

Hungarian leader discusses U.S. policy

An exclusive interview with our correspondent in Bonn

During the 68th Session of the Inter-Parliamentary Union held in Bonn, West Germany, Inter-Parliamentary Council and Hungarian Parliament member Miklos Nagy was interviewed on Sept. 7 by the Executive Intelligence Review's correspondent in Bonn. Here is Mr. Nagy's analysis of the volatile Middle East situation and U.S.-USSR relations:

Q: *What is your estimate of the Camp David meeting, in light of reports that Zbigniew Brzezinski is controlling the summit?*

A: The main issue for the Middle East is a stable peace, but the meeting in Camp David is not at all suited to solve this problem and restore peace. For 30 years, Israel has fomented hostilities, mainly against the Palestinians. The only reasonable proposal in sight is Geneva, where all sides are participating.

I am very skeptical concerning the success of Camp David. Begin is intransigent, and Sadat cannot make any more concessions. The possibility of a new war cannot be excluded. A solution which ignores the Palestinian question is no solution at all. In the long term, this doesn't serve the interests of Israel either.

Q: *What about the state of U.S.-Soviet relations?*

A: Under the Nixon Administration, there was a major favorable shift. This improvement of American-Soviet relations positively affected the entire international situation. This shift alone made the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe — ed.) possible.

During the U.S. electoral campaign of 1976 a worsening of relations began, which we thought would be only momentary. But the new U.S. Administration questioned many positive results of detente; it abandoned previous policies and has given official support for anti-Soviet actions. The U.S. is neglecting international organizations like the United Nations for the solution of world problems. It has abandoned the possibility of a joint Middle East solution, despite the common declaration with the Soviet Union one year ago.

But one should not be pessimistic. The sane forces still exist, as before. The U.S. will eventually return to this old policy. Then the detente process could be continued.

At the moment, the international situation is not favorable, but different from the time of the

Caribbean, the Vietnam and Korean wars. Some results of detente are irreversible today. There is no realistic alternative to peaceful cooperation.

Economic blackmail against the Soviet Union doesn't work. The Soviet Union will continue to fulfill its Five-Year Plan targets despite the arms race imposed on it, whereby it must be considered that the arms race is also affecting the Western countries.

Q: *The U.S. National Security Council, of which Zbigniew Brzezinski is the chairman, is putting out the line that the Soviet Union will not stand by Syria in case of an Israeli attack because Brezinski's networks in various East European countries would be mobilized to destabilize the Warsaw Pact. In this context, do you see a coordination with Hua Kuo-feng's recent trip to some Balkan countries?*

A: I think it is very naive to establish such a link between the Middle East with the internal situation in the East European countries as the NSC does. The so-called "dissenters" don't have any political influence. Although there is no proof of a coordination between Brzezinski's policy and Hua's trip, it must be stated that China is playing a very adventurous role. It's a very dangerous game for the United States at the same time, since China is not a reliable ally.

China is not in the position to launch a war against the Soviet Union; maybe it will be in 20 years, assuming the Soviet Union does not develop its own defense capabilities in the meantime. But who guarantees that China would turn against the Soviet Union then, and not against the United States?

Q: *Given that the Maoist policy of the Chinese leadership is mainly a product of rural backwardness, do you think that an industrial development policy toward China that at the same time seeks to contain the military buildup could produce changes in the Chinese leadership and world outlook?*

A: There will be no change within a short time. After one or two decades, it could, or would, change.

Q: *Can you detail proposals Eastern European countries have made for improving economic relations with the West, like the pan-European conference on energy? Does it include cooperation in developing thermonuclear fusion?*

A: Fusion is only one part of scientific-economic

cooperation which is very important. The conditions for joint research in the energy field could be created within a short time. One preliminary condition for economic cooperation would be that the CMEA and the EEC reach an agreement. That would positively affect the cooperation between East and West, and with the developing countries. The proposal for pan-European conferences includes joint research in nuclear energy. Scientists on both sides see no danger

at all in nuclear energy, if necessary measures are taken. An agreement should be reached on how to use the joint results of this research.

In general, new initiatives are needed in a constructive and positive way. The sooner this is done, the international atmosphere which has very negative aspects right now could be improved. A constructive attitude would help considerably.

Moscow is on to Brzezinski's Mideast game

Authoritative statements in the Soviet press are warning Washington that if the Camp David summit meeting adopts measures establishing a U.S. military presence on the West Bank of the Jordan River, or if widely mooted proposals for a Middle East Treaty Organization (METO) modeled after NATO are implemented, the USSR will view this as a grave threat to its national security.

These warnings do not, however, signify that the Soviet Union is reacting to Mideast developments with the hysteria that Great Britain and its agent, U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, would like to provoke. On the contrary, cool and astute analyses of the Mideast crisis, like that by leading Izvestia commentator A. Bovin excerpted here from the Sept. 6 edition of the Soviet government paper Izvestia, signal that Brzezinski's efforts to spark a U.S.-Soviet showdown are proceeding on the basis of a profile of the Soviet leadership which is dead wrong.

"Camp David: A Knot of Contradictions"

... Neither the USA, nor Egypt, nor Israel is interested now in an expanded war in the Middle East. Therefore the search for a compromise, the search for some kind of separate, partial solutions, will continue. However, success, even by the most optimistic formula, is extremely problematic. The conceptions held by the different sides of the nature of a possible peace are too different.

For Tel Aviv, peace is Israel's consolidation of the West Bank of the Jordan River, Jerusalem and other occupied territories; it is an absolute "no" to the creation of an independent Palestinian state....

Even some American friends of Israel are irritated by this inflexible, futile position. However, Begin is convinced that the grumbling in Washington will not reflect upon the active military and financial support for Tel Aviv, and therefore he has no intention of giving way.

Washington is playing its own game in the Middle East. The peace the United States is looking for is intended to expand and strengthen its influence in this strategically most important and wealthiest region. That is the goal. The means is to split the anti-Israel

front, to consolidate conservative, pro-West regimes under American aegis, to create a stable modus vivendi of Arab reaction with Tel Aviv.

The latest round of military activity in the Middle East does not correspond to American interests. War would force the Americans to quit their policy of balancing between Israel and the Arab world. War would force the Arabs to resort to the "oil weapon," as they did in October of 1973.... That is why Washington is persistently trying to find safe ground for an agreement between Egypt and Israel, but an agreement which, giving some tactical benefits to Egypt, would still preserve Israel's strategic supremacy. This is the meaning of Camp David.

Both Washington and Tel Aviv oppose the creation of a Palestinian state. At the same time, the Americans understand that even Sadat will not go for an agreement which completely ignores the Palestinian problem, since such an agreement would not be recognized by the Arabs. Therefore Washington is trying to construct a formula which would give the appearance of a solution to the Palestinian question (variations of "self-management," "participation" of the Palestinians in determining their fate, etc.). Washington evidently calculates that social and class interests will sooner or later nudge the conservative Arab states toward support of such a formula.

Both Washington and Tel Aviv oppose Israeli withdrawal from all occupied lands. At the same time, the Americans realize that Israel's aspiration, based on security considerations, to keep the West Bank as well as other "strategic points," could paralyze the negotiations. And the Americans evidently are proposing a compromise: sovereignty over these regions to be given to the Arabs (Egypt or Jordan), and as a "security guarantee," to replace (or supplement) Israeli troops there with American ones. I do not know whether American troops would be capable of guaranteeing security for Israel (or, really, oil for the USA), but they certainly would guarantee the general destabilization of the situation in the Middle East — that much is obvious. Furthermore, neither Egypt, nor even Israel, has yet agreed to Washington's long-range plans.