

The Murderous Life & Legacy of Henry Kissinger: Perfect Symbol of the Rotted US Security State

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

Glenn Greenwald (GG): Now, let's look at a few of the specifics of the kinds of things Henry Kissinger did. One of the worst was his support for what became the completely savage junta that ruled Argentina, the military junta that ruled Argentina in the 1970s, in which hundreds of thousands of people were disappeared. And here is a National Security Archive posting from August of 2004 that reveals that Kissinger told the Argentine generals in 1976 who were at the head of this military junta - because this is at a time when these countries that relied on the United States and were in the corner of the United States in the Cold War, had to observe the limits the United States imposed for what they could and couldn't do. And Kissinger wasn't a fan of limits. And he told them, quote, "there are things that you have to do that have to be done, you should do them quickly." A newly declassified document obtained by the National Security Archive shows that amidst vast human rights violations by Argentina's security forces in June 1976, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told Argentine Foreign Minister Admiral Cesar Augustus Guzzetti, quote, "If there are things that have to be done, you should do them quickly, but you should get back quickly to the normal procedures." Another document recently unearthed by the National Security Archive and posted for the first time there shows that on July 9th, 1976, Secretary Kissinger was explicitly briefed on the rampant repression taking place in Argentina. Quote, "Their theory is that they can use the Chilean method." Kissinger's top aide on Latin America, Henry Shlaudeman informed him, quote, "That is to terrorise the opposition, even killing priests and nuns and others." Kissinger reiterated his message during another meeting with Guzzetti in New York on October 7th, telling him, "The quicker you succeed, the better." A day earlier, on June 9th, 1976, clandestine Argentine security forces had ransacked the Catholic Commission for Refugees in Buenos Aires and stolen refugee records. The day after Guzzetti and Secretary Kissinger met, on June 11th, twenty-four Chilean and Uruguayan refugees were kidnapped, held illegally for two days and tortured by a combined Argentine-Chilean-Uruguayan squadron. Guzzetti also described the intelligence coordination with neighbouring dictatorships. Quote, "The terrorist problem is general to the

entire Southern Cone. To combat it, we are encouraging joint efforts to integrate with our neighbours, all of them Chile, Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay, Brazil." This collaboration was codenamed Operation Condor. By the end of 1976, 10,000 Argentines had been disappeared or assassinated by the Argentine security forces. Half a dozen American citizens had been kidnapped and tortured. On the international front, the cooperation between Argentine military and intelligence forces and other Southern Cone militaries left hundreds of Uruguayans, Chileans, Bolivians, Paraguayans and Brazilians disappeared, tortured and or dead.

Here's the Buenos Aires Herald, the largest newspaper in Argentina. In April of this year - and I just want you to see these things don't go away in the consciousness of the countries to whom the United States does these things. But the people of these countries think of the United States especially when you have China over here saying, come be in our corner, we don't invade countries, we don't bomb countries, we don't engineer coups. We want to do business with you. These perceptions linger for obvious reasons, as if you lived in a country where there was a bloody coup and a bloodbath that followed, where the government that you or your parents voted for was removed from power with the help of a foreign government wanting to control your country and its resources and imposed on your parents or your family or your country was a brutal dictatorship that slaughtered tens of thousands of dissidents and journalists and activists and members of the opposition party and piled up bodies by disappearing them. And you knew the United States or some other country was directly responsible for it. Of course, you will have great animosity toward that other country. And you wouldn't trust the things they say. And you would scoff at the idea that they're devoted to spreading freedom and democracy around the world. When they start a new war and they say, We want to help, you would, of course, be very cynical, jaded about that. And the more countries where that happens - we're talking about large countries here - then, of course, the more anti-Americanism there's going to be in the world. And if you're the only superpower and there's no alternative, then - and some of the countries stew in their resentment, then there's not much that they can do - but the minute there's a multipolar world or some alternative, those countries can't wait to put the knife in the back of the United States because they feel like they've been waiting decades, if not generations, for vengeance. This is the sort of thing that has serious consequences all over the world. Here's the Buenos Aires Herald from this year: *46 years of the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo. They took on the dictatorship looking for their children and have not stopped since.* Quote, "Once a week come rain or shine, a group of mothers gathers in a Buenos Aires square and walks. They wear white handkerchiefs tied to their heads with names sewn on to them. Today marks the 46th anniversary of their first demonstration on April 30th, 1977. On that Saturday, the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo first got together at the square, which would give them their name. Since then, they have returned, demanding to know the fate of their disappeared children 2392 times. In 1977, a silence and fear coated social life in Argentina. The Buenos Aires Herald was one of the few media outlets that reported on the forced disappearances denounced by families and friends of those who went missing. The mothers, as well as the grandmothers of the Plaza de

