



Ukraine, Israel & Taiwan: What the Media Won't Tell You | Prof. Peter Kuznick

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

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source. I'm your host Zain Raza. Before we begin this interview, I would like to remind you to join our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram. YouTube, owned by Google, can shadow-ban and censor us at any time, especially given the fact that we provide another perspective to the corporate media. If that day ever comes, we won't be able to reach you even with an announcement. Hence, we are asking all of our viewers to join these channels as a precautionary measure. Furthermore, if you are watching our videos regularly, make sure to support our channel with a donation. Even though our subscriptions of viewers are growing during the summer, our donations have dropped considerably. And as we don't take any money from corporations, governments, all with the goal of providing you with information that is free from external influence, we depend only on you. You will find out how to donate as well as links to our other social media channels in the description of this video below. Today I'll be talking to Professor of History and the Director of the Nuclear Studies Institute at American University, Professor Peter Kuznick. Peter Kuznick is also the author of the book *The Untold History of the United States*. Peter, welcome back to the show.

Peter Kuznick (PK): Thank you Zain, glad to be with you.

ZR: I'd like to begin this interview with developments in the South China Sea that we believe are not receiving the attention they deserve. On July 9th, Taiwan launched its largest-ever military exercise, a ten-day operation involving 22,000 reservists. The drills include US-supplied Abrams battle tanks – heavy armored vehicles – F-16V fighter jets, HIMARS capable of long-range precision strikes, as well as National Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile Systems designed to intercept drones and cruise missiles as well as aircrafts. The US claims that these weapons are aimed to boost Taiwan's defense and strengthen its deterrence against a potential Chinese invasion. In addition, US-built Arleigh Burke-class guided-missile destroyers have conducted several Freedom of Navigation patrols through the Taiwan Strait this year. While no US aircraft are directly stationed in the Strait, carrier strike groups remain

active in the wider Indo-Pacific and Washington has also deepened its intelligence-sharing and joint military exercises with Taipei.

China, on the other hand, has responded with growing military pressure. On July 6th, it extended its patrols into the M503 civilian aviation corridor, prompting formal protests from Taiwan. Chinese military aircrafts are regularly crossing the Taiwan Strait median line, once considered an unofficial boundary. Earlier this year, the China's People's Liberation Army (PLA) held large-scale drills called "Channel Thunder" and "Joint Sword" – simulating blockades and amphibious assaults, showing Beijing's willingness to escalate. How do you assess the actions of the United States and China in the Taiwan Strait? Do you believe the U.S. Military and political support is genuinely aimed at protecting Taiwan's independence and sovereignty? Or are there deeper strategic and geopolitical motivations driving Washington's policy in the region?

PK: Well, the United States has been preparing for war with China going back decades. The key original planner, from what I've been studying, is Andrew Marshall. Andrew Marshall mentored a lot of people, including Donald Rumsfeld, including so many of the hawks that we've seen over the years, the Richard Pearl's and the Paul Wolfowitz's have been mentored by Andrew Marshall. Then there's this recent generation of China hawks – Krepinevich. You look at these people and what their progeny is really, what their origins are, and many of them studied both with Marshall and then some also with Zbigniew Brzezinski. So you put people like Michael Pillsbury into that category, and you see the influence they've had over US policy going back decades. Now, Krepinevich, or Marshall actually, was an advisor on hand, and Krepinevich also – I think Krepinevich has been involved in 12 administrations. So Marshall is older, but Krepinevich dates back, he was first in the Nixon administration in 1973. Then he's been an advisor to every administration since. And these are the China hawks. So around 2009, Krepinevich really was the one who developed the Air-Sea battle plan which was based on the Air-Land battle plan which came out of the Yom Kippur war. He has been employed by the United States in all of its wars since then. Now, the Air-Sea battle plan is specifically designed against China. After the Soviet Union collapsed, these people turned their attention from the Soviet Union to China, and they began developing war plans since then. So they start the Air-Sea Battle Plan really in 2009, Krepinevich starts working on it. By 2011 when Hillary Clinton announced the Asia pivot and Obama backs her on that, then it's been focused now much more on China and the Indo-Pacific.

