

Jeffrey Blankfort: Chomsky Misfires on US-Israel Relations (Part 1)

Jeffrey Blankfort is an American journalist and recognized expert on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Kathleen Wells Hi. I'm Kathleen Wells, political correspondent for *Race-Talk*, and today I'm speaking with Jeffrey Blankfort. Jeffrey Blankfort has been engaged in political work on behalf of the Palestinians since spending four and a half months in Lebanon and Jordan in 1970, photographing the Palestinian refugee camps.

Blankfort is a Middle East analyst who has written extensively on the Israel-Palestine conflict. He is a former editor of the *Middle East Labor Bulletin*, a photo journalist and currently hosts a program on international affairs called "Takes on the World" for *KZYZ*, the public radio station of Mendocino County in California.

Last July, Blankfort participated in a conference on Israel's nuclear weapons held at the Spy Museum in Washington DC and sponsored by the Institute for Research: Middle East Policy.

Thank you, Jeffrey for taking the time to speak with me this morning.

Jeff Blankfort: I'm very happy to be with you, Kathleen.

Kathleen Wells: I know that you've been a consistent critic of Professor Chomsky regarding many, if not most, of his public positions on Israel. But instead of conducting an interview that sort of rehashes some of that criticism, I thought readers would be more interested in an interview that highlighted your position and knowledge of Israel and her policies and her relationship with the

United States and its impact on Palestinians.

Jeff Blankfort: Well, first I should say, I actually agree with many positions of Professor Chomsky. What I disagree with are three critical positions of his. The first is regarding Israel as a strategic asset of the United States in the Middle East or he believes that Washington views Israel as a strategic asset. The second is his dismissal of the pro-Israel lobby or the American Jewish establishment as having any significant influence on U.S.-Middle East policy. And the third is his opposition to boycott, divestments and sanctions targeting Israel.

Kathleen Wells: Okay. So before I get to highlighting your analysis, let's look at that specific issue that you've just raised. Let's just look at it briefly. So I know that a central theme that ran through my interview with Professor Chomsky was that essentially Israel represents a strategic ally, or rather a “cop on the beat” or client state for the United States. Can you sort of elaborate on why you think that this position is erroneous?

Jeff Blankfort: Well, it's interesting. The only source that I have ever seen, that Professor Chomsky uses to justify that statement was the late Senator [Henry] Scoop Jackson from Washington, who was a major recipient of pro-Israel funding and was co-author of the Jackson Vanik amendment which prevented the U.S. and Soviet Union from having a detente, unless the Soviet Union allowed its Jews to leave the Soviet Union. So Scoop Jackson, he's considered to be the oil expert, and Jackson is the only source that Chomsky ever quotes as Israel serving as the U.S.'s “cop on the beat.”

In fact, if you look at the history of Israel in the Middle East, in 1958, when President Eisenhower was concerned that there was going to be a revolutionary change in Lebanon, he sent in the U.S. Marines. And we see, of course, in 1991, when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, President Bush -- senior Bush -- at the

time, had to persuade Israel from not intervening itself even after Saddam Hussein sent scuds into Israel. It was important for the coalition that the first President Bush had with Arab countries to keep Israel out of it. So at that time, Israel was a liability, and then we saw again in 2003 that Israel had to stay out of the war.

Now Chomsky alludes to two particular situations. One, in 1967, when the United States was not the prime supporter of Israel but France was, in which Israel preemptively attacked Egypt in '67 and took the Egyptian Sinai, the West Bank and Gaza and the Golan Heights from Syria. But that took place in 1967, quite a few years ago, and the only other instance he cites is in 1970 when King Hussein launched an attack on the Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan in September (I had actually been there just before that happened). And the Syrian President sent some tanks across the border to assist the Palestinians, and the United States, according to Chomsky, called on Israel to flex its muscle to keep Syria from intervening.

But, in fact, at that time, which Professor Chomsky doesn't mention, the head of the Syrian Air Force, who later became President Hafez Al-Assad, was very critical of Yasser Arafat and the PLO and refused to be a part of any attempt to rescue the Palestinians at that time. And several months after Black September, Hafez Al-Assad staged a coup in Syria, put the pro-Palestinian president in prison, and put in prison also hundreds of pro-Palestinian Syrian activists. This has been kind of written out of history, and Israel has been given the credit without lifting a finger as serving as the cop on the beat.

