

some suggest, said Fuelner, then the United States should not expand trade with the Soviet Union, but *curtail* trade and thereby exert pressure.

In responding to the argument that if we don't sell given items to the Communists, other nations will, Fuelner pointed out that this argument overlooks the policy considerations of Communist trade: Is it desirable? Is it in the interests of United States national security?

Those who use the "other nations will trade with them" argument do not deal with the issues involved. In addition, they fail to see that if Communist trade is undesirable and not in the best interests of the United States and/or the West, we should attempt to convince other nations to cease such trade. We should hardly trade ourselves. In the case of trade affecting the Vietnam war and going through Haiphong Harbor, a blockade in time of war is appropriate.

Dr. Richard Allen of Stanford University has categorized the Communist objective as "trade to end trade." In other words, the Communists place their own goals of imperialism and domination first, and trade as a means of reaching these goals. Communists, according to Dr. Allen, are interested in picking-off countries *bilaterally*.

Dr. Allen was critical of the argument by Communist trade advocates that we could cause the Communists to rely on trade, and then threaten to stop trading with them. Not only is the argument open to question, but we would be building the Communists up in the meantime. Communist trade advocates in the past have shown no inclination to use trade as a weapon, and there is no reason to believe they will use trade as a weapon in the future. Current Communist trade seems to be done on terms entirely satisfactory to the other side. It is difficult to imagine Dean Rusk or Wayne Morse or William Fulbright using trade as a weapon against the Communists.

A Moral Question

The question of trading with the Communists during the Vietnam war has caused many Americans to ponder the effect on American fighting forces and morale. This subject opens a whole Pandora's box of Communist trade implications. What is the effect of such trade on anti-Communist exile groups? On anti-Communist defectors? On anti-Communist resistance groups, within Communist nations, and outside of Communist nations? What is the effect on people within the Captive Nations who may someday hope to reclaim their destiny?

Recently the talk of "building-bridges" has lessened. But the day-to-day granting of licenses for exports of goods to Communist nations continues at the Department of Commerce. Although the administration realizes the opposition of the electorate to continued Communist trade, the policy is a firm one within the Departments of State and Commerce.

The question of Communist trade must consider all the issues raised on these pages, as well as the underlying assumptions of the administration relative to a detente and a "thawing" (a favorite term) of the Cold War. But in the end, there are serious moral issues involved.

These moral issues include our obligation to those behind the Iron Curtain, to provide *some* incentive for their governments to give these people a higher standard of living. We owe something to those who resist communism inside and outside the Captive Nations. If this nation's leadership refuses to support our soldiers in Vietnam with complete military support and a call for victory, the least the administration can do is provide some moral support for those called upon to give the ultimate sacrifice for their nation. Such moral support would *preclude* trading with the nations which supply funds, armaments, and supplies to North Vietnam.

Of course, the settlement of these moral issues involves acceptance of an assumption unpleasant to Communist trade advocates. That assumption is that the people in a Communist country are not the same as the government in that Communist country. If our current planners accepted this assumption, they would necessarily have to accept its corollary: that one must differentiate between aiding a Communist government of a nation and aiding the people of a nation. Thus, we may morally feel disposed to aid the people of a Communist nation, but Communist trade aids the Communist governments and *not* the people. Communist trade helps keep unjust Communist governments in power, and it spares these governments the option of allocating more resources toward improving the standard of living of these people. Communist trade may well have anti-humanitarian effects.

Rep. H. R. Gross, Republican of Iowa, and Rep. Paul Findley, Republican of Illinois, proposed amendments to the foreign aid bill last year. The Gross amendment would have banned U.S. aid to nations trading with North Vietnam and prohibited U.S. purchases or sales of defense equipment with such nations. The Findley amendment would have suspended "most-favored-nation" (i.e., low tariff) privileges for Poland—because Polish officials have been boasting of the weapons that they are sending to North Vietnam.

The Gross-Findley amendments lost on a 200-196 rollcall vote on November 8, 1967. *Human Events* printed the rollcall on the amendments in its Nov. 25, 1967 issue. Many Congressmen who voted against the amendments were upset at the newspaper's disclosure.

The reason such Congressmen as Robert Taft of Ohio, Clement Zablocki of Wisconsin, Bradford Morse of Mass. and others were upset is understandable. Their constituents, like the American people as a whole, oppose Communist trade. Such Congressmen—like the administration, should be held accountable for their actions.