchhike and so on, but it wasn't done a great deal. But now it is taken as perfectly automatic, and you go across on the scooter or something. And the Germans are mixing so much with the French. This is the exciting thing.

MR. NEWMAN: Is it also a sign of change within Britain that the young people have a position they never had before?

MR. HEATH: Yes, I think it is. I think it is a different balance in society, and I think that is a very healthy thing.

MR. NEWMAN: What brought it about? The loss of colonies perhaps—did that have something to do with it?

MR. HEATH: I don't think directly, no, but I think with the growth of education and with our much higher standard of living in the last 15 years, this has had its effect on youths.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Heath, there are many observers here who believe the British Commonwealth has outlived its usefulness. Do you think so?

MR. HEATH: No, I don't. I believe there is still a part for the Commonwealth to play, and for this reason: We have a common language. We have all had experience of British administration, for good or ill. There is a great deal in common between our law and legal systems, between the professions and so on, and this enables us to talk to each other the whole time, even when we have differences, as I don't believe any other countries can talk to each other, except perhaps Britain and the United States.

MR. RASH: I am sorry to interrupt, but our time is up. Thank you, Mr. Heath, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.