And, of course, one might say, if it had not been for Israel's foundation and the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians, there would have been no problem of Palestinians in Jordan because they would still have been in Palestine.

So there is no other source of Israel being a “cop on the beat” that Chomsky can allude to, where there's no expert in U.S. foreign policy or any other scholar

that he can quote that says the same thing, other than those obviously in the Israel lobby camp.

Kathleen Wells: So essentially, your position is that Israel is *not* a “cop on the beat,” is *not* a strategic asset or interest for the United States. Is that the position you're taking?

Jeffrey Blankfort: It is not only that. It has been more of a liability. And that every President since President Nixon has made an effort, some more than others, to actually get Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories -- first, Egypt, Syria and as well as the West Bank and Gaza -- not for the benefit of the Palestinians, but because it was in U.S. interest, and there are a number of scholars who have said that over the years who Chomsky has ignored.

Kathleen Wells: And, in fact ...

Jeffrey Blankfort: Actually, each one of these efforts has been thwarted because of the Israeli [lobby]. A critic, in Israel, Uri Avnery, has pointed out, [that] Israel summons [the] Israel lobby to do its thing, and each President has [had] to back down because of domestic political considerations.

As a matter of fact, there's an article in the *New York Times* just the other day in which it says the pro-Israel lobby is very concerned because Senator George Mitchell or Hillary Clinton said that peace between Israel and Palestine is in the U.S. national interest. And that is of concern to the Israel lobby, because they have been very instrumental in making sure that Israel's occupation continues and the settlements continue to expand.

Kathleen Wells: Well, I kind of want to address that later, but one thing I wanted to touch on is the fact that last July, Assistant Secretary [of State] Shapiro indicated that the characterization of the relationship between the

United States and Israel is irrelevant, because no matter what the characterization is, the commitment, the bond, between Israel and the United States is unshakable.

Jeffrey Blankfort: You're speaking of the Assistant Secretary of State for Military and Political Affairs Andrew Shapiro, who spoke at the Brookings Institution in the middle of July, who gave a speech in which he sounded like he was speaking at an AIPAC conference or to a Jewish audience and which even caused Medea Benjamin of Global Exchange and Code Pink, who was in the audience, during the question period to say he sounded like an agent of Israel, which in fact he serves as.

What was interesting, he said he had been doing the same job when he was assistant to Secretary of State Clinton when she was a senator. What he is talking about is something called "shared values." You hear this term, "shared values," repeated by all the apologists for the Israel-U.S. relationship, whether they're in Congress, whether [its] the President of the United States or a member of the Zionist community. But they never outline what these shared values are. Perhaps the ethnic cleansing which took place here in the United States with the Native Americans, the occupation of Native American land or preemptive wars, but I'm not quite sure that most Americans, if they would have listened to the speech of Andrew Shapiro at the Brookings Institution, would not have been outraged to hear someone to whom they're paying his salary speak as if he was working for Israel and not for the United States.

Kathleen Wells: Okay, now let me go back to the issue that you touched on before about the Israeli lobby -- AIPAC. Talk to me about its role. Talk to me about its significance.

Jeffrey Blankfort: Well, AIPAC is the officially registered pro-Israel lobby. But it is only *one*, and an extremely important one of a number of organizations

-- Jewish organizations, not exclusively Jewish organizations but predominantly Jewish organizations -- that are lobbying U.S. Congress, and actually foreign governments in certain instances, to push Israel's agenda.

For example, which is, since the invasion of Iraq, has been to confront Iran militarily, if necessary. And so, AIPAC was born out of an organization called the American Zionist Council, which formed shortly after Israel became a country and embarked upon a plan, which was spelled out in congressional hearings in 1963 held by Senator Fulbright, in which they would penetrate -- they would lobby every sector of American society that might be critical to Israel's future, particularly the media, the churches, the black community and labor unions, etc., in order to get an atmosphere that would be so pro-Israel that no member of Congress or President would be able to go against it.

And all of this is documented in these hearings, and actually new documents have recently been released, in which Grant Smith of the Institute Research: Middle East Policy in Washington, D.C., has put on his Israel Lobby Archives, which I strongly recommend.