So in recent years, they have hyped that further. It certainly occurred under Trump during his first administration. And then many of us hoped that Biden was going to break with Trump's hawkishness toward China, but Biden doubled down on it. Biden came into office with 18 top advisers from the Center for a New American Security. These are the China hawks. And you look at Blinken and you look at Sullivan and the top advisors around Biden. These are all the real China hawks. Then Trump comes back with Ely Ratners and Hegseth. Hegseth said, we have to end the war in Ukraine so we can focus on the real enemy: China. And that's really the source of America's intensified hostility toward China, which, as you mentioned, has really been lost sight of because there is so much else going on in the Middle East and in

Ukraine. So there has not been enough focus on China. These latest rounds of war games are quite ominous, but quite revealing also. China has received 38 of the Abrams tanks, but there are 108 in total in the pipeline that will be coming in this year and next year.

ZR: You mean Taiwan received them.

PK: I'm sorry, yes, Taiwan received 38 out of 108 that they've purchased. Now, Rand issued a report a couple of years ago saying that we've got to end the war in Ukraine as quickly as possible because the United States is four years behind on the weapons that it has promised to Taiwan. Especially under Trump. What we've seen, though, is an escalation, both in diplomatic relations and in military weaponry that the US has been providing to Taiwan. Part of the strategy is the porcupine strategy to make it so difficult for China to actually absorb Taiwan militarily. So they're loading it with weapons. The Chinese accused them of turning Taiwan into a weapons depot. But the Chinese have also been increasingly hostile to the United States. They were the one country that hit back against Trump's tariff wars, his trade war. So, China has stood up on that. And while we just had the NATO summit going on, there was also the BRICS summit taking place at the same time. Now, the BRICS, as you know, represent 54% of the world economy and a much bigger swath of the world's population at this point. So the world is not stagnant. NATO cannot call the shots the way it once did. When it comes to Europe, though, you'll see a lot of people talking about the need to develop an Asian NATO. And it's appalling to me that among the countries that have fallen for that is Japan. Ishiba, before he became Prime Minister of Japan, called not only for developing an Asian NATO, but for Japan having access to its own nuclear weapons, which is anathema to the Japanese people historically. But Japan is doubling its military spending. And as now, the US strategy for dealing with Taiwan – and since the United States is at a greater distance and would not, if China moved militarily against Taiwan, the United States would not be able to intervene in time – the United States has actually depending on Japan and South Korea to get there first. So, that just makes the irony involved in US trade war with Japan and the US demanding, Trump demanding, that South Korea pay for American troops. The US has 28,500 troops in South Korea and more troops than that in Japan.

So, I was recently in Okinawa. I was invited there by the governor of Okinawa to support the anti-base movement in Okinawa, because the people in Okinawa know that they're in the front line of this. It's the first island chain where the US has the bases and the troops and the aircraft carriers located. But you know, there's all this debate about the relocation of the base from Futenma to Henoko and they're going to supposedly put all the US troops there and the landing strips. Well, if you actually study the plans, they can't do it because the Aura Bay surface is like mayonnaise – that's the word that's often used for it – and so they can't put the long landing strips that they need for the Ospreys and the other US planes. But they're jamming this, they're forcing this down the throats of the people in Okinawa. In fact, I published a book with Oliver Stone recently about the untold post-war history of the US and Japan and our other co-author was former Japanese Prime Minister Hatoyama. Hatoyama was the first non-LDP, real progressive reform prime minister of Japan [Okinawa] who was opposing the base relocation there. And you know who destroyed him? Obama. Obama

crushed him and forced him out of office because he was opposed to the base relocation. So this stuff goes back to Clinton and Obama and was traced through Trump and Biden and now Trump again. There's this whole lie that China is engaged in the biggest, fastest military buildup in history. Do you know what percent China spends, percent of its GDP goes toward the military? I think it's 1.3 or 1.4 %, which means they wouldn't even come close to the NATO minimum guideline of 2 % before Trump raises it to 3.5 % and now 5 %. You know, they're trying to get the Asians also to go to 5 % of GDP-spending on their military. This is absurd. This is insanity. So the situation in the Pacific is increasingly dangerous, increasingly ominous. And Lai Ching-te, the president of Taiwan, is considered by China to be a separatist. If Taiwan officially announces separating from China, then I think that's the trigger for China to move in militarily. And all bets are off then, because the United States probably can't defend Taiwan without using nuclear weapons. And so there's a lot of the planning going on, which we can get into when we talk about some other topics.

