

State Department spokesmen described the Arbatov article as "serious and thoughtful" and said they were giving it "careful study." On March 29, the Baltimore *Sun* reported that Carter had dispatched new instructions to U.S. SALT negotiators in Geneva, "instructions which privately encouraged the most staunch advocates of arms control."

Meanwhile, the State Department has dispatched a team composed of Deputy Secretary Warren Christopher, Counselor Matthew Nimetz and Assistant Secretary George Vest to "explain to the USA's European allies the reasons for Carter's decision to delay production of the neutron bomb." Officials in Bonn should have little trouble understanding Carter's reasons, as West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has long sought to establish the preconditions under which the provocative weapon — which the Soviets correctly regard as evidence of U.S. belief that "limited nuclear war" can be fought in Europe — could be "negotiated away." According to a March 28 article in the *New York Times*, Carter personally vetoed the Brussels NATO announcement on the grounds that he remained unsure that NATO governments would agree to deployment of the bomb if it were actually produced. Although much of the U.S. press is now reporting that the State Department mission is an effort to twist the arm of Schmidt and other European leaders into requesting the bomb's deployment — something only Britain's James Callaghan has so far done — there are equally strong indications that Carter hopes to use the upcoming special session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament in May and June to provide a context for defusing the whole issue.

The Soviets have repeatedly stated publicly that a full U.S. commitment to the neutron bomb would signal "a new round of the arms race." Members of a U.S. Congressional delegation in Moscow last week told reporters that "every other word" to them from Soviet officials was a condemnation of the n-bomb.

Carter Faces 'Acid Test' For U.S. Policy In Africa

On the verge of President Carter's scheduled meetings in Africa on his third international tour, UN Ambassador Andrew Young, speaking from Lagos, Nigeria, stated that an "internal solution" for Rhodesia is a "suicide policy" which, if supported by Great Britain, would lead to "civil war in Africa" and "the end of the British government." Young's statements, reported by ABC networks as representative of both the White House and the State Department, sets the stage for Carter's Africa policy. The question now is whether or not Carter will pursue the line established by Young and fight for it at home in the U.S. despite the activities of Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski, who favor a "tough line" for Africa against the Patriotic Front and Soviet presence.

Such a decision by Carter can no longer be put off, at the risk of a complete "blow-up" in the Horn of Africa. An Administration source this week admitted that the one world "hot spot" where U.S. "prodétente forces" do not have a handle on a solution is the southern African region.

Britain's desire for Carter couldn't be clearer. One British commentary charged Young with seeking black votes for Carter, while the *Daily Telegraph* challenged the President to "insist on more restraint and better manners." The *Daily Mail* editorialized: "The British are heartily sick of being insulted... We do not expect to get it from a member of the U.S. cabinet."

Memorandum on AFL-CIO Economic and Strategic Policy

The following memorandum was released on March 16, 1978 by Warren Hamerman, of the U.S. Labor Party's National Executive Committee.

I have before me for consideration three recent policy statements by the AFL-CIO leadership which go beyond the usual mere incompetence and indecency on economic and strategic issues that we have come to expect from AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland and his minions. While the duplicitous leadership presents for the credulous a monolithic policy front, I also happen to know that each of these statements is put forward in the most defensive "macho" fashion because the "Jewish Lobby" crew around Kirkland and the labor-intensive

Maoist networks of former UAW boss Woodcock are being opposed *policy by policy* by thinking men and women inside the AFL-CIO.

The three statements are: (1) *The AFL-CIO American Federationist* of February 1978, which contains the economic program of Felix Rohatyn, Mike Blumenthal, and Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht reworded to simulate a labor movement policy; 2) the March 1978 *Free Trade Union News*, published by the AFL-CIO's Department of International Affairs under the "dictation" of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger; and (3) Lane Kirkland's recent speech at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, on the near-term "inevitability" of U.S.-USSR confrontation.