When you read these documents, you see how successful they were in getting newspaper editors, magazine editors, etc., to run pro-Israel articles. And then, for example, one article in the Atlantic magazine, the *Atlantic Monthly*, which took an Israeli position on Palestinian refugees, they sent to every single one of 53,000 [people] of those who are listed in Who's Who in America.

This was going on even when the majority of the Jewish community was not that interested in Israel, which is interesting. They were, nevertheless, dedicated to getting the Israeli position deep into American society, American culture; whereas, until 1967 -- the Six-Day War -- most American Jews weren't really paying much attention to Israel. And, in fact, before that war, more Jews were leaving Israel than were immigrating to Israel, and their economy was totally stagnant. So the Zionist lobby, the Zionist section of the American Jewish

community, which is a minority section, was very dedicated, and it's been doing this since Israel became a state.

Kathleen Wells: And so ...

Jeffrey Blankfort: [AIPAC's staff] are the ones who directly approach members of Congress, but they don't really lobby them anymore. They instruct them in what they should do. They write their speeches, they sit in on every kind of committee meeting that discusses issues relating to Israel or the Middle East, and they simply dictate to members of Congress what they're going to do and say about Israel. And when you go into Congress -- you're running for Congress -- AIPAC comes to every candidate, every viable candidate and asks them to sign a statement about their dedication to the U.S.-Israel relationship.

Cynthia McKinney, one of our most wonderful members of Congress (who no longer is a member of Congress) refused to do that. And so she was targeted from the very beginning. But most members of Congress go along to get along, and not only with the Israel lobby but with the insurance companies, with the arms industry, with the banking industry, and so on. They are a bunch of lawyers who essentially work for large corporations, and Israel happens to be a large corporation, in this sense.

Kathleen Wells: So, I mean, if what you're saying is true, the organized Jewish establishment or this lobby has essentially bought Congress, at least with regards to issues regarding Israel. So, I mean, this is very disturbing to hear, and it says that something is wrong with our entire system of government.

Jeffrey Blankfort: Well, 101 years ago, Mark Twain wrote in one of his books that it could be argued that there is only one native criminal class in America -- Congress. And a few years later, the cowboy philosopher, Will Rogers said, "America has the best Congress money can buy." And the only thing that's

changed has been the price and the names of those people who have been bought.

They have been bought by every major sector/special interest of American society that represents American capitalism: the arms industry, and so on, and, in this sense, Israel and the Jewish establishment that supports it have been a major player. They had been responsible for, at least since World War II, at least 60 or more percent of the money that goes to the Democratic Party, making the Democratic Party, literally, a subsidiary of the Zionist establishment.

In 2000, *Mother Jones Magazine* ran what they called “Mother Jones [400],” which listed the top 400 contributors to the American political campaigns in that year. And of the top 400, of the top ten, seven were Jewish; of the top 20, 12 were Jewish; and of the top 250, where I stopped counting, at least 125 were Jewish. And 75 percent of their money went to the Democratic Party.

In 2002, one Israeli-Egyptian born American named Haim Saban, who brags about his loyalty to Israel being his primary interest, he contributed \$12.3 million to the Democratic Party, seven of which bought their office building in Washington, D.C., and that was only about a million and a half dollars less than the political action committee of the arms industry gave to both political parties. So this is the kind of clout that they have in Washington.

And there was once an institution, one independent think-tank in Washington that wasn't in the pro-Israel lobby camp, and that was Brookings [Institution.] And in the same year, he [Saban] gave \$12.3 million, the same number, to Brookings [Institution] to found Saban Center for Middle East Policy, thereby taking over Brookings' role in the Middle East. And it was at Brookings where Andrew Shapiro gave his talk. And the head of Brookings is a man named Kenneth Pollack, whose book, “The Gathering Storm,” was one of the most instrumental pieces of propaganda that got us into the current Gulf war. I

covered a lot of ground there but all ...

Kathleen Wells: Yes. Yeah, and you know, the American people are not aware of this, the depth and breadth of this influence, and it's a bit overwhelming to hear this. You were once a member of AIPAC, is that correct?

