



## **Iran's Victory: A New Order in the Middle East?**

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

**Glenn Greenwald (GG):** Good evening, everybody. Welcome to our Thursday night Q&A session where we take questions from our Substack subscribers and try and engage with as many of them as we can. Obviously, tonight we're going to have a focus on what appears to be the end of the US-Israeli war with Iran, at least for the moment an end to it, perhaps a permanent end to. There's all kinds of fascinating and consequential events that have taken place around that war that continue to take place. Around it, including comments from both Trump and JD Vance that are truly remarkable. Whether they lead to any actual changes in US government behaviour policy or not, the rhetoric itself is remarkable. But that is an important question worth asking, whether there is actually a meaningful shift in the American perspective vis-a-vis Israel, vis-a-vis Iran, whether this is just kind of a ruse, whether the pro-Israel campaign that is already underway and will only intensify will actually derail this peace deal or force a reconciliation if there is even a breach between Trump and Netanyahu. There's a lot to talk about there and related issues as well. I just want to say one word about our studio though, before I do. We didn't do the show last week for a bunch of reasons, but the week before that we unveiled what was intended to be our new studio. As some of you know, we were in the Rumble studio where we were the last three years, but it's a huge studio. You need 12, ten people to operate in the control room. We're kind of paring down, since we're not doing a nightly show. So we just built a new studio and we debuted it, even though there were things we knew still needed to be done that weren't quite done. Maybe we just got a little bit overexcited and I was in that studio two weeks ago for the show and the reaction, I wouldn't say universally hateful, but close to it. The consensus was definitely very intensely negative and the primary objection was that the set that we had constructed was just ugly, which is kind of a very fundamental critique. The thing is, the set is not ugly. It seemed ugly, but that's just because there were still things that needed to be done that weren't yet done. It's not like we just suddenly lost any sense of taste or colour coordination or anything and presented an ugly set that we had spent months building. It just wasn't ready. It didn't have the proper lighting yet. We just decided – we were a little too excited and debuted it before it was really done. So we're just gonna wait this time, probably another week, another two weeks. This time it's gonna have all the right lighting, all the different features, the LED lighting in the background, the colour scheme will be more robust and obvious. And I'm

convinced that other than a few of you who are obviously gonna hate it because maybe you hate everything or because just the internet never produces a positive consensus, I do think it'll be not just workable but actually quite nice. This is just our temporary setup in the meantime while we actually build an actual real studio with a real camera, real lighting, real microphone and everything. So we heard your comments. I didn't even need to hear them as soon as I saw the video too, and even a little bit before that, when I saw that video feed, I knew that it was kind of revolting, but rest assured we are working on that. And when it redebuts, it's going to be majestic, really, really quite beautiful.

All right, well that's to get into a lot of questions. I actually am working on an article that I'll probably have tomorrow morning up on our Substack where you can go read it, [greenwald.substack.com](https://greenwald.substack.com) about various aspects of this war that I think have received too little attention thus far in terms of the implications of where we are and why we got here and what the implications are likely to be but there's a lot of questions and I want to get into them and the first one is from Trudy Cooper who asked this, quote: "Hi Glenn given that virtually none of the goals of the US and Israel have been met in this new deal what do you predict the future stature of a strengthened Iran will be in the world. How does their position affect the overall balance of power, the perception of Western power in the World, and future relationships between major powers?" All right, so let's just break this down a little bit. I'm going to take a little time because I do want to give as much of an analytical framework as I can of what has happened here in my perspective. So let me just begin by saying I thought the war itself from the very start when it was just being talked about, when it became apparent that it was going to start, once it started was a complete and utter error on every level, pragmatically, geostrategically, morally, ethically, legally, politically, economically, just an outright unjustified war, yet another one of the kind that Trump promised repeatedly over the last decade he was going to avoid. Another Middle East war, presumably a regime change war. And my view of the war was that not only was it completely unjustified, we were attacking yet again a country that had not attacked us, that was not planning to attack us, that could not attack us. We talked about before how the United States has suffered many terrorist attacks on the American homeland over the last 30 years. Absolutely zero of them have come from either Iran or from Shia terrorists, they were Sunni terrorists or from other parts of the world. So we're talking about a country that hasn't attacked us either directly with the military or through terrorist attacks or any other way. Obviously, we've had conflict with Iran in that region where we put troops in our military bases near their country and there's definitely been conflict over that, but there hasn't been any attacks on our homeland and just as a general rule, I don't think we should be starting wars against countries that aren't attacking our country and can't. And that was true for Iran.

