

Vietnam's war material; almost all of North Vietnam's motor transport of supplies is on civilian vehicles), (3) testifying before Congressional hearings on East-West trade, and (4) educating YAF's membership on the peril of bailing out the economy of the Communist Empire and—in effect—sustaining its dictatorial control over the oppressed nations that comprise the Soviet bloc. The fact that the Soviets also routinely demand that our trading companies (sometimes unwittingly) kick back 5%—

The Soviet View of Trade

The "cultured" classes of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America, i.e., the ruling classes, the financial aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the idealistic democrats should be regarded as degenerate and treated accordingly. . . . The Chambers of Commerce, the federations of industry, bank groups and others will close their eyes and ears to the obvious truth that the world is 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 armaments industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers.

—V. I. LENIN

10% of the purchase price to an internal Communist Party in our own countries, makes East-West trade even less palatable to YAF.

IT SHOULD BE SELF-EVIDENT that aid to the USSR is inimical to U.S. interests: by selling wheat to the Soviet Union, we subsidize their armies (who "travel on their stomachs", after all) at home and abroad; by selling them other goods we have made the Soviets more powerful, not more friendly; Communist sources reveal that the Soviet economy has lowered the percentage of consumer goods from 13.1% in the last Seven Year Plan to 11.9% in the current Five Year Plan, while trade with the West has allowed them to plan an increase in industrial production of 55%; since 1963 the U.S. has built 15 fertilizer plants in the USSR, and now Soviet fertilizer is a major item of war aid to North Vietnam; computers are vital to Soviet ballistic missiles, yet the U.S. is sending a stream of licenses for up-to-date computers to the Red bloc. . . the list is endless.

BUT, WHAT ABOUT TRADE with the satellite countries of Eastern Europe—in the hope that exposure to our products and ideas will draw them away from the Soviets? The experience—especially of the last ten years—has been the reverse: whether the country be Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia or another, all American trade and military and economic aid has resulted in has been to cement shaky Communist leaders in power (many of these

"In the present epoch, the struggle for (Communism) and the fight to gain time depend above all on an unremitting increase in Soviet military power and that of the entire socialist camp, based on the development of productive forces and the continuous growth of its material and technological base."—V. D. Sokolovsky, "Soviet Military Strategy," 1963. YOUNG PEOPLE WITH KNOWLEDGE of international affairs are generally aware that the 1960s saw a shift in American vs. Soviet policy from the "containment" or "defense of the status quo" approach of Eisenhower to the "convergence" "detente" "bridges-to-the-East" policy of Kennedy-Johnson. They also know that the 1960s have seen: the establishment of a Soviet base for the proxy subversion of Latin America in Cuba; the de facto establishment of a Soviet base in the Arab Middle East; the establishment of a Soviet base for the proxy subversion of sub-Saharan Africa in Tanzania; the attempted establishment of a Soviet base for the proxy subversion of Southeast Asia in Vietnam. . . all modeled after their successful pre-World War II establishment of a base for the proxy subversion of China in the northern, Yenan province of that country. In other words, most politically hip young people are aware that the Cold War is not "over"; that the USSR (with its colonies) is still expanding, just like all of the other imperialist powers of world history.

YOUNG AMERICANS TODAY DO NOT have a very clear idea of what the future holds for them. But they do know that the Soviet Union—when they were born only a war-ravaged Russia held together by \$11 billion of American Lend-Lease aid—now has nuclear parity with the United States, and threatens superiority. Consequently, American youth may be somewhat confused by the massive effort by the U.S. Government and European powers in the mid-1960s to supply the Soviet Union and its Eastern European colonies on credit, with repayment ranging from 5 to 30 years—with every kind of good short of actual military hardware. (The fact that the Soviets have defaulted on the bulk of credits extended to them in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s probably adds to their confusion.)

ONLY YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, among the youth of today, has been active in objecting to this aspect of our foreign policy—on the grounds that it amounts to committing national suicide. YAF was instrumental in recent years in (1) forcing cancellation of a projected Firestone synthetic rubber plant planned for Communist Rumania (a supplier of North Vietnam), (2) forcing cancellation of an American Motors deal with the Soviet Union to supply automobiles in return for steel (the Soviets supply more than 80% of North

countries are occupied by the Red Army, as well) and ease the pressure on the Soviet Union to fuel the world Communist enterprise.

AND THIS LEADS TO THE CRUX of the East-West trade issue: the failure of American foreign policy generally, to realize that the governments of the USSR and its colonies are not synonymous with "their" peoples. The people are "another country" in James Baldwin's phrase, "the most dependable and important allies we have" in the words of Walter Judd. And most especially the young people! Yet American policy—in all areas, including that of East-West trade—has been to deal with Communist governments as if they were of the people. . . never extracting concessions from them for their peoples (as we have attempted to do elsewhere; e.g., in South Africa and in Latin America).

WHAT ABOUT THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE? Hear the words of Russian poet Valery Tarsis (Bhebotle, Ward 7) writing in THE NEW GUARD, the magazine of YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM, in June 1966 after his escape from the USSR:

"No family in Russia is without some horrible wound, inflicted by Communists: a father shot, a son vanished in a camp, a wife raped by a local party official. All these people hate the Communists and are your allies. . . After the war the people's discontent with the Communist system grew ever stronger and stronger. In recent years this resistance has expressed itself in mass riots, strikes, and demonstrations. . . as in the demonstrations of youth last April and December; as in the circulation of anti-Communist writings and magazines. . . The Russian people are now squaring their shoulders in battle. They are becoming ever more determined to shake off the shackles of a half century of slavery. . . Perhaps I will best express the feelings which animate the young generation in Russia today (by quoting) four lines from a verse written by one of my young friends:

"We had scarcely opened our mouths,
Coughing quietly into our handkerchiefs:
We have used up and ruined half of Russia,

Let us now bury the Bolsheviks!"

WILL AMERICAN YOUTH BETRAY RUSSIAN youth? To allow East-West trade to occur untested, unchecked, is to endanger the United States militarily. . . and to encourage oppression and misery in both the Soviet bloc and the Third World, YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM urges American youth to study the foreign policy issues raised by East-West trade, assess their effects on our generation, and participate in political action that will bring about their end.