CHET HUNTLEY REPORTING

(JFK REPORT #7)

Sunday, June 4, 1961

NBC TELEVISION

MR. HUNTLEY: Good evening. Normally at this time Mutual of Omaha brings you our regular half-hour program of weekend news and observation. But this afternoon, the first meeting between President Kennedy and Russia's Khrushchev ended. We have therefore put together a full hour about that one historical event. And, at NBC's invitation, Mutual of Omaha has revised its long-made plans and agreed to the extra effort to bring the program to you. The rearrangements required of networks and sponsors so that programs like this can be done is not always obvious to those sitting at home, and I think it should be acknowledged.

[Music]

ANNOUNCER: NBC News presents CHET HUNTLEY REPORTING -- JFK Report #7, brought to you by Mutual of Omaha, the greatest name in health insurance, providing low-cost protection for people of all ages.

MR. HUNTLEY: The Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting is over. The President arrived in London a couple of hours ago and was met at the airport by Prime Minister Macmillan. Rising early tomorrow morning, Khrushchev flies from Vienna to Moscow.

Some of the 1800 reporters have left; the rest are packing their bags. They knew all along that more important than anything the meeting would achieve was the fact that it was held. But you can say that just so often. This afternoon they got some news -- the communique:

"President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev have concluded two days of useful meetings, during which they have reviewed the relationships between the United States and the U.S.S.R., as well as other questions that are of interest to the two states. Today, in the company of their advisers, they discussed the problems of nuclear testing, disarmament, and Germany. The President and the Chairman reaffirmed their support of a neutral and independent Laos, under a government chosen by the Laotians themselves, and of international agreements for insuring that neutrality and independence, and in this connection they have recognized the importance of an effective cease-fire. The President and the Chairman have agreed to maintain contact on all these questions of interest to the two countries and for the whole world."

Hidden by such documents, history is made, and on them hopes rise and fall. That is our subject today, and we get deeper into it after this message about health and accident insurance from Mutual of Omaha.

[Commercial]

MR. HUNTLEY: The results of top-level meetings unfold slowly over the weeks and months and years, like the unrolling and deciphering of parchments we find in caves. But already the diplomats are saying Secretary of State Rusk will probably meet Soviet Foreign Secretary Gromyko in Geneva this week to get the Laos talks back in gear. The time has come to add up what we already know

so new facts can be understood as they are revealed. By television tape and live radio circuit, two NBC News reporters will take part in this discussion with us.

On the left, John Chancellor, NBC News, Moscow, whose assignment was Khrushchev; and on the right, Sander Vanocur, NBC News, White House Correspondent, who travelled with the President.

MR. CHANCELLOR: As they went into today's session the Russians in Mr. Khrushchev's party seemed relaxed and cheerful. Their new spokesman, Kharlamov, had described at least part of the talks as fruitful. And no amount of clarification he gave that word later could take away its essential meaning to the Russians. That at meetings of this kind with this American President they have produced a workable diplomatic technique.

There are indications that the President persisted with Mr. Khrushchev in his examination of the problems of Laos. And that Mr. Khrushchev, in turn, persisted with the President in an examination of the problems of Berlin. But the cold war is in some ways like a coffeepot. You have to turn it down every once in a while to keep it from boiling over. And the main lesson of Vienna seem to be that with the current American President this may be possible.

MR. VANOCUR: When these talks were described by an American spokesman as being searching the description was apt, but not in its usual diplomatic sense. The two men, we are told, searched

each other out mentally and verbally like two boxers meeting for the first time in round one. We are also told that President Kennedy had one big advantage here. He came into these talks keyed up after his conversations with French President de Gaulle. Officials here think that the President had the confidence restored which he had last January, but which was shaken over Cuba. They think this is of immense value when you meet a man like Khrushchev, who can spot the weaknesses and chinks in his adversary's armor. And they think that the President's restoration of his confidence as leader of the Western world would have been of immense value in these talks.

MR. CHANCELLOR: The feeling that the two men could at least agree to disagree peacefully seemed to have been continued at today's meeting, held at the Soviet Embassy not far from the center of Vienna. Motorcycle escorts had roared and hooted through the Vienna streets earlier, taking Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy to church. Mrs. Kennedy went on to see the famous Spanish Riding School in Vienna. Mr. Kennedy devoted his morning to protocol chores before he met Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. Khrushchev, in from his suburban residence, met the President on the steps of the Embassy. Mr. Khrushchev, jovial and talkative, met the President with a small speech. He said, "Mr. President, I greet you on a small piece of our Soviet territory. Sometimes we drink out of a small glass but we speak with great feeling." The President responded with some thanks for this, and the

two men then went inside the Embassy.

