



Interview: Dr. Jill Stein on AOC's Instagram Attack, Green Party Challenges and Victories, and More

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

Glenn Greenwald (GG): Dr. Jill Stein is one of the most influential and important independent politicians in our country. She is currently the presidential candidate representing the Green Party, the same thing she did both in 2012 and 2016. Dr. Stein is also a medical doctor. She practised internal medicine for 25 years after getting her M.D. from Harvard College. And as a result of the fact that Democrats hate nothing more than third party candidates from the left or who want to transcend the two party system, she has also become one of the politicians with the thickest skin, by necessity. She continues to pursue what she believes are her principles, what she believes are the improvements necessary in our political system, no matter how viciously and falsely she continues to be attacked. And that's just one of the things we respect so much about her. And there's a lot going on with the Green Party, with Dr. Stein's candidacy. And as always, we are delighted to welcome her to our show. Dr. Stein, good evening. It's great to see you, as always.

Dr. Jill Stein (JS): Great to be here. Thanks so much, Glenn.

GG: Sure. So one of the things we've been talking about is that the primary claim of the Democratic Party and you saw this this weekend when people like Bernie Sanders explained why they were so happy to get Dick Cheney's endorsement, is that essentially the main concern of this election is not ideology, it's not policy, it's none of those things. It's that the Democratic Party is the sole vehicle for preserving American democracy. And, of course, the irony of that is at the same time, they're saying that they've done everything possible to essentially get every one of their opponents banned from the ballot. Donald Trump, RFK junior, when he was running in the Democratic Party race, other people in the Democratic Party race. Obviously, they have spent a lot of efforts to get you and your candidacy and the Green Party banned from states where you have doubled or tripled the amount of signatures required. Can you talk a little bit about the recent conflict in Nevada, but also the broader attempt by the lovers of democracy in the Democratic Party to get you banned from the ballot so nobody can vote for you?

JS: Yeah, it's so emblematic of this Democratic Party that prides themselves on being the vehicle for democracy and defending democracy around the world. But of course, here at home, they're doing everything in their power. They are arguably the anti-Democratic party, which is pulling out all the stops to throw their opponents off the ballot. They've hired an army of lawyers. They proudly announced back in June, they are clueless that they're actually proud of this, and boldly announced that they had hired an army of lawyers in order to throw their competitors off the ballot based on lawfare, basically trivial details that they're searching for, violating the spirit of the law in order to suppress their competition. They have boldly advertised for infiltrators and spies and for paid positions to manage such infiltrators and spies in order to mess up our ballot drives and arguably our organisations as well. We've suspected for a long time that this has been going on, but we never had the evidence to prove it. They also hijacked our public funding and kept us off of actually a couple of ballots where we have to now run write-in campaigns instead of being on the ballot, because the money that we had earned through public funding, which should have been paid to us about two months ago, was held up by ridiculous excuses by the Department of Treasury. That is, again, within the Democratic Party that found excuses essentially to delay that funding. So we expect to be getting it in the coming week or two. But after the ballot lines and deadlines are basically passed. So they're doing everything that they can. Most recently, we had qualified in Nevada by getting 30,000 signatures and voters in Nevada who wanted to see an anti-genocide choice on the ballot, a pro-worker, a actual climate emergency choice, an anti-war choice, which the other campaigns that are on the ballot, certainly Biden and Harris and RFK do not represent. So we would be that one challenge actually at the national level across the country. And so we got three times the number of required signatures. And the secretary of state for Nevada approved our ballot line and announced that. And then the DNC basically through the Democratic Party in Nevada, then challenged both the secretary of state and the [inaudible] to get us thrown off the ballot. They altered the reason for their case midstream, I'm not sure how kosher that is, but they were allowed to change their argument when they discovered that their original argument wasn't going to hold water. They challenged our distribution; you have to meet certain distribution requirements with the signers to show that they represent voters across the state. And they saw that they were not going to make it on that basis. So then they challenged us based on the footnote in the petitions that were used. Now, the story there is that the Greens had used the correct petitions and then the secretary of state's office corrected us with the wrong petition. So they swapped out what was initially correctly done by the Green Party of Nevada. They swapped out the correct petition for a petition that only differed in a minor way, basically an attestation that the petitioner confirmed that each signer was a resident of the county for which they were signing. This is just done normally in the process of collecting signatures. This is a routine part of signature collection. And when the case went to the district court, they basically agreed with the secretary of state that this was a distinction without a difference, that this was not a substantive reason to deny 30,000 voters their choice on the ballot, and they approved it. The Democrats then took it to the court of appeals, which flipped the decision and basically validated this effort of the Democratic Party to silence 30,000 voters in Nevada and basically deny the entire state of Nevada an anti-genocide choice, an anti-war choice, a pro-worker and climate emergency choice. So we're now in the process of exploring on a very tight timeline whether we can take this to the

Supreme Court. We'll see. But we will fight this for all it's worth. Nevada does not have a write-in process. So if in fact our ballot line is denied by this very partisan and outrageous anti-democratic decision, it will really be outrageous and a real tragedy for the voters of Nevada.

