



## **Jill Stein on the War in Ukraine - Pentagon Leaks, Nord Stream & Activism**

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

**Zain Raza (ZR):** Thank you for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source. I'm your host, Zain Raza and today, I'm happy to welcome physician, activist and former presidential candidate for the Green Party USA, Jill Stein. I've already had a fundamental and contextual discussion with Jill Stein of the war in Ukraine. So in case you missed that, be sure to click on the link in the description. In this part, we will be focusing solely on recent developments. Jill Stein, welcome back to the show.

**Jill Stein (JS):** Great to be with you, as always.

**ZR:** Let us begin with the Pentagon leaks. This week, the FBI arrested a 21 year old Air Force guardsman who was responsible for one of the most significant US government leaks in recent history. The leaks were reported in the German mainstream media, but the facts that were quite critical of the prevailing narrative around Ukraine were not highlighted sufficiently. Notable leaks included the US government's understanding that Ukraine has little chance of defeating Russia and that the fighting in the Donbas region is heading into a stalemate. In addition, the documents reveal NATO's direct involvement in the war, this includes how US intelligence agencies have deeply penetrated the Russian military, obtaining vital information of Russian operational plans. It also exposes how 97 Special forces from NATO countries, including from the US, are active inside Ukraine. Another document reveals how the US has been spying on President Zelensky, fearing Ukraine may start striking Russia's territory if Washington provides it with long range missiles. Can you talk about the significance of these leaks?

**JS:** They are huge. You know, the leaks really confirm that our governments are lying, meaning the governments of the West, they are lying about the war; this is like the

Afghanistan papers or the Pentagon papers from the Vietnam War. We're learning that our governments are not being truthful to us and they are actively conducting information warfare on we, the people, in whose name and with our tax dollars, these wars are being conducted. So that's one thing. Our governments are lying, which again, underscores that we cannot trust what they say or how they report. It really throws everything else into, shall we say, relief, in which all of it must be questioned. So governments are lying and Ukraine is losing. I mean, Russia is certainly having a hard time, that is very true. But Ukraine is running out of weapons. According to the leaks Ukraine is running out of air defenses and its air defense system is Russian. About 90% of its air armaments, that is missiles to defend off, fend off incoming aircrafts are Russian. So we cannot supply those munitions. And if you look at firepower, Ukraine is unbelievably outgunned. It has about one armed aircraft for every five that Russia has. So the terms are not good. And the leaks clarify that Russia is pounding Ukraine. The losses are devastating on both sides, but Ukraine is less equipped to withstand those losses, both by way of its population being, I think, like one quarter of Russia. So, you know, this is a devastating and horrific war and both countries are having to really ratchet down in order to procure the bodies to go out there and be forced into the meat grinder. So, you know, this is a humanitarian catastrophe on both sides. And it's predicted that Russia is going to continue to grind down Ukraine. It's awful on both sides, but Ukraine is losing and will continue to lose. The leaks are also clear that this much hyped spring offensive is not expected to change things. And in fact, it's even questioned whether this spring offensive is going to take place at all. So these leaks are very significant. As you mentioned, the leaks also confirm that the US is spying on everybody, from Ukraine to our allies and is also deeply embedded in Russia's intelligence, it appears, and military. That's nothing new exactly. It's been known for a long time. You know, I think it was Obama who was exposed for spying on Angela Merkel's cell phone. And this has been kind of a constant. The US is very good at spying. But it's especially these revelations about the terms of the war. Also, what was exposed was that Ukraine is violating the terms of our agreement. That weapons, the more powerful weapons were being supplied with the understanding that they would not be used to enter sovereign territory of other countries. But in fact, Ukraine has sent drones not only into Crimea, but also like 300 miles deep into Russia in order to basically bombard a Russian airfield, I believe it was. So this just makes the stakes of the war so much more perilous. The fact also that the US and NATO has some 97 troops there on the ground, it's been known for at least a month or two that the US is directly targeting. And in fact, Ukraine apparently cannot send missiles into really anywhere into the Donbas, the eastern provinces. They cannot send their so-called defensive missiles without US intelligence to target them, which is extremely incriminating. And in fact, you may have heard that one of the terms China has outlined for becoming involved in assisting Russia is evidence that the US and NATO are directly involved in incursions into Russian territory; that that would be a red line for China. So we are very much and Ukraine is, we ourselves, because of our involvement, our troops on the ground, their engagement and everything, including specific targeting with armaments that we have supplied, this is meeting China's red line to become involved and to start sending weapons to Russia. So we could see the terms of this change very quickly. And in

