



## **INTERVIEW: Newly-Elected, Anti-Establishment Member of UK Parliament—George Galloway—on the New Politics of the West**

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

**Glenn Greenwald (GG):** Good evening. It's Thursday, March 7th. Welcome to a new episode of System Update, our live nightly show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. eastern exclusively here on Rumble, the free speech alternative to YouTube. Tonight: George Galloway was elected to be a member of the British Parliament just last week. He did not just win but crushed both major political parties, the conservative Tory party that is currently in power, as well as the Labour Party, that's widely expected to win the prime ministership later this year under the tepid, vapid and principle free establishment symbol named Sir Keir Starmer. Galloway, running as part of a hard to characterise new party, received more votes than all other candidates combined. He is whatever else one might want to say about him, a fascinating figure. He first came to prominence in the United States in 2005, when he voluntarily went to the American Congress, which at the time vehemently supported the Bush-Cheney invasion of Iraq on a widespread bipartisan basis. And he humiliated his interrogators in Congress on live national television, who had been accusing him of opposing the Iraq War only because he was accepting money from the Saddam Hussein regime. For those of you who never saw it or have not seen it in a while, I highly recommend watching it. It was one of the most eloquent, articulate and scathing displays of oratory I have ever seen, and he was unflinching in expressing his contempt for war hungry Washington over its invasion of Iraq and the broader war on terror, as well as the slander campaign launched against him to discredit him for opposing the war. Now, at the time, Galloway was a member of the left-centre Labour Party, and he had been long regarded as a man of the left. But the Labour Party in the UK, just like the Democratic Party of Hillary Clinton, John Kerry and Joe Biden, was fully on board with the war in Iraq. Its then prime minister, Tony Blair, who was a member of the Labour Party, the leader of it, who was intensely mocked for being George W Bush's puppy dog, often offering a more vibrant and eager defence for the invasion of Iraq than George Bush himself could ever muster. As a result of Galloway's very outspoken denunciations of Tony Blair and his role in the Iraq War, he was expelled from his own party. Since then, Galloway has twice returned to Parliament,

representing three different parties and four different districts or constituencies as they are known over there. He's like an anti-establishment zombie. They think they keep killing only for him to haunt them with his continuous returns.

But the case of George Galloway is fascinating not only because of the unique rage and contempt he induces in the political and media establishment, and really, it is something to behold. But he also clearly represents a new kind of politics, someone who, during the Iraq War, was universally regarded as a leftist, only for him to then adopt a series of views that put him directly at odds with the left liberal orthodoxy in the West. He vehemently opposed the US NATO regime change wars in Syria and Libya, loudly opposed the US/UK fueling of the war in Ukraine from the start of that war, heaps contempt on elite left wing culture war pieties that alienate the exact working class that the left insist it represents. He defended Brexit, the UK decision to leave the EU, and he also resisted many Covid orthodoxies. And he opposes mass and uncontrolled immigration into Europe and the UK for the same reasons he opposes their wars, namely by arguing that it's a boon to elite classes while the working class and ordinary people suffer from those policies. Interestingly, George Galloway has changed none of his views from that era when he was expelled from the Labour Party from the left for opposing George Bush and Tony Blair's war in Iraq. But neoliberal foreign policy, centrist economics and left liberal culture war views have changed dramatically around him. And more than anything else, George Galloway, like so many people these days, is driven by an ideology best described not as right or left, but as anti-establishment. In fact, the reason his victory sparked such intense contempt in the media and political classes is because that is the ideology and the growing movement, anti-establishment views, that they fear more than any other. We sat down with Galloway just a bit earlier today, just a few minutes ago, about a wide range of issues, and we really view his victory in the UK, and this interview as very worth paying attention to. We are very excited to show you our conversation that covered a wide range of issues, from various wars taking place to domestic politics in the UK, the way it reflects a broader political movement, and a transformation of politics in both the West and in various parts of the democratic world. He is as amusing as he is articulate, as provocative as he is insightful and we're very excited to show you this interview.

Before we get to that, a few programming notes. First of all, we are encouraging our viewers to download the Rumble app because if you do so, it works both on your smart TV and your telephone. And if you download the app, it means that you can follow the shows that you most love to watch here on Rumble. And if you do that, you can activate notifications, which we hope you will. Which means the minute any of those shows begin broadcasting live on Rumble, you immediately get notified by text or email or however you want, and you can just click on the link and start watching. It really helps the live audience of all these programs that you want to support, and it really helps Rumble itself in its free speech mission. As another reminder, System Update is also available in podcast form where you can listen to every program, every episode, 12 hours after the first broadcast live here on Rumble, on Spotify, Apple, and all the major podcasting platforms. If you rate and review and follow the program on those platforms, it really helps prep the visibility of the show. Finally, every Tuesday and Thursday night, once we're done with our live show here on Rumble, we move to Locals,

which is part of the Rumble platform where we have our live interactive aftershow that's designed to take your questions and respond to your feedback, to your critiques and your suggestions. That show is available solely for members of our Locals community. If you want to become a member, which gives you access not only to those twice a week after shows, but also to the interactive features we have that let me respond to questions and comments throughout the week, it's the place that we publish the transcripts of every program we broadcast on Rumble – we publish professionalised transcripts on the Locals platform every day – it's the place where we publish our original journalism first, and most importantly of all, it's the community on which we rely to support the independent journalism that we're doing here every night. Simply click the join button right below the video player on the Rumble page, and it will take you directly to that Locals community. For now, welcome to a new episode of System Update, starting right now.

The British media likes to treat George Galloway whenever they're forced to pay attention to him, namely every few years when he finds a way to win his way back to the British Parliament, despite expressing contempt and disgust for the entire political media establishment and both of the two leading political parties, the Tories and Labour that run the UK, and when they pay attention to him, they try and treat him as the singular figure of contempt. This person that has no principles, has no fixed ideology, who just says whatever he needs to say to win elections. And the reality is the exact opposite. There are few people in politics, love him or hate him, more principled and consistent than George Galloway. And it's remarkable that he was somebody who warned that everything that did end up happening from the invasion of Iraq would end up happening. He was right about all of that. Meanwhile, even Tony Blair and the Labour aides who ruled Britain at the time and who insisted that the invasion of Iraq would spread democracy throughout the Middle East, admit that instead what happened is it created a huge power vacuum into which emerged ISIS, as well as a whole bunch of other harms. You would think that would give the establishment some degree of humility and some kind of deference to George Galloway, because he was right about the most important question of the last generation, and they were so disgracefully and destructively wrong. But there is no accountability of any kind. And while the media and the political establishment despise George Galloway, as much as in the United States they despise Donald Trump, obviously voters continue to respond to him because he continues to keep going back to the Parliament, because he continues to find a way to be elected with different parties, even with different constituencies. And that's exactly what he did last week. Here is Politico on March 1st with the headline: *George Galloway, Britain's newest MP is a pro-Gaza, anti-NATO firebrand*. "Galloway was kicked out of Tony Blair's Labour in the 2000s – but he's headed back to the UK Parliament on a pro-Palestinian ticket". "In the early 2000s, Galloway was one of the loudest voices in the anti-Iraq war movement, opposing a foreign policy pushed by Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair. He was eventually expelled from Blair's Labour in 2003 for, quote, 'bringing the party into disrepute'." The people who invaded Iraq, who destroyed Iraq based on the lies, that turned out to be one of the worst political crimes of that generation, that brought chaos and destruction to the Middle East that persists today, took somebody who was opposed to their war of aggression, who denounced their lies and expelled him for bringing disrepute to their party. It goes on, quote, "Galloway described