Mayo, would visit the Herald's newsroom to tell their stories and provide information for its reporters to write about what was otherwise completely made invisible."

Now, let's assume you're in Argentina. And you know that one of the people who enabled all that to happen in your country was Henry Kissinger, who representing the most powerful country on earth, told the generals who had assumed dictatorial control of your country: Go take care of whatever you need to take care of in the quickest way possible - knowing that they were talking about exactly this. Giving them the green light to go ahead, providing them the support and the arms needed to stay in power as they did it. These are things you don't learn in American schools. I went to school - elementary school, middle school, high school - in the United States. I know what I was taught about my country and what I should think about my country in this history was not included, but it is included in most of the world. And it's a reason why so often Americans think other people in other parts of the world are crazy in their views. But maybe that's because we are as propagandised as any other place in the world. And maybe our perspective of our country's role in the world is what is distorted or incomplete. Probably - and again, it is very hard to say what the worst thing Kissinger did is, I probably would put Laos and Cambodia at the top. One of the worst things the United States of the latter half of the 20th century was its very close partnership with the extremely savage dictators of Indonesia, the military leaders of Indonesia and the mass murder, the genocide really, that they perpetrated in East Timor. And Henry Kissinger was at the heart of that as well as the entire United States government. Indonesia is today one of the top four or five most populous countries on the planet. And Indonesians also know of this history, of course, much better than the United States does. So imagine you're in Argentina or you're in Indonesia and Henry Kissinger dies and you see Joe Biden and Blinken and Hillary Clinton and George W Bush saying "this was the greatest man. We loved him. We took advice from him, to this very day we did. A month ago, I was taking advice from Henry Kissinger." What would you think about the United States government?

From the Washington Post in 2001: *1975 East Timor invasion got US go-ahead*. "President Gerald Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger gave Indonesian President Suharto - easily one of the worst monsters of the 20th century - the go-ahead for Indonesia's 1975 invasion of East Timor that left at least 200,000 people dead. Newly declassified documents show it has long been suspected that Ford and Kissinger approved the invasion of the former Portuguese colony. They met with Suharto in Jakarta on December 6th, 1975, the day before he sent Indonesian forces into East Timor. In a secret State Department telegram, Ford and Kissinger assured Suharto that they would not object to what the Indonesian leader termed, quote, 'rapid or drastic action in East Timor.' Quote, 'We will understand and will not press you on the issue', Ford said, according to the telegram, which was declassified in June and posted on the website of the National Security Archive at George Washington University. Quote, 'We understand the problems you have and the intentions you have'. Kissinger told Suharto, quote, 'It is important that whatever you do succeeds quickly'. Same thing he told the Argentinean generals. He also urged Suharto to wait until he and Ford returned to the

United States. Quote, 'The president will be back on Monday at two p.m. Jakarta time', he said. 'We understand your problem and the need to move quickly, but I'm only saying it would be better if it were done until after we returned.'" That was the only request that he had of Indonesia. Knowing they were going to invade and massacre the people of East Timor. He said, Just do us a favour, wait until we're back home for you to start it.