The Premier then walked inside the grey stone building which formerly housed the Czar's Ambassador to the court of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Mr. Khrushchev led his guests upstairs to the second floor. Aside from translators, the chief aides of the two men were their Foreign Ministers, Rusk and Gromyko, and who already know one another and, as inferred in today's communique, will get to know one another much better in the coming weeks.

Also present were Mikhail Menshikov, and the Soviet Ambassador to Washington, and Llewellyn Thompson, the American Ambassador in Moscow. Yesterday the President and the Premier spent most of the afternoon alone, while their advisers were in an adjoining room. Today, however, the advisers stayed with their principals in the ring for the entire affair. People who keep track of these records say that today was the longest continuous conversation Mr. Khrushchev ever had with an American President. The conversation ranged from polite chit-chat to the most serious issues, but from all reports it was carried on by both sides with little emotion.

MR. VANOCUR: The Khrushchevs were the first to arrive last night at Schoenbrunn Palace to attend a glittering dinner and reception given in honor of himself and President and Mr. Kennedy by the Austrian government. This was Vienna's answer to the

same kind of an affair given last Thursday night by the French government to honor the Kennedys at Versailles. The dinner and reception were open to only the highest levels of Austrian society, plus the staffs brought to Vienna by President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev.

The affair came at the end of a long, six-hour session between the two men. So, when the President and the First Lady arrived, he might well have wished to have a quiet dinner at the American Embassy and then gone to bed. But the Viennese would have been offended. It has been a long while -- you almost have to go back to the Congress of Vienna in 1815 -- since the Austrian capital has been the scene of so momentous a diplomatic meeting. The Austrians wanted to put on a good show, and they did. At one point of the Vienna proceedings the cameras that took these pictures were barred by the Americans. Despite the fact that the American Embassy in Vienna had listed the live TV coverage of the banquet in their schedules, the White House killed the idea because one White House aide thought it would be "politically inappropriate" to show live television pictures of the two leaders.

The Austrians who heard of this were enraged, since it also involved pictures of the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, an organization as sacred to the Viennese as the Yankees are to New Yorkers. The Americans later reinstated the telecast. Premier Khrushchev was engaged in animated conversation with Mrs. Kennedy

during the reception. And the President talked to Mrs. Khrushchev. The best anecdote of the evening was when President Kennedy's sister Eunice said to Khrushchev, "Have you found out how tough my brother is?" Said Mr. K., "Why, he said you were the tough one in the family." Said Eunice to the Soviet Premier, "Just wait until you talk to him tomorrow."

Knowing that she is an ardent horsewoman, the Austrian government invited Mrs. Kennedy this morning to a performance of the famous Lippizzaner horses at the Spanish Riding School, established by Hapsburg Emperor Maximilian in 1572. As you can see in this cabled film, this was the high point of Mrs. Kennedy's visit to Vienna. And it delighted the Viennese, a people who subsist primarily on their dreams of past imperial glories, and on whipped cream.

Mrs. Kennedy's impact on Vienna, though considerable, was less than her impact on Paris. Though the Hapsburgs intermarried with French nobility for centuries, it would have been difficult to stretch the collective Viennese imagination, which can be stretched pretty far, to claim the same descendancy for Mrs. Kennedy which the French could, and did, claim. But she did attract large and enthusiastic crowds in Vienna, especially today, when the weather was fair, wherever she went. Shop windows displayed her picture, and the newspapers were filled with photographs of the First Lady.

MR. HUNTLEY: Thank you, fellows. Stand by. We shall

be back to you later.

Some history book yet unwritten may say that the vivacity and good looks of Jacqueline Kennedy helped solve the Berlin problem or the Laotian crisis. But all the facts are not yet in, and the problems we went with are still the problems we have. We want to review those problems after hearing from Jan Clayton with a message about health and accident insurance from Mutual of Omaha.

[Commercial]

MR. HUNTLEY: Let us remove the handicap which has frequently been imposed upon the reporting and analysis of this Presidential journey, and remove such words and phrases as "exchange of views," "encounter," or "sizing up." These talks were negotiations, out of which, for once, we did not expect too much. These men cannot meet without negotiating.

We start with the basic issue: Khrushchev's implacable determination to make Communism the order of the world, and his conviction that it is predestined to come about. That is not negotiable; and the President, as we know, wasted no time trying to cancel it.

Therefore, the basic issue became something else -- to warn Khrushchev that some of the methods employed in behalf of Communist expansion are dangerous and could lead to the big war which neither he nor we want. This issue, we trust, is negotiable.

There are at least four methods now most apparent:

Communist penetration in Southeast Asia by armed subversion; Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere by underground conspiracy; the Communist threat to West Berlin, which is the threat of ingestion; and Communism's demand for a change in the ground rules for all international cooperation.

