

May 20, 1965

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Vice President

FROM: Ted Van Dyk

RE: Early Bird Program, May 24, Minneapolis.

Attached is an outline of your appearance, live, on the Early Bird program Monday in Minneapolis.

You will note that the format includes statements by you of three to four minutes each re the Great Society at home and abroad.

Attached are the statements, as prepared by John Rielly (abroad) and myself (home).

Mr. Tolra - Mr. Lowe - Mr. Priestlund

QUESTION: "I wonder if you would give us a fuller explanation of what the Great Society implies -- what domestic problems it seeks to solve -- here in the United States?"

SUGGESTED ANSWER:

*Not just the quantity of goods -- but quality of people*

I would say that the Great Society, above all, implies creation in the United States of full and equal opportunity for all our citizens. Our nation was founded on the premise that individual men and women, and their children after them, were entitled to the <sup>*opportunity*</sup> ~~chance~~ to make a better life for themselves.

Although we work for real equality of opportunity, we certainly have not achieved it.

President Johnson has given this country great leadership at home. He has brought Americans to an unprecedented peacetime unity -- some people call it consensus -- in working together to create full opportunity.

There is real <sup>agreement</sup> ~~consensus~~ in our country

today:

That all Americans shall have equal voting rights.

That young Americans shall have a good education.

That older Americans shall have adequate medical <sup>Hospital</sup> ~~care~~ <sub>medic</sub>.

That we should make our cities better and healthier places in which to live and work.

That we should preserve this nation's beauty, history, and natural resources.

That we should open our doors again to immigrants <sup>Immig</sup> who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life.

That we should help urban and rural Americans alike to adjust to technology and social change.

To achieve our Promise of America until both mind and law accept equality of opportunity as a true man's right

This Congress, under President Johnson's leadership and with the support of our people, is passing historic laws to make this consensus alive and real.

There is no question in my mind that America will never fulfill its promise until both mind and ~~law~~ accept equality of opportunity as every man's right.

You in other lands say: *America has many* ~~This is~~ imperfections.

And I agree with you. There is imperfection here. *But* We mean to act as free men, through democratic processes, to make right what is wrong.

If we can't do this here -- in the richest country in the world -- how can it be done elsewhere? I believe we will ultimately succeed.

# Foreign Policy

Suggested Response, Early Bird Satellite Program, May 24

According to the advance outline, a discussion of foreign policy will open with a question somewhat like the following: "To what extent does the Great Society as a phrase have meaning for the foreign policies of the United States? How does it relate to the issues which confront you abroad?"

As President Johnson has stated many times, the aim of United States policy in the world is the preservation of world peace. Just as we cannot have stable peace at home without justice, so the same is true abroad. To achieve a peaceful and just world, it is necessary that wealthy powerful nations like the United States accept special responsibility. This the United States has done.

We recognize that in many parts of the world, fundamental changes in the economic, political and social systems must be accomplished. We believe that these can be achieved through deliberate, thoughtful, systematic, democratic action. We believe that change can be achieved through orderly processes. Both abroad and at home, we no longer regard poverty, illiteracy and disease as a load to be patiently borne, but as a burden to be cast off. The war on poverty which the President has launched is not just a local war, but a global war. It is the only war that this nation desires to fight. It is a war in which we ask as allies every other nation on the face of

the earth.

To assist the various nations of the world in fighting the war on poverty, the United States has, for almost two decades now, carried the heavy burden of a large foreign aid program. We continue to assist many nations of the world, through capital assistance, technical assistance, the Food for Peace program, and the varied activities of the Peace Corps. Through the World Bank, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank and the various agencies of the United Nations, we continue to support those who are trying to modernize their countries, those who are trying to bring economic and social justice to their peoples.

At the same time, we recognize that all our efforts at economic and social improvement will be in vain if we permit various nations around the world to slip under the yoke of totalitarian dictatorship, whether its inspiration is of the left or the right. For that reason, we are willing to use the military power of the United States to assist freedom-loving countries in their efforts to prevent subversion from within and intimidation from without.