the process that saw him booted out – including on charges of inciting attacks on British troops – as a quote, 'politically motivated kangaroo court'. His new party's 10-point programme promises, quote, 'end to imperialist wars and financial domination, starting with withdrawal from NATO'. In recent weeks, he said Tucker Carlson's interview with Vladimir Putin would show people the Russian president is, quote, 'not Vlad the Mad or Vlad the Bad, and that they've been lied to about him'."

So the article began by saying he was elected on a pro-Gaza platform, and the reality is that his politics are far broader than that. He opposes basically every establishment prong, from mass immigration, to he was in favour of Brexit. He is a vehement opponent of not just the war in Israel, but the war in Ukraine, as well as the regime change wars that NATO and Europe and the United States pursued both in Syria and Libya, to the great destruction of both of those countries. He is also extremely uncomfortable with more extremist parts of the left liberal cultural agenda, even though he had received the words 20 years ago for being among the first people to stand up and defend the rights of gay couples to be treated equally under the law. The new form of left wing culture war is one that he believes alienates working class voters. And we actually, and we talk about this in the interview we're about to show you with him, thought about who we could compare him to. And one of the people who he reminds me of is the politician in Germany named Sahra Wagenknecht, who we interviewed about six months ago. She was a long time person of the left, just like George Galloway and yet in recent years, she turned against the war in Ukraine. She has become an outspoken opponent of left wing culture war issues, as well as the effects of mass immigration on the working poor. And as a result, while she still attracts a lot of left wing support, she got driven out of parts of the left, and now she attracts a lot of people on the right and in between. And she's really become a heterodox figure. And we interviewed her about six months ago and her politics is like George Galloway's and like a lot of people in the United States and throughout the democratic world.

Now, a lot of people first encountered George Galloway back in 2005, when he was being vehemently attacked by the entire bipartisan pro-war wing of Washington, accusing him of having opposed the war in Iraq because they said he received money in bribes and kickbacks from Saddam Hussein's regime. That was what was done to people who oppose the war in Iraq. Just like if you oppose the war in Ukraine, you get accused of being a Kremlin agent. It was the same exact environment, the same exact tactics from the same exact pro-war factions in the West that were doing that. And he went and confronted Congress about it. He didn't need to. He's a British citizen. They couldn't subpoena him, but he volunteered to go. And he destroyed the people in Congress trying to accuse him of that. The ones who had advocated the war in Iraq in a form of testimony that I think Washington had rarely seen before. We're going to just show you a short clip, but if you're interested, and I really hope you are, I really recommend going on YouTube and watching this. Here's a part of what happened.

**George Galloway (GeGa) in Video:** When I was Senator, I gave my heart and soul to oppose the policy that you promoted. I gave my political life's blood to try to stop the mass killing of Iraqis by the sanctions on Iraq, which killed a million Iraqis, most of them children.

Most of them died before they even knew that they were Iraqis, but they died for no other reason other than that they were Iraqis, with the misfortune to be born at that time. I gave my heart and soul to stop you committing the disaster that you did commit, in invading Iraq. And I told the world that your case for the war was a pack of lies. I told the world that Iraq, contrary to your claims, did not have weapons of mass destruction. I told the world, contrary to your claims, that Iraq had no connection to al-Qaida. I told the world, contrary to your claims, that Iraq had no connection to the atrocity on 9/11, 2001. I told the world, contrary to your claims, that the Iraqi people would resist a British and American invasion of their country, and that the fall of Baghdad would not be the beginning of the end, but merely the end of the beginning. Senator, in everything I said about Iraq, I turned out to be right and you turned out to be wrong. And 100,000 people have paid with their lives, 1,600 of them American soldiers, sent to their deaths on a pack of lies, 15,000 of them wounded, many of them disabled forever on a pack of lies. If the world had listened to Kofi Annan, whose dismissal you demanded, if the world had listened to President Chirac, who you want to paint as some kind of corrupt traitor, if the world had listened to me and the anti-war movement in Britain, we would not be in the disaster that we are in today. Senator, this is the mother of all smokescreens.

**GG:** Alright, so that's pretty much how the entire day went. And I want you to just think about this for a minute; everything that he said, he said in fact, he did say before the war. And he's absolutely right when he says that everything he said before the war turned out to be true. And everything that the advocates of this war said about what happened turned out to be false. You would think in a rational world, that would mean that his credibility would increase, and the credibility of those who were so dreadfully and disastrously wrong would retreat and yet that doesn't happen. If you pick up a newspaper, you would think that George Galloway is the one who somehow got discredited, while the people who advocated for the Iraq War, which, remember, includes people like Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton and John Kerry, and half if not more of the Republican Senate caucus as well, and meeting neocons like Bill Kristol and Jeffrey Goldberg, who's currently the editor in chief of The Atlantic, those people have more influence than ever. How is that? How can that be? That's why George Galloway is such an interesting case study to understand how Western power centres work. The people who are right, but who advocate for the wrong cause, get destroyed and discredited and excluded and despised, and the people who are constantly wrong over and over and over get rewarded because they're lying for the power centres that are in the position to bequeath awards on them. That's really how things work. Now, in addition to opposing CIA and NATO regime change wars in Syria and Libya, the current war in Ukraine, he also is a very consistent opponent of the US and UK's support for Israel and its funding of the destruction of Gaza. Now, one of the primary grievances of American conservatives is that people on the left will accuse them of being racist, or bigots, or white nationalists as a way of shutting down dissent and discrediting political enemies. And while it's true that that is a common tactic on the left, perhaps the faction that uses that tactic more than any other are supporters of Israel. The minute you stand up and question what Israel is doing or questioning why the US and the UK are funding what Israel is doing, you get called a racist, an anti-Semite, a bigot and a racist. Your motives are impugned. They try and destroy debate

exactly the way conservatives complain about what the left does, the pro-Israel right does over and over and over and over again. In 2013, George Galloway went to Oxford, where he participated in a debate union, and he spoke about his opposition to the Israeli treatment of the Palestinians and a pro-Israel student stood up and accused him of being a racist. And he gave one of the most eloquent and effective answers to that accusation of any that I've ever heard. Here's what happened.