NBC News Far East correspondent James Robinson flew from Laos to Hong Kong to film this estimate of how Communist method number one is creating the problem in Southeast Asia.

MR. ROBINSON: Militant pressure by Asian Communist forces, ably assisted by Russia, is today finding the free world's defenses out here vacillating and unsure. A series of military and political defeats in Laos highlights our inadequacies. The Reds deliberately defied the posturings of the Seventh Fleet, and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. They struck into the very heart of Southeast Asia. The United States, our Asian and Western allies, refused to meet this challenge. The result has been a disastrous, face-losing defeat.

The shock waves from the Laotian debacle have made stunning impact in every Far East country. And many now believe Laos is a cruel example of the new trend in Asia. The Laotian army is but one example of what has gone wrong in Southeast Asia. Laotian soldiers were bought and paid for with American money, armed and transported by American equipment. In fact, they were practically

hand-carried by United States military advisers to the point where the guns must be triggered. But these troops had not been told why they must fight, so more often than not, they refused to fight.

Paradrop operations in Laos were beautifully conceived--except when the soldiers landed in Communist-held jungles, where they either surrendered or retreated. It was one military defeat after another until the Laotian government abjectly cried for peace.

Truce parleys are held three times weekly inside Communist lines at a nondescript village called Bandumon.

Most everyone in Laos would like to believe there is a cease fire; but while government forces relax, the Communists continue probing and infiltrating. And every other day, delegations from the Laotian government -- the Communist Pathet Lao -- and the neutralists meet inside the tent in Bandumon. Here, like on the battlefield, the Communists hold the upper hand. The Red delegates speak like victors. The government makes concessions, hoping thereby to somehow bring about a genuine cease-fire. But these talks are for the Communists just another tactic to be used for conquest.

A few mountain ridges away from the Laotian truce negotiations, there is another war. But, unlike Laos, South Vietnam with their excellent army is determined to resist, and eventually defeat Communist aggression from North Vietnam.

Highly trained troops with a will to fight fan out through Red-infiltrated deltas, warily stalk the jungle. The enemy is everywhere, yet nowhere. For the Communist guerrillas are

specialists of the hit-and-run, of murder, and pillage. These soldiers today are equal to the Reds in combat, and better equipped, than the invaders from the north.

Along these canals that criss-cross Vietnam's rich farmland there is death every day. A continuous war claiming hundreds of victims monthly. Every village knows the smell of battle. On rare occasion, Communist soldiers are captured; all of them veterans of the savage war, sent by North Vietnam for the sole purpose of overthrowing by force the South Vietnam government.

The prisoners sullenly admit their transgressions, but the invasion from the north continues. Strangely, the new wave of Communist victories in the Far East comes at a time when Red-Asian nations are at their economic worst. China is nearly broke; her people hungry and apathetic. North Vietnam, likewise.

But amidst this acute poverty, there remains the determination and ability among the Red leaders to impose even harsher controls, and expand areas of domination. What is to counter this offensive? Certainly not dramatic new spending programs, nor cursory visits, curiously called fact-finding missions by American politicians.

The Communist challenge is a militant one. Red victories in Asia have been achieved solely by force of arms. The Communists only stop when confronted by a superior force willing and capable to halt their agressions. The United States has

outspent the Reds in Asia, outarmed the Reds in Asia, but the United States has yet to outfight the Communists in Asia.

This is James Robinson, NBC News, Hong Kong.

MR. HUNTLEY: Sander Vanocur, you have heard Robinson set up the problem from Hong Kong. Did the Vienna meeting deal with it?

MR. VANOCUR: Chet, I think the meeting did deal with it, but I do not see how this meeting is going to stop Communist penetration in Southeast Asia. Tonight's communique said the two leaders again reaffirmed their support of a neutral and independent Laos, they recognize the importance of an effective cessation of hostilities there.

But you know, it is like Alice in Wonderland. Words mean what people want them to mean. Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko are to have meetings, this matter could be decided between them. But I think it would be unwise to be too optimistic about our long-range chances in Laos.

Even if we reach agreement with the Soviets in this matter of subversion in Southeast Asia, we have not reached agreement with the Chinese Communists, nor can we be sure the Soviets have either.

MR. HUNTLEY: Thank you. Stand by.

Now for Communist method number two, expansion again,

which impinges upon us in West Berlin. We have been told by both French and American official sources that President Kennedy and President de Gaulle found their attitudes, convictions, and plans in harmony for the meeting of this problem. We do not know the details of these plans and convictions; but we do know they include the use of Western military force should the Communist bloc attempt to restrict, to menace, or cut off our access to West Berlin, or should they attempt to seize West Berlin by any means. The French-American premise is that our rights in West Berlin are non-negotiable, and cannot be diluted by compromise. The British, however, are not in full sympathy with these plans, and President Kennedy is now in London seeking to correct this discrepancy in Western unity.