To the extent possible, we favor enlarging the role of the United Nations in preserving peace and order around the world, in defending the freedom of new countries against

subversion from without or within. We strongly back the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations. But, unfortunately, the machinery of the world organization is not yet sufficiently advanced to handle all situations. This is particularly true of disputes involving the Great Powers. Although we hope the day will come when the United Nations can handle Great Power disputes, we recognize that until this is so, the United States must be prepared to undertake special responsibilities to preserve the freedom of its friends and allies around the world.

I believe that the essence of what the Great Society means for American foreign policy was expressed by Arnold Toynbee when he said: "Our age will be remembered not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which man dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race."

\*\*\*



UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON

[Transcript]

July 15, 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Frank Hall  
Office of The Vice President

Enclosed you will find the transcript and tape of the  
Vice President's interview that was beamed to Europe via Early  
Bird.

Alan Carter  
Director of  
The Television Service

Enclosure:

As stated

[\* Tape not in folder when  
papers were processed.

K. Johnson  
Dec. 1976]



# Trans. Early-Bird T.V. Interview

Minneapolis, Minnesota  
May 24, 1965  
1:00 o'clock p.m.

## A CONVERSATION WITH THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following conversation with Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey was participated in by Gerald Priestland, Joseph Louw and Hans Vohra.

MR. PRIESTLAND: Mr. Vice President, some four months ago when you and President Johnson took the oath of office the keynote of the occasion was very much the Great Society.

Since then I think world attention has rather turned to United States foreign policy, and perhaps we need reminding what this Great Society was all about.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Mr. Priestland, the terms or the phrase of Great Society is more than just a political catch phrase. We feel that it implies, well, it implies a picture of the kind of a society or commitment to the sort of society that we would like to have for ourselves and our posterity.

The great Society ought not to be confused with just the material wealth or with things, it's really much more concerned about the quality of our lives and the quality of our people than it is about the quantity of the goods and services that are made available to our people.

Now, I don't think these are mutually exclusive, may I say, because the quality of life surely can be enhanced by prosperity and by the comforts and luxuries of life, but a Great Society surely would imply for us the creation of a social order in which there was true equality of opportunity for every citizen in which each and every person would be encouraged and, indeed, asked to contribute to his utmost to the building of a better social order.

The Great Society would also imply that each and every person has a greatness inherent within him, and it is our belief that the individual possesses human dignity. This is a spiritual concept, but it also can be translated into political and economic reality.

The promise of American life is the promise of individual betterment, and the Great Society encompasses this individual betterment through education, through the arts, through cultural activities, through appreciation of

beauty both manmade and natural beauty, through a love of country and the resources of the country; and I would add that as the President sees the Great Society, as he has explained it, it involves the attainment of a consensus or a broad area of agreement amongst our people, a unity that is based upon mutual respect and understanding, a dialogue that's constructive and helpful in terms of building common areas of agreement, and today I think there is general agreement in our country on a number of very important developments or possible developments.

All Americans now believe, or at least the vast majority, that we should have equal voting rights without restrictions.

Now, this is quite an achievement, and this relates itself to individual betterment and to human dignity that young Americans should have a good education, that the quality of education should be improved as well as its base, I mean the extent of it; the feeling that our elderly Americans, in particular, should have proper and adequate medical and hospital care. There is a general agreement in the country on this and that there ought to be a sense of beauty, beautification of our cities and of our countryside and personal sense of beautification in

terms of the appreciation of the arts and the conservation of our resources, the building of our cities so they are livable and not just places in which you work.

I think this sort of explains to you some of the building blocks of the Great Society, but to summarize it, it is a sense of personal values in which there is a commitment to share of one's talent, to be a citizen as well as an individual, to accept responsibility as well as the privileges of citizenship, to understand that with the role of leadership comes duty and burdens of responsibility.