GG: Yeah, very strange behaviour from a party that portrays itself as the sole guardian of democratic values. Because, as you say, we have two major wars, one in Ukraine and one that we're funding in Israel against Gaza. And whatever one might think about the war in Israel and Gaza, all the other candidates, the major candidates, are unified in their view on that war. And if you actually believed in democracy, you would hope that there would be an option for people who oppose either the war itself or US support for it to have someone for whom they can vote, which would be you. And of course, the Democrats have made sure that there is no such choice on a lot of these ballots. I think it's also notable how at the same time they're trying to keep you off the ballots, they were fighting to keep RFK Junior on the ballot even after he said he didn't want to be on and is now supporting Trump, almost as if they're not actually motivated by any fixed principle, but instead manipulate the democratic process for their own interest. Let me ask you one of the reasons I think the Green Party is so important is it's really the only third party, maybe the Libertarian Party as well, to a lesser extent, that has demonstrated an ability to systematically get on ballots, which, of course, the two parties have deliberately made an extremely difficult and expensive task, as you know better than anybody. How many states, I know a couple are in dispute at the moment, but how many states are you likely to be on? And how many of the swing states say the eight or nine swing states that will determine the election will you be on?

JS: So as of now, we are on all the swing states, they've challenged us also in Georgia. So they're trying to get us thrown off the ballot and we are fighting there as well. I don't even know what the basis of that case is yet. This just happened a couple of days ago. But they are trying to get us off in Georgia. But from where it stands now, we're actually on the ballot in all of the swing states. We are on the ballot, actually, if you include the write-ins, and there will be something like eight states in which we have to conduct a write-in campaign. We'll be on in 48 states and it'll be about 95%, maybe 96/7% of voters. So effectively, we're going to be a full bore challenge to empire oligarchy and genocide, which is what you need to do. We've been essentially ignored. We've been blacked out. We've been cancelled from this entire race. Even the likes of Democracy Now, supposedly a progressive media outlet, they have chosen not to have us on, ever, I think, because for the very reason that you identified, we are a progressive force that actually knows how to fight this battle. And we've been able to challenge power by being on the ballot. If you're not on the ballot, you're not actually challenging power. You may be promoting good ideas and helping to circulate the ideas of certain kinds of resistance, but you're not actually challenging the empire. To do that you have to be on the ballot. And the Greens are actually the only people-powered political party that has been able to do this. Now the Libertarians have done this as well, but they are not an exclusively people powered party. They take big money. They use victory funds, for example, where a single donor can write a check for \$1 million. And any donor who's writing a check for \$1 million is going to come with a lot of influence; you know, pay to play, etc.. That just

goes on behind closed doors. Libertarians also work with superPACs, which is another conduit for actually unlimited quantities of money. So the Libertarians play that game. The Greens do not. We put our money where our mouth is. We believe in people powered campaigns, not corporate power, not billionaire power, not oligarch power, but actually people power. And so we have a grassroots network of regular, everyday working people. And on that basis, we can actually stand up for the things that working people desperately need; like Medicare for All, a health care system that would provide healthcare for everyone as a human right. We are fighting for housing as a human right with a federal program of rent control, because the rent is too damn high and 50% of Americans now are [inaudible] 30 to 50% of their income every month just to keep a roof over their heads, which doesn't leave much money then for your health care, for your pharmaceuticals, to pay your student loans, etc.. You know, these are real issues of great struggle. Not to mention the military budget, which consumes half of our congressional dollars, are spent on the endless war machine, which delivers the likes of the genocide in Gaza, the war in Ukraine, which could eminently have been avoided and which could have been brought to a peaceful conclusion within two months of the start of the war, which the US and the UK basically disrupted. So this is what our bought and sold political system is. [It is not a] democracy, if it's being bought and sold in spite of what the Democrats say. So at any rate, it's really important that those choices be on the ballot. And we're seeing the Democrats here pulling out all the stops, particularly through ballot access. And I should mention also, there was a time when we had more choices. So in the early 1900s, we had socialist candidates who were mayors and governors, actually, senators, congresspeople. We had socialists at all levels of government making a huge impact. Labour rights and child labour laws and the 40 hour workweek and so on, so there was real political muscle behind that working people's agenda. And during the red scares in the early 1900s, laws were passed for ballot access that basically made it impossible for people-powered campaigns to gain access to the ballot. So socialists were beaten back from having representation at all levels of government all across the country to now, where there's a socialist city councillor here or there, but you can count them basically on one hand. You had the Peace and Freedom Party, which emerged in opposition to the Vietnam War and the Peace and Freedom Party had as many as [inaudible] 13 lines during the period of war. It is so difficult, so expensive, so unbelievably labour intensive to maintain ballot lines under these really oppressive rules that Peace and Freedom was beaten back. I think they only have ballot status now in one state. That's California. So we've seen people powered parties just totally slammed. And the Greens have been able to fight that. Really starting with Ralph Nader's campaign in 2000. He attained ballot status, I think, in like 40, 42 states. And that was the real emergence of the Greens as an anti-corporate force, as a people-powered force. And for [inaudible] basically, we have been able to continue that fight. So when the Democrats seek to disparage Greens as being, quote, "ineffective or spinning our wheels", that's actually not true. It takes incredible energy and organisation and strategy to maintain our ballot status, not to mention that we have elected over 1500 candidates to local office. I just had a discussion, I shouldn't say, a debate with Mehdi Hasan on this afternoon about this fact. Because he's quite an apologist for the Democratic Party in spite of being trashed by MSNBC and the rest. But there are so many people who buy this party line that if you're not being elected to major offices, that your work is meaningless. Well, no, it's a reflection of

