



Charlie Kirk, Ukraine & Israel: Exposing the Media Narrative | Dimitri Lascaris

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. Even though our YouTube channel has grown to 160,000 subscribers, only a few thousands have joined Rumble and Telegram! We are not asking you to leave and switch to these platforms. All we are asking you is to subscribe to these channels as an alternative. Because Google owns YouTube and YouTube can shadowban and censor us at any time and if that day ever comes we won't be able to reach you even with an announcement. And if you're watching our videos regularly, make sure to donate to our journalism. We don't take any money from corporations or governments, all with the goal of providing you with information that is free from any external influence. We only depend on you to continue with our work. How you can join our alternative channels or donate to your journalism, you can find out in the description of this video. Today I'll be talking to independent journalist and lawyer for international law and human rights, Dimitri Lascaris. Dimitri Lascaris also has a YouTube channel called Reason2Resist. Dimitri, welcome back to the show.

Dimitri Lascaris (DL): Always a pleasure to be on AcTVism Munich, brother, thank you.

ZR: Let's begin with the case of conservative activist and Turning Point USA founder Charlie Kirk who was fatally shot on September 10th at Utah Valley University. His case made headlines worldwide including here in Germany. The suspect, 22-year-old Tyler James Robinson, is accused of firing from a rooftop, allegedly leaving a note expressing intent, confessing via text messages and being tied to the weapon by DNA. He is currently being held without bail and prosecutors have announced that they will seek the death penalty. You recently released a video on your YouTube channel Reason2Resist, asserting that the official narrative is full of holes. Given the grave geopolitical crisis worldwide, especially the dire humanitarian situation in Gaza, I don't want to spend too much time on this topic. Could you

therefore briefly explain why you believe the official narrative about Kirk's assassination is highly questionable?

DL: Well, without getting too much into the weeds, there are conflicting reports about the clothing that he was wearing. There's video of him allegedly descending a rooftop without the rifle and then the rather large instrument with which he's alleged to have killed Charlie Kirk magically appeared in the woods, fully assembled, and in a box with I think a blanket wrapped around it. He doesn't come from a background that one would expect the killer of Charlie Kirk to come from. He comes from an affluent family. His two parents are registered Republicans from Utah. They have close connections to the Mormon Church. One wouldn't think this doesn't rule out the possibility that he's the perpetrator, but that is a bit surprising that somebody of this background would want to kill Charlie Kirk, who was very much aligned, I would imagine, with the values of his parents' household.

And then there was this strange incident where a gentleman by the name of George Zinn, and I use the word gentleman loosely, claimed at the very moment when the police were searching for the killer, he was there on site very close to the rooftop where the shot is supposed to have come from, he claimed he was the killer and actually called for the police to shoot him. And all of this had the entirely predictable effect of distracting the police at a moment when they wanted to be focusing on the actual alleged perpetrator. And he, obviously, Mr. Zinn was not that person. And there are reports that Mr. Zinn is himself a Zionist and he has a history of rather bizarre behavior. So that and other factors raise questions about the police narrative, but really at the same time, and this is something that I focused on in my report, it's very clear now based upon statements that Charlie Kirk himself made publicly in the weeks leading up to his death, and people who knew him well, were friends of his, including Candace Owens and Tucker Carlson, that he had begun to raise very serious questions about US support for Israel. He was under intense pressure to change his commentary publicly and the people who have funded him from the very beginning, were people who are known to be very supportive of the state of Israel, very affluent people, and the Grayzone in a very detailed report, relying in part, but not entirely upon an anonymous source, said that Charlie Kirk felt threatened by these people and even to the point of fearing for his life.

