



This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

THE SOURCE

Jill Stein responds to Clinton & talks about Edward Snowden, Greta Thunberg & Julian Assange

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you guys for tuning in to another episode of the source. I'm the host Zain Raza. Today, we'll be talking to the physician, activist and former US presidential candidate for the Green Party that ran in 2012 and 2016. Dr. Jill Stein. Dr. Jill Stein, thanks for joining us today.

Jill Stein (JS): Really great to be with you, Zain.

ZR: So, Jill, I would like to start off by playing a clip of a recent statement given by Hillary Clinton that mentions you.

Hillary Clinton (HC): I'm not making any predictions, but I think they've got their eye on somebody who's currently in the Democratic primary, and are grooming her to be the third party candidate. She's a favourite of the Russians. They have a bunch of sites and bots and other ways of supporting her so far. And that's assuming Jill Stein will give it up, which she might not, because she's also a Russian asset. Yes, she's a Russian asset. I mean, totally.

ZR: Let's break this down. In the first part of the statement, obviously, she was referring to Tulsi Gabbard and then she refers to you. First of all, for our German viewers, could you first introduce Tulsi Gabbard? And thereafter talk about why Hillary Clinton decided to target you.

JS: Tulsi Gabbard is the front-and-centre peace candidate in this election. She's the one person who really talks about regime change wars almost every time she gets in front of a camera. She's talking about regime change wars, about the devastation that's been caused. How these wars basically endanger us. They're not making the world safer. They're not making America safer. And the incredible cost in blood and treasure. And, you know, she's definitely a threat to the narrative that war is the answer or the solution. She's a threat to the very foundation of empire. And so, it's not just Hillary Clinton, it's the Democratic Party, which is doing everything that they can to try to smother this conversation. So it's no surprise that she's being accused of being groomed by Russians or by Republicans. It's not clear exactly who Clinton was talking about. It seemed like it was Russians. Now she's back-peddalling because there's been so much pushback against this outrageous smear, this unhinged smear, conspiracy theory really, that she has launched.

And it's very interesting because what's being thrown at Tulsi is very similar to what was thrown at me starting the very week that I received the Green Party nomination. So this is clearly a blueprint, really, promoted by the Democratic Party to silence political opposition, but especially to silence its progressive opposition. And that includes the anti-war opposition.

And it's no surprise that Clinton and the centrist Democrats are doing this because there is so much revolt going on around the world, as we've seen in the millions of people out in the streets, from Chile to Iraq to Lebanon, and so on. You know, the world is really in an uproar at this neo-liberal project of privatization, austerity, financialization, inequality and militarization. This has been a disaster the world over, likewise for the American people, who are really hurting – a recent poll done by The Wall Street Journal, not exactly a bastion of radical thought – what that poll just stated, this was about a month ago, was that 70 percent of Americans are not just fed up with the political establishment, they describe themselves basically as fighting angry with the political establishment that's thrown them under the bus. That's absolutely correct. And the war machine is very much a part of this system, which is bankrupting us at home, embroiling us in catastrophic wars abroad, and has helped sell our democracy to the highest bidder. So they're very worried that the discontent out there should actually connect with a political vehicle for transformation.

ZR: Last year, when you were in Munich for our event, there was an investigation taking place that alleged that the presidential campaign colluded with the Russian government. Could you update us on your findings? Could Hillary Clinton have based her statement on this?

JS: That's an interesting question. And really, I often wonder how far this, what appears to be a coordinated campaign to smear independent and anti-war figures (goes). And it's not limited to the US, we know that in Europe there's been a project exposed called the Integrity Initiative, which involves the military in the UK, it involves state departments, including that of the US, and a variety of pro-war think tanks and institutions that are very much connected to the military industrial complex. And one has to wonder when you see how much the game plan is really a blueprint, what they're doing to Tulsa, it's the same players, it's the same institutes, which I can talk about momentarily if we have time, and many of these same media sources that are piling on now against Tulsa – and these were the same ones that were piling on against me, which still are piling on against me.