Jeffrey Blankfort: Well, I actually joined AIPAC in 1988. I had just begun editing the *Middle East Labor Bulletin* and co-founded a committee called the Labor Committee on the Middle East, which focused on the situation of Palestinian workers in Israel and in the occupied territories and in other Middle Eastern countries, which tried to show Palestinians as activists, as not just victims.

But I began to see the role of AIPAC and so I joined AIPAC, and I went to a luncheon that they gave in San Francisco. Now, every year in Washington, the biggest event of the year in Washington is the AIPAC Conference, in which at least half the members of Congress attend and have their names put on a roll so their constituents back home -- Jewish constituents -- know that they attended, and usually a major speaker from Israel or the U.S. Government, [the] Secretary of State, Vice President, and so on, speak there.

But they also have local conferences in cities around the country. In San Francisco, they have usually three events -- two luncheons and one dinner in different parts of the Bay area, so I went to a luncheon in San Francisco. And I was astounded to see that all the local public officials had been invited to attend and were there at the Fairmount Hotel, which is one of the most flashiest, gaudiest hotels in San Francisco, where they were addressed by a major speaker -- a U.S. Senator. These U.S. Senators or governors, they go around the country, and they speak at AIPAC events. The news media are not involved, are not invited. And back home, they don't know about it either, wherever these senators come from.

But what was astounding to me was to see that all the important people in San Francisco were attending this luncheon. And when you come, you're given a card that tells you how much you've contributed to AIPAC, and, of course, they collect money there. What happens after these meetings, and they take place all over the country, is that local Jewish community organizations -- the Jewish Community Relations Council or Jewish foundations or federations -- then spend the money and send these public officials -- police chiefs, fire chiefs, mayors, city council people, supervisors -- to Israel on all-expense-paid trips where they meet the prime minister, the defense minister, very important people. They go to Yad Vashem, the Holocaust Memorial Museum; they go visit the West Bank settlement; they come back to the United States, and they know they have very powerful friends in the Jewish community who accompanied them on the trip. And from this group of people, we get our members of Congress, since they are already indoctrinated into being pro-Israel even before they file for running for Congress.

So most Americans and actually most people -- even pro-Palestinian supporters -- are not aware of this. They don't follow this because they've been told by Professor Chomsky and others that the problem is not the Israel lobby but U.S. imperialism -- which is a pretty remote target for most people. If they thought it was their members of Congress who were involved in voting for money for Israel/supporting Israel policies, they might be sitting in at their offices.

For example, Nancy Pelosi, the Speaker of the House, has spoken at a number of AIPAC conferences in which she repeatedly pledges her loyalty to Israel, but there has never been any major protest against Pelosi for her support of Israel. As a matter of fact, she is the favorite of the liberals in San Francisco because she's criticized China and she's very good on the issue of gay rights, which is an important issue in the Bay Area.

Kathleen Wells: So you're basically hitting on or touching on issues that the

activist -- pro-Palestinian activists -- steps they should take to be more effective.

Jeffrey Blankfort: Well, yes, to this point the solidarity movement for Palestinians in this country is an utter failure. They have succeeded in doing absolutely nothing, and you see around the world the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement [BDS] targeting Israel has been gaining ground in Europe, among labor unions in England and Ireland and Scotland, and so on. And here, there is a movement that is developing, but it's only targeting companies that do business in Israel, which is very positive, but there is no reason that it shouldn't be like South Africa, in which you target the economy of the country that's responsible, and that's mainly Israel.

I mean during the anti-apartheid movement, which I was involved in, they had sit-ins at South Africa Airways and forced South African Airways to close its offices. But there's never been a sit-in, as far as I know, at any offices of the Israeli Airline El Al, and they're all over the place, and the question is Why not? There has never been a major campaign to call Congress to stop aid to Israel; whereas, for example, in the 80s when Congress was giving \$15 million a year to the Contras to overthrow the Nicaraguan government, there was a national campaign to stop aid to the Contras -- calling members of Congress -- and it was successful. As a result, we had the Iran-Contra scandal. Why has there never been a similar campaign waged by the very same people who are also involved themselves in pro-Palestinian activities to do the same regarding Israel?

Kathleen Wells: Well I mean, let me ask you -- Why? Why hasn't that happened?