And the reason I was so against it just strategically, like the reason why I thought it was going to be a failure was because Iran has been planning for this for basically 50 years, since 1979, when the Islamic Revolution swept out the Shah and the US and the Israeli and European puppets that had been placed in Iran for the prior 25 years to rule Iran and they knew that because they had succeeded in overthrowing this tyranny that the US and Europe, the UK principally, were using to control Iranian resources that there was going to be attempts to

dislodge that revolutionary government. And so they've been planning and thinking about this and spending money and developing military capabilities and strategies for basically decades now. And you're talking about a country that is filled with very sophisticated, smart people. Their political class is filled with PhDs, scientists, economists. This is not a joke, Iran is not a joke. It's also a huge country. It's a very proud civilization. And the idea that we were just going to go in and do what we did in Venezuela, just kind of go in and decapitate their government and then instantly convert them into puppets of the United States, the way we did with Venezuela's government at the end of a rifle, was utter fantasy from the very start. And I believe that's how they convinced Trump, and I knew that that wasn't going to happen. Iran was going to put up a huge fight, they had a lot of weapons in their arsenal. That's the reason why no country has gone to war, meaning the United States or the UK, despite how contrary they've been to Western interests for the last decades because Iran is a serious country and was going to put up a formidable fight on their land. [00:07:22][101.2]

So, I'm going to give you a quick metaphor, something I have learned from working so extensively with dogs, because I think it actually extends to the entire animal species, including human beings. I'm sure you've seen this, if you have dogs, dogs very vigorously defend your home or your space, which is also their territory and their space. And when you have packs of dogs, like I do, if you ever have a pack of dogs much bigger than your pack of dogs, but that big pack of dogs, much stronger, much bigger, comes and invades your property or your territory that those dogs that are your dogs consider to be their territory, they are going to win that fight, even if they're weaker, even if not as agile, because they just get more vicious when they're defending their territory. And I think that's true of countries as well. How many times have we seen that? In Vietnam, in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Iran, all those guerrilla war fighters who faced a much military superior army were able to vanquish it from their homeland because they were fighting for something that they were willing to die for. Which is their home in the case of Iran, their civilization. So either this is going to be a very prolonged war that Trump was going to have to end prematurely because of the economic harm that it caused because of unpopularity politically that this war would engender and he would have to end it without achieving any of the stated goals. That was one possibility. The only other possibility for actually achieving the stated the goals was a full on ground force invasion or a level of devastation that was basically unthinkable, nuking Iran, carpet bombing Iran, just completely destroying their society, which was even a worse alternative, in my view, in terms of the death and destruction that it would have wreaked. And so Trump, I guess to his credit, if you're looking at just those two choices, once the war starts, either continue the war, just once you're in, just keep going all in, and even if it means fighting for years, like we did in Iraq, occupying their country, having thousands of American troops killed, hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, trillions of dollars slaughtering huge numbers of Iranians, destroying their entire civilisation, if that's the only choice or the alternative is end the war without the objectives being realised, I'm glad he chose to end the war. But there is no doubt that the stated objectives have not been realised.

The first day Trump said, my main goal in this war is to bring freedom to the Iranian people, to liberate them from the tyranny that is oppressing them, a regime change war. Obviously,