And in fact, there was so much hysteria created, really sort of a mob, a violent social media mob, that was whipped up against me using false and highly misleading deceptive information, which we could also go into, if you're so interested. But suffice it to say, there was a real smear campaign taking things entirely out of context, neglecting the press releases and the social media postings that went along with my visit to Moscow, and to Paris actually – it was part of a European tour to promote a peace agenda, to promote a ceasefire in Syria and the Middle East, to promote a weapons embargo to the Middle East. These are all things that have really stood the test of time. They very much need to be done. And I was there to advance that agenda at a media conference that took place in Moscow, with the likes of the BBC and Canadian Broadcasting Systems and China and India TV and so on. Major press to be able to speak to the world and have a broad audience to clarify that not all American presidential candidates are warmongers. It was a very important message. And you know, because a picture got snapped during the few minutes that Vladimir Putin sat briefly at the head table before giving a speech in Russian. There were no translators. There was no talk. I wasn't introduced to anybody. You know, I introduced myself to the person who spoke English next to me. But, Putin, who walked in with his entourage that I thought were bodyguards and actually turned out was his chief of staff and key staffers. One of them sat next to me, we didn't exchange a word, we never even introduced ourselves, you know. So all this was taken out of context with a photo that was used to rip up this anti-Russia frenzy and to create the illusion that I was there to collude.

You know, eventually that rolled over into an investigation by the Senate Intelligence Committee, which I cooperated with. And I turned over all my relevant information, did a vast document search of my own materials and everybody on my staff that I had to re-establish contact with after a couple of years and so on. I guess at that point it was like a year or a year and a half, but it was a very extensive search, I turned it all over, went to the Senate Intelligence Committee meeting with several staffers, underwent hours of questioning and they never even followed up with me. They never even said, oh, let's look into this or can you explain that. There was zero follow up! There was absolutely, absolutely nothing that even hinted of something inappropriate or untoward, including that I had the receipts for all my expenses, the hotel bills and the transportation and so on. And it had been published as a lie, starting with the Steele report. You know, this discredited opposition research report that had been funded first by the Republicans, then by the Democrats. And among the many false things that it contained, was this claim that the Russians were courting me and others, and that my trip had been paid for by Russia as part of that process of, you know, engaging me as an asset. And that was totally disproven by investigative journalists who actually cared to look into it. And by the Senate investigation.

ZR: You know, what baffles me is the fact that in democratic societies, I'm not talking about societies like Saudi Arabia, for example, that Hillary Clinton just couldn't call you and say, hey, where's the standing? I mean, she just goes straight up and smears you without even knowing these facts that I probably know more facts than she does regarding this case. So what is the state of democracy when people can't even have constructive discussions with each other?

JS: Well, this is kind of the way that it works right now. And in my view, it's very connected with this climate of McCarthyism that we're in.

ZR: Can you explain that briefly for our young viewers? What does McCarthyism mean, and then proceed with your point?

JS: Sure. So McCarthyism broadly involves political repression and attacks on political opponents, censorship to silence political opposition, and warmongering. And it harkens back to the era of Joseph McCarthy, who was a congressman, who claimed – he claimed – he held up his piece of paper and said he knew that there were communists in the American State Department and in other official government agencies. And he never exposed his evidence or said where it came from. He just claimed that he had these omniscient, all-knowing powers and he had this inquisition, basically. This is where the term political witch hunt became popular. This was in the 50s and maybe a little bit into the 60s, but I think was mostly during the 50s. And he blacklisted people. He ruined people and a lot of people lost their jobs. I'm not sure if people were incarcerated as well, but certainly people were financially ruined and destroyed, and the left was really destroyed. The left parties in the US were essentially torn apart. And that's where really the momentum was taken out of the left political movement inside the US.

So this is a very dangerous thing, in part, because it goes hand-in-hand with warmongering. And during the 50s, it was part of the Cold War. And this, you know, incredibly dangerous moment where we and the Russians, had more nuclear weapons than we have now without treaties. But, you know, guess what? The Cold War is back for any number of reasons, but it can't simply be blamed on the aggressions of the Russians. The Russians are understandably sensitive about incursions on their border, as we were when Russian missiles were brought to Cuba. We were ready to go to war to get those missiles out of

