

the way they did in 1948 (in Palestine) and leave us with 30 years of trouble?"

We reprint below Young's editorial statement as it appeared in the Atlanta Constitution. The statement is an important step in undercutting the efforts of National Security Council Chief Zbigniew Brzezinski to use the Rhodesian situation as a theatre for a showdown between superpowers:

The problem with an "internal settlement" in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) is that it is not really a settlement. Any agreement which does not include the forces that are doing the fighting — the Patriotic Front and the Rhodesian security forces — simply paves the way for a repeat of the Angola experience, with the result being continued bloodshed and civil strife. This conflict would inevitably spill over the borders of Zambia, South Africa, Mozambique, and Botswana.

It is already clear that the agreement announced Feb. 15 between Ian Smith and three black leaders — Bishop Abel Muzorewa, the Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, and Sen. Jeremiah Chirau — will not end the fighting. There is, however, a proposal — formulated by the British and United States governments — which is the only hope for stopping the warfare and guaranteeing free and impartial elections.

There are those who are only too glad to wash their hands of the entire matter, deluding themselves into believing that Mr. Smith has had a miraculous change of heart and is finally ready to transfer power.

But a realistic appraisal would suggest that the increasing military capabilities of the Patriotic Front and a rapidly collapsing economy in Rhodesia are more responsible for his change in attitude. Meanwhile, the increased pressure exerted by the presidents of the nearby "front line states" plus the internal talks, have led to the Patriotic Front's willingness to discuss the substantive Anglo-American proposal.

These discussions began recently in Malta, where Dr. David Owen, the British foreign minister, and I met for several days with leaders of the Patriotic Front, including Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe. We held detailed conversations concerning transition arrangement, a United Nations peace-keeping force and the current military actions inside Rhodesia. The talks were positive and generally helpful in advancing the Anglo-American plan for a peaceful transfer of power in an independent Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Mugabe committed themselves to free and impartial elections and expressed a willingness to pursue a negotiated settlement.

The U.S. interest lies in stability and order in Zimbabwe and peace in the entire region of southern Africa. It really doesn't matter which nationalist leader emerges at the top of a new government, so long as that person is the choice of the Zimbabwe people.

The need for Western capital, markets and technology for development assures us of a relationship which can be negotiated to protect U.S. interests. Anything short of free and impartial elections that include all of the nationalist leaders simply plays into the hands of the Soviet Union and instability.

We have received extremely strong and positive support from presidents Julius Nyrere of Tanzania and Samora Machel of Mozambique, as well as the government of Nigeria, for our proposal.

If the mood of the American people were such that it encouraged abandoning our proposals in the face of an "internal settlement," we would be abandoning the development potential of an entire region.

Clearly, the U.S. government cannot support an "internal settlement" but our national interest is tied to peace and cessation of the warfare in the area, and that can only come about as a result of the agreement by the two parties that control the arms — the Rhodesian security forces and the Patriotic Front.

Carter Begins Confrontation With Jewish Lobby

Forces within the Carter Administration are moving to confront one of the chief political barriers standing in the way of a comprehensive, Middle East settlement: the so-called "Israel Lobby."

THE ADMINISTRATION

The politically powerful Jewish Lobby was set up largely through City of London/Rothschild networks, and has historically been used to thwart any U.S. attempts to help resolve the Middle East crisis — not out of any concern for Israel's national interests, but to further Britain's global aims. The Jewish lobby has raised a continuous and loud cry over the U.S.-Soviet joint communiqué of October, 1978 and the Administration's Mideast sales package.

The assessment that the White House has launched a concerted effort to break the Jewish Lobby's grip over U.S. Mideast policymaking was made by a spokesman for the American Israel Political Action Committee (AIPAC). Commenting on the March 8 resignation of Mark Siegel from his post as President Carter's liaison to the Jewish community in protest against the Administration's allegedly anti-Israel policies, the AIPAC representative told a reporter: "The Administration doesn't give a s--t that Siegal quit. They're after us, they're looking for a confrontation with the Jewish community...They want to break the 'Jewish Lobby'."

Noting that Siegel's resignation had come just one week before Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin is to arrive in the United States for discussions with Carter and his advisors, the AIPAC spokesman reported that "the Administration is very upset with Begin" and is

“heading for a very big confrontation” with him.