that didn't happen. Once the Trump administration was kind of pressured as the world dragged on to state what their goals were, they kind of gave up on that one and they said things like: We want to destroy their nuclear programme, get the enriched uranium out of Iran, destroy their capacity to stockpile and build ballistic missiles. And none of that is done either. Iran has stockpiles of ballistic missiles, they've demonstrated that repeatedly, in fact, very recently. They have drone capacity, they're now building more ballistic missiles, building more drones. They have not agreed to give up their enriched uranium. In fact, it's almost certain that they will retain the right to enrich uranium as part of a peaceful nuclear programme the way they could under the Iran deal in 2015 that Trump ran on a pledged campaign in 2016 to nullify and then did nullify in 2018 under the pressure from the Israeli government. And then not only that, the capacity of Iran, not only to shut the Strait of Hormuz, which they did, but also to demonstrate a pretty easy ability to attack and impose great harm on the oil and energy infrastructure of what we call our Persian Gulf allies, meaning the Persian Gulf tyrannies and dictatorships with which we're aligned Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Jordan, they demonstrated this ability to Qatar as well to attack those countries as well, not so much Jordan, but the others and their energy infrastructure in a way that is devastating economically. And now Iran is going to, because this is always a condition for them ending the war and for opening up the Strait of Hormuz was they want their assets back that the United States has stolen. They sell oil on the open market and we freeze their money in bank accounts that they don't have access to. We take their money. And we deprive them of use of it and then we also sanction Iran. So it makes it very difficult for them to sell the oil in the open market, lifting sanctions and getting their assets back was an unconditional or a non-negotiable condition from their perspective to ending the war. And now they're getting that. So they're going to be strengthened in all sorts of ways, certainly economically as a result of the end of this war.

Now, I personally am glad about that. I don't think the United States ever had a right to take those assets. I don't think we should be sanctioning them and starving their population, choking off their population from the benefits of the resources that that country naturally has. And I'm glad that that's being lifted. It was lifted under the Iran Deal as well, which is the reason why I favoured the Iran deal and opposed the nullification by Trump of the Iran Deal also. But once you start the war, which obviously I vehemently oppose, but once it started, you have two bad choices. And it was so predictable that these were going to be the choices. You either go all in and destroy Iran and yourselves in order to force some kind of unconditional surrender or regime change or whatever, or you do what Trump and now JD Vance are doing, which is ending the war based on an agreement that obviously falls radically and drastically short of not just all of the war aims, but even some of them, it doesn't achieve any of them. And that has been the reaction. So I personally am glad that the war is over. I hope this deal sticks. I think it is actually good for world peace and for the United States, for Iran to be reintegrated back into the world economy, for us to stop acting as though there's some kind of like aberrational country, some expression of unprecedented and incomparable evil, that there's some kind of great threat to the United States, there are none of those things. That's just been propaganda, basically Israeli propaganda, because I understand why Iran is a threat to Israel. They're not a direct threat to Israel, they are a threat to Israeli hegemony in

the region. They're the only country that can provide a formidable counterbalance to the ability of Israel to dominate that region. And all of its oil resources and its neighbours and everything else. And the goal of the Israelis was just to smash Iranian society into a bunch of little pieces, the way it was done in Libya, the way it was done Syria in order to just render them utterly impotent and weak, or just put Iran back into the hands of a puppet regime that Israel and the United States could control, like the Shah. That's what the Israelis wanted and it was not in the United State's interest to pursue that. And obviously Trump has, at least for the moment, decided that he doesn't think it is either.

Now Trump has given an explanation for the reasons he had to stop the war. You probably have noticed over the past couple decades when anyone talked about Iran closing the Strait of Hormuz, which everyone understood was a great amount of leverage in the Iranian hands just given the geography of Iran, you can't do anything about that. That Strait is very narrow, it's right off the coastline of Iran and they're always going to be able to menace commercial traffic passing through if they want to. That is leverage in the hands of Iran, that unless you change their geography or change the regime, you're never going to be able to change. And it was always talked about like this was some kind of cataclysmic outcome that the world economy could not withstand, even for a few days, the shutting of the Strait of Hormuz. And the Strait of Hormuz has been shut for weeks, in fact, for a couple of months; first because Iran shut it and then the United States imposed a full-scale embargo on it so Iran couldn't pick and choose who gets through and who doesn't. And oil prices obviously went up, gas prices went up in a way that made Americans mad, but it didn't go up in the kind of catastrophic way that a lot of people had expected to \$150 a barrel or \$250 a barrel, or \$7 or \$8 a gallon, it went up to \$4, \$4.50 a gallon, went up to a hundred, above a hundred per barrel, 110 at some points, 115 I think might have been the high point. But then it came down even without the Strait of Hormuz being open.

