

the ruling classes, the financial aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the idealistic democrats should be regarded as deaf-mutes and treated accordingly . . .

The deaf-mute capitalist hoarders, their governments, the Chambers of Commerce, the federations of industry, bank groups, steel kings, rubber kings, aluminum kings and others will close their eyes to the above-mentioned truth and so become blind, deaf, and dumb. They will grant us credits, which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armament industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers.

Lenin's comments are, to us, a reflective commentary on the strategy which underlies both the long-range and the short term positions of the Communists in support of East-West trade.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain realities about East-West trade which cannot be overlooked.

Communists carry out trade only through the officials of political regimes. Their motives, even in the area of trade, are political and, as the Republican Task Force on East-West Trade has so well put it, power-oriented.

Communist regimes are committed to a policy of hostility to the Free World, particularly the United States, and this policy is aimed at our entire society.

Communist nations have very little that we need, not only in commodities, but more importantly in technology, while the Free World has much to offer in both categories.

Some of our national policy-making leadership appears to often look at Communism as a system which does not constitute a vital threat to the Free World, that will and must somehow soon pass away, and which will eventually yield to normalcy.

We must also remember that the amount of private consumption is effectively controlled by the state in Communist countries and that their governing regimes are committed to give first economic priority to their power purposes.

Western trade representatives would enjoy contact only with a few government officials appointed by the Communist elite, which officials are tested for their political reliability, as well as administrative competence and which are subject to removal at the whim of the regime. These Communist regimes have the capacity and the will to decide what the consumers share of the nation's material goods shall be, which, in the past, have remained on a very low priority.

As all of us are aware, recent Administrations, particularly this one, have adopted policies described as "building bridges to the East." While this concept of lessening tensions between East and West may sound good on its face, the bridges which the present Administration proposes to build are, in reality, one-way avenues carrying benefit to the Communist nations with little, if any, benefit to the Free World.

Of the greatest concern to our members is the Hypocrisy of '68—the waging of a war against the Communists in Southeast Asia by the United States, while, at the same time, the present Administration seeks to trade with Communist governments providing war materials to our adversary in Asia. At a time when the Soviets boast of supplying North Vietnam with eighty-five percent of its war materials, and at a time when American soldiers are dying because of the use of that war material, it is incomprehensible to us as to why our government seeks to bolster the countries of Eastern Europe.

Young Americans for Freedom has also been disturbed at the policy of the Department of State of encouraging businessmen to participate in the development of industrial capacities of Communist countries, which development can only increase the Communist capability to compete with the West in economic, as well as military, means. We are also alarmed at the increasing number of items which our government deems as non-strategic, despite the Congressional exposure of many of these so-called non-strategic items as strategic indeed.

*What is "strategic"?*

Young Americans for Freedom, as I have indicated, is opposed to trade of a strategic nature. Of course, whether a particular good is strategic or non-strategic depends, to some extent, on the need of the purchasing Communist country for the product as an instrument of state control, planning, or com-