proximity. Well, as you're well aware, NATO over the past couple of decades, since the early 90s, has basically been violating the US promise not to move one inch to the east of Berlin, which was part of this deal for admitting a united Germany into NATO. There was supposed to be no further encroachment around Russia's border. Russia, who has been invaded several times over the course of history and lost about 27 million citizens in the last war – you can understand why they're sensitive about that. That's not to say that Putin is not an authoritarian and a militarist himself. But let's put this in perspective. The size of their budget is 60 million dollars. I'm sorry, 60 billion. That's the size of the increase in the US budget, which is at least 10 times that size. And that's a typical increase for us. Actually, it's smaller than a typical increase from one year to the next. What Russia does have, however, are nuclear weapons. And we're about in parity and we have about 2000 very powerful nuclear weapons on hair trigger alert pointed at each other. So we need to be able to have a civil discussion and not simply warmonger against each other. And, you know, the US has played a major role in warmongering against Russia and inflaming this conflict. For example, it was the US under Barack Obama that re-instituted, or shall we say it called for and began to produce a whole new generation of nuclear weapons to the tune of 1.5 trillion dollars and rising over the next two to three decades. So this is devastating. We have unleashed a whole new arms race, which none of us can afford. And we're not dealing with the essential problem that can only be dealt with through diplomacy, dialogue and renewal of treaties. Instead, the US has led the way, starting with George Bush, in dismantling our treaties to control this global threat. And the real solution, of course, is being promoted in the United Nations right now. The majority of the world's nations are actually calling for the complete banning and abolition and dismantling of nuclear weapons. And that's definitely where we need to go.

ZR: Talking about nuclear weapons, we interviewed Daniel Ellsberg recently, who just released a book called *Confessions of a Nuclear War Planner*. And for those who haven't watched it, we'll relink the YouTube description. So Jill, getting back to the Clinton statement, Samantha Power retweeted it, and I quote her from this point: "2016 election was won by 78,000 votes, spread among three states. Absent third party candidates Hillary Clinton would have won and Donald Trump would not now be harming Americans (and our friends) and aiding autocrats. If Tulsi Gabbard runs, it would be a huge windfall for Trump, Assad, Putin, Xi." Xi, the leader of China. I find this tweet quite baffling as you actually provide a solution that could address the way that voting functions right now, to make it function much more efficiently and democratically. Can you elaborate on what you mean by ranked-choice voting?

JS: Yes. And first, let me just say that that statement is typical of the arrogance and ignorance of the Democrats, for which they did poorly in the last election. You know, this was the problem. And one of the ways that's ignorant and arrogant is the fact that polls, good scientific polling has shown, that the vast majority of people who voted Green would not have come out to vote. So these votes did not belong to Hillary Clinton. Politicians have to earn the votes of voters. They can't just assume they belong to them. And absent myself or another green, the vast majority of my voters would not have voted. So they can't simply be moved to the Hillary column. And if one runs through the numbers, according to what the exit polls tell us about how those votes would mostly be absent, in each of those three states, you do not even come close to the threshold of the win that Hillary Clinton would have needed. So this is a very false and arrogant argument in the first place. But you make a very good point, anybody who is screaming right now about the Russians mounting these third party threats and that third parties are really just Russian plots, you know, that is preposterous. And it's incredibly hypocritical for anybody to be screaming about Russian

assets in our election if they're not pulling out all the stops for the real solution here, which is ranked-choice voting. A simple voting reform that's used now by the entire state of Maine, in many cities across the country, and countries around the world, for that matter. This is a well-tested, well-worn system, which works really well. It prevents any splitting of the vote. It prevents any spoiling of the election. And it also makes sure you never throw away your vote by actually voting your values. Think for a minute. What does it mean if we go to the polls in order to vote against who we are most afraid of, rather than the candidate who represents our vision and our values and our programs to move forward? If we're only voting against things and not for things, whenever we don't have a moral compass, we don't have a vision forward. And our democracy really shows that problem. So this system could be implemented now in time for this election. The Congress, remember, Congress passed an 800 billion dollar bail out for the crooks on Wall Street and it took them less than one week to do it – against the will of the American voters, by the way. If they could come up with eight hundred billion dollars in a couple of days, they can fix our voting system and we can do that in the legislature across the land in the same way that Maine did. Our legislators, if they have concerns about potential Russian interference, then let them strengthen our voting system by unleashing the power of our values into our vote.

ZR: If I understand it correctly ranked choice voting is basically, for example, if somebody votes for Hillary and they also want to vote for you, they'll select Hillary number one, Jill Stein number two, Bernie, number three. And then, if Hillary does not win, the votes go to you? Could you explain it to me? I'm kind of confused at the moment.