**Student:** My question for you is, are you a racist?

**GeGA:** Why are you applauding that? What kind of people would applaud that? Am I a racist? You've sat through the last hour and a half of me speaking, and you're applauding someone asking me if I'm a racist? What kind of people are you? Or do you just applaud anything? Would you just applaud anything? You made a better job of it than your friend. I'll grant you that. Talking to me in a language I don't understand, and then waving an Israeli flag in my face was not, I suspect, the finest moment that he will experience in what I hope is a long life in public affairs. I'll let you in on something you don't know. I'm one of the few people on the left in Britain, who travelled the length and breadth of apartheid South Africa as an underground agent of the African National Congress led by Nelson Mandela, then in Pollsmoor Prison in Cape Town. Therefore, the subject of apartheid is particularly important to me. The question of racism is particularly important to me. And in parenthesis, let me tell you this, that throughout the entirety of my time underground in South Africa under apartheid, every house I slept in, every dinner I ate, every car I drove in, was provided by Jewish activists of the African National Congress. So Jews don't have to be on the side of apartheid. They don't have to be on the side of racism.

**GG:** I think the important point of that was that the attempt to try and suggest that if you belong to a certain group, you're required to hold a certain set of beliefs. A favourite tactic of liberals who tell Black people that if you're Black, by virtue of your race and the colour of your skin, you're somehow duty bound to support the Democratic Party and its liberal agenda. Remember, Joe Biden in 2020 said when he was on The Breakfast Club and questioned about whether or not he has done enough to convince Black people to vote for him, he said if you aren't sure that you're going to vote for me, maybe you probably ain't Black. Meaning with being Black comes a certain required and mandated set of beliefs about the world. And that's always the implicit assumption whenever people try and use this tactic in political debates; that if you express a certain view, a criticism of a foreign country, a criticism of a war, and you get accused of being a racist, it means that somehow that there are groups of people who are duty bound to hold a certain set of beliefs, and if they don't, they're somehow traitors to their race. And he was pointing out that a lot of Jews historically have opposed apartheid wherever it appeared. And of course, there are a lot of leading Israeli officials, including the person Benjamin Netanyahu selected to be the head of the Mossad in 2015, who, one month before the October 7th attack, said in an interview with The Guardian that Israel had become an apartheid state. You don't have to agree with that, but the idea that you become anti-Semitic because you see it that way is exactly the sort of tactic that typically conservatives object to, except when it comes to Israel or the pro-Israel wing of that

movement starts to use that tactic to shut down debate, discredit critics. And I think his answer so perfectly illustrated the corruption of that mentality.

Now, on the night of his victory on March 1st, he was interviewed by Sky News. And right when George Galloway was announced as the winner of the election, the Tory prime Minister of the UK, who is deeply unpopular, almost certain to lose the next election, Rishi Sunak, convened a press conference where he spoke primarily about George Galloway's victory and he said it was deeply alarming. He said it was beyond alarming, like it was a national crisis, that George Galloway had gotten elected. They speak of him as just like plague.

Conservatives and Labour aides don't speak of one another the way they speak about George Galloway, a special kind of hatred and contempt is reserved for him. And so when he won, he was interviewed by someone from Sky News and it was in his constituency, and people start to realise that it's him, that he's being interviewed and they start gabbing around and the interviewer is, of course, doing what these journalists do, which is being the voice of the establishment. And the way that George Galloway heaped scorn in contempt on his questions was such a masterclass in the way these people should be treated. Because it really reveals this conceit that they have, that they're speaking for the people and condemning George Galloway on the very night that he became a member of Parliament, because a majority of people of his district have voted for him to go to the Parliament, who here is speaking for the people. Watch this interview. It is as riveting as it is hilarious.

**Sky News:** The Prime Minister is saying...

**GeGA:** You are talking as if he was God. We're talking about little Rishi Sunak in the fag end of his prime ministership. Don't talk to me as if he's come down from the mount with tablets of stone. The things that he says are somehow meant to awe me, they may awe you, but they don't awe me.

**Sky News:** A lot of people have just watched what the Prime Minister said. This is your opportunity to respond to what he says. He says that there are forces here at home trying to tear us apart. He is implying you are a divisive figure. You have run an election campaign that is trying to appeal particularly, not entirely, to one section.

**GeGA:** Who won the election? Me or Rishi Sunak? I've got the democratic mandate here, not Rishi Sunak. He didn't even come second. He was lucky to come third. So don't put to me statements made by Rishi Sunak. Because if I'm supposed to be impressed by them, he don't impress me much.

**Sky News:** We have spent some time today on the streets of Rochdale, and there are people who say that they feel intimidated by people like you and the people who have supported you. And they have pointed out that you have concentrated your campaign on foreign affairs, and they worry that Rochdale will not be the winner.

**GeGA:** I am the winner; that's my answer to you. I was just elected with a thumping majority by the electorate in Rochdale. That's all that matters to me.

**Sky News:** So why are there people in the streets of Rochdale today worried?

**GeGA:** People voted yesterday and they voted for me. Why is that difficult for you to grasp?

**Sky News:** Why are there people on the streets worried?

**GeGA:** There may be people who didn't vote for me, who are worried, but the majority, the thumping majority voted for me. I've got the mandate and I'm going to the House of Commons with it.

**Sky News:** And it's a mandate, you think, to do what? Because there are people that listen to what you say, what you say about whether or not Israel has a right to exist, what you say about what many Jewish people think is threatening.