how incredibly corrupted and tilted the playing field is that it's unbelievably difficult for a people-powered party simply to maintain the fight and to live to fight another day. Because it is a moving target. People are waking up to the fact that the Democrats are not [inaudible]. The Democrats really are today's Dick Cheney's neocon party. They are pushing the envelope for cop cities, for the militarisation of our police.

GG: What you said just now is the perfect kind of segway into what I wanted to ask about as well. By the way, just as an aside, I'm as surprised that Democracy Now refuses to put you on the air that radical progressive network, as I am that Dick Cheney endorsed Kamala Harris, for just to say, not at all. I think I was the most frequent guest on Democracy Now from like 2008 to about 2017. And when I began descending on Russiagate, I just became banned from that show, except maybe once to talk about the reporting I did in Brazil. So they like so many of these previously independent institutions in the Trump era, so many of them have just made themselves completely subservient to the Democratic Party. And sadly, Amy Goodman And Democracy Now are among them. You mentioned Ralph Nader. I did want to ask you about that. Because in my lifetime, the only third party candidate that really was able to get a large percentage of the vote in the election was Ross Perot in 1992, when he, of course, was a multibillionaire, able to fund his candidacy, which is why he was able to do that. And absent that, it's almost impossible. You had George Wallace winning five states, but that was sort of its own separate thing. That was before I was born anyway. So the system is so constructed to make sure that third parties have as little effect as possible. The two parties work together to make sure of that. One of the things, of course, about Ralph Nader, who had been a long time hero of American liberals and the left because of his consumer advocacy and work on auto safety and a whole bunch of other issues, is that he basically became the devil because although they accuse Dick Cheney and George Bush, the beacons of democracy now, of stealing the 2000 election, they also blamed Ralph Nader on the grounds that, oh, had Ralph Nader not run and all these people who voted for Ralph Nader had instead voted for Al Gore, the Democrats will have won the election. The same exact excuse the Democrats made in 2016, when Hillary lost. They had a lot of villains they blamed, Russia and WikiLeaks and The New York Times, everyone except the Clinton campaign. But obviously, you are one of the main villains, because the argument was, had you not been on the ballot, all those votes that you got would have gone to them. There's kind of this foundational view of the Democratic Party that they are entitled to these voters, that you are stealing illegitimately. And the same with Ralph Nader. Those were their voters. They own those voters. And Ralph Nader, like you, are stealing them. I don't know if you can give me a percentage of any kind of precision based on any sort of data, but you've been a candidate with the Green Party around the Green Party for a long time now, what is your sense of, roughly speaking, how many of the people who will vote for you, who have voted for you in 2016, would have voted, say, for Hillary Clinton or will vote for Kamala Harris had the Democrats succeeded in getting you off the ballot?

JS: So that data actually exists. There were exit polls done in 2016 that answered that question. And the statistics that stick in my head is that 61% of people who voted Green would not have come out to vote. And then those that would have been divided about two to

one to Clinton versus Trump. So the numbers were very small. And the benefit to Clinton is, to some extent, counteracted by the benefit to Trump. And if you actually crunched the numbers in the swing states, it does not amount to a different outcome in any of the swing states. So this is really a nonsense argument that is part of the Democrats propaganda armamentarium to try to blame and shame people who actually vote on behalf of their own interests and to try to force people into drinking the Kool-Aid and voting for the same zombie candidates and zombie political parties that have created the mess that we're in right now, which they have no intention whatsoever of fixing. So this is just a nonsense argument. There is no data to support it. In fact, there's a lot of data to counteract this argument.