So my view, Zain, is that I don't know. I'm reserving judgment. You know, as a lawyer with over 30 years experience, I've learned to be cautious about these things. I don't have a lot of confidence in the US justice system, especially when the stakes are so high. And I think we should all reserve judgment, wait until more evidence comes out. I understand that he has pled not guilty, despite the claims that he confessed to the killing, which in and of itself is curious. So before we all rush to any conclusions, and I'm certainly not willing to do that at this stage, we should continue to examine critically what the authorities are saying and at least entertain the possibility that Israel and or the United States government had something to do with this.

ZR: Let us switch to the Middle East, where Israel has sharply escalated its military actions across the region, bombing a number of countries ranging from Lebanon, Yemen, Iran over

the summer, and now we see Qatar. In recent weeks, Israel carried out multiple strikes in Yemen, one in Sanaa and al-Jawf killing dozens, and another aerial that killed the Houthi-run government's prime minister and several ministers. In an unprecedented strike more than a week ago in Doha, Qatar, Israel targeted a Hamas meeting killing five Hamas figures, including the son of Syrian negotiator Khalil al-Hayya, along with a Qatari security officer while they were evaluating the hostage deal that reportedly came from the US. Before we get into the broader details and reactions, do you believe the United States had prior knowledge of Israel's strike in Doha, especially given the fact that the US Al Udeid Air Base, CENTCOM's forward hub, is stationed nearby?

DL: Actually, Zain, I was in Qatar in the spring of last year, and I drove out to that military base from Doha. It's just a few dozen kilometers. It is absolutely massive. It is reputed to be the largest US air base in West Asia, the largest military base. And given the extent and sophistication of US weapon systems, radars, and also their military satellite technology, which are constantly hovering over the region, given the trajectory that the Israeli aircraft would have had to take in order to reach Qatar, it's simply inconceivable that the US government did not know of this in advance. And quite apart from the technical aspects of this, this is a very important ally to the United States and the region, Qatar. Israel is existentially dependent upon the United States for its support. It's simply strange credulity that the Israeli regime would launch an attack of this nature, which had the potential to cause huge problems between Qatar and the United States, the main backer of Israel, without at least seeking a green light from the administration. And it's not just me who's saying this. Military experts, including Daniel Davis, retired lieutenant colonel from the US army, Douglas McGregor, retired colonel, Scott Ritter, US weapons inspector, and on and on, Larry Johnson, Ray McGovern, many US military experts find it completely unbelievable that the US didn't know. And they believe, as do I, that in fact, the US likely facilitated this attack.

ZR: Let us now look at the reactions from the Arab and Gulf states. In the wake of Israel's strike in Doha, Qatar convened an emergency joint Arab Islamic Summit that brought together representatives from nearly 60 countries, including members of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Notable leaders in attendance included, for example, Turkey's President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Iran's President Masoud Pezeshkian, Egypt's President Fattah el-Sisi, Jordan's King Abdullah, and Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman. The final communique condemned the attack on Qatari soil in the strongest terms, expressed full solidarity with Doha and its mediation role, and urged states to consider legal and diplomatic measures, including sanctions and restrictions on arms transfer. In addition, the Gulf state pledged to activate a joint defense mechanism and to convene their unified military command in Doha. How do you assess these reactions? In your view, did the Arab and Gulf states go far enough in ensuring that Israel is held accountable?

DL: Well, I spent a lot of time poring through the 2,700-word final communique of the two-day summit, and I saw absolutely nothing in there that amounted to an announcement of a new economic sanction on Israel, not one. I saw nothing in their relating to diplomatic