many ways, this is like pre-World War One before the assassination of the Duke that triggered everybody becoming involved in what was really a local conflict. Suddenly it was a global conflagration. And we are at the brink of that. The difference this time being that it will be nuclear. And the closer we get, the more escalation that occurs, the more perilous it is that nuclear weapons will begin to be used. And the nuclear weapons that are, I think, deceptively called tactical, what are they? You know, these are weapons that are the size of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs. And even larger, they may be smaller, but they also may be much larger. So just because they're being called tactical doesn't mean they're any less dangerous. And that really provides for a very slippery slope. Once you've entered the nuclear realm at all, then the escalation begins up the nuclear ladder and that could happen very quickly. Jens Stoltenberg, the head of NATO himself, said as much in December of last year when he said that this war has a very real possibility of engaging NATO and the US therefore against Russia and that terrible things may happen if that is the case. So it's really important for us to be clear eyed about what exactly we are engaging in here and to basically shut it down. There is no solution other than an immediate cease fire and the beginning of negotiations. And those who have argued from the part of NATO and the West that, Oh, we can't do it right now because Ukraine is not in a dominant position and would wind up having to allow Russia to maintain its territory in the Donbas and so on, as well as Crimea, those who argue we can't do it now: wait. You know, that's not only ethically and morally wrong and historically wrong, it's just wrong on pragmatic terms as well, because it's likely that Ukraine is going to continue losing territory and may be on the verge of losing a whole lot more.

**ZR:** There seems to be a discrepancy of what Western politicians and media are telling the public and what they actually know behind the scenes, according to the Pentagon leaks. We continuously hear that Ukraine is capable of winning this war and will capture all of its territory, including Crimea and therefore all of these weapons shipments, advanced weapons battle tanks and now fighter jets from Poland are being justified upon this premise. Why do you think there's such a discrepancy between what the government actually knows and what it is communicating to the public?

**JS:** Well, welcome to the greatest empire the world has ever known. And, you know, this empire really emerged out of the Second World War when enormous resources were available to the US and the competitors had pretty much disappeared. The developing world was not yet sufficiently developed by any means. And the US at the time that the Soviet Union broke up in 1989, approximately shortly thereafter, the US military issued its formal policy. And at that time, it was published in The New York Times, or at least excerpts of it were, in 1992, declaring essentially what has now become known as full spectrum dominance, which is the formal official military policy of the United States. And when it says full spectrum, that means geographically, it means across the globe, it means in its military, in all battle spaces, whether it's land, sea, under the sea, in outer space, that we will dominate all potential battle spaces. We will have full spectrum dominance and we will have full spectrum dominance politically, geo economically, geopolitically, that we will not allow competitors even to

emerge at the regional level. We made this explicit starting in 1992, and that policy has basically been reiterated with each major position statement of the Pentagon again in the year 2000, where it issued the Vision 2020 statement, which basically said the same thing. And again, in 2017, when it issued, it's "something at risk" or I believe, it is called "at our own peril". And the point there was that great powers are emerging. We must not allow them to emerge. We are in a new era of great power contests. And, you know, indeed this is taking place. US hegemony is on the way out. Very much, you know, at its own making because people are waking up right now to the fact that the emperor has no clothes in this vast global empire. The emperor has no clothes as far as the rest of the world is concerned. Now, Europe hasn't woken up to this yet. I think just by virtue of habit. There's a very close relationship and the US is insisting on meeting the military and defense needs for Europe, kind of keeping Europe in a forever, you know, childhood dependency on the US, if the US had its way. And trying to ensure that Europe cannot procure its critical resources like fossil fuels from other places, which is why I think we can be pretty sure the US destroyed the Nord Stream pipeline. So the US has an enormous conflict of interest in keeping the rest of the world down. You know, we're in a very advantageous position right now, basically commanding resources and being able to give marching orders to the rest of the world. Of course, US capitalists would like to keep it that way, but that's not to the benefit of the rest of the world. The rest of the world is waking up. You know, the Rubicon has been crossed. And I think there's no going back. The alliance of China and Russia, we have really forced that alliance thanks to our global hostile domination. We have forced our worst competitors together to be even stronger. And they now have the BRICS alliance. I believe that's the Shanghai Alliance. There are various other alliances of everybody else. They have the numbers. They have the vast population. Recent data suggests they also have the majority of the world's GDP now. If it's measured in local purchasing parity, something to that effect. But our economic domination has also faded and hostility does not breed cooperation. We need to be a part of a cooperative global future. And the fact that our media here, that our mainstream media is very much in bed with the military industrial complex, goes a long way to explain why the media is doing all it can in order to keep the people, certainly in the United States and around the world in the dark about what's actually happening and the incredible role that we can all play in supporting this, shall we say, global evolution to a greater state of democracy, peace and justice.