I think all of this tells us a bit about the nature of the Great Society as we would hope to see it unfold.

MR. LOUW: Mr. Vice President, sir, I wonder where the burden of the program is going to fall? Former President Eisenhower addressing businessmen in New York urged them to oppose what he called needless Federal intervention and competition with private business. Where is the role going to fall? How does the role of Government figure in the vision of the Great Society?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: There have been those, Mr. Louw, who over the years have tried to breach the doctrine that there was a natural animosity or enmity

between business and the private sector, I mean Government and the private business sector. We repudiate that kind of thinking.

When I speak to you of this broad consensus that we are trying to develop, this sense of unity, this doesn't mean that there is no difference of opinion. This doesn't mean that people are all alike. It means that you come to an agreement upon common goals and objectives and your approaches to the fulfillment of those goals and objectives may be varied and different.

The attitude of the current administration, of which I am proud to be a part, insofar as the private sector is concerned, is this: We believe that Government should act as a partner with the private sector, not just business, but with labor and voluntary groups and educational establishments. We do not look upon Government as the dominating or domineering force. We look upon it as a cooperating, and at times as a coordinating mechanism. We really believe that the economic dynamics of our society is in the private economy and that Government can aid and supplement and policies of Government can be very helpful, for example, this Government has passed tax reforms at the time when we had deficits in our Federal treasury.

We completely reversed our economic thinking of, let's say 50 years ago or 25 years ago, and we proceeded to sharply reduce corporate taxes and personal income taxes, giving also investment tax credits to do what? To release the capital and to place it into the hands of the individual in the belief that the individual and the management of industry knew better what to do with excess capital or free capital than any Government planning group or any individual set of Government officials.

Now, this tells, I think, a great deal about the role of Government. The Government set a policy, but it relied for the implementation of that policy primarily upon the private sector of your economy, upon the business and management and finance and labor sector of your economy. We think that the empirical evidence shows that this works. As a matter of fact, we have unprecedented prosperity today, 51 months of continuous economic growth.

So to summarize it, we reject the idea that there must be Government as a natural enemy to the private sector. We accept the idea that Government and the private sector can work hand in hand, that through consultation, through dialogue, through mutual respect and understanding prior to the establishment of a policy and then after the

establishment of a policy that we can release tremendous energies in this economy for public good and private good.

MR. VOHRA: Mr. Humphrey, when you say you are developing a partnership between the private sector and Government to a greater extent than has been attempted before, isn't this what has been done abroad for several years? Aren't you sort of catching up with Britain and Sweden and France and other countries?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: They have had a partnership, and I don't wish to draw a value judgment, but their partnership concept is a little different than ours. This doesn't mean a Federal investment. Actually, the Federal Government in the United States has been limiting its involvement in ownership in the economy insofar as public power, for example, is concerned, or proprietary interests, rather than to expand that, we have been curtailing it with the exception, may I say, of the development of our great river systems. However, we do feel there are certain parts of the economy that require public investment, to wit, and for example, our highway

system, our airport system, our ports, and we also feel that the Government can make a tremendous contribution in this partnership that I am speaking of when you talk in the field of education and particularly in research and development.

Today about 85% of the research dollar that's expended in the entire economy of America is the Government dollar. In other words, the Government is doing a large, over half, about three-fourths.

MR. VOHRA: You wouldn't call it welfare, would you?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: No. As a matter of fact, I would say that we do not embrace what is known as the, for lack of a better phrase, a welfare state. We do, however, feel that the Government has an obligation to provide a state of opportunity for every citizen, to help to remove impediments and barriers, for example, the impediment to voting. This, we say, the Government must remove that impediment; and then the impediment of illiteracy, because to have the right to vote and to be illiterate or to have no social motivation to vote doesn't really make you a free citizen.