sanctions, no announcement that the Israeli ambassadors were going to be expelled, for example, from any of the countries that currently host Israeli diplomats and are part of the Arab League or the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. There was absolutely no announcement in there, nothing, no indication that there was going to be a military retaliation. There was nothing but a series of 22 so-called decisions, which really amounted to condemnations. And most of the condemnations were simply a rehash of condemnations that have previously been expressed by various of these governments. This is a complete sellout. There is no reason to believe, based on the final communique, that any of these states, or at least the collectivity of them, are going to take meaningful action against Israel. And just in conclusion on this point, I want to go back to something that was said this week in an interview, again, retired US army Colonel Douglas McGregor was on the Daniel Davis show and he said that he spoke to the people from Raytheon and Lockheed Martin, military contractors that have provided weapon systems to Qatar. And they said it was simply impossible, this is what Douglas McGregor reported, simply impossible that the Qatari regime, not just the US, but that the Qatar regime did not know in advance of the attack. And of course, why didn't the Qatari air defenses engage when these Israeli aircraft approached? There's no real explanation that has been proffered in that regard. So not only does this communique amount really to a betrayal of the Palestinian people and the peoples of these Gulf states, the citizens of Qatar in particular, but there's good reason to believe that the Qatari regime actually knew in advance that this was going to happen.

ZR: I want to take a look at Europe's reaction as well. Following Israel's strike in Doha and its intensified offensive in Gaza City, the humanitarian toll has worsened dramatically in Gaza. According to the United Nations and major aid agencies, more than 65,000 Palestinians have been killed since Israel's assault began in October 2023. Hundreds of thousands are now being forced to flee to the south of Gaza into overcrowded areas where famine is spreading and shortages of water and medicine face extreme shortages. Against this backdrop, the European Commission has proposed suspending Israel's preferential trade terms with the European Union and imposing sanctions on Israeli ministers, violent settlers, and also on Hamas. Spain and Ireland have strongly supported these measures, joined by others such as Denmark and Sweden, while Germany has taken a much more cautious stance. Berlin condemned the Doha strike and even criticized Israel's offensive as a wrong step. But so far, resisted suspending the EU–Israel trade framework or adopting meaningful sanctions. Firstly, how do you assess Europe's reaction so far? And secondly, wearing your hat as a lawyer for international law and human rights. How do you view Germany's position, often framed in the media here, as a difficult balancing act between its historic responsibility and its obligations under international law?

DL: First of all, with respect to the first part of your question, let's go back to the attack by Israel on the Islamic Republic of Iran when they killed Ismail Haniyeh, the political leader of Hamas, during the inauguration of Iran's new president. At the time, the European Union came out and said that this was an act of self-defense and that it was retaliatory. That's the position that they took, even though Iran had not attacked Israel, not initially at least. What actually provoked the round of hostilities between Israel and Iran was the destruction of the

Iranian consulate in Damascus, a diplomatic compound in Damascus. That's what started the exchange of volleys between Israel and Iran. It was clear that Israel provoked attacks by Iran, and nonetheless, the EU characterized that on the part of Israel, it was an act of self-defense and retaliatory, and in this case, the EU, in the case of the attack on Doha, had no hesitation in saying that this was an international legal violation.

I think the way to make sense of this is simply that Qatar is on Team USA, whereas Iran is not, and whether or not the EU perceives something to be a violation of international law or an act of self-defense depends on which team the victim is on. Because Qatar was on Team USA, it was violative of international law, because Iran isn't, it was an act of self-defense. So again, we see the blatant hypocrisy of the European Union in this regard. With respect to the latest round of sanctions, I guess it's better late than never, Zain. Long ago, months ago, Amnesty International declared Israel was committing genocide. Human Rights Watch, the UN Special Rapporteur for the human rights situation in occupied Palestine declared Israel was committing genocide. Two Israeli human rights organizations, B'Tselem and Israeli Physicians for Human Rights, declared that Israel was committing genocide, and the world's most esteemed Association of Genocide Scholars declared Israel was committing genocide and it wasn't until finally yesterday, the UN Independent Commission of Inquiry added its voice and declared Israel was committing genocide that finally the EU suspended certain of the preferential trade provisions under the EU-Israel Association Agreement.