The reason for that, the reason why there wasn't this cataclysmic damage to the global economy, and there's been real damage, just not cataclysmic, is because the US and other countries were using the strategic reserves of oil that they have to compensate for the faulting of Persian Gulf oil that comes through the Strait of Hormuz on the global market. And those reserves are running out. They're not infinite. They've been tapped and been used for two months now as the Strait of Hormuz has been closed. And Trump said we were about four weeks away from those reserves being exhausted. And then there would have been utter global catastrophe, economic catastrophe. And Trump understood that that would be the end of everything. His presidency, his party, his legacy, the world economy. Trump doesn't care about a lot of things in an authentic way, but he does care about the economy. It's who he is. It's what he's been. He cares about wealth. I believe that he was genuinely concerned by that. I think the calculation was: if we impose a full-scale military embargo on the Strait of Hormuz and Iran can't get any oil through and can't get any revenue, they will collapse and they'll have to capitulate before we get to the point where we can no longer withstand the closing of the Strait of Hormuz. And the United States lost that game of chicken. The Iranians were clearly willing to go a lot longer because again, they're fighting for their sovereignty. They're fighting their self-determination. They're fighting for their society, homeland and

civilization. And that will make you endure a lot more pain than people who aren't fighting for those things. I believe Trump, when he says he felt compelled by necessity to end it, but that is a remarkable admission because that does mean that Iran basically won the war. Obviously, Iran's military didn't vanquish or defeat the Israeli and American military. Nobody ever thought that was going to happen. But the Vietnamese didn't defeat the American military either. It just through leverage and guerrilla warfare, wore them out. Same with the Taliban in Afghanistan. If you get to the point where you have to basically end a war because the other side has demonstrated that they have leveraged that they're willing to use that you can no longer endure. You're going to end up leaving that war certainly without a victory and basically with defeat. And I think that's what has clearly happened here.

Now, one of the really disturbing parts of this is that Trump wants out of this war. That's clear. Trump is not somebody who likes to be talked about as some kind of loser, who is humiliated. He wanted unconditional surrender. He obviously didn't get anything close to that. He hears even his own closest supporters, how the Israelis are talking about him, how conservative senators are talking on TV, how Fox News is talking, that this is what to them looks like a surrender. And a lot of them are very angry about it. Trump's not a person who wants that. So I think clearly Trump felt compelled to do it, but also I do strongly believe, and this isn't just my own perception about how Trump works or what has happened, but things I've heard as well from people who are close to that circle, that the way the war started is that Netanyahu and the Mossad absolutely convinced Trump that a regime change war would be quick and easy. That he would be able to do in Iran what he did in Venezuela. And once he saw that wasn't the case, and it wasn't the case that it would require a much more concerted, endured, prolonged, costly bloody war than he was led to believe, then he became angry at the people who he thought misled him. Trump is not a person who's very renowned for accepting fault or blame or responsibility. He looks around to see who's to blame, who actually screwed up. And I think the Israelis in a lot of ways are taking the brunt of that. But I'm glad the war is over. But I am also glad, if that is the case, that we're now hearing things from JD Vance and from Donald Trump as well, that we really have not heard from any American leaders in decades, if at all, when talking about Israel, but also talking about Iran.

You probably have seen today JD Vance. He's been doing this media circuit throughout the week in part because he has a new book out, so he was planning on doing it anyway but obviously in a way his book got upstaged by the fact that he became the face of this peace agreement that Trump and Vance in the United States government signed with the Iranians, but without notably the Israelis and so it's JD Vance – Marco Rubio, I don't think has done a single interview, has made a single public statement about this deal. He was clearly removed from the centre stage in terms of orchestrating the deal; by all accounts, he was opposed to it. He's not out there defending it. So it's really JD Vance who's doing it. And JD Vance today came out and said – and obviously he would not have said this without Trump's approval – he spoke at the White House briefing room and he wasn't even asked, this is something he wanted to say. He said: Before we end, I just want to get out of my way and make a point, which is, I've heard Israeli officials, people high up in Netanyahu's cabinet, attacking and criticising Donald Trump and the United States government in ways that are very personal

and very harsh. And JD Vance said: I think the Israelis should remind themselves that they don't have any other powerful supporters or allies in this world other than Donald Trump. That's the only one that's left. And they ought to be very well advised to remind themselves that the reason they were able to pursue these wars, not just in Iran, but Lebanon and Gaza and the West Bank and Syria is, as JD Vance said, because the United States is the country that gives them the defensive weapons they use to protect their society as they do it. And he was basically saying, you better be more grateful. We're not going to sit here and tolerate you attacking our country, attacking Donald Trump. And he's the only friend that you have left. That's kind of an extraordinary admonition. That's something that American presidents or vice presidents or politicians should have been saying for a long time, because it's true.