The British are inclined to the premise that perhaps the Berlin issue can, at the last moment, be compromised or negotiated, and therefore that the hardening of Western strategy and any plans to react with military force only tend to restrict the area of Western maneuver.

From Berlin, NBC News correspondent Piers Anderton reports by film on Communist method number two.

MR. ANDERTON: The old crises between Communism and the West vanish -- Iran, Greece, Trieste. New tropical diseases break out -- Cuba and Laos. But Berlin remains, getting a little

sicker for the Communists, then for the West, never getting better, just adding complications; until now no one can diagnose it. What is this once and future crisis?

What Berlin is to the citizens of Communism and their leaders can be told in two lines. One is the line of refugees in West Berlin's main refugee center. I have been to this center every year for the past three years, and every year the lines get longer.

In the last dozen years, more than three million people have come over to West Berlin from East Germany. In the first four months of this year, more than 66,000 persons have come across, an increase of 25% over last year.

These films were shot a week ago, a week during which more than 4,000 persons walked across the border into Berlin. The lines get longer, and the patience and pocketbook of East Germany gets shorter, for that Communist state's main poverty is manpower, especially young manpower; and more than half of the refugees are boys and girls under twenty-five.

The kindergarten in West Berlin's refugee center is full of the lost future of East Germany. A few days ago these children were living under Communism. Even now, they play under the helicopter patrols in this city of impassable crisis.

You have seen similar pictures of Berlin refugees many times before, but the point is that you have been seeing them

for twelve years. And they are the big reason that Khrushchev calls West Berlin a cancerous sore which drains off East Germany's workers and technicians and doctors, crippling its factories and farms.

And to add immediate insult, West Berlin's economy booms. It is the largest industrial city in Germany, and expanding every year. Only 21,000 of West Berlin's two and a half million residents are unemployed.

The IBM building was started after Khrushchev's threat to Berlin in 1958.

And the final insult for rubble-strewn East Berlin came last month when a movie company came to Berlin to make wartime scenes. The movie makers were unable to find any rubble in cleaned-up West Berlin, so they had to manufacture their own and spread it around. A few hundred feet away, across the border into East Berlin, there are blocks and blocks of rubble, unmoved in fifteen years.

The other line of resistance to Communism forms during the regular visits to West Berlin of East Germans. The American Memorial Library was built intentionally close to the border. A short walk in the sun, and all the ideas of the West are available, beating in a tide of books and magazines and newspapers, and even in the new wave of the movies.

And these are not East Germans who stay as refugees; these go back to Communism at the end of the day, or the end of the weekend, as carriers of the ideas of freedom.

The United States and our allies are pledged to keep the city alive. What we mainly demand is that we be allowed to go back and forth across the 120 miles of Communist territory to Berlin. But the more Berlin's economy thrives, the harder it will be for us in the event of another blockade. An airlift would be almost impossible now because West Berlin is a vastly more industrialized and complex city than it was in 1948.

To the East Germans Berlin is a desperate case. It reminds the rulers and people of that satellite of their own ailment, and it postpones their recognition as a real nation. The East German government constantly pleads with Russia to end the crisis.

But to Russia, Berlin is less desperate. East Germany is, however, the most important, industrially, of the seven satellites in the eastern economic bloc. And Moscow would like to keep its twenty Soviet divisions in East Germany, which is more reliable politically as a border guard than Poland or Hungary.

And more than two years ago -- in November, 1958 -- Khrushchev promised to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany if West Berlin is not made a demilitarized free state. More recently, Khrushchev admitted that he must solve the German problem soon before West Germany becomes a major military power with nuclear weapons. Already, the West German army, the Bundeswehr, is the strongest military force in Western Europe.

The pressure on Khrushchev is to stabilize and

strengthen East Germany, to stabilize its borders and to strengthen its economy, mainly by stemming the deadly drain of refugees. There is one place that Khrushchev must start, and must end -- Berlin.

This is Piers Anderton, NBC News, Berlin.

MR. HUNTLEY: John Chancellor, we know the Berlin issue was raised in Vienna. The communique says so. Briefly, do you have the feeling that French-American firmness on Berlin was made clear to Khrushchev?

MR. CHANCELLOR: The question of when Mr. Khrushchev will start on Berlin is in many ways more interesting than whether or not he will start at all. The Soviets have invested a good deal of prestige in the issue, and they can be expected some day to bring Berlin to a point of crisis.

However, from what we have learned tonight both sides today limited themselves to a simple statement of views imposing of course on the Berlin situation; that was all.