**ZR:** In February, world renowned investigative Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Seymour Hersh released an article based on an anonymous source or multiple anonymous sources - we don't know that yet - that detailed how the US bombed the Nord Stream pipeline. A few weeks later, The New York Times released an article based on anonymous US intelligence sources that claimed a rogue group used a yacht from Rostock to bomb the Nord Stream pipeline. They even found traces of explosive material, as well as fake IDs on the yacht, and ruled out any involvement of British or American citizens. Following The New York Times article, the German media led by the site Der SPIEGEL, conducted their own investigations. They came to the same conclusion that the perpetrators may be a rogue pro-Ukrainian group

that is not affiliated with the Ukrainian government or some Russian anti Putin group. There's even talk about this by senior officials in Germany that it may possibly be a false flag operation that is intended to blame Ukraine with the intention of damaging its relations with the West. How do you evaluate the story of Seymour Hersh vs the story of the mainstream media? Which one do you find to be credible?

**JS:** Well, let's start with the mainstream media story, because it doesn't pass the laugh test on many counts. In fact, it's actually really surprising that such a far-fetched and ludicrous proposal made it past whoever you know is supposed to be conducting their information warfare. I mean, because it's just not credible at all. The idea that a 50 foot sailboat could go out with a dive crew of five or six and that they could conduct this extremely dangerous deep diving operation that would require enormous technical expertise and support, it is just not credible that anyone other than the world's most trained military divers would be able to do that. And, you know, that's what Seymour Hersh is talking about. But also the idea that you could do this from a sailboat... Sorry. I don't know if you've ever been on a sailboat, but you can't really launch divers from a sailboat, especially divers that are going to be carrying hundreds of pounds of unbelievably dangerous explosives. This C-4, that can't be launched from a sailboat, You have to have really an extensive diving platform that cannot be done from a sailboat where usually, you know, there's no platform at all. You either have to climb down or jump in. And so that's just not going to happen. And sailboats would have a really hard time anchoring at that depth of 260 feet. You would need almost a half a mile of anchor line coiled up in this 50 foot sailboat, which is going to be really heavy and take up a huge amount of space. And then you'd also have to bring loads of extra diving tanks because of the time that it takes to adjust to the changes in pressure, which would likely be many hours. So you'd have this sailboat that's sailing around, you know, how are the divers even going to find it? And it's crazy, it's laughable. So on those counts alone, it's just not a believable story. And it's no surprise that the media is now trying to back off of that story. Western media is trying to say, Oh, maybe that story. This is the latest I heard that the hypothesis that that story is just a decoy or that that boat was just a decoy because they've sort of, I think, been shamed into realizing that this is an absolutely ludicrous proposition. Seymour Hersh's explanation that this was, you know, essentially a boat, I think whether it was Norwegian, I believe it was a Norwegian very large boat that had been outfitted with a whatever it's called a barometric chamber or something that would allow divers to come up and then re-pressurize and that would have adequate room and support for all the high tech stuff, and that this was done during NATO exercises so that it wouldn't raise suspicions with this boat being off of Bornholm Island in the area to which they were going to attach the explosives. So you know that story, Seymour Hersh's story, which was given to him by a source or sources who were directly involved and knowledgeable, kind of explains everything at a level of great detail. One of the other real red flags here that the West is lying is the fact that they refused to acknowledge or investigate the story and that the vote was clearly manipulated in the United Nations, where Russia had proposed that there be an independent investigation, truly independent. And the vote was I think it was Russia and China and Brazil, I believe, that