Now, you might be thinking, well, why is it the responsibility of the United States to stop Indonesia from invading and massacring the people of East Timor? That is not the point. The point is that the United States had helped put these people in power. We're propping them up in power with military aid and money. They were controlling Indonesia like they control so many countries today through aid and through weaponry. So this wasn't a question of if the United States failed under Henry Kissinger to take action to stop atrocities in their countries, it was Henry Kissinger who gave the green light, who enabled it to happen. To have massive amounts of bodies piled up by supporting dictatorship. And at the same time that the American people largely believed - because their media and their government told them - that all of these wars and all of these military actions and all of the CIA coups were all designed to just make the world freer, when in fact we were implanting and controlling the most savage despots on the planet. The exact opposite of what the American people were told to believe about their country. Here from SciencesPo in October of 2011: *Three centuries of violence and struggle in East Timor*. Quote, "Incidents of mass violence have on many occasions made East Timor a focus of attention. Those that received the greatest media coverage were perpetrated during the Indonesian occupation from 1975 to 1990, which saw the death of 20-25% of a population that totalled 700,000 in 1975. So we're talking about 200,000 people being massacred and murdered. And this invasion to that Henry Kissinger said the only request I have is you waiting until we're back home - talking about out of a population of 700,000 - they wiped out a quarter of the population. In December 1978, the Indonesian military admitted to having interned 372,900 Timorese people, 60% of the population in 150 camps. Confined, and with very little land to cultivate the prisoners experience the famine that the International Committee of the Red Cross says, quote, was "as bad as Biafra and potentially as dramatic as Cambodia." The situation did not improve in subsequent years. Three other famines occurred in 1981, 1982, 1984 and 1987.

This is a monster, Henry Kissinger, and his view of the world was very clear, which was, if anything, in some way advances American interests then we should do it regardless of the body count, regardless of the ethical considerations or the moral considerations or the legal considerations. In other words, we're not interested in the democracy of other countries at all, even though we keep saying that that's what makes us better than the Soviet Union, even though we keep telling the American people that that's what our project is. Our project is the opposite. Henry Kissinger's view was not that we should sit at home and ignore the rest of the world. That's an isolationist view. Henry Kissinger was not an isolationist. He was the opposite. He was an interventionist. He wanted to go around intervening in other parts of the world, not under the pretence of helping those countries, although, of course, that was the

propaganda, but not his pretence that he would offer to help. Instead, it was if we need something that we want to take here, if we need to control a country here, we're going to put in whoever we want and whatever the cost is in terms of human life. To do it is the cost we're going to pay. It's like a sociopathic foreign policy spread all over the world.

This morning, one of the senior foreign policy officials in the Obama administration, Ben Rhodes, with whom I've had all kinds of clashes and for whom I have all kinds of critiques wrote an article in The New York Times about Henry Kissinger's death that was very mildly headlined: *Henry Kissinger, The Hypocrite*. But it was actually a much better and more scathing indictment of Henry Kissinger than that headline suggests. Now, ironically, a lot of the critiques that Ben Rhodes made of Henry Kissinger apply very much so to the Obama administration and to Obama officials. But nonetheless, it was a critique that you don't often hear of the American foreign policy community from a top level foreign policy official published in The New York Times. And one of the focal points of this op-ed was this illegal war that Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon started where we were in the Vietnam War and we were losing. That, of course, is what the Pentagon Papers proved, that American officials knew we were losing, we were unlikely to win, that a stalemate was the best possibility. While we were telling the public, while the government was telling the public for all those years that victory was six months away, that they just had to keep being a little more patient and paying for a little bit more and sending their sons to die in the jungles of Vietnam. Inside the Pentagon, inside the White House, including in the Nixon administration, they knew that victory was impossible. And it was Daniel Ellsberg who exposed that in the Pentagon Papers. And that was why Nixon and Kissinger despised Daniel Ellsberg. They broke into his psychoanalyst's office, Henry Kissinger suggested he was a Soviet agent. Because he exposed the truth. But one of the things that happened as part of the Vietnam War was that Nixon and Kissinger started a secret war that not even the U.S. Congress knew about in Cambodia and Laos on the other side of the Vietnam border, based on the view that there were Viet Cong operating from Cambodia and Laos. And it was at a time when the Americans really were getting humiliated and starting to lose the war. And the order that Kissinger gave to the Pentagon, to the military to take this illegal war, the secret war that was not known to the Congress, let alone authorised by it, let alone to the American people, was to shoot and bomb everything that moves, shoot and bomb everything that moves. The United States dropped so much ordnance on Laos and Cambodia, that it might have been the most amount of bombing, including World War Two as I'm about to show you. To this very day, children of Laos are killed when they find undetonated bombs and traps of all kinds in their country. It was one of the most savage and indiscriminate war crimes committed in that time. It was domestically illegal and morally reprehensible. And we all know it. Hillary Clinton knows it. Antony Blinken knows it. Tony Blair knows it. George W Bush knows it. And yet just nothing but oozing praise for this person while we purport to be the moral authority and beacon of freedom in the world. Quote "For him," - this is Ben Rhodes in The New York Times, "credibility for Kissinger was rooted in what you did more than what you stood for, even when those actions rendered American concepts of human rights and international law void.

