

**"They've been blamed for everything for the last 2000 years and the death of Christ. I just say that they don't have any reason to fear that from me."**

## **MCCLOSKEY**

*Continued on page 10*

ravings of a madman and, as I say, I'm sad about it.

**Would the prospect of organized Jewish opposition be a factor in any decision you may make about whether to run or not run for Congress?**

No. I don't think I've ever backed down from any decision I've ever made because of who the opposition was.

**You have criticized the participation of Jewish financiers in the electoral process, saying this money played a role in the defeats of Ed Zschau and Sen. Charles Percy. Yet there are many Jews who are not active in the kinds of high-finance political machines you object to who are tarred by the criticisms you make merely because they are Jews. What about them?**

That's an understandable fear. That's been the course of governmental treatment of Jews for 2000 years. It's understandable that Jews would have some concern, that whenever blame is attributed, the Jews will get the bulk of the blame. That they've been blamed for everything for the last 2000 years and the death of Christ. It is an understandable fear. I just say that they don't have any reason to fear that from me. They don't have any reason to fear that in a community like Palo Alto or on the San Francisco peninsula.

You get down into Ku Klux Klan country, you get down into Redneckville, where people are still preaching hatred for the Jews and the Blood of Christ and all that—it's still a perfectly understandable fear. It's just like a black man—he may feel secure walking into Stanford University but he isn't going to feel that secure walking into the University of Alabama or the University of Mississippi even today, when their football teams are primarily made up of black football stars.

**A more practical question: If you are re-elected to Congress, would you support a cutoff of aid to Israel in order to get Israel to move away from policies you disagree with?**

I sponsored an amendment to that effect during the invasion of Lebanon, and I would again.

**What would be the effect of such an action? If it were more than symbolic, if you could get a majority of your congressional colleagues to join you in cutting off aid to Israel? Do you see Israel as then being in a very vulnerable position with the loss of US financial aid?**

Not at all. I think that—you see this is the difference—Israel, in my judgment, is getting more and more vulnerable as they continue to hang on to the West Bank and Gaza and refuse to allow self-determination by the Palestinians. They are more

vulnerable rather than less. Their military strength is greater, but they are more vulnerable rather than less when they roll out atomic weapons as they have now rolled out the threat. And when they start bringing long-range missiles in thinking that if they threaten the Arab cities with long-range missiles capable of carrying atomic warheads somehow they are safer—I don't think that they are.

I think Israel is far more secure if there is a Palestinian homeland and Palestinian self-determination and you remove that cause for a threat to Israel. And that's what the debate is all about. Because the radical Zionists—the radical people like Shamir and Sharon and the religious parties—who believe that Israel is entitled to that land because it was given to Abraham by God 10,000 years ago . . . if you take that point of view and deny the United Nations resolutions and say, "Israel was given this by God and we own it and we're going to annex it as we've annexed the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem," then I think you make Israel less secure. And I'm going to bet you 10 to 1 that the majority of the Jewish community in this country believes that, but the Jewish opinion is still triggered by this fear that anything that hurts Israel will reduce Israel's security.

That's like saying that anything that decreases America's number of atomic bombs decreases American security. It's a bona fide debate. I think the people on the other side are wrong.

**Should the US coerce Israel to give up the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in the absence of PLO recognition of Israel?**

No. That's the whole key to this. Mutual recognition. As a matter of fact, [PLO Chairman] Yassir Arafat announced that at a UN conference about three weeks ago. He said, "We are offering mutual recognition of Israel, we accept the UN resolutions and they do, and we give up violence." Now that's the exact position I urged on him five years ago. I wish that he had accepted that position five years ago. Today, you find in the Jewish press—I think I read it in last week's *Jewish Bulletin*, which I subscribe to—and on the back page is the recognition that Arafat agrees to, mutual recognition, and accepts UN resolutions 242 and 338 and an end to violence, and then a statement right beside it that Jewish leaders don't believe him.

You know this is a debate that ought to be taking place in America. It hasn't been taking place because there is no politician that has been courageous enough to disagree with the AIPAC position and still remain in office. But it is a debate that ought to take place and the Jewish community ought to be in the leadership in this debate. I hope they will, and maybe that's a reason to have a Konnyu-McCloskey contest.