supported it. This was on the Security Council and I believe 12 nations abstained. Now, why would you abstain from an investigation? And the official line was, Oh, well, Germany and Sweden and I think the Netherlands, if I'm not mistaken, that there were three ongoing investigations. But they're secret, they're secret. Even the people in their own countries can't know what's going on in those investigations. So, you know, I'm sorry, but this is very funny and it's ludicrous and shameful. And again, it exemplifies the fact that our government is lying to us as we saw it clearly in the gamer leaks.

**ZR:** Let us move to another development. Germany recently approved a Polish request to send Ukraine five MiG 29 jets. The approval from Berlin comes just hours upon receiving the application. Ukraine also received its first Patriot defense system, also delivered by Germany. The Patriot system is used to combat enemy aircraft, ballistic missiles and cruise missiles, and it's considered one of the most advanced defensive systems. This comes on top of the German Leopard 2 and American Abrams battle tanks that were approved earlier this year. The Ukraine counter offensive is now expected to begin any day. Do you think all of these weapons will end the war in favor of Ukraine and lead to long lasting peace?

**JS:** Of course not. Weapons create more war. They don't create peace. And we saw from the leaks really confirming what any unbiased expert has been saying, you know, all across the globe that this is like World War One, but with nuclear weapons, you know, people are very dug in and with more destructive weapons that have the potential to accelerate to nuclear. So, I think Ukraine may have these weapons, Ukraine is also out of people. There may be some trained troops coming in, but they're relatively few. Russia is said to have, you know, 100,000 or maybe 300,000, but a lot of trained troops who've been training for like six months. When Ukraine troops get training, they get, you know, like six weeks or seven weeks, and they don't have experience either in battle or with the equipment. So the equipment may prolong the war, but it's virtually impossible that it's going to change the outcome of the war. Which is why, you know, there is one other outcome other than stalemate, which is escalation towards nuclear war. And that really should be front and center in everyone's mind. And it is just staggering, I think, how our elected leaders are purposefully in denial. They're like living in some fantasy world as though nuclear weapons don't exist, or as though nuclear war is survivable. There are many of them that think that. And that's certainly, you know, I think it was New York City that recently put out some public service promotion about what to do in case of a nuclear attack. You know, stay indoors, don't go out and don't expect anybody to come for a little while because all your health care infrastructure may be destroyed and all your health care providers may be killed. It was so preposterous. It's like duck and cover from the 1960s and 50s. So it's really important - what everyone needs to know is that nuclear weapons right now are far more powerful than they were in the days of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were horrible enough. But now we have nuclear weapons up to 1000 times the strength and the way that nuclear targeting is done now, it's believed that major cities are targeted with about a thousand times the strength, not in just one bomb, but in several bombs that are each more powerful, maybe 20 to 50 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bombs.

If just one city is targeted, let's just say one, which would never be the case. There would always be a response. So there would be at least two. But let's just pretend and then there'd be no holds barred from there, it'd probably be them all. And we have the capacity to do that. Just one, if just one city, were targeted with basically a thousand times the power of Hiroshima, you would lose about 127 million people like that. But then you would go into nuclear winter where we would lose one out of every four people living on the planet. Basically, 2 billion people would die in nuclear winter churned up by the firepower with which one city is likely to be targeted. This is not survivable. This is just not survivable. Nuclear winter lasts for probably decades, we think, because so much debris is kicked up into the upper atmosphere, the stratosphere or above the stratosphere where weather cannot bring the debris down. So it's like, you know, what led to the death of dinosaurs and a global extinction that would begin to happen. I mean, we're already in that, you know, sixth grade extinction right now. All we need is massive famine, which is what nuclear war would trigger. So there is no recovery even from a small nuclear war. So it's really important for everybody to know that nuclear war is not over there. If we slide down the slippery slope towards the use of nuclear weapons, every one of us is in the crosshairs of that nuclear winter, no matter where you are. Everybody needs to recognize that we all have skin in this game. We all need to stand up right now, as we have done many times before, because when we do it together, there will be no stopping us. And, you know, we can ensure that this war gets shut down with a ceasefire, a truce and the beginnings of negotiation towards an agreement. We were there, remember that? The parties were all in agreement shortly after the war began in March, where both Russia and Ukraine were making significant concessions and sufficient to satisfy them both. And that was disrupted. That peace accord was disrupted by guess who? You know, the US, together with the UK, said, No doing. More recently when Zelensky indicated that he was very interested in talking with Xi Jinping about his peace proposal, what did the US do? They came out and said, No, no, no, no way. We respect Ukraine's sovereignty, except when Ukraine wants peace, then we don't respect Ukraine's sovereignty. So enough bullshit. Let's just stop putting ourselves at the nuclear brink right now. We all have skin in this game. This game is solvable. It's winnable with a win-win for us all if we make it happen.