He helped extend the war in Vietnam and expanded to Cambodia and Laos, where the United States rained down more bombs than it dropped on Germany and Japan in World War Two. That bombing - often indiscriminately massacring civilians - did nothing to improve the terms on which the Vietnam War ended; if anything, it was just and it just indicated the lengths the United States would go to express his displeasure at losing. Kissinger wrote a shelf of books, many of which polish his own reputation as an oracle of global affairs; after all, history is written by men like Henry Kissinger, not by the victims of superpower bombing campaigns, including children in Laos who continue to be killed by their unexploded bombs that litter their country. Credibility, after all," - sorry I just lost my place - "credibility, after all, is not just about whether you punish an adversary to send a message to another. It's also about whether you are what you say you are. No one can expect perfection in the affairs of state any more than in the relations among human beings. But the United States has paid a price for its hypocrisy, though it's harder to measure than the outcome of a war or negotiation. Over the decades, our story about democracy has come to ring hollow to a growing number of people who can point to the places where our actions drained our words of meaning and democracy just sounded like an extension of American interests. Similarly, our insistence on a rules-based international order has been ignored by strongmen, who point to America's own sins to justify their own."

Now, one of the major culprits in all of this has been the corporate media. I've talked many times before about how people like to debate what is the ideological bias of the corporate media. I was thinking about this recently, in fact, when if you ask supporters of Israel they will tell you that The New York Times is one of the most viciously anti-Israeli pro-Palestinian newspapers on the planet. But if you ask pro-Palestinian activists, they will tell you The New York Times is a fanatically Zionist newspaper that's owned by a family, the Sulzberger family, that are fanatical, supporters of Israel. They editorialised in favour of Israel. And it made me realise that people love to complain about the media being biased. Everyone insists the media is being biased. I've never once heard, never once, anyone say the media is biased, but on this particular important issue, it's biased in favour of my view. Everyone always thinks the media is against it, against them - everybody. But what people argue: is the media biased toward the left or is it biased toward the right? I do think on cultural issues and the like, you can have that debate and they're clearly biased toward the left. On cultural issues like abortion and LGBT issues and gun control, those sorts of things. But on issues of war and foreign policy, it's absolutely not a bias of the left or the right. The bias is subservience to the security state. They describe to their viewers and propagandise their readers on behalf of the vision of the U.S. security state. And I can show you so many examples. So many examples where the CIA would overthrow a democratically elected government in a particular country and the media in the United States - Time Magazine under Henry Luce, which was very influential in the Cold War and The New York Times, The Washington Post. And to this day, they do the same. They would describe the overthrow of a democratically elected government and the imposition of a dictatorship as an advancement of democracy. They would say the people rose up and overthrew their corrupt dictators and it's a

vindication of democracy, even though it was the CIA overthrowing the government, the leaders that those people had elected democratically. That's how Orwellian the media was and going hand in hand with these policies. Now, here from The Intercept in 2023, there's the title: *Blood on his Hands*, with a picture of Henry Kissinger. Survivors of Kissinger's secret war in Cambodia reveal unreported mass killings. Quote, "Kissinger bears significant responsibility for the attacks in Cambodia that killed as many as 150,000 civilians, according to Ben Kiernan, former director of the Genocide Study Program at Yale University and one of the foremost authorities on the US air campaign in Cambodia. Grandin estimates that overall, Kissinger, who also helped to prolong the Vietnam War and facilitate genocides in Cambodia, East Timor and Bangladesh", - we haven't even gotten to Bangladesh - "accelerated civil wars in southern Africa and supported coups and death squads throughout Latin America has the blood of at least 3 million people on his hands." Let's just stop here for one second. Henry Kissinger has the blood of at least 3 million people on his hands. This is a very systematic study. This person at Yale specialises in the air campaign in Cambodia. And what they're talking about is the policy of Kissinger and prolonging the Vietnam War, facilitating the genocides in Cambodia, East Timor and Bangladesh; and the civil wars that he accelerated in southern Africa and then the death squads throughout Latin America. And if you total that up, we're talking about somebody who has the blood on his hands of at least 3 million people. And yet, U.S. Leaders have no problem going before the world to these countries and saying Henry Kissinger was a great man who represented us and from whom I sought counsel and advice.