JS: Let me just set the example the way it's likely to roll out. So we know in the last election there were a lot of people who wanted to vote for Sanders when they couldn't. You know, when Sanders was sabotaged, when the progressive was sabotaged by the centrist Democratic Party, many of those votes would have come to me, except people were very afraid that it might inadvertently help Trump. You have to rally around Hillary. You know, it's the so-called lesser evil voting system that prevents people from ever voting for what they want. So ranked-choice voting says you can vote for what you want. You could rank me first or you could have ranked Ralph Nader first. You can rank the candidate you truly believe in without worrying about unintended consequences or giving help to Trump inadvertently. You can rank me number one, you could rank Hillary number two, you could rank Gary Johnson or whatever, number three – or not even do a number three, you can just do two rankings. And what happens is that – this is the simplified explanation – if your first choice loses, say I don't get a majority in the first round, then I would get eliminated. If I'm the lower contender or the loser, I get eliminated, your vote gets reassigned to your second choice. Or put that simply, if your first choice loses, your vote is reassigned to your second choice. So that way you never have to worry about your vote inadvertently helping Trump. And it liberates you to vote for what you really want. A lot of people wanted to vote for Medicare for All. Health care is a human right, which we don't have in this country or to end student debt. You know, we've got, what is it, it's tens and tens of millions of young people. I think it's 45 million right now. Young people are locked in this unpayable student loan debt. Their financial lives are really ruined for most of their future. There would be enormous numbers of people, not only liberated to vote the way they want, but they would be coming out to vote because who doesn't vote in the USA? It's almost half of voters. It is the largest bloc of voters are those who choose not to vote for either of the major parties being rammed down their throats, but they would come out to vote if they knew that they would have a guaranteed right to a job that would help fight the climate crisis, that their student debt would be abolished, and that public higher education would be free.

ZR: I find it baffling that, if I'm correct, that in the United States it's still a working day when there are elections, whereas in Germany, it's a holiday during elections. Is that the case? Just briefly, am I correct?

JS: Yes. And there's better than that, too, you know, we purge voters as well. There have been big voter purges going on that have excluded millions, tens of millions of people, largely low income, immigrant, poor, etc. The progressive voting bloc is really there and could seize the day. And the beginnings of that could happen the minute we open up our votes to be able to bring our values to that vote.

ZR: Before we move on to the next topic, just briefly, how did Bernie Sanders respond to this Clinton tweet?

JS: Interestingly, he did eventually come out in support of Tulsi and say that, you know, that that's like crazy, horrible, you know, really offensive. So he came out swinging for Tulsi. But, you know, in his mind, I don't exist. And independent third parties don't exist, even though he was allegedly a member of an independent party and supposedly still is, he doesn't actually acknowledge them.

ZR: All right. Moving on to 2020 presidential election. I just want to talk about the notable names such as Joe Biden, Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders, Tulsi Gabbard. Talk about their pros and cons from your perspective and what issues they're not really addressing or are there any at all issues that you feel that they're addressing adequately?

JS: Well, you know, I do think Tulsi is doing a good job of talking about the war machine and the Cold War and all of that. I'm not fully up to date on her other programs. I'm not sure I'm entirely in agreement with them. But, you know, she's doing hero's work here on the war. Bernie is mostly on topic for social and economic and racial justice issues. He said a few things about the war machine lately, and that's good. I think he recently proposed that we take Israel, so whatever it is, eleven million dollars a day in US funding to conduct their occupation and war crimes. You know, he's suggested courageously that some about some of that money come back to the US. I mean, I think all of it should be eliminated. None of it should go to war criminals and human rights abusers and so on. So, you know, he's taken some steps in the right direction. He has a good climate policy. However, he calls for 100 percent clean renewable energy by 2050. And we know that that will give us a 50/50 chance of avoiding climate catastrophe. We need to move with all possible haste. We need to declare a wartime emergency right now. It took us six months to transform our economy after Pearl Harbor was bombed. We need to consider this a Pearl Harbor on steroids right now, because this isn't just temporary destruction, this is forever, from which there will be no recovery in the time frame of human survival on this planet. So, you know, that falls short. He recently stated that he would not use the Espionage Act, but he won't talk about the victims of the Espionage Act. I've not heard him say a thing about Chelsea Manning or Edward Snowden or Julian Assange, most critically. So, you know, he gets part way there, but not all the way there. At the end of the day, the real problem here is that he's running in the wrong party. He will be sabotaged, Tulsi will be sabotaged, they are being sabotaged right now. It's really important to build a permanent political force that doesn't get entirely dismantled when the Democratic National Committee conducts its sabotage campaigns. You can't afford to be starting all over again. This has been going on since the Second World War and the sabotage of Henry Wallace, who was a democratic socialist that was about to be nominated during the Second World War, and the microphone was turned off on his nominator and a