**ZR:** One of the arguments made in the Western media when it comes to the nuclear threat that this war poses is that Russia will never ever use nuclear weapons because it will be the first to have nuclear winter and fallout. Secondly, it is also argued that the nuclear threat that this war poses was also invoked when the West was sending defensive weapons, then the West began sending smaller offensive weapons and now it is sending larger and more advanced offensive weapons. And in none of these stages, Russia used nuclear tactical weapons and that there's much more room to send more weapons. How do you respond to these two arguments?

**JS:** Well, nuclear winter is global. So when the debris goes up into the atmosphere and it's propelled up with a force of about 600 miles per hour, there's like literally an upward tornado

and that's sort of how I've seen it described by nuclear scientists. So it goes up with incredible force. And once it's up there, it just diffuses. And it's not concentrated long enough to cause nuclear winter. You know, nuclear winter has to happen over a period of at least weeks, you know, but it's not like it's in some box overhead. It just diffuses like smoke. When smoke comes out of your chimney, does it hover over your house? No, it begins to diffuse immediately. So that's just ridiculous. And it's just shocking that anyone in a position of so much power and influence is incredibly cavalier. And I think it's a reflection of how degraded our media and our press has become that they would put all of us, including themselves, really at the nuclear brink and then just give us a little shove. You know, it's just unbelievable.

**ZR:** Another argument against diplomacy, most notably voiced by the German chancellor, Olaf Scholz and let me quote him here. Quote: "Wanting peace does not mean submitting to a bigger neighbor. If Ukraine stops defending itself, it will not mean peace but the end of Ukraine". How would you respond to this kind of talk?

**JS:** So there are a couple points. One is that this is why you need a peace agreement. This is why you need a treaty. This is why the United States needs to be involved as a guarantor, as well as the EU. It's like the conditions of the Minsk Accords, except with more security added in because the United States was not a party to the Minsk Accords and in fact was not supportive and didn't encourage Ukraine to participate in all that. And the European nations were attempting to undermine the Minsk Accords. So we need to start with an actual treaty to ensure the security of all players and even go beyond that, you know, to creating an alternative non militarized security architecture for Europe. That's what the E.U. was supposed to be. It was supposed to end those hundreds of years of war, you know, particularly between France and Germany, and provide a non militarized means of economic and political interaction. So we need that. We need that now. And it should include Russia as well. So that's one part. Number two is that this boogiemans of the latest Hitler, I mean that's been invoked every time NATO and the US arms industry wanted a war, it was always because someone's been characterised as the latest Hitler. And the Soviet Union is not the same as Russia. Russia has been involved in some border skirmishes, but it is not a Soviet Union and it cannot afford to be a Soviet Union. It can hardly pay the pensions that it already has responsibility for. During the Vietnam War, this was the rationale for fighting the Vietnamese Communists because they were going to ally with China. Well, in fact, what did they do? The Communists of China and Vietnam went to war with each other when the US war in Vietnam ended. So we invoke these rationalizations for the benefit of the weapons industry to remain on high drive forever. We concoct one war after another, and we should stop. You know, we just have to stop it because we're now all in the target hairs of these wars. We cannot afford for the weapons industry to be calling the shots in our foreign policy anymore.

**ZR:** Another argument made is, it is too late to negotiate as Russia has caused so much debt and suffering on civilians and committed unspeakable war crimes such as attacking residential complexes as well as civilian energy infrastructure. It is politically impossible for



Ukraine President Zelensky to pursue negotiations, and some may even argue the same for Putin, given how much price Russia has paid in this war. What do you make of this argument?