Jeffrey Blankfort: Well, because the left for many years has been predominantly Jewish, and this is because there's a history of Jewish radicalism going back to the beginning of the trade unions in this country. Jewish radicals -

- Jews -- were very heavily involved in all progressive organizations -- the civil rights movement, and so on, against the war in Vietnam. But, suddenly, when it came to Israel, it's closer to home.

And there was a reticence to put the blame on Jews. Israel calls itself a Jewish State, though 20 percent of the population is not Jewish, it's Palestinian Arab. But there was this reticence to do that. It was a lot easier to blame U.S. foreign policy, U.S. imperialism.

For example, when Israel was heavily involved in supporting the Contras in Nicaragua, supporting and arming the Salvadoran government, arming the government in Guatemala, the solidarity groups in those particular arenas were predominantly Jewish, but they refused to take critical positions on Israel arming Salvador, Israel arming [the] Nicaragua [Contras], and Israel arming Guatemala. And when I organized a demonstration in 1985, opposing Israel's roles as a U.S. surrogate in South Africa and Central America, those organizations would not endorse the demonstration.

As a matter of fact, the Nicaraguan Solidarity Committee gave an excuse that they weren't giving any more endorsements. Guatemala Solidarity Committee [Guatemalan News & Information Bureau] did finally endorse, but I had to call and threaten them with exposure, and it split the organization. And the same thing with CISPES around El Salvador.

Kathleen Wells: So what we are talking here is ethnic loyalties. So are you saying that ethnic ...

Jeffrey Blankfort: We're talking about a kind of tribalism that, even though these particular Jewish activists were anti-Zionist (they didn't believe in a Jewish state), they became very defensive when it came to criticizing Israel specifically. And this is one of the reasons you had members of Congress who were very adamant about apartheid in South Africa, but when it came to Israel

arming apartheid South Africa, they were silent. When it came [to the U.S. arming] the Contras [they spoke out]. But when it came to Israel helping the Contras, they were silent. [When] we had the Iran-Contra hearings, Israel was never named as a country. They were country A.

Kathleen Wells: So let me ask you, are these ethnic loyalties -- or tribalism, as you term it -- taking precedent over defending the rights of Palestinians?

Jeffrey Blankfort: It has. They would deny that this is the case. I have been attacked for suggesting that it is. But I see no other reason, because, I mean, I've been into this 40 years, and when I first came back from my trip to the Middle East (I happen to be Jewish, but I come from a non-Zionist family -- non-Zionist, which later became anti-Zionist) and people I knew who've been active around civil rights, and before there was a civil rights movement, when they heard that I had been with the Palestinians, they went crazy. They literally became like Afrikaners because they had been traumatized by the holocaust.

And this feeling of the victimization of Jews in World War II was something that Jews growing up with, including myself, felt very strongly. So the notion of blaming Jews was to them going back to periods of anti-Semitism and playing into a right wing and what they call "a neo-Nazi agenda."

The fact of the matter is, however, that it was a Jewish state, done in the name of Jews, [that] had ethnically cleansed the Palestinians and it was Jewish organizations that were lobbying, not only in the United States, but throughout Western Europe, for continued support of what Israel was doing -- not only ethnic cleansing but all its wars against the Palestinians, against the Lebanese.

And whereas Professor Chomsky says, "None of this would have been done without the U.S. authorization," it's simply not true.

As a matter of fact, when Menachem Begin, the Israeli prime minister, annexed the Golan Heights in Syria, Ronald Reagan was on a trip to Europe and it was like [he was] blindsided.

Chomsky will also, by the way, point to a situation where the United States was very unhappy and complained when it was discovered that Israel had been selling Falcon radar warning devices to China without U.S. approval, and there were some U.S. parts in this. Now, Chomsky and his supporters say, "Where was the lobby on this?" And, in fact, the lobby was not informed and felt blindsided. It was very embarrassing for some of the neocons in Washington, like Douglas Feith, one of the instrumental people in giving us the war in Iraq. They felt blindsided by it because the Israelis, who basically have very little respect for their American counterparts -- they had made a deal with China without notifying the Jewish establishment here in this country. So that was an embarrassment on their part, for them. And they were quite upset with their Israeli friends because they weren't notified about it.