fire emergency was declared at the Democratic convention – in 1942 I believe it was. One after another there's been a Democratic progressive hero that's always lifted up to sheepdog people back into the Democratic Party and, you know, are we moving in the right direction at least? No. We're not even tiptoeing in the right direction. We are taking giant strides in the wrong direction, towards greater war and austerity and economic inequality. Racism and segregation is actually worse than it's been for decades here in this country. So this game plan just ain't working, folks. You know, it's time to get with the program and stand up and fight for an America and a world that works for all of us. We actually have the solutions and we actually have the political momentum. If we would have the courage of our convictions and actually stand up and do the right thing.

ZR: What about the Green Party? Could you talk about its state and whether you or somebody else will be planning to run in the upcoming elections?

JS: So I am not planning to run this time around. I'm really focusing more on ranked-choice voting, and I'm also still overseeing the recount lawsuits, which are actually making great progress and have really helped bring back paper ballots and good reliable audits with eyeballs and hand counts of the vote and so on. So I'm not contemplating a run this year, maybe in a future cycle, but not this one. But I would really like to help work for the infrastructure that makes our votes have more meaning. It's a very difficult race for the Greens to run in. We are being, you know, fear campaigned and smear campaigned all over the place. We're being largely locked out of the public discussion. And many of the liberal media outlets that gave us a trickle of coverage in 2016 are not covering us now, which is really too bad, because look at what that trickle of coverage did. It completely changed the agenda. We introduced the Green New Deal. We introduced a bailout for student debt, which I was ridiculed for on John Oliver. We introduced free public higher education. And Ralph Nader as our candidate in 2000, had introduced Medicare for All, which we've really been leading the charge on. So this is really too bad. You know, I think we all suffer for it. And my hope is that with this latest kerfuffle around Hillary's rant, or conspiracy theory rant, that it has helped us break into the conversation a little bit. We have our own primary process, which is ongoing right now, and we have some good, solid candidates who are in that fight. I'm very excited about a race that we can actually win on an even playing field. This is a race for Senate, for Susan Collins' seat. She's a notorious and vulnerable Republican senator from the state of Maine. We have a candidate named Lisa Savage. Lisa for Maine, that's www.lisaformaine.org, who is running as a peace activist, as one of the leaders of the "Bring the war dollars home" campaign nationally, a very well-informed and well-spoken public school teacher from the rural backwoods of Maine, who has a lot of stuff going for her and is a real contender and is being treated as a real contender in this multi-party race that uses ranked-choice voting. So the whole smear campaign fear campaign thing is gone. This is a race we can actually win. And I encourage people who are looking for something really solid and winnable to get behind. Check out lisaformaine.org.

ZR: Let's switch gears here. There was this huge hype about the importance of whistleblowers for democracy when information came out that Trump blackmailed the Ukrainian government to get dirt on Joe Biden that he would like to use against him in the election. However, I want to focus on the whistleblowers that were not brought into the context of this discussion. And this includes Edward Snowden, Chelsea Manning and also the investigative journalist Julian Assange. Talk about the Green Party's position on them. And let's say if they win the election in the upcoming presidential election, what would happen to these whistleblowers and investigative journalists?

JS: Well, number one, we would stop prosecuting them, and we would release them from their punishments. You know, Julian Assange is being tortured and actually murdered, in my opinion and I would say in the Green Party's opinion, before our very eyes, I would say in anyone's opinion who's actually informed. And let me just mention the work of Nils Melzer, who is the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, who had no sympathies for Julian Assange when he was basically asked to take on the case to see whether there was a case of torture being inflicted on Julian Assange in his seven-year confinement in the Ecuadorian embassy. And he has really come out swinging for Julian Assange, basically saying that what's going on there makes an absolute mockery of our system of so-called justice. The cases held up against him, Melzer describes, as highly irregular. And I would use probably stronger language myself to say that this really does make a mockery of our judicial system. And he's been the subject of a smear campaign, many smear campaigns, for at least the last seven years or more.