From the Russian point of view this summer seems a bad time to press the West on Berlin, for two reasons. One is that, as of a few hours ago Moscow is again talking to Washington. Second is that the Soviets hold their twenty-second Party Congress this October, and the Berlin question with its danger and its past Russian diplomatic failures is not the kind of item the Russians include in a Party Congress agenda.

Mr. Khrushchev also shows, as of this moment, no sign of stopping at East Berlin on his way home. Therefore, I think we can assume that Berlin has been set back just a little on the shelf.

MR. HUNTLEY: Thank you, John.

Communist method of expansion number three -- by underground subversion conspiracy -- is one flushed with recent success, and tends to underscore and embellish our most recent bungling: Cuba and the Western Hemisphere.

It is not generally known, or it has been forgotten, that the Communist cells of Latin America are among the oldest, and sometimes the most efficient, of the whole world-wide Communist apparatus. Fresh from their gains in Cuba, Communist agents are almost romping in and out of expanded Communist embassies from Mexico City to Buenos Aires. In one way or another, President Kennedy had to tell Khrushchev that the only way in which we can tolerate further Communist expansion in the Americas is by the unlikely process of popular choice or self-determination of the people.

NBC News reporter Richard Valeriani saw it happen in Cuba, spent the days of the recent invasion hiding in embassies or in the homes of friends, and became one of the last American reporters to leave. This is his report on Communist methods in Latin America.

MR. VALERIANI: Fidel Castro has carried the cold war into the sunny Caribbean and laid it defiantly on the American doorstep.

Ninety miles off the Florida coast, Castro has developed a Soviet-styled state and advertised it as a beacon to light the way for all Latin America. Oil for his revolutionary lamps is now supplied by Moscow.

The Cuban strongman has already stirred up plenty of trouble, directly and indirectly, throughout the hemisphere. Much more "Castro-Inspired" trouble looms on the Latin horizon.

In Mexico City, the Red battalions of the hemisphere gathered at a pro-Cuban, anti-American rally to shout "Cuba, Yes; Yankees, No." And to sponsor such Castro-inspired measures as the nationalization of all U.S. property in Latin America.

Castro's chief emissary was Vilma Espin, his sister-in-law. With typical Communist arrogance, the conference delegates adopted national sovereignty, economic independence, and peace as their own personal gods. Fidel Castro was their prophet.

Lazaro Cardenas, ex-President of Mexico, gave the obviously Communist-dominated conference an air of respectability; but Mexico itself symbolizes the hands-off attitude toward Cuba shared by some important Latin governments.

However, Mexico's National Anti-Communist Party, drawing heavily on peasant support, demonstrated simultaneously

against Castro. Like many Latins, they desire democracy, not demagoguery; development, not defiance. They maintain a traditional faith in America's ability to help them win a better life in freedom.

Pro-Castro agitators burn an American flag on a Guatemalan street, underlining their determination to exploit latent anti-Americanism, and to create the kind of turmoil on which the Castroites and Communists thrive.

In Honduras, demonstrators for social justice and economic reform manifested the same anti-Americanism with placards and speeches rather than violence. But they, too, still look to Castro as champion of the poor and underprivileged.

On May Day in Havana, portraits of Castro and Red Chinese Premier Mao Tse-Tung symbolized Cuba's identification with the Communist camp.

Castro troops celebrated their recent victory over American-backed invaders and defiantly shouted "We will win."

Women, as well as men, have been mobilized and armed for national defense in the tradition of Soviet states.

Increased gymnastic activity was inspired by Czechoslovakia, Cuba's model and her diplomatic representative here.

Czech anti-aircraft guns and Soviet tanks dramatized the Communist-backed arms buildup and gave the rally a Red Square atmosphere.

The American eagle atop the monument to the battleship Maine was torn down and paraded ignominiously, emphasizing Cuba's break with the United States.

Soviet ships bring in oil and arms, and the necessary props for Cuba's struggling economy almost daily. The Communist bloc has unloaded more than $250 million worth of credits in Cuba.

Another enthusiastic crowd turned out to hail Castro for being awarded the Lenin Peace Prize. The Russians last year rattled rockets for the Cuban Premier, and this year gave him another Red stamp of approval -- a further attempt to raise his stature among the impressionable masses of Latin America.

Castro today talks and acts like a man who thoroughly believes in the Soviet vision of world conquest.

Fidel Castro served as a political Sputnik over the Latin American skies, awakening the United States to the dangers of a careless foreign policy.

The structure of the Cuban government has been recast in the Communist mold. Soviet and East German technical missions flood the country. Red Chinese experts are aiding agricultural development. The Czechs supervised re-organization of the police machinery.