There are issues in which the Israeli lobby -- actually, it's more of a hotel or a Leviathan or an octopus -- is not dominant, but it is when it comes to Middle East policies, certainly when it comes to Palestine and pushing toward the war in Iraq, pushing for the war against Iran. Up to now, they haven't succeeded, largely because there are people in the Pentagon and the intelligence agencies that know that a war or attack on Iran would be a global disaster -- not only bad for United States, but bad for the world economy.

Nevertheless, it seems now that the possibilities of an attack on Iran are greater than ever. And this has been at the top of the agenda of the Zionist establishment since the attack on Iraq. You could just go to the AIPAC website, the website of the American Jewish Committee, which is a very important, probably the second most important organization in the Jewish community. It's the foreign policy arm of the Israel lobby with offices in Latin America, Africa,

Europe. And they have been lobbying foreign governments for years to take pro-Israel positions.

The head of that organization, David Harris, is probably the most well-known American Jew outside the United States. He meets regularly with the heads of state of all the European countries -- our NATO allies -- with Mexico [and] countries in Latin America, Africa, and so on.

If there is going to be a war against Iran, there is no way that it could not be said that it is a war for Israel. As a matter of fact, the United States, since the defeat of George Bush, Sr., has increasingly made Israel's enemies our enemies. So where Hezbollah and Hamas are not American enemies (they're seen as Israel's enemies) they have now become our enemies.

Yet Hezbollah has never [been] proven to have done anything to attack the United States [although] they were accused of being responsible for the bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983, where I happened to be at the time. Hezbollah formed as a resistance organization to the Israeli occupation, and there are a lot of questions as to who actually carried out that bombing, but it has never been proven that Hezbollah did it. Hezbollah has never launched a terrorist attack against the United States, nor has Hamas, and yet those two organizations are now considered to be U.S. enemies because they're essentially Israel's enemies.

Kathleen Wells: We're covering a lot of ground here and I can hear your critics say that you are contending that there is a cabal driving U.S. foreign policy.

Jeffrey Blankfort: When it comes to the Middle East, there is no question about it. It is not only outside of the government. Let's [look at] what it consists of: You have AIPAC; you have the American Jewish Community; you have the Anti-Defamation League, which is quick to call any critic of Israel an anti-Semite. It is actually an organization that has been spying on American

leftists since the 1930s, including me and thousands of other political activists, including the NAACP -- virtually every political group that might have an issue around Israel.

We have a group called the Israel Project, which is a propaganda arm of Israel which holds regular events, press conferences in Israel and has 18 members of Congress on its board of directors. Eighteen members of the U.S. Congress on the board of a pro-Israel lobbying group which, of course, is tax exempt [and is not required to register as a foreign agent.]

You have a number of think tanks: the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, which was founded by AIPAC in 1985, whose talking heads appear every Sunday, every ... they're on NPR, they're on PBS, and they are never identified as being part of an Israeli lobby institution. The American Enterprise Institute is also a pro-Israel lobby institution. You have the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, which you never hear about, but this has members of Congress, senators, a former CIA chief, Jim Woolsey [who] is on every one of these pro-Israel lobbying groups -- every one of them. You have JINSA, the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, founded in 1976, which has about 20 former generals and admirals on its board but also has many of the neocons: Michael Ledeen, Richard Perle, Max Kampelman. These are the ones -- people who are very much involved in fomenting the Iraq war; Paul Wolfowitz.

There was PNAC, Project for New American Century from 1997, which called on the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, which had some of the very same people on it -- mostly Jewish neocons -- which is largely a Jewish movement, although not exclusively Jewish.

Fomenting the war on Iraq was done on every single level in the media. You had op-ed pieces written by William Safire in the *New York Times*; Abe Rosenthal in the *Washington Post*. You had Kristol, Chuck Krauthammer, and you had Mortimer Zuckerman, who is the owner of the *US News and World*

Report and the *New York Daily News*, writing op-ed piece after op-ed piece calling for an attack on Iraq. You had Kenneth Pollack, the head of the Brookings Institution Saban Center writing a book called "The Gathering Storm" endorsing the war on Iraq.

It is a cabal, and it's not a hidden cabal. It's quite public, except those people who don't want to see it don't look at it. It's like the monkey: see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. This is how the solidarity movement has been when it comes to this cabal.

This extensive interview was published in three parts, all three of which now can be found online.