But what really stood out for me from today's announcement is, and I saw no indication, none, that the European Union has imposed, as Spain has done, an arms embargo on Israel. And if you're serious about stopping the genocide, the very first priority should be to block the transfer of any weapons or military components or dual-use items to Israel. And as far as I can tell, even now, even with this enormous body of expert opinion that Israel is committing genocide, the EU still hasn't taken that step. I'm also, frankly, quite doubtful – we'll have to see what happens, whether or not these suspension of certain provisions of the EU-Association agreement will actually be enforced, that remains to be seen. And the reason why I say that, Zain, is because the EU has had for many years a rule in place that the products that are produced in Israel's illegal settlements that are exported to the EU cannot bear products of Israel labels. Okay, that was the rule. But we know, because I litigated a case in Canada on this very issue, that the EU's enforcement of that rule was very, very questionable, to put it mildly. So I have serious concerns about whether even these modest steps are going to actually be enforced by the European Union, and especially those countries that are very, very supportive of Israel, for example, Hungary, who's a president, disgracefully welcomed Benjamin Netanyahu to his country after the ICC had indicted him for crimes against humanity.

ZR: And what do you make of Germany's position that is often framed here in the media as a very tough balancing act between its historical responsibility and its obligations and international law?

DL: Well, my understanding is that Chancellor Merz announced several weeks or months ago that Germany was imposing some kind of an arms embargo on Israel. And that is the way that

it was presented to the media and that's the way the media characterized it. But if you actually look carefully at Chancellor Merz's announcement, what he said, as I understand it, is that Germany would not provide to Israel weapons that could be used in Gaza. That's the formulation that they used. The implication being that Germany would continue to provide weapons that could be used elsewhere. First of all, I don't understand that distinction. If you can use a weapon in the West Bank, why couldn't you, as a technical matter, be able to use it in Gaza? Which leads me to believe that what the Chancellor was saying was that Israel had provided to him assurances that any weapons Germany provided would not be used in Gaza. And of course, there's no rational reason to try to trust those assurances. Israel is, after all, committing genocide.

So is the Chancellor taking Israel's word that it won't use German-made weapons in Gaza? If so, what reason does he have to believe Israel? But quite apart from that, Israel is also committing genocide in the West Bank. Israel is also violating international law on human rights in South Lebanon and in Syria. And it has killed many civilians in Yemen. And it has also launched a war of aggression on Iran. So the implication of the Chancellor's statement is that it's okay for Israel to use German-made weapons for all of those illegal purposes, but it can't use them in Gaza. So this, frankly, is a wholly unsatisfactory commitment by the Chancellor and I don't think we should have any confidence whatsoever that the flow of weapons from Germany to Israel has stopped.

ZR: I want to put forward a counterargument to your criticism of Israel's assault in Gaza. And we often hear this in the media and from Israel itself. And it goes as follows: If Hamas were to lay down its arms, release all hostages and surrender, then the Israeli military will end its operations in Gaza and will return it back to Palestinian' hands. What do you make of this argument, Dimitri? Does it have any legitimacy in your view?

DL: Well, let's just look at what's happening in the West Bank. Hamas doesn't control the West Bank. There have been almost daily attacks by Israeli settlers with the acquiescence or support of the Israeli military on unarmed Palestinians in the West Bank. This has been going on for now almost two years, even though there's not even an allegation, let alone proof, that those victims are in some way associated with Hamas or acting on behalf of Hamas. And there are many cases in which they are unarmed. So we can see in the West Bank in real time, Zain, that Israel is persecuting, killing, tormenting, dispossessing, stealing property from unarmed Palestinians who have no known affiliation to Hamas in the West Bank. Why would anybody believe that if resistance fighters in Gaza laid down their arms, that Israel would suddenly begin to respect their rights? And on the question of these so-called hostages, my understanding is that all the ones who remain in detention are Israeli soldiers. I think the proper way to characterize them is as prisoners of war; and there's about approximately 20 of them remaining alive. What about the thousands upon thousands of Palestinians, civilians, who are languishing in Israeli dungeons, many of them being subjected to conditions that amount to torture?! And a lot of them are children and a great many of them are being held pursuant to what is called administrative detention, which means that they're being held without any charge being filed against them, let alone any conviction.