**GeGA:** We had this conversation last night. Why are you reheating it?

**Sky News:** Because in the light of the Prime Minister's....

**GeGA:** Don't keep telling me about the Prime Minister as if he was Moses.

**Sky News:** Do you not respect the Prime Minister?

**GeGA:** Do I respect the Prime Minister? I despise the Prime Minister.

**GG:** Alright, so it went like that and it got to the point where the people around him who weren't part of his campaign, they just were ordinary people passing through and noticed this interview going on, started applauding for him and started cheering for him. And again, this person was here, dispatched to say the Prime Minister has spoken negatively about him. The Prime Minister's hatred in the UK. It's expected that the Conservative Party under Rishi Sunak is expected to lose something like by 300 votes in the majority. But this is what they do. They speak for the establishment and they adopt this conceit that they're speaking for the people, even though the people hate the establishment. That is always the mismatch in established media discourse and George Galloway just doesn't play the game where he adopts their premises. Now, before we show you the interview, just one final thing, which is how The Guardian is trying to grapple with the fact that public enemy number one in establishment political life in Britain returned again as a member of Parliament in a constituency that had been held by Labour. The Guardian, March 3rd: *Writing off George Galloway ignores his dangerous appeal to both far left and right*. "Muslims angry over Gaza and white conservatives joined in electing the new MP for Rochdale. Those who see him as a fringe figure do so at their peril". "Things would be more straightforward if we could take Galloway, and the Workers Party of Britain that he leads, at face value. They claim to be a

leftwing outfit that won Rochdale on a surge of pro-Palestinian sentiment in the wake of Israel's brutal assault on Gaza. But the truth is murkier. During this campaign, Galloway's team sent out more than one set of correspondents. One, addressed to Muslims in the constituency, urged voters to quote, 'use your vote to send Keir Starmer and the Labour Party a message – stop supporting genocide, stop supporting Israeli aggression and stand with Palestine'. His other elected address, targeting a different demographic, tells another story. It trumpets Galloway's record of backing Brexit, opposing Scottish independence and supporting family values. A whole paragraph is dedicated to outlining his opposition to transgender rights and his conviction that, quote, 'God creates everything in pairs'. Quote, 'I believe in law and order', the letter reads. 'There will be no grooming gangs in Rochdale. Even if I have to arrest them myself'. It ends with a deliberate nod to Donald Trump, promising to 'make Rochdale great again'. Alienated white voters were also a key part of Galloway's winning coalition. Across Europe figures are toying with the same strategy. Sahra Wagenknecht was recently a prominent spokesperson for Germany's Left Party. She split last year to found her own project and is now polling at about 7% before May's European elections." They're actually polls showing her much higher than that. "Like Galloway, she espouses an explicitly conservative agenda on culture war issues and opposes environmentalism. She has long called for a rolling back of Germany's acceptance of refugees, once warning that, quote, 'there should be no neighbourhoods where natives are in a minority'. Like Galloway, she was critical of Covid lockdowns, playing to an audience otherwise courted by the far right. And, like Galloway, Wagenknecht has spoken about Putin's right to push back against, quote, 'NATO aggression'."

This is a kind of politics that really evades the attempt to put it into a left-right circles, is opposition to the war in Syria and Libya left or right is opposition to fuelling the war, the NATO war in Ukraine, left or right. For a long time, opposition to open borders was considered to be a left wing cause because it protected the workers from driving down wages, whereas open borders was a Koch brothers plan, or a plan of the Chamber of Commerce, or George Bush and Dick Cheney to flood America with cheap labour so that businesses could make more profit by paying their workers less – is opposition to open borders now a left or right issue?! And so many of these issues are no longer susceptible to that. The far more important metric is whether somebody supports this neoliberal establishment that, in the wake of Brexit and Hillary Clinton's defeat, are trying more than ever to seize control of the methods of communication, of the flow of information, to entrench their own power, to fight wars that is in nobody's interest other than themselves, and to impose economic policies that come at everyone's expense except their own as well. You're either for that establishment or you're against such a thing, a much more relevant metric than these archaic left-right principles that really except in the culture war no longer have real meaning or coherent valence. And I think George Galloway's victory, the reason it causes so much intense and unique and singular hatred among establishment forces is because they like when things are liberal versus conservative, Labour versus Tory, Democrat versus Republican. What they fear the most is anti-establishment politics. And they know George Galloway represents that. And they know that increasingly more and more people are subscribing to that form of ethos as well. And they understand correctly that there's nothing more threatening to them than that.

Right before we get to our very wide ranging and fascinating discussion with George Galloway, I want to tell you about a relatively new sponsor of ours, who we are very excited about. It is, 1775 coffee. And part of their mission is very simple. It is the fact that there's a lot of coffee out there that's just very poorly made, that does not taste very good. Coffee is an important way that people start their day, and their beans are ethically and exclusively sourced from some of the finest coffee farms of Bolivia. They really spend a lot of time and a lot of attention on figuring out how to create a very stimulating and very tasty coffee. More so importantly, I think, is the fact that Rumble, which is a free speech platform that is under a lot of attack because of the fact that they are a free speech platform, they have an attack on corporations that are advertising on Rumble to try and drive them away, they have all kinds of media attacks that are trying as well to subvert and undermine the platform as they do with any platform that allows free speech is also part of this effort to bring you new coffee, and so Rumble benefits as well. And if you go to [1775coffee.com](http://1775coffee.com), you can see the products that they have there. You should go to [1775 coffee.com/glen](http://1775coffee.com/glen) and that way you can use the code *glen* in your checkout and you will get 10% off of your first order. Even though it's a relatively new sponsor we talked about them several times before. We've already had people buying their product. We've gotten very good feedback just how we are going to continue to speak about products. And as we always say, if you believe in free speech, Rumble is really an important cause. And one of the ways to support them is to be at least open minded about trying the companies that are willing to stand with Rumble under all this pressure to sponsor our shows to be our patrons, it's really worth trying out. Go to [1775 coffee.com](http://1775coffee.com) and use the promo code *glen*.

**GG:** The right honourable George Galloway, newly elected Member of Parliament, it is very nice to say that and it's even nicer to speak with you. Thank you so much for taking the time to talk to us tonight.

**GeGA:** This is the Oscars for me, being on with Glenn Greenwald. But unlike some of the Oscar nominees, I will be speaking out.

**GG:** Absolutely. And with no time limits, with no music cutting you off or anything like that. Alright, so I'm excited to talk to you for a lot of different reasons. One of which is that the trajectory of your political career is so interesting. It's so rare. This is the third party that you have represented in Parliament. You are expelled from the Labour Party, famously for criticising Tony Blair and the Iraq war. You represented the Respect Party. You now have a new party and a new constituency that just elected you by a massive mandate. You got more votes than the two major parties combined, Labour and the Conservative Party, as well as everybody else running against you. What do you think really were the main themes that propelled you to, I think, what was a somewhat improbable victory given the massive establishment forces aligned against you?