**JS:** Well, it's absolutely true that the longer a war goes on, the harder it is to back out. But no war would ever end, if that rationale held sway. And, you know, we can honor the sacrifices, the catastrophes, the victims in no greater way than by achieving a lasting peace. And that's clearly the direction we have to go.

**ZR:** Intergovernmental organizations such as the EU, G7 and even NATO regularly cite Russia violating international order and law and that diplomacy that takes into account territorial concessions will only incentivize as well as send false signals to other authoritative states that they can invade any country whenever they want without repercussions. And it is therefore essential that they face repercussions instead of resorting to diplomacy. How do you respond to this argument?

**JS:** We developed the rules of international law predominantly after the Second World War. The US has been in the business of rejecting those rules, and there has been no greater aggressor worldwide than the United States. We've conducted regime changes in about 68 different countries. We have interfered in the elections of over 80 countries. According to a database at Carnegie Mellon University and a professor there named Dov Levin, we have according to the Congressional Research Service, we have sent our military into incursions over 250 times just in the last 30 years. So, yes, we absolutely do need international law and the effort to substitute a rules based order where the rules are not written down. The rules are just kind of called spontaneously by the United States. You know, this is laughable again, and that is the problem we exemplify. The US empire exemplifies exactly the problem that's being described here. And this is why we need an improved United Nations. We need an international law which is actually fair and consistent and not controlled by a handful of countries who happen to be the power holders at the end of the Second World War on the Security Council, you have the permanent members and a few others who rotate in. But this is not acceptable. We need a more democratic, global order. And as the United States and its allies begin to lose their stranglehold on world power, we ought to be thinking about what comes next and whether the torch will pass and power will pass to some body governed by laws. Are we going to be a world governed by the rule of law or by the law of the jungle? You know, it's going to be one or the other and we're going to be in the target hairs of this next world order. So we should be using the influence that we still have to support actual international law and reforms within the United Nations to enable that to happen.

**ZR:** I want to talk about the demonstration Rage against the War Machine that happened in February. A similar demonstration happened here in Germany, organized by the leftist politician Sahra Wagenknecht, which was attended by estimates ranging from 30 to 50.000 people. How was the falling out reaction on the demonstration that took place? As far as I

know a lot of people from left wing, right wing, libertarian, socialists, the Green Party and a lot of people from different backgrounds were involved. Could you talk about how the political system reacted to this demonstration and what sort of problems that you guys were faced with?

**JS:** The political system and the media largely ignored it altogether. There was a follow up demonstration of about the same size that was more the lefty groups and a lot of grassroots groups, which had a very similar agenda, except that there was also a very concerted agenda in support of human needs and to stop the theft of our resources by the military industrial complex. And, you know, it had a more of an anti-corporate theme to it and more of a climate protection thing to it as well. And indeed, these problems really are very connected. They are joined at the hip, as Martin Luther King said. You know, he named that connection as the triple evil of militarism, racism and extreme materialism, of which the climate crisis is really one product. So it was taking place more on that theme. And so it tended to bring in more people from the left and low income and oppressed groups. They were both great demonstrations, in my view. And we should be organizing, in my view, in every conceivable modality, I don't see them as detracting from one another. And it's very important that everybody become involved. The powers that be mostly just ignored it because I think they didn't have anything to say in response. They continued to mostly censor and to shadowban is what they continued to do. And media sources, for example, like Consortium news, The Grayzone, I believe, they get these scarlet letters from some of these censorship groups, the so-called Newsguard, which gives you a red letter and then prevents you from being accessed in public libraries and perhaps in public higher education institutions. I'm not sure about that. But, you know, it's very destructive and exemplifies the authoritarianism that we claim to be opposing globally; we, the US, that is claimed to be opposing. We badly need freedom of the press in order to be a democracy, in order to hold power accountable and fight this war. So I think that's where the fight is, it's against censorship. But I do think that things are getting increasingly discussed, and they try to suppress any discussion of the Nord Stream pipeline and things like that that are very undermining of the US mythology about the nature of this war. So, the truth will have out. It is having out I think, conversations are growing. People are paying an unbearable price for this war, which costs us here in the US, the war machine itself takes up over 50% of our discretionary budget. And if you add in the war at home, that is our oppressive prison system and homeland security and the likes, it's two thirds of our budget. Meanwhile, some 15 million people are losing their health care as the COVID emergency health care access is curtailed. Millions of children have been forced back into poverty as the temporary extension of the child tax rebate has been curtailed. You know, millions of people are facing eviction. Things continue to grind down on the American public. I'm not sure how it is in Germany, but, you know, just about one out of every two Americans is either in poverty or near poverty. And the kinds of social supports and safety nets that used to be there are no longer. And we are, you know, crushing inequality is becoming more crushing by the day. People are not going to stand for it. There's a lot of organizing going on right now among some of the breakaway labor unions that are not held hostage by the Democratic Party the