ZR: Let us now turn our attention to Ukraine, where the war continues to rage on. In June 2025 alone, Russia launched more than 1,600 drones and missiles into Ukraine, marking one of the largest and most sustained air campaigns since the war began. In recent days, the escalation has continued with over 700 additional strikes, hitting both military and civilian infrastructures in cities such as Kyiv, Kharkiv, Zaporizhzhia and Odessa. On July 6th, Russian forces also captured several villages in the Donetsk and Kharkiv regions. In response, Ukraine drones have targeted military and industrial sites inside Russia, including ammunition depots and border towns. Ukraine is now urgently working to restore and expand its air defense systems, while Washington has resumed military aid, delivering defensive missile systems, air defense platforms and other advanced weapons. Diplomatically, peace talks remain frozen. Moscow insists that Ukraine must withdraw from occupied territories and abandon its NATO ambitions before any negotiations can resume. While Pope Leo XIV has offered the Vatican as a neutral site for talks, Russia rejected its siding, its location in Italy, which is a NATO member and a staunch supporter of Ukraine. Meanwhile, US President Donald Trump, who had promised to end the Ukraine war within 24 hours of taking office, has so far increased pressure on Russia publicly criticizing Russian President Vladimir Putin and backing new secondary sanctions in addition to the continued arms shipments that I just talked about right now. How do you evaluate the Trump administration's approach to Ukraine so far? Given the stalled diplomacy and ongoing military escalation, do you still believe peace is realistically possible even?

PK: This is necessary. It's going to come at some point. The question is, when is it going to come and what is it going to look like? We know the basic outlines of it. It's not that difficult. And it's along the lines that you're laying out there. Russia has, I guess now, 100% of Luhansk and more than 70% of Donetsk and Zaporizhzhia and Kherson. But Putin's claiming 100% of all four regions, which I think is where they can negotiate and say that Russia is compromising by agreeing to cut it off at the line that they now hold. But Putin is not in any hurry to negotiate because Russia is advancing on the battlefield. And it's not rocket science. Ukraine does not have the economy. Ukraine does not have manpower. Ukraine doesn't have the weaponry. So it's outmanned, outgunned, outflanked strategically at this point. And

Russia is advancing. We've been waiting for them to take Pokrovsk for months now. They're advancing slowly, but they're advancing steadily. And Ukraine's air defense is compromised. You mentioned how many drones and missiles and rockets the Russians launched in June, but that number lately has gone through the ceiling. Two days ago, the biggest attack ever in terms of the number of missiles and drones. And then last night, more than 400 drones and a couple dozen missiles at Kyiv now. So they're expanding. They've got more ground in Sumy. They're taking other areas as well, or at least making advances in other areas. So for me, the whole thing is tragic. And I talk to Russians and I talk to Ukrainians and they used to feel like they were one kind, you know, brothers and sisters. And their families are divided. And the situation is tragic, but it's only going to be more tragic for Ukraine the longer this goes on. They're going to be losing more people. So if this ends in six months or a year, there'll be tens of thousands more Ukrainians and Russians dead and injured, and more of the economy destroyed. I just read a report from a British analyst this morning, from RUSI [Royal United Services Institute] – the Royal, whatever it's called in London – saying that we have to hold out, we have to keep fighting, and eventually we can defeat the Russians in Ukraine. You know, that's been the West's wet dream for years now that they can defeat Russia militarily. It's absurd. Russia is not going to be defeated in Ukraine militarily, no matter how much support the Europeans and the United States give to them. So, you know, we're in a tragic situation. As we are in other parts of the world. All these wars are tragic. You see all the people without arms and legs and eyes and genitals, it's horrific.