**GeGA:** Well, Gaza is obviously the elephant in the room. Others don't want to mention it, but, I figure there's an elephant in your room, it's pretty foolish to pretend it isn't there. But it

isn't just that, actually, because one of the main lessons from our by-election that has been missed is that it isn't just me that crushed the big parties of the state, but the guy who came second was a local independent, not mentioned in the betting markets, not mentioned in a single by-election a piece of coverage. He came second and well ahead of the mainstream party. So between me and an unknown independent, we got almost two thirds of the votes in the national by-election in Britain. That was very widely covered, I mean for a by-election, it was very big news indeed when it became clear that I had a shot at winning. The cameras descended on us. We had 30 television crews at the count in Rochdale on election night. So, Gaza was a big issue, but the lack of love for the main parties of the state, responsible for the ground on which this election was fought, nobody loves them. Anyone who moves for them does so out of interest, not out of love. And when there is a chance of voting for someone, that comes along with a chance of winning, well, the British electorate like to give them a good kick up the two cheeks of the same ass that they represent.

**GG:** So essentially, because there is this, you know, factor about your constituency, which is it has a heavier Muslim population than most of the constituencies in the UK. So I think there are a lot of establishment media outlets and pundits who are trying to dismiss this as an aberration, saying that you were able to exploit anger over the UK support for Israel. And yet at the same time, as you just pointed out, obviously it does go beyond that because there was this independent candidate who got more votes than the conservative and the Labour parties, and a big part of your campaign was about things other than Gaza. That wasn't just the only issue on which you ran. You ran on a wide variety of issues. So when you say that there's anger toward the bipartisan establishment, very similar to the United States, where the Republicans, Democrats pretend to be at each other's throats, but in reality have so much in common and people hate them for it, what are the sources of that dissatisfaction with those establishment parties?

**GeGA:** You're right to make that comparison with the United States. As Oscar Wilde said, we are two countries divided by a common language, but we are increasingly, the same kind of polity, with the same lack of care on both sides of the Atlantic for the great majority of the electorate. In fact, disdain for the great majority of the electorate who fall outside The Guardian-reading-liberal-intelligentsia-chatterati, if you like. We've got the same thing as you've got in the United States on that. But the way in which everything has been skewed towards, a view, a post-industrial view of Britain, well, the City of London, is the only thing that really matters. And inside the beltway, chatterati, set the moral parameters, the cultural media parameters, this is very widely, deeply felt, keenly felt in the north of England, where, of course, Britain's wealth initially came from – that provided the power, the powerhouse, of Britain's industrial revolution and its former greatness – no one can quite accept that if you don't pass muster with your pronouns, with the editor of The Guardian, you should be anathematised, you should be blackguarded and shunned. And that's the feeling people in the North have. And the British political parties, I'm the author of the two cheeks of the same ass gag, but it's funny because everyone knows that it's true. And, in the past they counted on the fact that there was nobody else to vote for. Indeed, Peter Mandelson, known to you and I, said we don't care about the left. They've got nowhere else to go. Well, as it happens, people do

have somewhere else to go. And when they see laid out for them a path to victory, they take it.

**GG:** When you first became very well known to Americans, it was 2005 when you had gone to the US Congress voluntarily and I think by all accounts, made a very good accounting for yourself, in fact, humiliated a lot of the people in Congress who had spent two years defaming you, accusing you of opposing the Iraq War because you were taking money from Saddam Hussein, his regime. And at the time, and I remember this very well, 2005 was the year I first started writing about politics, you were universally described, and I think perceived as being a man of the left. Now, if you go and read British media accounts about your victory, all of which or most of which in the establishment sector, the media are spewing all kinds of unbridled contempt at you – and I want to get to the reasons why in just a minute – but they basically call you anything but that. They'll use a whole bunch of adjectives for you. Even some will say that you are now somehow a man of the right, even though, as someone who's followed your career, I don't really think you've changed your core values in any way. And trust me, I empathise very much with this bizarre notion that you suddenly get accused of having turned to a certain direction, even though you haven't changed your views. Do you still identify as a man of the left, or do you think these labels are becoming largely archaic in the wake of our new political debates?

**GeGA:** Well, so much in that question. We could spend the rest of the night talking about it. I still call myself a social-ist, with a hyphen. I'm still a follower of the late and great Mr. Tony Benn, the best prime minister we never had. But I really don't like being called of the left anymore, because for me, the left has become synonymous with liberalism, small l liberalism. And I'm actually not all that liberal. I treat everyone as they would wish to be treated. I was a pioneer, for example, I got a Stonewall Award, for parliamentary heroism in my stance for the rights of gay people, for example. I don't let anyone describe me as any of the -ists and -isms that they throw. I mean, I get called a racist, even though I've got five mixed race children and I've represented more people of colour in the British Parliament than anyone in history. This tendency of liberals who like to think of themselves as the left, to call everyone one step to the right of them a fascist, to blame anyone who gets their syntax or their pronouns wrong as other kinds of -ists and -isms, this is the reason why I actually cringe when I am described as left wing. I stand for the workers. I'm the leader of the Workers Party. I fight for the rights of the workers and their families. And, I'm content with that. But what I am is a visceral opponent of bullying. Whether it is bullying on a domestic scale, a national scale, or an international scale. And if I see someone being bullied, I'll run to the side of the victim and stand with them.

**GG:** So, you know, in 2005 with the Iraq war, I think, there were some exceptions. There were some right wing voices in the UK raising objections to the invasion of Iraq. But by and large, you could, I think, create a left-right distinction that was somewhat reliable as an indicator of who was in favour of the war in Iraq and who was against. Lots of Democrats, though were in favour, lots of Labour rights, including the leader of your party at the time, Tony Blair, was, but you can kind of draw that distinction. Since then you have opposed

things like the US and EU wars in Libya, the regime change, war in Syria, the US-NATO war in Ukraine; I think there it's much more difficult to draw this left right distinction, since a lot of the opposition to those wars, both in Europe and the US, came from both the right and the left. You also are a critic of things like mass and uncontrolled immigration, and yet at the same time you are this like steadfast opponent of support for Israel and its destruction of Gaza and the Israeli abuse of Palestinians in general. To a lot of people, that may seem like a hodgepodge of issues that are really kind of confused and scrambled and that's why people are confused about your label. I'm wondering if you see any through line, any ideological coherence in what brings you to all of these positions that oppose this kind of neoliberal/conservative foreign policy and devotion to controlling the world through military force?