It's a reassertion, at least rhetorically, whether it happens in reality is something we're going to talk about, but at least, rhetorically, it's an assertion of reality, that who are the Israelis to act like they're entitled to everything? And if they don't get everything that they want, the US started a war against their enemy for them, if the US doesn't fight the war till the very last day that the Israelis think the war should go on, that somehow they're entitled to throw a tantrum when the United States is still financing that country, still funding their military, still arming them, still protecting them diplomatically and militarily, it's extraordinary that JD Vance went out of his way to say that. But it followed a series of statements from Trump that were even more remarkable. One of the things that happens is we get these narratives that stick for decades. And the idea that Iran is this supremely evil, terrorist state, state sponsor of terrorism, they chant death to Israel, and death to the United States, so there's apocalyptic cult, they wanna destroy life on the planet, they're suicidal, they're fanatical and supremely evil, this has been a narrative that no one in bipartisan Washington has really had the courage to contest for decades. I mean, even Obama and the Obama Deal, kind of defying the pro-Israel lobby, still affirmed these basic truths about Iran. Just nobody questions them. Until this week, when Trump was saying things like: Yeah, I think that Iran has every right to have ballistic missiles. After all, every other country in that region has them. Saudi Arabia has them, the Emiratis have them, Qatar has them, Israel has them. How is it fair to tell Iran they can't have ballistic missiles? These are conventional weapons. They're not a threat to us, Trump said. They're not like nuclear weapons, of course Iran should be able to have conventional weapons.

And he even said the same thing about enriched uranium; that Iran can enrich uranium as long as it's for peaceful nuclear purposes. They have that right. What they can't do is get a nuclear weapon. And he was talking about Iran as well and the Iranian leadership with whom he's been dealing, he said they're actually quite reasonable. It's been very good dealing with them. They're trustworthy. They're reasonable. This is basically talking about Iran like it's any other country, which is what it is. Doesn't mean they have a nice government, doesn't mean they honour civil liberties, but so many of the closest US allies in that region and elsewhere don't either. But to abandon this narrative that Iran is like the new Nazi-Germany or worse than ISIS or it is supreme evil, just to liberate ourselves from that, to have JD Vance saying that, and especially Donald Trump affirming that in so many different ways to the point of

saying: Of course they can have ballistic missiles. Why wouldn't they be able to have ballistic missiles? That is extraordinary.

But then also, Trump and Vance have said things about Israel this week that I don't think I've ever heard major American leaders say, ever. One of the interviews JD Vance did was with Ross Douthat, the New York Times columnist, and JD Vance was asked about Israel's options, and JD Vance said: Look, they have to come to the realisation at some point that they're not a big country, they're a small country, a country of nine million people. And they can't go around solving every national security problem they have by just killing and bombing everybody. And this followed Trump making a series of statements about how, whatever else is true here, however much of this is theatre, this split between Israel and the US or the anger that Trump has toward Netanyahu, whether this will endure at all or result in any meaningful changes, I'm very much in doubt about that, we can talk about that, I do think Trump was genuinely angry that as he was trying to finalise this deal with Iran, and again, I do believe Trump felt a very strong need financially, economically, politically, to end this war, that Netanyahu did what he always does, which is trying to do his best to do whatever is necessary to derail a peace deal. And in this case, he went and he bombed a civilian heavy neighbourhood in Beirut, knowing that Beirut is the red line for the Iranians; that the Iranian's just can't in good conscience to their own population justify doing a peace deal when Israel is out there still bombing civilian residential areas and apartment buildings in Beirut. And so of course Netanyahu goes and does exactly that. I think it enraged Trump in part because he understood why Netanyahu was doing it, but also I think it's important to realise like Trump's circle of experience, the people that he listens to, the people that he talks to, I think form a great deal of how his policies are formed and how he sees this region, I think the fact that his daughter, Ivanka, is married to Jared Kushner, who's an Orthodox Jew with a long history of supporting radical Israel causes, including funding the West Bank settlements, but also not just him, but other very close friends of like Steve Witkoff and Howard Lutnick, he's very comfortable around very rich pro-Israel Jews; that's the faction in Manhattan real estate in which Trump has thrived. I think, he has a lot of connections to people, Sheldon and Miriam Adelson that have oriented him to this very pro-Israel position.