Although Castro represents the Soviet threat in the Western Hemisphere, he is not the real enemy. Econmio misery and social injustice are the challenges facing the United States in

Latin America. Castro's welfare experiments and their appeal to the politically unsophisticated masses must not be ignored.

President Kennedy's "alliance for progress" has caught the imagination of the Latins, but the ruling classes, unwilling to surrender their privileges to social and economic progress, provide the kind of obstacle Castro is able to exploit.

The people want homes, not homilies. Otherwise, we may get a bumper crop of Fidel Castros in Latin America.

MR. HUNTLEY: Sander, the communique says nothing about Latin America, but I should think it came up, certainly by inference, if no other way.

MR. VANOCUR: Chet, you are probably right. Neither the communique nor anything I could learn would indicate that this problem of Communist penetration weighed too heavily in the Kennedy-Khrushchev talks. There may not have been time to explore it fully. While Khrushchev will probably pick up anything on the chief that he can of Latin America, he seemed to indicate in his talks recently with Walter Lippmann that he recognized, in kind of a general way, the legitimacy of President Kennedy's claim that we will be masters in our hemisphere.

But even if Khrushchev called off subversion in Latin America as a gesture of goodwill, the Chinese Communists would not. And they are working hard to gain a foothold in Latin American

countries.

MR. HUNTLEY: The fourth problem, Khrushchev's attempt to change all the rules for international cooperation, is especially serious in any discussion of disarmament. There are those who say that disarmament is an impossible dream; there are those who say it is mankind's only hope.

Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota once said it is the heart of foreign policy. We discuss disarmament and the Russian veto with Senator Humphrey after a message from Mutual of Omaha about being a good neighbor.

[Commercial]

MR. HUNTLEY: Ignominiously thrown out of the Congo last year, while that area was under control of the United Nations, Khrushchev came roaring into New York last fall brashly demanding an incredible change in the rules of international cooperation and diplomacy.

With an impossible act of banging his shoe on a General Assembly desk, he emphasized his impossible demand that all U.N. decisions in the future be based on unanimous decisions by the Communist bloc, the neutralist bloc, and the West --in short, the veto privilege for Communism. Now he has applied the same demand to nuclear test controls, to Laos, to the Congo, and presumably to all other international cooperative efforts, including disarmament.

This question, disarmament, lies much nearer than the foot of the rainbow, for it persistently refuses to die, and it comes up wherever statesmen gather. It is too laden with humanity's hope and with good sense to go away. And if ever a nation needed it, it is the Soviet Union. Given their philosophy and their set of material circumstances, they pay more for their weapons than we.

Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, long the most articulate American spokesman on disarmament, is at this moment in his home state attending the ceremonies of his son's graduation with honors; but before he left he said this:

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, Chet, I feel that first of all we need to recognize that disarmament is going to take many many months, and possibly years to achieve. But meetings between heads of state, like President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev, are all to the good. I think they are very valuable. These leaders of great powers need to know one another. In other words, to be able to size each other up, so to speak.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has a great deal to gain from disarmament. I mean by that that she needs to release her productive capacity for consumer goods and for the achievement of her own economic goals. Then too, the Soviet Union, I believe, has every reason to be concerned about the spread of nuclear weapons, particularly if those nuclear weapons get into the hands of Red China, which today is her ally, but might very well become her

adversary.

Insofar as we are concerned in the United States, we seek disarmament because we are a peaceful people, and we would like very much to utilize our vast economic resources, that presently go into the arms race, for more constructive purposes: For economic development here at home -- and we have much to do here at home; and for economic assistance abroad, to help new nations become strong and progressive nations, and free and independent.

So, out of a meeting between the heads of state, some good can come if we do not expect too much too soon. I believe we must be patient and persevering, but have purpose to the pursuit of disarmament.

MR. HUNTLEY: Well, even though we do not achieve total disarmament day after tomorrow, there still remain other areas where agreements are yet possible, is that right?

MR. HUMPHREY: Oh yes. I think this is one of the more heartening signs. And, by the way, any progress that we can make in any area of the world in disarmament -- for example, if we could get a regional agreement on arms control in Africa, or a regional agreement on arms control for Latin America, just a region, it would mean a great deal, because we would then have the experience of a workable disarmament system at least for an area.

Then too, the possibilities of mutual agreement in the development of outer space, I think, are really encouraging.

We had an International Geophysical Year in which the leading nations of the world, the more advanced nations of the world in science and technology, pooled their resources for a great area, or a great period of exploration and research in what we called the Geophysical Year.

I propose that we have an International Space Year, in which we join with the Soviet Union and other countries to pool our research, to have joint enterprises, common projects in the development and the exploration of outer space.