**GeGA:** Actually, I'm as constant as the northern star. I have exactly the same political views I have had in public life for more than half a century. And I believe that my views are consistent with one the other. What's happened is there's been a bizarre outbreak of cross-dressing so that the people on the left support the FBI and the CIA and the surveillance state and banning opponents from standing in elections and so on and yet still think that they are the left and still think they have the right to anathematise others and to ontologically miss call them, misgender them, if you like, misname them. So, you know, I just plough on. All my views are consistent of that. I'm very clear because my views are driven by my conscience, which I consider my daily communion with God. And if my conscience is telling me that this is the right thing to say and do, I do it. And I don't think I've been wrong yet. Glenn, if I wrote a book, it would be called *We Will Write About Everything*. We will write about Ireland. We will write about Iraq. We will write about Libya. We will write about Ukraine and so on. I don't think I've put a foot wrong. It's the others that have done so. It's the others who are now dressed in different garb, but retaining their right of blackballing people, the right to veto people and so on. So I oppose the overthrow of Colonel Gadhafi, not because I loved Colonel Gadhafi. I never met him. I never loved him. But I can never accept an African country having its regime changed by a motley coalition of Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Mr. Sarkozy, and David Cameron. I can't accept that colonial powers should be able to push around colonies or even their former colonies. I am against mass uncontrolled immigration. In fact, only Trotskyists and liberals are in favour of it. Mass immigration beggars the country from whom the immigrants are coming, deprives them of the best and brightest and most hardworking people in their countries and it drives down wages and living standards, conditions in the countries to which they emigrate. That's obvious. I'm the leader of the Workers Party. If I was negotiating with my employer, and my employer could tell me there's 10,000 people standing at the gate ready to take the jobs of your members on less money, so you better climb down; I mean, you don't have to be, you know, Maynard Keynes to understand the simple economics of that. Now, people say, people on the left in quotes say, "Well, that's because we live in a capitalist society, etc.." Well, if my aunt had a beard, she'd be my uncle. We do live in a capitalist society, and I have to defend my members here and now, and I have to defend the poor countries who are having their workforce, skilled workforce – I mean, where I live, for example, almost all of the National Health Service people have come from Africa and Asia. Well, what about the patients in Africa and Asia?

Why am I being able to enjoy the health care of these health care workers? Because there has been this mass uncontrolled immigration. So racism is a different matter. Once somebody is in here, in this country, I will give my life's blood to defend their rights as equals within this society. But that doesn't mean I want to abolish borders. As I say, only ultra left and ultra rich people want to abolish borders.

**GG:** You know that and in fact, you know, it used to be a long time cause of the left to oppose open borders. When I started writing about politics, again, in 2005, the idea of open borders was considered to be a Koch brothers plot or a Chamber of Commerce plot, an attempt to make sure there's this huge surge of labour supply in order to drive down the wages of national workers. This was commonplace left wing doctrine, and then suddenly got put through the culture war grinder and now it's viewed solely as whether you're racist or not. Let me ask you this: a lot of people love the claim that they're anti-establishment, that the establishment fears them. I don't know of many people who are more hated by the establishment in their country than you. And if anybody has any confusion or doubt about that, just go pick up any of the mainstream media articles that talk about George Galloway's victory, and you will see a kind of bile and invective reserved, almost only for people like pedofiles and terrorists, and sometimes not even them. I mean, you really provoke a lot of rage and anger, and one of the things that's amazing to me about that is that pretty much the consensus in the UK now is that the Iraq war, which you opposed and they supported, was a monumental disgrace. Even Tony Blair says it's what gave rise to the emergence of ISIS, that that was the political vacuum that was created that you predicted that they didn't that gave rise to ISIS. When you were elected the Prime minister of the UK, the Tory, who is almost certainly on his way out, Rishi Sunak, convened a press conference, almost like it was a national crisis that you had won and declared your victory, quote, 'beyond alarming'. I'm wondering why it is that you believe that you provoke so much visceral disdain among these guardians of establishment pieties, both in Labour and Conservative, and everything in between. What is the real reason you think you do that?

**GeGA:** Well, partly because I'm good at what I do. I persuade people, I can build things. I build my own audience, for example, as many millions per week, on my show, which is almost as good as yours. And the skills that God gave me, I deploy them and I deploy them fearlessly and consistently. I'm not afraid of anyone. I don't want anything from anyone. And nothing that matters to me can be taken away by anyone. So that makes me, what Baldwin called, the independent man. The man who fears no one and therefore is worth listening to. But mainly it's because of the power of example. Because what if what I did last Thursday is done by scores of people, scores of constituencies rather, up and down the country, maybe hundreds. We've got 300 parliamentary candidates already to pay their own parliamentary election expenses. 300! We didn't have three, five weeks ago. What if this is an idea whose time has come? What if it bursts the toxic bubble in the beltway? In Whitehall and Westminster? What if it puts the skids under the prevailing orthodoxy that we have lived under, for so very long? Doctor Johnson said the grimmest dictatorship of them all is the dictatorship of the prevailing orthodoxy, and that's the dictatorship we've been living under. Sure, there was a bit of lipstick on the pig, and a lot of synthetic sound and fury between the

two front benches, just like as you describe happens in America. But in truth, you could argue about the colour of the walls in the Ministry of Health, or a penny or tuppence on or off the income tax, but that's all you could argue about. The basic givens, that Britain will be a neoliberal capitalist country in thrall to the United States and will follow an imperialist foreign policy abroad, these were beyond questioning. And anyone who even might be having a question of those things, like Mr. Corbyn, my parliamentary colleague for many decades, he had to be destroyed. Not because he would have put the income tax up by a tuppence [inaudible] instead of tuppence. He might not even have done that, actually. But because he could not be depended upon to support the foreign policy of the United States, which is de facto the foreign policy of Britain.

**GG:** One of the criticisms that I have heard being cast about you in your campaign is one I wanted to ask you about, I haven't heard you respond to it, which is they take these different mailings that your campaign sent out so there was a mailing that went to predominantly Muslim precincts within your constituency that emphasised your opposition, very vehement opposition and long standing and principal opposition to Israel's treatment of the Palestinians and its destruction of Gaza, but then in more white working class neighbourhoods, you sent out mailers that emphasise what we just discussed about your views on immigration and the need to control more of the influx of people from other countries in an uncontrolled way. Now, I never knew before that it was some sort of scandal for politicians to speak to different constituencies about their different priorities. I had always thought that that was pretty common for political candidates to do, but apparently in your case they are regarding this as a big scandal. But I think the argument is, that there's almost like a tension between these two populations that you were trying to aggrandise, namely telling Muslims that you were their representative, but then telling the white working class that you were their representative and stopping the flow of immigration, including from Muslim countries. What is your response to that critique?