One night in December 1970, Nixon called his national security adviser in a rage about Cambodia. Quote, "I want the helicopter ships. I want everything that can fly to go in and crack the hell out of them," Nixon barked at Kissinger, according to a transcript, "I want gunships in there. That means armed helicopters. ...I want it done! Get them off their asses. ...I want them to hit everything." Five minutes later, Kissinger was on the phone with General Alexander Haig, his military aid, relaying the command for a relentless assault on Cambodia. Quote, "It's an order. It's to be done. Anything that flies on anything that moves. You got that?" So that was the US approach to the bombing campaign in Cambodia. Anything that flies, anything that moves, you bomb. How is the United States ever having moral credibility to accuse others of war criminality? Or crimes against humanity. Here, from Al Jazeera: *US bombs continue to kill in Laos 50 years after the Vietnam War*. "The US dropped 2 million tons of bombs on Laos at the height of the Vietnam War. Why are cluster munitions still killing now?" Again, the United States is not at war with Laos. Congress never declared war on Laos. Kissinger and Nixon ordered the bombing of Laos secretly. Meaning illegally. Obviously, Laos wasn't a country that could attack the United States. They claimed it harboured - or that pro-Vietnamese, pro-Vietcong fighters were using Laos as a base to attack American soldiers. And their solution was just to unleash a bombing campaign on Laos worse than what happened in Japan and Germany in World War Two. That, as we just showed you, had no constraints of any kind. Kill anything that moves, bomb anything that flies. On Thanksgiving Day in November 1968, the United States escalated its war against North

Vietnam in Laos. At the same time, the US began dropping millions of tons of bombs. They, quote, "felt like rain on" the supply lines in Laos, a network of paths and tracks known as the Ho Chi Minh Trail and most of the east of the country. Now, some 80 million unexploded bombs and airdrop cluster munitions left over continue to maim and kill Laotian men, women and children. Quote, "about 75% of injuries from cluster munitions involved children", she tells Al Jazeera, referring to the tennis ball sized fragmentation bomblets that have acquired the local name "bombies". They were dropped in their millions on Laos. Thousands of children have been killed or severely wounded by them, and Thor says they are, quote, "everywhere". Calum Gibbs, a 26 year old Scot working in the southern province of Savannakhet for HALO Trust, a UK-based NGO focussed on bomb clearance, said data suggests there have been 50,000 casualties since the war ended. Just from the remnants of bombs that Kissinger and Nixon left.

Here's in The Guardian, that also attempted to define the worst parts of Kissinger's legacy, and it's from Latin America. It's the Latin American perspective: *Latin America remembers Kissinger's "profound moral wretchedness"*. And this is about what the United States and Kissinger did in Chile in overthrowing the democratically elected left-wing government in Chile under Allende and replacing him in a military coup with Augusto Pinochet, who ruled that country as a dictator for many years to come. Again, they had a democratically elected government in Chile voted for by the people. We didn't like the results of that election. So we worked with Chilean generals that we paid, that we courted, to use military force to remove that government and then imposed dictatorship on Chile that murdered all kinds of dissidents and journalists, dropped people from helicopters, terrorised the country to submit to Pinochet's rule. *U.S. statesman's encouragement of Pinochet's coup in Chile and his backing of Argentine military dictatorship left a lasting stain*. Quote, "Nowhere has been the reaction more damning than in Chile, where Kissinger was instrumental in the 1973 coup that led to the death of a democratically elected socialist president, Salvador Allende, and the installation of a dictator, General Augusto Pinochet, and his military junta." Kissinger was a man, quote, "whose historical brilliance was never able to conceal his profound moral wretchedness", wrote Juan Gabriel Valdez, Chile's ambassador to the US, on X, formally Twitter. The coup was seen as a major victory by Richard Nixon's White House, but it marked the start of 17 years of autocracy in Chile. The files published by the NSA make clear Kissinger's central role in the Chilean coup. In 1970, he warned Nixon that Chile would become, quote, "the worst failure" of his administration and that it might develop into, quote, 'our Cuba' without U.S. intervention. He chaired the committee that oversaw CIA operations to undermine the Allende government. Quote, "I don't see why we need to stand by and watch a country go communist due to the irresponsibility of its people", Kissinger said, "the issues are much too important for the Chilean voters to be left to decide for themselves."