So we are deeply committed to the expansion of educational opportunity. The Government may very well remove impediments in terms of the enforcement of certain policies to prevent monopoly, thereby encouraging competition.

So there is a role for both, and they don't need to get in the way of one another, that's what I am trying to say, the public, we mustn't downgrade the public, we need that public sector, water systems at community levels, sanitary systems, the schools, the hospitals, all of this is what you might call the infra-structure, the network around which you build a viable private economy.

MR. PRIESTLAND: One still can't help wondering, Mr. Vice President, especially when it comes to social necessities, education and medical care, and relief of poverty and distress, whether or not the Great Society isn't the thin edge of a wedge that could be labeled a welfare state; you are taking care of the elderly citizens, why not the younger citizens who also need help and care?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: We happen to feel if you have a viable economy, that is an active

economy, and you permit young people to have a good education, encourage them to have one, they will develop their talents and their abilities and their skills so they can take care of their own needs, and we feel that this is the way it ought to be.

Now, when it comes to our elderly citizens, many of them being workers, people that do not have an opportunity to accumulate large amounts of savings over a lifetime, we feel that a program of social insurance, that is of laying aside in a trust fund a certain amount of capital to take care of the health and hospital needs at a later day in life. We think that's sensible, whatever you wish to call it, the tag is unimportant. What we seek to do, to be very frank about it, is in the dawn of life of the youngster or the young man and woman, to give them every bit of encouragement and assistance that you can in terms of good community life, housing, by helping to make possible that they are parents for a decent home, primarily of education, yes, of some health services which they obtain through their local public health service and private medical care; and then in that period from the

day of a college training or a technical training up to the point of where we call it the three-score and five, when retirement age comes, to be able to provide basically for their own wants and their own needs, and to also contribute rather generously to the common good of the community, and then when you arrive at that point of the twilight of life, it is our view that decency and compassion and a sense of justice calls for special consideration for the needs of those people.

I believe that, and somebody said to me the other day, you mentioned it again, a welfare state. No, I say it's a society in which human welfare has a high priority, yes, but human welfare is provided for in this society more generously by private groups than it is by public. For example, some of our large corporations have a much better health plan and a much better pension plan than any Government agency has, and yet this is a private corporation, privately owned. So the commitment to the human welfare is there, but the commitment to human dignity and opportunity to enhance dignity is a national commitment in which the Federal Government and State and local Government cooperate.

MR. PRIESTLAND: I wonder if we could now turn to some international implications of the Great Society if, indeed, it has any, or is it purely a selfish thing?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: If it were only a selfish thing I couldn't call it a Great Society, because greatness implies a sense of responsibility and leadership and also a sense of community, and the community of today is no longer the community of the Twin Cities, of Minneapolis and St. Paul, of Minnesota or America, or India or England or South Africa, or wherever it may be, the community is the world, and our basic commitment, if we are to be worthy of being called citizens of a Great Society, our basic commitment and our fundamental commitment must be to a society in which justice is the constant challenge and the goal and in which the advancement and the increasing of the areas of freedom is a discipline and a requirement and in which the human life, the individual and his well-being is paramount.

This means a society in which we seek peace, a peace with justice, not a peace of the aggressor

or of appeasement but a peace that has a sense of justice and of security and of freedom to it.

I believe that that is what we are trying to do.

We may approach it at times with error of judgment but this is our commitment.

MR. LOUW: Speaking of your commitment, the United States voted against economic sanctions in the United Nations, and Mr. Flimpton, your United States representative there, explained that the reason for this vote was primarily because sanctions were not implementable, so to speak.

MR. PRIESTLAND: Against South Africa?