So the main focus, it seems to me, if we're going to talk about hostages, should be on the far more numerous hostages in the detention of Israel, who have done absolutely nothing wrong. The West goes on and on and on about these 20 Israeli soldiers who are held in detention. I would like to see all of these people released from detention, even the soldiers, but the West doesn't seem to be remotely concerned about the thousands upon thousands of Palestinians who are real hostages, who are basically surviving in the most dire of conditions in Israeli prisons.

ZR: Let us switch topics here and move to another war theater in Ukraine. In particular, I want to focus on US-Russia relations. I would like to first recap some of the most notable developments of the last few months for our viewers. In July, President Donald Trump authorized major increases in arms deliveries to European allies and threatened secondary sanctions on countries trading with Russia if a ceasefire was not achieved. In August, after a public spat with Dmitry Medvedev, Trump deployed nuclear submarines near Russia but soon after met President Putin at a summit in Alaska. The talks were described as productive, though no ceasefire was announced. Shortly afterwards, Trump hosted President Zelensky and European leaders in Washington, where Zelensky ruled out any territorial concessions. Since then, Washington has floated tougher sanctions, hinted at US air support and approved \$1.1 billion in sales for cruise munitions, Starlink services and Patriot sustainment. In mid-September, a NATO-led European fund called the Prioritised Ukraine Requirements List — began deliveries of Patriot missiles and HIMARS systems worth \$500 million. Soon after, Sweden pledged \$7.5 billion in aid over two years and the United Kingdom more than \$1.4 billion. On September 9th, Russian drones crossed into Polish airspace from Belarus and were shot down, leading Warsaw to invoke NATO's Article 4 and approved allied reinforcements under Operation Eastern Sentry. On September 12th, the Kremlin announced that peace talks with Ukraine were paused, blaming European states. On September 17th, the European Union's 19th sanctions package was delayed due to disputes over Russian oil imports and US pressure. There are a number of contradictions from our observation. First, in US policy, one day pursuing diplomacy, the next escalating sanctions and armed deliveries. But also within the wider US-Europe NATO framework, where European countries at times appear to undermine the very diplomacy Washington claims to pursue. How do you assess these contradictions? And is peace even possible under these conditions?

DL: No, it's not possible. And the reason is because the United States administration has absolutely zero interest in peace. And we were in a position to figure that out back in February. In February, the new US defense secretary, Pete Hegseth, went to Brussels and gave a speech in which he said that the Europeans should assume responsibility for funding the Ukraine war so that America could turn its attention to China and other theaters of conflict, and I think certainly what he meant there was West Asia, Israel and Palestine. So how can you say with a straight face that you're trying to end the Ukraine war, you as an American administration official, when you're telling Europeans to increase their military spending so that they can continue the funding of the Ukraine War? And then a few weeks later or months later, JD Vance, the US Vice President, said exactly the same thing or essentially the same thing in an interview with the American media. He said, you know, if the

Europeans want to continue buying weapons to fund this war, we're fine with that, we'll provide the weapons. This is not the attitude of someone who is determined to end the war. And the people who really are driving intellectually, if I could use that term generously, the Trump administration's foreign policy are two individuals, one by the name of Colby Elbridge, another by the name of A. Wess Mitchell – one of them currently serves in the administration, the other was a deputy Secretary of State in the first Trump administration, Mitchell – they've written extensively about what is really going on here.

What is really going on here is, as Hegseth called it, a division of labor. The Americans want to focus their limited resources on West Asia and China, and they want the Europeans to focus their limited resources on Ukraine. There is no real interest here in ending the Ukraine war. So one may ask, why does Trump keep saying that he wants to end the Ukraine War? Well, it's very simple. This is a time-honored tradition of lying to your base. The Trump crew, his campaign advisors understood last year that if he wanted to maximize his chances of defeating Kamala Harris, he had to appeal to the people in the MAGA base who wanted an end to US forever wars and wanted the US to retrench and focus on domestic concerns. And so he lied. He said over and over again during the campaign, I will end the Ukraine war within 24 hours, which was a preposterous claim to begin with, and here we are eight months later, and its escalating is certainly not over. And he did that simply for electoral advantage.