Now as many of you know I live in Brazil and have lived here for 18 years and my husband was a congressman and I started a media outlet here and did reporting in Brazil. I know Brazilian culture quite well. And Brazil had its own US sponsored coup in 1964. And that

wasn't on the ledger of Henry Kissinger. He wasn't in government yet, but it was very similar to the kinds of coups Henry Kissinger loved to engineer all over the world. And Brazil had elected not even a left-wing government, a centre-left government that was doing things like offering land reform and rent control. And first, the Kennedy administration, and then the Johnson administration said, we're concerned you're moving too far left. Remember, this is a democratically elected government in Brazil, the CIA, JFK and Lyndon Johnson are sitting in Washington telling the Brazilians thousands of miles away, you're moving too far left on your economic policies and if you don't stop that we're going to do something about it. And the Brazilian president said, I was elected by the Brazilian people. We have radical economic inequality and I intend to fix that. And Brazil was determined to be neutral, to stay out of the axis of the United States or the Soviet Union in the Cold War. But neutrality wasn't enough for Washington. They demanded that governments be fully pro-Washington. And so the CIA, under LBJ, worked hand in hand with Brazilian generals to violently overthrow the democratically elected government in Rio de Janeiro, that was the capital of Brazil at the time, force the Brazilian president into exile, took over the country and proceeded to rule Brazil as a military dictatorship supported by the US and the UK for the next 21 years. From 1964 until 1985, when it began to re-democratise. And there was all kinds of brutality. Disappeared journalists, exiled dissidents, murdered and disappeared people of all kinds. And obviously the shadow of that dictatorship hangs over Brazil. And if you ask somebody who's in Brazil what they think of the United States, that coup 60 years ago is going to colour what they think of the United States and what they think of the United States claims that they're going to war to protect democracy and spread freedom. And this just repeats itself over and over and over and over. What was done in Brazil was not even close to the top of the list of horrors, but it still shapes views of the United States in a way that I think many Americans are incapable of understanding because they aren't told that history. So when they hear this anti-American sentiment, they think people just hate the United States irrationally. And so much of this was on the ledger of Henry Kissinger.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at seven p.m. Eastern exclusively on Rumble. You can catch the full nightly shows live or view the backlog of episodes for free on our Rumble page. You can also find full episodes the morning after they air across all major podcasting platforms, including Spotify and Apple. All the information you need is linked below. We hope to see you there.

END

Vielen Dank, dass Sie diese Abschrift gelesen haben. Bitte vergessen Sie nicht zu spenden, um unseren unabhängigen und gemeinnützigen Journalismus zu unterstützen:

BANKKONTO: Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V. Bank: GLS Bank IBAN: DE89430609678224073600 BIC: GENODEM1GLS	PAYPAL: E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org	PATREON: https://www.patreon.com/acTVism	BETTERPLACE: Link: Klicken Sie hier
---	--	--	---

Der Verein acTVism München e.V. ist ein gemeinnütziger, rechtsfähiger Verein. Der Verein verfolgt ausschließlich und unmittelbar gemeinnützige und mildtätige Zwecke. Spenden aus Deutschland sind steuerlich absetzbar. Falls Sie eine Spendenbescheinigung benötigen, senden Sie uns bitte eine E-Mail an: info@acTVism.org

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO: Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V. Bank: GLS Bank IBAN: DE89430609678224073600 BIC: GENODEM1GLS	PAYPAL: E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org	PATREON: https://www.patreon.com/acTVism	BETTERPLACE: Link: Click here
---	--	--	---

The acTVism München e.V. association is a non-profit organization with legal capacity. The association pursues exclusively and directly non-profit and charitable purposes. Donations from Germany are tax-deductible. If you require a donation receipt, please send us an e-mail to: info@acTVism.org