Indications that the Administration is girding itself for a major showdown with Begin over his continued refusal to adopt a rational negotiating position were also forthcoming from Robert Strauss, the White House Special Trade Negotiator who has been taking on an increasingly influential role in foreign policy decision-making over recent weeks. Speaking at a meeting of reporters March 7, Strauss couped a strong defense of the U.S. dollar with an urgent call for American Jews to support the Administration's Mideast peacemaking attempts. “There is considerable lack of support among American Jews for Begin, and I share that view,” said Strauss, adding that he was “confident” the Jewish community would rally behind the President's peace initiatives.

Rumors abounded this week, in fact, that Strauss — a leading figure in U.S. Jewish circles — had pressed for Siegel's resignation, with a view toward taking over his liaison functions himself. Strauss's aim, apparently, is to consolidate the widespread but unorganized elements of the Jewish community who believe that Israel should accept a Mideast settlement along the lines of U.N. Resolution 242, into an effective counterweight to the highly-coordinated, City of London/Rothschild controlled “Jewish Lobby.”

The fact that the Administration moved this week to undercut the Jewish Lobby indicates that they may be preparing some major new initiatives for the troubled Middle East. Such a possibility was suggested by one well-informed Washington-based policy analyst in an interview this week:

Q: What is your assessment of how the Administration will move on the Mideast?

A: ...The Carter Administration does not favor a separate peace between Israel and Egypt. If the talks between the Israelis and Egyptians continue along current lines, the Administration is more likely to pressure the Israelis and/or to go back to Geneva.

Q: Are you suggesting that the Administration will reaffirm the October U.S.-Soviet joint communiqué?

A: Exactly. Rather than support a separate peace, the Administration may well go back to the joint statement. How this squares with the Horn of Africa problem is complex. But note that Israel and the Soviets are both in Ethiopia, and thus have a strange sort of convergence. So maybe the Israelis are not so adamant against Soviet involvement in the peace process as you would think on the surface....

State Legislatures Demand Carter Expand Eximbank, Nuclear Development

The House of Representatives of President Carter's home state became the first state legislative body to memorialize the U.S. Congress and the President to expand the funding of the Export-Import Bank of the United States in coordination with federal support for the currently undervalued U.S. dollar. The Georgia House of Representatives unanimously passed the U.S. Labor Party-backed memorial resolution March 7, only 24 hours after its initial introduction.

Introduced by a Republican, Rep. Bob Beckham, and Democrat Rep. Dorsey Matthews, the Georgia “privileged resolution” calls upon the White House and Congress to “go bullish on America by announcing that full support for the dollar is a national priority.” Blaming the dollar crisis in part on the Administration — “in particular, the Treasury Department” — the resolution states that a solution can be found through:

(1) “early rechartering of the Eximbank, including increasing its funding from \$5 billion to \$200 billion...”

(2) the replacement of the Administration's current energy program “with one which emphasizes the development and utilization of existing and...to be discovered fossil fuels, the mobilization of our advanced research and development capabilities to expand existing nuclear facilities, proceeding with the breeder program...(and the expansion of) our nuclear fusion program...”

(3) White House “support of the American System with its unequivocal commitment to industrial, agricultural, and technological progress as the means of ensuring an expanding economy at home and peace abroad...”

The Georgia resolution is reportedly already on its way to Carter and the Congress. On March 6, the New York State Senate passed a similar memorial resolution, which now awaits State Assembly deliberation. Bills along the lines of the Georgia model are in committee or under serious consideration in five other states: New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Connecticut and Delaware.

Such so-called memorial resolutions stem from the days when the U.S. republic was young and workers' associations and local public bodies would frequently use memorials to instruct their federal representatives on crucial national issues. Today, they are being revived by elected officials to make popular sentiment felt on the issues of national policy which actually determine the economies of cities, states, and regions. Through such memorial resolutions, nationally oriented state legislators are rejecting the agenda of “local problems” set for them by the media and liberals, since the questions can only be solved by a federal policy of expanding high-technology goods produced by specific regions and resetting a correct agenda for the U.S. Congress.

New York Resolution Sets Pace For Gubernatorial Race

The importance of program emphasizing high-technology exports, embodied in the resolution to expand the Eximbank by Democratic state Senator Jeremiah Bloom of Brooklyn, could be crucial to the upcoming New York