And then, I would hope that we would seek to enter into an agreement under the auspices of the United Nations, for putting outer space out of bounds for military purposes. The time to do that is before it is staked out as a military battlefield. And I think the chances of doing that are rather good. We have had some experience in this in the Antarctic Treaty, where the Antarctica, a part of this world, has been declared for military purposes completely out of bounds -- neutralized -- and there is an international agreement, with international inspection, to make it a reality. I think that experience can be applied now, not merely to the earth, but to outer space, and what that means for the future would be very, very good.

MR. HUNTLEY: Senator, I sense you take the position that wherever and whenever heads of state or diplomats meet these days, this question of disarmament is going to come up, and that it

did come up at Vienna?

MR. HUMPHREY: It surely will come up. It surely did come up. And it ought to come up. Because there is no subject matter that is more vital to the future well-being of humanity in this world than the subject matter of disarmament. And there is no subject matter that requires more careful and prudent consideration than this. Therefore, the first duty of statesmen and of world leaders is to find a way to chart the path to peace, and the path to peace will be found not only in disarmament, but in the settlement of the great political problems that challenge the nations and that create the tension. The two must come together. Political solution of the unsolved political problems, and arms control and disarmament, as a step by step procedure to relieve this world of the terrible burden of the arms race.

MR. HUNTLEY: Senator Humphrey, is disarmament just a long-range dream for humanity, in the category of eternal youth?

MR. HUMPHREY: Well, if it is a dream it is one that everyone of us should have. Because without the dreaming about disarmament and, might I add, the hard work toward its achievement, what was a dream can become a horrible nightmare, a nightmare of thermonuclear and nuclear war which could mean destruction of the civilization that we love so much.

We have learned a great deal in recent years about disarmament. We have not put nearly enough effort into it. We have

as yet committed far too few of our resources, and far too few of our capable and talented people to the cause of disarmament. But we are beginning to learn.

We have learned, for example, that disarmament will not come easily, there is no magic formula. It will take tireless and, at times, painful negotiation.

We have learned that disarmament cannot be based upon what we call trust. It must be based upon a system of international inspection and control; it must be international. We cannot disarm just in the United States. We must have disarmament of the major powers.

I think we have also learned, from the talks at Geneva in particular on the nuclear weapons, that we can develop through science, systems of protection and of inspection and of control which will give us assurance; and then too, possibly we have learned that while there may be a risk in disarmament, there is a greater risk in the uncontrolled arms race which consumes our resources, which devours our energy and our talents, and which denies the world an opportunity to really make the economic and social progress which modern science and technology have made available.

MR. HUNTLEY: Well, John Chancellor, the communique mentions disarmament, but it says nothing about Khrushchev's veto demand, of course. But wouldn't you agree that these two things

had to be discussed together?

MR. CHANCELLOR: Well, Chet, the question of the Troika, as the Americans call this new Soviet idea of the three-way standoff in the operation of international organizations, has been one of the great underlying issues of the Vienna meeting. It was too elusive to be fitted into a communique. But whether or not it was mentioned by the two men, it was on both of their minds. As you say, it affects the U.N., the Laotian truce, the test ban talks, and disarmament. It has also been taken up as an article of Soviet doctrine, not just Soviet tactics to harass the West, and I think that whatever happened in Vienna a few hours ago, we will hear more of this new Russian idea that there are no neutral men.

MR. HUNTLEY: Short meetings usually produce more than long meetings, but at short meetings statesmen and newsmen alike plow ahead without any time for the city they are in. They spend most of the time not knowing or caring whether they are in Vienna or Sandusky, Ohio. But some of the magic of old Vienna was part of the proceedings, and we will get to that after this message from Bob Considine for Mutual of Omaha.

[Commercial]

MR. HUNTLEY: When chiefs of government meet in Vienna, everyone is reminded that Vienna is the city of Metternich. After dinner at Schoenbrunn Castle last night, the Kennedys and the Khrushchevs drove downtown from the suburbs to be reminded that

Vienna is also the city of Mozart and Johann Strauss.

[Mozart-ballet video-tape]

MR. HUNTLEY: And so we have come to the end of the first Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting, the seventh between an American President and a Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers, or as we usually call him, a Soviet Premier.

They conferred for a total of ten hours, four hours yesterday, and six hours and twenty-five minutes in two sessions today. They also dined together as guests of the President of Austria last night, and spent the evening being entertained and entertaining each other.

It is true, and should be recognized, that Khrushchev came to the meeting stronger than he or any other Russian leader has come to any of the earlier ones. It is not true that Yuri Gagarin, Souvanna Phouma, and Fidel Castro have made him invincible. His people are grumbling, his Chinese partners are starving, and the unity of the Communist world has some weak seams.