And now because he built up this expectation in his base that he would end the war, he has to put on this display of trying to do that. And that's what I think Alaska was all about. Invite the Russian President to US soil, pat him on the back, shake his hand, say we had a great conversation, then invite the Europeans to the White House, knowing full well that European leaders are going to say, we're not going to make any concessions to Russia, which is going to destroy any possibility of a peace deal. And then Trump can look at his base and say, well, I tried. I did my best. You can't blame me. That's what this is all about. The Trump administration, I think this is now clearer than ever with the new sanctions, the threats of additional sanctions, the provision of missiles to Ukraine, these ERAMs and so forth, the reality of the Trump administration's foreign policy is that it wants the war in Ukraine to continue, but it wants European countries to bear the financial burden of financing it. It's as simple as that.

ZR: I want to put forward another narrative that is strongly circulating in the German political and media establishment. And they point to Russia's recent Zapad military exercise, which literally means West in English. It is a joint drill with Belarus that was held from September 12th to 16th and involved around 13,000 troops. The drill covers land, air, and naval components and included nuclear-capable systems, which many media outlets portrayed as preparation for a larger conflict. A similar drill took place in 2021 in Belarus and is often cited as a rehearsal for Russia's invasion of Ukraine a year later in 2022. Added to this narrative are also the Russian drone incursions into Polish airspace from Belarus, which I alluded to in my previous question. In response to that incident, German Chancellor Friedrich Merz stated, and I quote him here, quote, "This reckless action by the Russian government is part of a series of provocations we have observed in the Baltic region and on the Eastern

flank of NATO. This is a very serious threat to peace in Europe", unquote. Do you see these examples as credible evidence of an increasing Russian military threat to Europe and also a justification for Germany to continue raising its military spending to counter this threat?

DL: Well, these military exercises in Belarus are not new. As you yourself indicated, they were happening before the invasion of Ukraine in February of 2022. And if we really wanna talk about provocative military exercises, why don't we go back to the first Trump administration and the very provocative military exercises that NATO did with Ukraine, you know, in the Black Sea and on Ukrainian territory. Military exercises in these areas are a standard feature of the conduct of these militaries, there's nothing particularly new about this. So I don't think that the NATO countries really have a leg to stand on when they say that the Zapad military exercises in Belorussia are somehow a new provocation. At the end of the day, also let us bear in mind that NATO has troops stationed on the border, or near the border of Russia, in the Baltic States, for example. There are a number of states. The Russians do not have troops on the border of the United States or Germany, for that matter. There are no Russian troops. There are no armadas of Russian naval vessels off the coastline of Germany or of the United States. There are the normal sort of patrols by nuclear submarines and so forth, you know, far removed from the shores, there are military vessels. This has been going on for decades. But if you look at the array of military forces of NATO and the array of military forces of Russia, no rational objective person would say that Russia has adopted a more threatening posture towards NATO than NATO has adopted towards Russia.

Russia is basically surrounded, as is China, by the way, by the US and its allied military forces. The US has over 800 military bases in the world. Russia has a tiny little fraction of that. China has one in Djibouti. And they're constantly complaining about so-called aggression by Russia and China. And let us point out here, it's very important to recall, that the military spending of the United States alone, which is now over \$1 trillion, is well over twice the combined military spending of the Russian Federation in China. And by some estimates, Vijay Prashad has done a study with a colleague of his, which found that actual US military spending is \$1.6 trillion. This is before the most recent increase in US military spend. That is approximately four times the military spending of the Russian Federation and China combined. And then when you add in all the other NATO countries, we're talking about more than \$2 trillion. And they're now talking about raising it to 5% of GDP, which will probably take their combined military spending if they get there to over \$4 trillion, which would be ten times, I repeat, ten times current military spending by Russia and China combined. So you have to be living on planet Mars, when you look at the facts, to think that the Russians and the Chinese are adopting a more aggressive posture towards NATO than NATO is adopting towards them.