**GeGA:** Well, The Guardian went further and actually accused me of trying to unite these two disparate constituencies. And they said it as if it was a bad thing to unite alienated white English working class people, with the 20% or so of the constituency – that's all it was. And you're right to say it's heavier than most, but it's not nearly as heavy as many. 20% still left 80%. And I got 40% of the vote. So plainly, I got votes in both constituencies. It's common or garden election practice. It's the ABC of electioneering to send segmented mailings to people with quite clearly different priorities. So what you weren't told by the media was that I sent a segmented letter to women because the maternity hospital has been closed down, taken away. You can't be born in Rochdale except in a taxi on your way to Manchester if you're unlucky. What's wrong with highlighting my campaign to return maternity services to the town of Rochdale and sending that to the people most vitally involved, namely women? Ditto, segmented letters to people in a ward where the local leisure centre is being closed down. What would be disreputable would be if you were able to quote to me something from a piece of mail, which is not my already known frequently adumbrated point of view and clearly my belief, and a belief that is decades in the making. So highlighting your known policies, your declared policies with different emphases to different sets of voters, well, it's simply bad

losership on the part of those who are crushed in the election. I must have done something right, Glenn.

**GG:** Right. I think that's why they're particularly angry, like that Sky news reporter – we circulated that interview –, who seem to be accusing you of being an opponent or an enemy of the people, and he couldn't understand, as you kept pointing out, that you actually won the election because more people voted for you than any other candidate. When I was trying to think about how to kind of explain where you're positioned in British politics for people who aren't that familiar with British politics, I was trying to think of a figure who could most closely be compared to you. And one of the people who came to mind, I don't know how much you know about her, is Sahra Wagenknecht. We interviewed her a few months ago. She has been a long standing leader of a left wing party in Germany, long associated as a leftist like you have and yet, in the last, say, decade or so, she has become kind of a heretic because she opposes things like the German effort to fuel the war in Ukraine on the ground that things don't usually work out when Germans try and pursue war with Russia. She is a strong opponent of this kind of alienating culture war of left wing politics that alienates the working people the left says they're supposed to represent. She has become someone who's concerned as well about the unmitigated flow of immigrants and the effect that that has on the working class. And as a result, she still has a left wing base, but also attracts a lot of people who are on the right and sort of in between. And I'm wondering whether or not you think – and I see her the same way I see you, as more of an anti-establishment figure than anybody. I think there's examples in the US as well. To some extent, you could even put Trump in that category as somebody who, you know, denounced neoconservative foreign policy and tried to run on a more populist economic agenda – whether you see this as a kind of newly forming political identity, both in Europe and in North America, and if so, how would you describe it? What are the forces that it is intending to oppose?

**GeGA:** I do actually believe that it's an idea whose time has come. I think it's a logical development from, the last few decades; the failure of socialism in the East, in the Soviet bloc, the collapse of it, the unipolar moment enjoyed by the neocons around George W Bush and its shortcomings and now its manifest failings and the metamorphosis of traditional socialist labourist political representation into a kind of liberalism that appeals only to, well a very small section of the population. We are more than divided by a common language, of course, in the case of Sahra and the German Left, but from what I know of her, and I know people who know her well, I think she is in much the same place as we in the Workers Party in Britain are. And I think she has a level of support, currently around 15% in the opinion polls for the upcoming European Parliament elections. That would probably be about what we are. If we had proportional representation in Britain, I think we'd have about 15 points on the board, 15% support. And of course, in a proportional system, that could be the balance of power. If we had the balance of power, we'd be seeking to redress the imbalance towards the City of London. We'd be seeking to redraw many of the cultural and educational values, which are self-hating in many regards. I mean, the case that in these liberal educational authorities, I mean, you practically come out of the class wanting to jump over a cliff if you are white British, because you come out believing you're responsible for all the ills of the

world, when in fact, the white British working class gained almost nothing from the British Empire's control over a quarter of the world and a third of the world's population. It's not our fault. It's not my grandfather's fault that Lord Palmerston sailed a gunboat somewhere and subjugated someone. And so there are many things, culturally, socially, politically, economically in particular, that we would change if we had that balance of power. Wages would be higher, the conditions of work would be higher, the safety in employment terms of workers would be higher. But above all, we wouldn't be following the United States into war after war after war. I sat through the budget yesterday, Glenn, where it was made apparent that there's no magic money tree, that there's no means by which our peoples desperately need requirements to make something of their lives. No way it can be afforded. Well, how then can we send billions of pounds to little Zelensky in Ukraine? How can we spend hundreds of millions of pounds acting like pirates in the Red sea, shooting down Yemenis like we did in the Empire days, which ended when the Beatles were still number one in the hit parade, as we used to call it. The way in which Britain wastes money on weapons and war, all for the benefit of the United States ruling class with a little bit of crumbs for the British ruling class, and nothing for the mass of the British working people, all of that would change if we had political power in this country.

**GG:** So I have a lot more questions, but in respect for your time, I know it's late there, I just have two more that I would be very angry with myself if I allowed you to leave without answering. So one of them is actually something that is related to something you just talked about, which was, if you look at discourse in the West before 2016, even President Obama often said that Russia should not be regarded as this grave threat to the West, that it is a country that has an economy smaller than Italy, as its best, it sort of a regional power that is nowhere near a threat to the United States. And after 2016, with the approval by the British people of Brexit and leaving the EU, and then especially the defeat of Hillary Clinton by Donald Trump, suddenly everything got blamed on Russia, including the approval of Brexit and the victory of Donald Trump. And then after that, it led to this notion where Russia was back almost to being at a Cold War status, where we have to do everything possible to weaken the Russian state and even go to war with it. We're now more than two years into this war in Ukraine, where Europe and the United States are sending hundreds of billions of dollars to no effect. Ukraine is losing that war. Everyone can see the same trajectory of that war as we can. What do you think is the real reason that the United States and then their puppy dogs in the British political class that follow along, are so willing to fuel this war and to keep it going, even to the point of having prevented a negotiated settlement early on in the war. What is the motive for why they're so desperate to keep this war going?