What is the US role? Trump promised he was going to end the war within the first 24 hours of taking office. Nobody should ever listen and believe anything that Donald Trump says. It didn't end. And Ukraine accepted Trump's terms for a ceasefire, Putin isn't accepting them, Putin is pushing for a capitulation of Ukraine or a military victory, a collapse of Ukraine, and Zelensky is not going to do that so long as he has other alternatives. They just had a meeting in Rome yesterday about funding Ukraine and rebuilding Ukraine and more 10 billion euros was pledged, according to some estimates. But Trump has flipped. I did an interview a few days ago with a Russian TV station, and they cited a Guardian article which said that Trump has now put the future of Ukraine in Europe's lap, and the Russians wanted to know, is that true, that Trump is washing his hands of Ukraine? And I said don't believe anything that Trump says or does. He flip-flops over and over and over again. Today, he says it's in the hands of Europe, but tomorrow he's going to be back there supporting Ukraine militarily. And what happens? Exactly what I predicted. And, you know, people I know who know him tell me that he agrees with the last person in the room, the last person he speaks with. And Putin is not giving him what he wants and he had a big beautiful phone call with Zelensky and then he announces that we're going to renew the weapons shipment. And this absurd show is going on there, where Trump says he didn't authorize stalling the weapons to Ukraine. He says he doesn't know who did. Well, Hegseth was sitting next to him while they were saying that. Hegseth doesn't say a word. Trump is saying that the Pentagon never consulted him. And the person in the Pentagon who is responsible for this is Ratner, from what I can see. But clearly, Trump knew that they had suspended this. The suspension had gone on for a couple of weeks already. If he wanted to reverse it, he could have reversed it, but he didn't want to. However, what also has come out is that during the campaign, he says in some of his speeches that he

told Putin – this is back during his first presidency – that he told Putin that if he invades Ukraine, that the US is going to bomb Moscow. And he tells Xi Jinping that if he invades Taiwan, the US is going to bomb Beijing. Of course, you know, it's bullshit, like everything comes out of Trump's mouth. But he says that he accused Putin of bullshitting the United States. And he says Putin talks nicely, but we can't believe what he says anymore. So he's been upping his attack on Putin lately.

The situation is very, very dangerous. Ukraine is in a very weakened position, and Russia is on the offensive. Clearly, Ukraine is not going to be allowed into NATO for the foreseeable future. We should end this as quickly as possible. Russia is going to hold on to what it controls. It's going to incorporate – it says it's already incorporated those areas into Russia. It's going to hold on to Crimea. Ukraine is not going to join NATO. The people in the regions that Russia controls are going to get back the language rights and other cultural rights that they need. I don't know what's going to be resolved in terms of the Church there, but this is almost at the point where, de facto, Russia's gotten what it said it wanted and Ukraine is not going to recognize it, but it is time for this to end. The danger that we feared before Biden left office, when Biden gave Ukraine authorization to US ATACMS to strike deep inside of Russia – we know that the CIA at one point estimated that because of the US delivery of weapons, there was a 50-50 chance that Russia was going to use nuclear weapons in Ukraine. I think that danger, that risk has subsided at this point. But the longer this goes on, the more we can be in a position where that happens all over again.

We see the super hawks: Merz in Germany, Starmer in Britain, Macron in France. You know, I don't know how you're living with this Merz – he is really a piece of work. You know he is such a super hawk. I thought things were bad before, but he is very, very frightening in terms of wanting France and Britain to extend the nuclear umbrella to Germany, wanting Germany to have its own nuclear weapons, wanting Germany to become a major military power again, wanting Germany to supply all the advanced weaponry that Germany has to Ukraine. I know there's a lot of opposition. I thought when we got rid of Baerbock we would have less hawkish leaders in Germany, but that hasn't been the case, sadly. So I think it's a very, very dangerous situation where the Europeans are willing to fight to the last Ukrainian, based on two lies. One lie that Ukraine can eventually turn the tide and push Russia out of all of Ukraine and defeat Russia militarily – nonsense. The second lie: that if Putin succeeds in Ukraine, he's going to end up taking one piece of Europe after another. He's going to go after NATO next. What kind of idiocy that is. That any intelligent person can say that or believe that is madness to me. Putin can't even take – he's been fighting for more than three years and he's still stuck at the same 20 % of Ukraine that he's held for a long time. You know, I disagree with a lot about what Putin says and does, but he is not suicidal. He is not a madman. He's not a lunatic. He's quite rational in his own ways. I don't agree with the starting premise as always. I didn't endorse or support this invasion. I think it's terrible. It's hurt Russia much more than it's helped Russia. But Putin is not going to go after Europe after this, no matter what happens in Ukraine.

