

Mr. YOUNGER. I wouldn't have thought it made any difference. I am not suggesting that European countries would wish to see all limitations on strictly strategic goods and weapons removed. But I don't think it would be felt in Europe that what has happened in the Middle East was particularly relevant to the withholding of marginally strategic goods, the sort of hardware that could conceivably be used in some military connection, but would be more normally used in civilian affairs. I wouldn't think that Europeans would feel that that was at all relevant when you are considering trade with a country like Poland or Rumania. It would be thought to have nothing to do with it at all.

Senator MILLER. Well, suppose that Czechoslovakia were providing tanks for Egypt, and other war armaments, and there were a danger that this could result in a closing of the Suez Canal to the European nations. Do you think that under those circumstances that it would be prudent to expand trade between Britain and Poland and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. YOUNGER. I would very much like to know from Dr. Peccei if I am misrepresenting the European point of view on this, but I would think that in most countries of Europe, and I am sure in Britain, people are looking to a continuation of closer relations and of detente, which after all has been going on between the Communist world and the Western world at least for the last 3 or 4 years, at least since the Cuban crisis. They are not thinking of reverting to the earlier situation which existed, say, in the late 1940's or 1950's, because there was never believed to be a military danger. The object then was to weaken the adversary without any discrimination. Whether it was the Soviet Union or Poland or Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia, the object was to weaken them. I do not believe that this philosophy holds anywhere in Europe at the present time.

Senator MILLER. But if the philosophy moves from a philosophy of weakening to one of strengthening, or to one of a timing, the opportunity for expansion of East-West trade would be a factor in causing certain actions which Europe does not like to stop. What I am getting at is that it seems to me that a closing of the Suez Canal, possibly the withholding of petroleum shipments from Arab States, is of great importance to Europe, and that with a view to enabling that situation to cease, there is the opportunity for East-West trade to be expanded which could be used as a bargaining point to mediate the situation in the Middle East. In other words, it doesn't necessarily come down to widening an economy, I don't think that is putting it realistically. It gets down to a matter of the negotiating propositions.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would go this far, that if one is trying to get improved relations between the East and West there is an element of diplomatic bargaining over a situation like the Middle East, in the sense that you can say, well, if you are wishing us to be more friendly in this or that sphere of policy, you can't expect to be free to conduct wholly hostile policies in another area. This, of course, is generally true, I suppose, as a diplomatic proposition. The whole world in that sense is one, when you are dealing between great powers. But I would have thought the connection between the closing of the Suez Canal, possibly as a result of some Soviet moral or material backing for Egypt, and the provision of more or less normal civilian goods, capital equipment