MR. LOUW: Against South Africa, yes. And that the sanctions would hurt the very Africans the American people wish to help. I wonder if you could tell me how the Great Society envisions help to Africans, in other words, will there be an internationalization of civil rights?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: First, Mr. Louw, I believe the passage in this country of civil rights legislation, such as the Act of 1964, now the voting rights act, which will be passed here very shortly in 1965, has tremendous international implication or

implications. These Acts reveal a commitment on the part of the American people in law and in mind of equality of opportunity. We have closed in this country, and we are closing the citizenship gap, the gap which relates to the promise of the emancipation proclamation and its fulfillment, and it took us a hundred years to do it, and we have been very slow, and yet we have made steady progress in the past decade, so we have made phenomenal progress.

I believe of all the things we have done nationally that have had international complications, it is the improvement of the pattern of citizenship rights and equal opportunity, civil rights in the United States. I think this is a message to the world that we believe that regardless of race, color or creed, people shall be judged as people. They shall be judged on merit and not the false standards of color or stature or size or ethnic origin or geography.

For example, we now have before the Congress our immigration legislation to eliminate the national origins' quota system. We are going to have an immigration policy in this country that relates to the

value of people, not people in the north or in the south, not northern Europeans or southern Europeans, not Africans or Asians, but people, and I believe it will be recognized in the world as a much more equitable and humane policy.

So speaking of our policy relating to Africa, it is one of doing what we can within the limits of our knowledge, and we lack some knowledge in our areas of human relations with people that we know so little about, but doing what we can within our areas of knowledge and resources to help these individual countries to help themselves, to help them without appearing to be the big brother, so to speak, you know, and to help them without being domineering or patronizing.

I find that our friends in Africa, Asia and other countries are very self-conscious of their own rights. They are jealous of their own rights, their own dignity, and rightly they should be, and we are that way too, and we were even more so when we were a new country.

We are going to try to remember the lessons of our history, remembering that we too occasionally

stumbled and faltered. We, even at this day and age, we do not have always an orderly society and always a society in which there is total justice. We have poor in the midst of the rich. We have poverty in the midst of vast areas of plenty. We do have some, we do have discrimination in a country that proclaims only one citizenship, and because we know this, even though we are trying to do something about it which I think is the saving grace of my country, because we know this, we are somewhat sympathetic, I think the people are, and I believe the Government is sympathetic of the aspirations of people in the African countries.

Now, we occasionally make a mistake in our judgment. We occasionally follow a policy temporarily that may not lend itself to fulfillment of an objective, but we have the courage to change.

So, Mr. Louw, I think that's the best part of America, that America still has a conscience. It does not feel self-righteous. It knows it makes mistakes and it seeks to remedy those mistakes. It seeks to change its course when somebody points out



that the course is wrong, and if I may say so, I think that is a sign of strength, not weakness.

MR. VOHRA: Mr. Humphrey, you talked a minute ago about your commitment to law, I guess it extends also to international law. For the last several years, I should say three or four years, one felt those possibly living here and observing things, professionally, would agree that you are really working towards a rule of law both in relation to these United Nations and also in relation to O.A.S. regionally.

A lot of people were worried recently by your intrusion into the Dominican Republic as a deviation from law, and I was wondering whether you would care to comment on it?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Mr. Vohra, I know many people are concerned, and your question is right to the point, and I shall try to be responsive.

We do believe strongly in the United Nations. We believe in international organization. We are committed to the development and the strengthening of these international organizations, and I hope that as time goes on we will even be more firm in our commitment

and less reliant upon our own unilateral or even bilateral actions.

I believe very strongly, speaking for myself and I trust for my Government, in the development of peacekeeping machinery and peacekeeping forces in the international body known as the United Nations. I would hate to see any large power, United States or anyone else, assuming the role of world policeman. It would be a role that would only bring, well, I think it would bring the hate of others and the scorn of others and bring great difficulty and trouble to the policeman himself.

So on knowing that, we want international peacekeeping machinery.

Now, we move to the Dominican Republic, an area that was infected for almost 30 years by a cruel dictatorship in which the whole social structure, sir, was adulterated and corrupted. Regrettably, that is the price you pay for that kind of dictatorship or for dictatorship. It always has a way of doing something to the moral standards and the political standards of the Society.