The other thing I should say is that I'm so disappointed to see the Europeans being willing to massively increase military spending. And how do you do that? By cutting the social programs that people need: the food programs, the education, the housing, the jobs. I mean, this is so stupid on the part of Europe at this point, based on a false threat. To hear Rutte talk about, you know, how much he loves Trump and how much Europe is beholden to Trump, and he calls him "daddy", and he performs fellatio on him in public – it's really an obscene spectacle. And Merz is doing the same thing. They know how to play Trump. Trump is so easy to read. You flatter him, you work down his defenses, and you massage his ego, and say he's the greatest president the United States has ever had, and the greatest friend that Europe has ever had, and Trump caves in. You know, Trump's nickname in the United States is TACO. It stands for Trump Always Chickens Out, which he does on his tariffs and he does the military reversals. But his base is revolting against him. It's rebelling. The MAGA base is not happy with the fact that they're not going to release the files on Epstein probably because Trump is in them, as Musk said, that they've reversed themselves on Ukraine and that they're giving pardon's effectively to certain categories of immigrants who the businessmen need to do their farms and to do work in their factories. So the MAGA base feels like they're being betrayed by Trump and even his big beautiful tax bill that cuts social programs for the poor in order to afford a huge increase in military spending and tax cuts for the billionaires, that is going to hurt Trump's own supporters, the idiots who voted for him in the first place. So, you know, it's a sad situation.

ZR: I would like to switch our focus to the Iran-Israel war. Over the 12-day period starting June 13th, Israel launched Operation Rising Lion, striking over 100 targets across Iran, including nuclear enrichment plants, missile sites and military and scientific infrastructure. Iranian sources report around 1,000 civilian casualties, among them hundreds of women and children. Israel reported, on the other hand, 28 civilian deaths, more than 3,200 injured. And a destruction of 240 buildings. Israel also claims to have destroyed 120 surface-to-surface missile launchers, nearly one-third of Iran's long-range arsenal. On June 22nd, the United States also joined in with Operation Midnight Hammer, using B-2 bombers and submarine-launched Tomahawk missiles to strike Iran's underground nuclear sites, reportedly delaying Iran's program by 12 to 24 months.

In retaliation, Iran launched about 150 ballistic missiles and 100 drones towards Israeli bases and US forces in Iraq, Qatar and Syria, causing infrastructure damage and regional evacuations, but no US casualties. A ceasefire was however broken on June 24th through Qatari mediation. Diplomatically, Iran has suspended IAEA cooperation, however, in an interview with US journalist Tucker Carlson recently Iranian President Masoud Pezeshkian has said that he believes Iran can resolve its differences with the United States through dialog. Meanwhile, Russia has pledged to help Iran replenish its uranium reserves, while the G7 nations continue urging renewed negotiations. Could you briefly outline the long-standing strategy that the US has towards Iran when it comes to regime change or military confrontation, and then provide your assessment about this recent war? Unfortunately, we only have five minutes left, so I know it will be hard to compress that, but we will be thankful for your answer.

PK: OK, let me go fast then. You have to trace it back to 1953, when the CIA overthrew Mosaddegh, the enormously popular leader in Iran, who was Time Magazine's Man of the Year in 1951. The US ambassador reported back to Washington that Mosaddegh had the support of between 96% and 98% of the Iranian people. But we didn't care because he had nationalized British oil interests. So the CIA overthrew him in '53 and replaced him with the Shah. The Shah ruled through terror, through SAVAK, through the military for 26 years before he was finally overthrown by the Islamic Republic in 1979. The United States supported Iraq against Iran during that eight-year, nine-year war between Iraq and Iran, in which a million people were killed. It's covered up for Iraq's use of chemical weapons – everything. The US position has been totally immoral vis-a-vis Iran. I don't like the government in Iran. I hate theocracies. It's very repressive. It is totally misogynistic. It is reactionary. But the US cannot overthrow that government from the outside. The United States should not be responsible for regime change there. But against this latest fighting, Israel was strongly opposed to Obama's JCPOA. Netanyahu tried to kill it before it got off the ground, the Iran nuclear deal that Obama concluded in 2015, under which Iran shipped out 97 % of its enriched uranium. It mothballed almost all of its centrifuges. It was more than a year away from a nuclear weapon. Trump blew that up in 2018. And then now he comes to office again and says he's going to negotiate a better deal than Obama's deal. What's better about it? The terms the US was demanding is that Iran give up all of its right to enrichment of uranium. Iran is a signatory to the NPT, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Israel isn't. Iran is being investigated over and over again by the IAEA, Israel zero. And so when Trump demanded that Iran give up 100 % of its enrichment capability, of course the Iranians said no. They have the right to enrich under the NPT. So they're never going to give into that. So Israel starts the war, claiming they're facing an existential threat from Iran, which is racing toward a bomb. That was a bullshit lie. There was no truth to that at all. Even the IAEA, despite issuing that ridiculous report, giving some justification based on findings from 2002 and 2003, they said that there was no evidence that Iran has decided to push for a bomb. So Israel started bombing them. Israel does not have the B-2 bombers and the bunker busters that can destroy the Fordow facility since it's a hardened underground facility. So even though Trump kept saying the US was not going to get involved, which his base certainly didn't want to see the US get involved in another war, the United States decided to bomb Iran using Bunker Buster bombs at Fordow.

