

to, say, Rumania or Hungary would be thought in Europe to be very slight and, indeed, virtually nonexistent. I don't think people would see this as a possible bargaining element of any importance.

Senator MILLER. But certainly this must be a two-way street. If the bloc nations looked upon the expansion of East-West trade with great hope and expectancy, I can't understand why you say that this is a rather slim or marginal factor. I would think it would be a very great factor. And certainly, as you point out, their economies are weakening. If they have a hope to strengthen them, I would think it would be a very big factor. I can't understand why you would play that factor down in the diplomatic bargaining arena.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think there are rather important differences, if I may say so, between us on this. I suppose one of them is perhaps the assumption that by withholding some commodity from Rumania one can thereby bring direct pressure on the Soviet Union because of these other matters. It is much more the Soviet Union that is involved in the Middle East than it is Rumania, Hungary, or Poland. We don't regard the bloc, to use the old out-of-date phrase, as being very much of a bloc any more. And the danger that I see in what you have been saying is that this sort of doctrine can be used in Europe to support the proposition that Western Europe and Eastern Europe can never get back on reasonable terms so long as they have to follow an American policy of the kind which you have outlined. If the United States is always going to suggest holding back on East-West trade with Hungary or Poland because of annoyance with the Soviet Union in the Far East or Middle East or somewhere, this is precisely the argument that is used in Europe for separating Europe from the United States. I always combat that argument.

Senator MILLER. I don't think you have precisely stated the American policy as I understand it. And the American policy is certainly not this at all. It is a temporary matter hoping that in time it can develop into a genuine trading partnership. But it is a matter of timing. It is not an always, forevermore negative proposition at all. So, I think we ought to make that clear. But it just seemed to me—and I appreciate your frank comments about the attitudes, the European attitudes—and I was trying to point something that might be timely, because I know petroleum is of great concern to free Europe, and if Europe received the impression that the bloc nations were contributing to the difficulty of petroleum, I would say that from an American standpoint it would not appear to be a proper and prudent time to start expanding the trade. It would be a proper and prudent time to hold out the opportunity for expanding trade when the petroleum problem is diminishing.

Now, there is another point, too. I don't think that we ought to say that the American viewpoint toward the Soviet Union is identical with the American viewpoint toward the so-called bloc nations. I would like to ask you whether you feel that the trade approach ought to be identical vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and the bloc nations or whether you would recommend perhaps a more relaxed trade position with some of the bloc nations as against the position toward the Soviet Union at this time.