Following the assassination of Trujillo and the re-establishment of a constitutional government which has lasted a very brief period of time, and whose fault it was I don't wish to even comment upon, and now with the new revolution in the Dominican Republic here is the situation that we faced.

First of all, it is our sincere belief that at the time we ordered the small contingent, at first, of some four hundred Marines, we did so because there was no other way that we knew to protect the lives of better than three thousand American Nationals and they were herded together, some of them in the Ambassador Hotel, they were being fired upon in the City of Santo Domingo, and there was the fear of general carnage and slaughter. That was the information that we had, and our President acted on that information.

In the meantime, and this thing needs to be known, we pursued every known way of contacting our friends in the embassies of the Latin American countries and the governments of those countries. We did proceed to the peacekeeping committee of the O.A.S., and it said it had no authority. We went to the Council of the Organization of American States and asked them to take cognizance of this development and take jurisdiction, that first they thought they had no authority, and then on subsequent

re-examination came back a few days later and said, yes, they possibly did have some authority within their own right to have an Organization of American States peacekeeping operation.

The reason that there was a feeling of no authority and no jurisdiction is because of the commitment of each member to the O.A.S. of non-intervention in the political and life of another nation; but we were of the mind that the O.A.S. had an organic authority of its own, I mean it was an organ of its own right and had as its prime responsibility the maintenance of peace, at least one of its prime responsibilities is the maintenance of peace in the hemisphere.

Now, I want the record clear because many people do not know this record. We did not act as if we had no concern for anyone. We acted first in protection of our own Nationals, immediately through the Councils of the Organization of American States, and out of this Dominican crisis we found, first of all, that the O.A.S. hesitated, too long; secondly, we found that the O.A.S. did discover it did have juridical

authority to be able to send in peacekeeping operations; thirdly, I think out of this tragedy, and it is a tragedy for us and for the Dominicans and for many others, that out of this tragedy may well come the establishment of permanent peacekeeping forces on the part of the Organization of American States so that when there is anarchy and chaos and when people seem to be engaged in the sad and sordid business of slaughter, that there can be a provisional government established, that there can be peacekeeping operations and that it can be done without the United States of America having to do it.

We don't want to do this, my good friends. May I say that our heart is heavy because of what we think is a burden that's been placed upon us. We do not want it, and as you noted, when the forces come in from Brazil or when they have come in from other countries, we have withdrawn our forces and will continue to do so.

In the meantime we will be perfectly willing to place all of the American forces under international command and not have them under the command of an American officer.

MR. PRIESTLAND: As I understand it, sir, the root of the trouble is the existence of Communism in this hemisphere. How are you going to get rid of that

threat while there is still Communism in Cuba?

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY: Well, sir, part of the trouble, of course, in the Dominican Republic was the concern over the infiltration of the Communist movement and the very clever and yet aggressive hold that this movement gains on total disorder. It doesn't take many highly disciplined Communist organizers and activists to be able to grab hold of a rather fluid situation, but I would say that we have a job to do in this hemisphere if there wasn't a Communist around, and you ask how do we intend to be able to proceed when there is Communism in Cuba? Through the Alliance for Progress, through the encouraging of constitutional government, the encouragement of it, through improvement of education; and by the way, this is the first year since the establishment of the Alliance for Progress which is in, what is it, this is its fourth year now, that the Alliance has produced economic results over and above the population.

We think that by patient, persevering activity and cooperation between ourselves and the Government and the peoples of these fine Latin American countries, and the great people in these countries, that

we will be able to build and help to build, we will contribute to the building of a much more just society in which the threat of the dictator and the Communist will be rather meaningless.

MR. PRIESTLAND: Mr. Vice President, I am afraid we have been ambushed by time. I would like to thank you very much, indeed, for sparing some for us.

\* \* \*



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)