Why? You know, he is being punished, as is Julian Assange and Edward Snowden, for releasing the truth, and the truth that does not reflect well, that in fact exposes lies, torture, war crimes on the part of governments, particularly the US, but governments all over the world. So Assange, in particular, ruffled a whole lot of feathers by releasing this information that was either stolen or leaked, regarding the Democratic National Committee. And it's tilting the playing field, some have called it rigging, some inside the Democratic Party have called it the rigging of the primary against Bernie Sanders. Exposing that has really inspired the fury of the Democratic establishment against him. So, you know, people have abandoned him and it's pretty terrible. And that includes the press. And it's you know, in my mind, this is like the classic case of that saying, you know, first they came for the gypsies. Then they came for the communists and the Jews. You know, this is coming home, this kind of totalitarianism, which is persecuting, in Melzer's words Assange is not being prosecuted, he's being persecuted. This kind of persecution against a whistleblower really undermines some of the basic foundations of our democracy, our need for a free press, which needs whistleblowers in turn, because whistleblowers are really critical to holding power accountable. So under a Green Party administration, Julian Assange, the charges against him, and the extradition effort would be absolutely dropped. He would be held harmless. And in my view, he should be compensated. I believe the U.N. has called for that as well. And they've come out, as well, saying that he is a victim of arbitrary detention. And, you know, it gets much worse from there. So, yeah, we need to, I think, rightly respect, thank and, you know, give gratitude to these people who have really sacrificed their livelihoods, their lives, literally, in order to protect our basic liberties.

ZR: Let's move to the last topic of this discussion: climate change. What is your assessment on the Friday's for future movements in all of this, like extinction rebellion emerging all over the world? I observe what is going on on social media. There is this one camp which says that they are not addressing militarization. I guess the more symbolic part of that statement would be Greta Thunberg's visit to Obama personally where she fist-bumped him and they exchanged words and took many pictures. But then there's this other side of the argument that's going on on social media that I'm observing and it's saying at least she's doing something as a 16 year old and she's trying to awake people on climate change, which might have a spill-over effect on other issues. How do you stand on this dichotomy and what do you hold of Fridays for Future? Second part of the question is, have they contacted you guys?

JS: So let me say, I'm really grateful to Friday's for Future and Extinction Rebellion, for pushing the issues. They are, you know, in my experience, knowing a lot of these people,

they are people who largely haven't been involved in political action before. So they represent a whole new kind of mobilization. So they are very early on the learning curve of, you know, of politics. What I am really glad to see is that they have not rushed into the waiting embrace of the political establishment, and while Greta Thunberg did go to visit Obama. She also had a lot of things to say about the political establishment and the policies, not just of Republicans, but Democrats as well. And she has been ruthless in her criticism and her continued finger pointing at them as the people who are essentially murdering future generations. And she doesn't mince words about it.

For the most part, their demonstrations, like those of Extinction Rebellion, have not featured the powerhouses of the Democratic Party network. They pretty much say no, from what I've seen, they usually say no to anybody representing any political party. But the temptation is for them to cut some kind of a deal, you know, and in the same way that the anti-pipeline movement, the anti-Keystone movement, featured lots of Democrats and it gave lots of lip service to Democratic Party solutions and it silenced Greens for the most part. It refused to have an even hand towards various political options when our agenda was far more aggressive and consistent with theirs. They wanted to shut us down. I mean, so they are an example in my mind - and this doesn't go for the indigenous people – the indigenous people I found, you know, involved with the pipeline struggles were great and really held to political integrity. But not so for, you know, some of the other big money funded large movements that were very partial to Democrats. For the most part, I'm not seeing the Extinction Rebellion or Fridays for Future do that.

But we badly need to work together and they need to be proposing things. You know, Extinction Rebellion is getting a lot of pushback for only talking about the climate, and not talking about the economic crisis that workers are facing, and so on. And I've heard them express real interest in exploring a discussion with us in coming up to speed and so on. But all this is very informal. You know, all these movements are very decentralized. They're real grassroots movements. And I hope that we can work together to harness the synergy. There's great synergy here between their ideas, our ideas, their power as a grassroots movements and our power in terms of our analysis and our political experience. That stuff needs to be brought together. And your second question, there has not been any formal outreach yet, but on the other hand, there has not been – what shall we say – you know, there's been no pushback against us either. And I regard that as a very important first step.

ZR: Dr. Jill Stein, former US presidential candidate for the Green Party and activist, thank you so much for your time.

JS: Really great talking with you. And thank you so much for the really essential work that you and acTVism are doing.

ZR: And thank you guys for tuning in today. Don't forget to subscribe by clicking on the subscribe button below and to donate so that we can continue to produce independent and non-profit news and analysis. My name is Zain Raza. See you guys next time.

END