**GeGA:** Well, I would have opposed this Russo-mania even if I didn't like Russia. Because it's not in our interests, and it hasn't been in the interests of anyone in Europe to be effectively one step short of war with Russia. But I actually, because a man of my age and class doesn't not only not hate Russia, but actually has a great deal of respect and admiration for it, I find it utterly maddening and maniacal, actually. If it were not for the Russians, we'd be having this conversation in German. And that's just a fact. However, many times the public opinion in your country and mine are told that the Americans won the war, the British won the war, the

Russians won the war at massive cost and sacrifice. So as someone born in the shadow of the Second World War, I have to respect Russia because my parents and my grandparents taught me to. Because they lived through what happened and what might have happened. But for the sacrifice and the victories of the Red Army. And as it happens, I'm a great admirer of the Russian people. Their language, their culture, the natural beauty of their country, the biggest country in the world, Moscow and Saint Petersburg, two of the greatest cities in the world. I just think that when you're not doing so well yourself, as neither Britain nor Germany, nor France, nor Italy, nor the United States are doing, that this is all a kind of transference: Look over there. Look at the big bad Russians. Look at Putin. Actually, if you look at Putin and compare him with the moral and political dwarves that rule our countries, actually many people would wish they had a leader like Putin rather than Joe Biden. Who'd want Joe Biden rather than Putin, who would want Rishi Sunak rather than Putin? So it's not only that it's not in our own interest, it is terrifyingly dangerous. These people, these fools like Biden, have led us right to the door of World War three and the end of all human life, all life on the planet. I'm so old, I layed in my bed scared during the Cuban Missile Crisis, that the world was going to come to an end. I had my parents discussing in hushed terms that the world might be destroyed in a nuclear holocaust. And now we've got it again. And for what? For whether what side of a line Kupiansk might lie on; what it's been on in four different countries in the last 100 years. You've got children. I've got children. We're not prepared to let our children die for Kupiansk. Sorry. We've got other, more important things closer to home to struggle for.

**GG:** Absolutely. One last question, also well connected to what you just said, which is it's not just the war in Ukraine that the United States and Europe is sending billions of dollars to in order to fuel, but also the war in Israel. You just mentioned the fact. You put it kind of harshly, I don't like – I just had my birthday yesterday. I don't like this word old, so I'm going to avoid that. But you have seen a lot in your lifetime of atrocities, of horrors from wars. We are now in our fifth month, going into our six months, of this relentless bombardment and siege and starvation of the 2.2 million people in Gaza by an Israeli military that is backed by one of the richest and most powerful superpowers in history, if not the richest and most powerful, that is the United States. In this scheme, in the kind of hierarchy of the horrors that you've seen in your lifetime as a result of wars, atrocities and immoral acts, where do you rank what the Israelis are currently doing to the people of Gaza? And do you see any signs at all that people in the West are starting to feel some kind of pangs of guilt about it, to the point where they want to actually do something to stop it?

**GeGA:** Well, it's the worst I've seen. Which doesn't mean it's the worst there's been. But I didn't see it, and neither did you or the vast majority of the people of our countries. But this horror they are seeing, and I think that's what changes its character, because you can kill a lot of people. Britain did, the United States did, in many hidden conflicts. Conflicts that took many weeks for dispatches, heavily camouflaged, to arrive back in London or in the capitals, the metropolis. But here, every person and their child can open their telephone all day and every day and see the most obscene crimes against humanity literally happening in front of their eyes; in real time you can see it. And this is something new, and it has changed

everything utterly. It's the reason why the movement against this war in just 150 days or less has become so global, so total, even in Western countries. You know, try organising a demonstration in favour of Mr. Netanyahu and his actions, you know, you will not be able to muster a crowd even if you paid them. But in every town, every city, every village, hamlet, in Western countries, let alone the Global South, where revulsion at what's happening in Gaza is virtually total. I saw your own president, Lula, on the stage with the Palestinian flag just earlier today, his government is quite typical of governments of the Global South, albeit Brazil is a very powerful and important member of the Global South, but even in the poorest countries of the Global South, people's revulsion is virtually total. And that's another reason why the British politicians hate me so because they know that I'm not just speaking for myself. I'm speaking for millions of their constituents, for millions of people in Britain who are locked out of parliament, unheard in Parliament, can't get a word in edgeways in the so-called mainstream media, but have nonetheless been able to find their way to a point of view that says, not in my name. I will not accept as normal the murder and maiming of children and their mothers, their brothers and their sisters. Not for any cause and definitely not for Netanyahu.

**GG:** Well, if a genie came up to me and said, I'm going to grant you a wish, you could drop George Galloway in any place on the earth that you would want, there'd be a lot of people who would answer that very differently in different ways. I would say, please drop him right into the middle of the British Parliament. That's exactly where you now are. I can't wait to see all the things that happen as a result. We're going to continue to follow everything that you do there and continue to report on it. It was fantastic to finally speak to you. I hope we get another chance soon to do so. And, best of luck with your new colleagues.

**GeGA:** Thanks, Glenn.

**GG:** Have a great evening.

**GeGA:** I am very fond of your show. I promote it endlessly. As I say, this is like a night at the Oscars for me. Thanks for having me.

**GG:** Absolutely. Thanks for joining us. Bye bye.

**GG:** So that concludes our show for this evening. As a reminder, System Update is also available in podcast form. You can listen to every program 12 hours after the first broadcast live here on Rumble in podcast version on Spotify, Apple and all the major podcasting platforms. If you rate, review and follow the show, it really helps spread the visibility of the program. As a final reminder, every Tuesday and Thursday night, once we're done with our live show here on Rumble, we move to Locals, which is part of the Rumble platform where we have our live interactive aftershow designed to take your questions, respond to your feedback and critiques, hear your suggestions for future show and guests. That aftershow is available solely for members of our Locals community. If you want to become a member, which gives you access not only to those twice a week aftershows, but also to the interactive

features we have where we can take your questions and I can respond to as many comments as I can. It's the place we publish our transcripts of every program that we broadcast here on Rumble, we publish professionalised transcripts on the Locals platform. It's the place we publish our original journalism. And most of all, it's the community on which we most rely to support the independent journalism that we do here. Simply click the join button right below the video player on the Rumble page, and it will take you directly to that community. Although tonight is Thursday, we won't be having our aftershow on Locals tonight, in part because we had this interview that we showed you, with George Galloway, that we taped earlier today, but also because the State of the Union Address is live at 9:00. We know that many of you will be watching that instead, but we will be back next Tuesday and Thursday night after our Rumble show. And we will have those aftershows as regularly scheduled. For those who've been watching, we are, of course, always appreciative. We hope to see you back tomorrow night and every night at 7 p.m. eastern live exclusively here on Rumble. Have a great evening, everybody.

**END**

---

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

<b>BANKKONTO:</b>	<b>PAYPAL:</b>	<b>PATREON:</b>	<b>BETTERPLACE:</b>
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.	E-Mail: <a href="mailto:PayPal@acTVism.org">PayPal@acTVism.org</a>	<a href="https://www.patreon.com/acTVism">https://www.patreon.com/acTVism</a>	Link: <a href="#">Click here</a>
Bank: GLS Bank			
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600			
BIC: GENODEM1GLS			

The acTVism Munich 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](mailto:info@acTVism.org)