But then at the same time his other daughter Tiffany Trump married two years ago someone of Lebanese descent, he's Lebanese, a Lebanese Christian, Michael Boulos and Michael Boulos' father is a close Trump advisor, and he also is obviously Lebanese as well, a Lebanese Christian. And the Israelis and the IDF have destroyed a lot of Lebanese Christian communities, old structures. Remember that embarrassment that they had when they got caught smashing a Jesus statue in southern Lebanon. The IDF did, and they had to pretend that it was some kind of outrageous thing that's never been done, that they were so embarrassed and angry by because they got caught. So there's a lot of Lebanese Christian anger toward the IDF. The attacks on Beirut have been utterly indiscriminate and disgusting. I think Trump is really of the belief that these were done, not just recklessly and discriminately, but also unjustifiably as a way of derailing his deal. And Trump understands that in the US-Israeli relationship, they are the very junior partner, or at least they should be. And Trump had came out and said things like, Netanyahu can't just go and blow up an apartment building

just because he thinks someone from Hezbollah is around, filled with people who have nothing to do with Hezbollah, innocent civilians, basically. And when I saw that Trump said this – I saw the transcript of it – I didn't believe it. I had to see the video of it. I had to really verify for myself. I couldn't believe that an American President would say this. I had go watch the video. And even once I watched the video, I had to watch it two or three times to make sure there wasn't some context I wasn't seeing or some erroneous expression. Trump said: I think the Israelis have gone so far in their reckless disregard for human life in Lebanon that maybe it would be better to have Jolani, whom the Israelis installed along with Turkey as the head of Syria, even though he is al-Qaeda operative, a senior al-Qaeda commander whom the United States had a bounty on the head of as recently as late 2024 when he suddenly became the new President of Syria with a name change and a costume change, but he's al-Qaeda, in fact, linked to ISIS, and Trump says: I think maybe it would be better to have him go and fight Hezbollah because he would be more humane and more careful, not as indiscriminate as the IDF and Netanyahu is.

I mean, I think al-Qaeda has more regard for human life, Trump says, than Netanyahu and the IDF when it comes to Lebanon. Just the fact that we not only tolerate but embrace an al-Qaeda operative after we dismantled our entire country and our civil liberty protections and our privacy rights and our due process rights and went to war for 25 years, supposedly in response to the existential threat that al-Qaeda poses and now we love one of the main leaders of al-Qaeda in Syria who worked with ISIS for sure against Assad, and yes, we did fight on the same side as as al-Qaeda as well in Syria, just shows you how fragile these narratives are, this propagandist framework. Okay, one day you're supposed to think that there's nothing more dangerous in the world than al-Qaeda. You're supposed give up all your civil liberties for it, give the government the Patriot Act and warrantless surveillance and everything else, fight a bunch of wars all over the Middle East in response to al- Qaeda, and then the next minute you're supposed to believe that Assad is worse than al-Qaeda, that Iran is worse than al-Qaeda, that even the IDF in Trump's view fights wars more indiscriminately and less humanely than al-Qaeda does. Look at how just quickly these narratives shift. So whatever else is true, and we're gonna get to that with a couple of questions in a second about how enduring this is likely to be, how genuine this is like to be, don't underestimate the significance of just the rhetoric alone, even if the rhetoric ends up resulting in nothing meaningful, meaning we still continue to finance Israel, we still can continue to go to war for Israel. Four months from now, once the midterms are over, Trump goes back and attacks Iran with Israel, all of which are very possible. The fact that this is all put into the discourse by the President and the Vice President about Iran and about Israel is going to be significant in terms of how the public sees these issues for a long time to come.

**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](#)