But we now know that despite Trump saying that we completely destroyed the Fordow facility and ended Iran's nuclear program, we know that the US did not destroy the Fordow facility, that Iran had a very large amount of enriched uranium, enriched up to 60 %. To make a bomb you need 90 % enrichment. Under the old JCPOA, Iran was enriching to 3.67 %. Then after the US blew it up, Iran started enriching up to 60 %. That's the highly enriched uranium that the US was trying to destroy along with the centrifuges. But Iran had other secret sites. We have evidence that Iran moved the highly rich uranium before the Israeli and US bombing and has a lot more centrifuges. Iran can reconstitute that. If they decide that they want to build a bomb, they can do it now. But they've stopped allowing the IAEA inspectors in there. So now we're blind. We don't know what's going on there. We don't know what the

underground sites are. We don't know where the enriched uranium is. And we don't know if Iran has decided to reconstitute its bomb program, which it gave up, according to the CIA, back in 2003. So we're actually in a worse position in terms of Iran developing a bomb, which should not happen. We don't want to see Iran get a nuclear bomb. That's all that crazy region needs. If Iran gets a bomb then Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Turkey, will all rush to develop a bomb. We're on the verge of nuclear anarchy worldwide as it is right now. 73% of the South Koreans have said in a poll that they want South Korea to have its own nuclear weapons. Israel is talking about it again and could do it very, very quickly. I mean, Israel has them, I'm sorry. Japan is talking about it. Israel, has somewhere between 90 and 400 nuclear weapons, which doesn't get brought up enough in these discussions. But a lot of countries are thinking about it. Because as North Korea said, when the US invaded Iraq in 2003, Saddam Hussein made one big mistake: if he had nuclear weapons, the United States would not have invaded, which is why North Korea will never give up its nuclear weapons because it could be a sitting duck. Gaddafi gave up his weapons of mass destruction, and then NATO invaded, and he got sodomized by bayonets and killed. This is the crazy, dangerous world we're living in now, more dangerous than ever.

Three days before Israel started bombing Iran, Tulsi Gabbard issued a warning. She released a three and a half minute video, starting with her in Hiroshima, in which she said the world is closer to nuclear annihilation than ever. She said, we've got bigger and more dangerous weapons. That what happened in Hiroshima was peanuts compared to what we're going to do now. And she says that there are evil warmongers at work and pushing the world toward World War III at this point. And they've got to be stopped. She's been cut out of all the deliberations. Sadly, she's groveled in front of Trump to try to keep her position there. But Tulsi's warning was very, very timely and very appropriate because the world is sitting on a powder keg that's ready to blow up at any moment. And when you have leaders like Trump and like Merz and, you know, even Putin – we have nobody who speaks for the planet now. Pope Leo, as you said, offered his auspices to negotiate a settlement in Ukraine. We should take them up on it. Pope Francis spoke for the planet. Guterres speaks for the planet. Sometimes Lula speaks for the planet. But we have too many leaders who just want to make their own country great again, more powerful, arm them to the teeth, and just don't speak for the planet at this point. So we've got to get the message out. Because as long as we haven't blown up the planet, we still have the opportunity. We're frying the planet. You know, as Guterres said, the planet is burning, but we haven't blown it up with nuclear weapons yet. And so we have the chance to reverse these policies. As Kennedy said, we created these problems. We can uncreate them. We have that capability.

ZR: And the message out we will get. Professor of history and director of the Nuclear Studies Institute, Peter Kuznick, thank you so much for your time today.

PK: Thank you, Zain. It's good to see you. Let's talk again soon.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. If you watched this video until the very end, please take a few more moments and find out through the description of this video, how you can

donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism. We are an independent and nonprofit media organization that does not take any money from corporations or governments, all with the goal of providing you with the information that you just won't hear in the corporate media. I thank you for your support and for tuning in today. I'm your host, Zain Raza. See you next time.

END

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](#)