

To try to argue the concept of East-West trade on purely economic bases is not going to result in a thoughtful dialog on the subject.

I was impressed with Senator Symington's comment about U.S. nationalistic approach to some extent with respect to economic question and U.S. international approach in other areas such as political and military matters. Yet the basic difference of opinion cannot be swept away with the kinds of comments that are in your statement, and I appreciate that your statement wasn't intended to exhaust the East-West trade question. Yours was a much broader subject, so I am certainly not being critical.

But they can't be swept away that simple. The difference of opinion that I sense in this country and to some extent among Members of Congress boils down to a difference in viewpoint as to the nature of the threat that exists in the world, and a difference in viewpoint as to the effect on that threat by increased East-West trade. One of the fundamental problems is that it is a difficult question to deal with in a broad way, because it seems to me that what is or is not desirable economically, politically, militarily, varies from country to country, from commodity to commodity, and sometimes from year to year. Therefore, I have trouble buying the argument that one must be for East-West trade or that one must be against East-West trade, because I believe one must look to the country and look to the commodity and look to the political and military and economic framework at the time that a decision is being made.

It would seem to me that we are going to have a more constructive dialog on this subject if the arguments are not based purely on economics, when the opposition is coming from people who recognize the economic advantages, but who are concerned more about the potential political and military disadvantages. Rather, the arguments must show specifically what we would gain economically in exchange for what we might be losing in terms of some potential political or military problems in the future.

Some argue, saying that the Communist countries are going to get the commodities anyway, from Britain, Japan, or from some other country. They further argue that therefore we should trade and get the economic benefits. Well, that has some merit economically, and it does eliminate one of the problems politically and militarily, but it doesn't solve the question because of the fact that the answer to it might be, well, why isn't this country exerting a little more pressure leadership in the world to try to develop support and cooperation from other nations, so that in the event a situation does develop with respect to a specific country or a specific commodity at a specific time, we could encourage other nations to see that they don't get it, instead of just throwing up our hands and saying they are going to get it anyway.

It reminds me of the story about the village where there was mud in the streets and the people who walked along the curb would get splattered with mud every time a cart went by. So the city fathers met and decided to work this out reasonably. They passed an ordinance saying that every time a cart came by everyone had to line up along the curb so they would all get sprayed with mud equally.

This has been a lengthy comment on a subject on which I need a great deal more information, but I would like to see a considerably