way that they have been traditionally here. So there's a lot happening. If you look at public opinion surveys right now, people are breaking away from the political establishment, which is reviled along with corporate media. They are reviled if you look at public opinion surveys. So there is a rebellion here in full swing and rebellion against the military stranglehold on our survival and our well-being is a part of this rebellion. And it's only going to grow. There's no other direction for it to go.

**ZR:** To another question regarding the demonstration. For example, in Germany, the peace movement is not uniting to stop the weapons shipments or escalation in the war in Ukraine. They're usually divided amongst the lines of cultural issues, whether it's abortion, transgender, etc., or on issues of economic ideologies, socialism or capitalism. How about this demonstration that you took part in, people from all sorts of spectrums with different opinions took part, how do you view this? Is the war in Ukraine so important that one should put aside the economic, ideological, new liberalism, socialism and cultural issues to fight for something bigger?

**JS:** In my view, there's an even better outcome here, and not everybody on the left agrees with me. But in my own experience, when you actually have a chance to move away from the corporate framing, from the framing by mainstream media, many people who moved into like the Trump camp were really pissed off Obama voters who felt that they had been thrown under the bus after promises that that they would be lifted up, they were actually shoved down, and that was on top of long standing promises from the Democratic Party who led the way under Clinton for the primacy of the banks, for the attacks on the safeguards against reckless, predatory banking, the offshoring of our jobs, the free trade agreements and so on, that really threw working people in this country under the bus. A lot of people look to Bill Clinton for that and then saw Barack Obama acting in that image. Those are the people who then rushed to embrace a demagogue like Trump, who was then promising, Oh, you know, I'm for the little guy, but not actually helping the little guy at all. I think this underscores that most people are not ideological. Most people are responding to their life circumstances. And people get that their survival, their welfare, their access to housing and jobs and health care and education is being crushed right now. And in my experience, when the right and left get together, we usually come out with a populist agenda, but they need to feel like they can trust. They need to trust the structure. And right now, nobody trusts government and so a lot of that sort of defaults to the far right. I think this is a global trend where we see the far right really rising up in the face of neoliberalism and how working people are being destroyed by neoliberal banking and economics and all the rest, which is why we need a truly progressive agenda. I don't see it so much as a matter of right/left, as a matter of corporate and predatory versus actually, populist in the sense of supporting everyday people. So when we get together to have this conversation about the war, we can begin to build trust around a broader agenda. And in the first presidential election that I ran in 2012, we were actually supported by many libertarians on the traditional right. And in fact, in a debate that was hosted by the Libertarians where there was a Libertarian candidate and myself, I was voted the winner over

the Libertarian by the Libertarians, which to me really underscores that people want to be respected and engaged. And when you go there, everything becomes possible.

**ZR:** Dr. Jill Stein, activist and former presidential candidate for the Green Party, USA. Thank you so much for your time today.

**JS:** Thank you, Zain. Great talking, as always.

**ZR:** And thank you for tuning in today. Don't forget to subscribe to our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. YouTube, which is owned by Google, can censor or shadowban us at any time, so if you want to make sure that you receive our information in the future, be sure to join us on these alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. And if you're watching this video and also our past videos, please take into consideration that there's an entire team working behind the scenes from providing camera, light, audio, in the case of audio and videos, translating, voice-over, correction. So if you want us to continue providing you with independent and nonprofit news and analysis, be sure to donate via bank account, PayPal or Better Place. I'm your host, Zain Raza, see you guys next time.

**END**