It is as dangerous to ignore their weakness as it is to ignore their strength. On Friday, just before leaving for Vienna, the President held a news conference in Paris. A reporter asked: "If you were Mr. Khrushchev, what would you think of the political position of Mr. Kennedy?" Here is the answer:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I would see where all Western

leaders may not agree on every issue. I would see where distinguished American correspondents who speak with great influence take a different view on what actions the United States should take. I would see Mr. Kennedy under critical attack by many of his fellow countrymen, as well as those who live across the ocean. I would look at my own country, where everything on the surface is serene, where nobody criticizes or opposes, and everyone is united behind me. And, therefore, I would draw a conclusion that the tide of history was moving with me.

If I were Mr. Khrushchev, however, and had spent some time in the West, I would take a somewhat different view of the tide of history. I would read those distinguished spokesmen who had prophesied the imminent collapse of Europe in 1947 and 1948. I would read those otherswho had felt it would be impossible for us to associate more closely together, and I would also recognize that dissent and controversy brings a kind of vitality and also protects individual liberty. And I would consider that possibly we could improve Russian society.

I will say that I do not agree very basically with one of the assumptions which a good many Communists put forward, and that is fromthe events of the last fifteen years they have made the judgment that the tide is determined, and in their favor. You cannot look at the relations between the countries behind the Iron Curtain, for example, the rather strange relationship between Albania and

China, or between Yugoslavia and Albania and Russia, or between all the other countries of the bloc, to feel that if time were permitted to pass and the Communists were permitted to be successful, that there would not inevitably be the same rivalries which we now see already in evidence.

The difficulty, of course, is that Caesar and Pompey, and Antony and Octavius and the others did not fall out until they were successful. We cannot afford the luxury of permitting them the kind of success which will prove them wrong finally in the kind of world of which they were witness.

We have to maintain our position. And therefore I hope Mr. Khrushchev is not misled by those signs of democracy which we understand but they do not, but instead recognizes that the United States of America, divided as it may be on many important questions, including governmental spending, is united in its determination to fulfill its commitments, and to play the role that history and its own free choice have brought upon it in these years.

MR. HUNTLEY: There are never as many answers as questions, and there is never a complete answer to the biggest question of all, which is: "Where does all this leave us?"

Well, one man's attempt in a moment, after Hugh Downs with this message about health and accident insurance from Mutual of Omaha.

[Commercial]

MR. HUNTLEY: So the young President went to see the elderly Premier, who says the United States is a dying and vestigial society, but who himself represents an old, archaic, unpopular order of political and economic and social suppression.

Khrushchev came to Vienna still demanding a change in the mechanics of doing the world's business, insisting on a Communist veto privilege.

He came to Vienna having recently denied the genuiness of neutrality in the cold war, for he said that nations might be neutral, but there are no neutral men.

He came to Vienna from a Communist Congress of last December in which he brazenly told the comrades and the world that peaceful co-existence is really only another Communist weapon, which kills just as dead, only a little more slowly and with less of a bang.

He came to Vienna having boasted that our grandchildren would live under Communism, that it is the inexorable wave of the future and that the West is in decline.

We know that President Kennedy firmly rejected these Khrushchev premises, and refused both his peaceful co-existence and his demands for the veto.

From Vienna Airport where the gray, drab Communist wall is visible twenty miles away, the President returns to the West -- the West, twenty nations, 550 million free people, a gross

annual product six times that of the Communist bloc, prosperous or reasonably so, economies expanding, well-armed, resolutely agreed in general, although not in detail, and with a pool of technical skill, knowledge, talents, and abilities which defy comprehension and measurements -- although a little depressed about recent setbacks.

Khrushchev returns to his Communist world -- Chinese, Russians, Albanians, and Yugoslavs yammering and pulling in diverse directions. His agriculture in serious trouble. Managers and functionaries have been caught cheating and with their hands in the till to the point that a new decree of death to the thief has been proclaimed. The Moscow press acknowledges it has caused the Soviet man to seek escape in alcohol.

True, Khrushchev returns to his countless ground forces, his artillery, missiles, and space technology, to undeniable excellence in other pursuits. But he also returns to weaknesses.

We have been blinded by some of his recent achievements coming simultaneously with our own errors. For example, we employ a cliche about Berlin -- that it is a small island in a vast and awesome Communist sea. It is an island, but it is an island of vitality, of hope, of movement and plenty, and light, where free men can talk out loud and even laugh, and through which the manpower of East Germany threatens almost to disappear.

The President returns with all the problems stemming

from Communist methods of expansion still there. But Khrushchev is aware of their risks, aware of our determination, and aware of his own weaknesses; and in this light that final line of the communique is most revealing: "The President and the Chairman agreed to maintain contact on all questions of interest to the two countries and for the whole world."

Chet Huntley Reporting for Mutual of Omaha. Good evening.

[Music]

Minnesota
Historical Society