ZR: Doesn't this argument also provide a justification for Germany to continue raising its military spending? For example, you stated that the Ukraine war theater is being left up to Europe and the US is slowly disengaging and focusing on West Asia. Does that mean that Germany has to step up and replace the US to counter a Russian threat on its own?

DL: Only if you believe that Russia has an intention to attack Germany, which is a complete fantasy. The Russian government has said repeatedly that it has no intention of attacking a NATO country. Even though weapons have been pouring in from NATO countries, through the last two and a half years of warfare in Ukraine, Russia has not actually attacked a NATO country. There has been no attempt whatsoever. These drones, which there's dispute about whether they in fact came from Russia – there are people who are saying they were a false flag – but I understand that everybody agrees that they weren't armed. And so they were not actually able to cause any meaningful damage and they didn't cause any meaningful damage. So it would be surprising to me if the Russians intended to attack a NATO country, because if that were the case, why wouldn't they have done it by now? In defense of their – what they perceive to be their own interests in Ukraine, and they haven't, they refrain from doing that. So if you don't believe, and by the way, I haven't even mentioned the prospect of nuclear war.

If Russia were to attack a NATO country, this would create an enormous risk of nuclear conflict. And I don't believe that the Russians are suicidal and nothing that they've said suggests that they are. So the proper approach of the German government, in my opinion, is not to drastically increase its military spending at a time when its economy is experiencing a very significant deindustrialization and decline, and the quality of life of Germans as it appears is going to be declining significantly in the years ahead, but it's rather to do a peace deal; a peace to deal and deescalate and put an end to the growing arms race, the intensifying arms race. But that would require, Zain, a willingness to make at least some concessions and the European governments, along with Zelensky have taken a maximalist position. They refuse to make any concessions. They've been very clear about this: We will not cede an inch of territory. Ukraine has the right to enter NATO, even though the US and European governments vowed to the Soviet Union that they would not expand NATO. There's no accommodation being made for the rights of Russian speakers living in Ukraine. There's no accommodation being made for the fact that there are far-right, heavily armed groups in Ukraine who exhibit rampant Russophobia. They're not willing to make any concessions at all, none.

And in that circumstance, I think the blame lies squarely upon the shoulders of European leaders. The last thing I wanna say about this, Zain, is that all of this just highlights the fact, and I say this as a citizen of the EU, and it pains me to say it, the leaders of our countries, including here in Greece and in Germany, Britain, France, and on and on, have basically made their foreign policy completely subservient to the dictates of Washington. That's the sad reality. And what we need to do here in Europe is to reassert our sovereignty, determine what is in the national interests of our own countries and our own peoples. And if that requires us to do a peace deal with Russia, then that is what we should do. If that requires us to continue to have access to Russian natural resources, rather than, for example, rely to a far greater extent on liquefied natural gas from the United States, which is much more expensive and much more polluting, then that's what we should do. But unfortunately, we're ruled by people who are effectively vassals of Washington.

ZR: Let us leave it at that. Dimitri Lascaris, journalist and lawyer for international law and human rights and the founder of the channel, Reason2Resist, thank you so much for your time and insights.

DL: Always a pleasure, Zain, thank you.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. If you like the journalism that we undertook in this interview, make sure to subscribe to our channel by clicking on the subscription button below. And if you want us to continue with our work, make sure you donate. There's an entire team working behind the scenes to make sure that this information reaches you from camera, light, audio, transcription, translation, and voiceover, all with the goal of providing you this information in English and in German. I thank you for your support and for tuning in. 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](#)