GG: And by the way, even if there were data showing that all your voters would have voted for Kamala or Hillary, absent you, you still have a right to run and those voters have every right to choose who they want to vote for. Speaking of previously independent minded outsiders who in the Trump era have become subservient instruments of the Democratic Party, they sent somebody out to try and attack you and demonise you in a very personal way that they thought would have an effect on younger voters, more left wing voters. And her name, of course, is the congresswoman from New York, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who actually worked for the Green Party and promoted the Green Party and used to campaign for the Green Party before she found herself able to access the levers of Washington power by becoming a hardcore partisan loyalist to the Democratic National Committee. And I just want to show some of what she said about you, because it was shockingly personal and about your character and integrity. And then I know you've responded a little bit, but I want to ask you a question about what it is that she said. Let's show a little bit of that.

AOC: Y'all, this is a little spicy, but I have thoughts. I feel like I should save this for a live. I'm not coming for people who are thinking about this. You, I'll talk to you. What I have a problem with is the fact that if you are running for president, you are the de facto leader of your party – and first of all, trust me on this, I run as a third party candidate in New York, I'm also run as a Working Families Party candidate in addition to running as a Democrat, because trust me, I've been on record about my criticisms of a two party system, so this is not about that – but you are the leader of your party, and if you run for years and years and years and years and years in a row and your party is not grown and you don't add city council seats and you don't add down ballot candidates and you don't add state electives, that's bad leadership. And that to me is what's upsetting. Because if you have been your party's nominee for 12 years in a row, four years ago and four years before that and four years before that, and you cannot grow your movement pretty much at all and can't pursue any successful strategy and all you do is show up once every four years to speak to people who are justifiably pissed off, but you're just showing up once every four years to do that, you're not serious. To me, it does not read as authentic. It reads as predatory. I'm sorry. I'm just saying it. Because as a person, I endorse Working Families Party candidates. I endorse DSA candidates. I take risks and I endorse even in primaries against Democrats when it's merited. What does this person do to grow power?!

GG: All right. I'm sorry to subject you to that. I know you've heard that before. It's difficult to listen to. I just want to note before I ask you this hilarious attempt to establish her bona fides by saying, in addition to running as the Democratic Party candidate, she also runs on the Working Families line as though only radicals would do that when pretty much so many mainstream standard Democrats do exactly the same thing. It's just kind of a formality at this point. And of course, you can ask her the same question, like, what have you done other than become Joe Crowley, the person that you decided to replace and then now basically serve the same function as he does, although much more effectively for the Democratic Party. But you alluded earlier to some of the progress that the Green Party has made. And I think that even if all you did was show up once every four years to give Americans a different, a broader range of choices, that would be something quite valuable. But what is your response to her obvious attempt to diminish and minimize your significance, your integrity, by saying that you don't ever accomplish anything? I mean, I wonder why, if you're so irrelevant, why she felt the need to disparage you that way. But what is your response to that just overall attempt by her to act as though you're some kind of fraud?

JS: Well it really is laughable. I think it's very humiliating to AOC that she just kind of exposes herself as an attack dog for the Democratic Party. Jamie Harrison, the head of the DNC, previously tried to smear us on social media. Jamie Harrison, the lobbyist for fossil fuels, for war contractors, for big Pharma, he tried to smear me as a Russian agent. Well, that was laid to rest, actually by a three year investigation by the Senate Intelligence Committee that found absolutely nothing incriminating whatsoever in my dealings with Russia, in my visit to Russia and in the campaign in general. That was extensively investigated for three years and laid to rest. And there they are trying to resurrect that dead horse. Again, you know, it's just laughable. And Jamie Harrison got himself hugely ratioed on social media by trying to smear me. And I think AOC accomplished the same thing. She really just makes a fool of herself and shows how little she actually understands about independent politics. The Working Families Party, and no harm intended here, but they're not a third party. They are a second ballot line for Democrats, largely for existing Democrats or for independents on their way to becoming Democrats. And they have all sorts of sophisticated funding mechanisms. They are not a people powered party, and above all, they are not subject to the smears of the Democratic Party, the army of lawyers throwing them off the ballot, the hires to sabotage their campaigns through spies and infiltrators. So they're just operating in a totally different universe. It shows how actually oblivious she is to the realities of people-powered politics, and knows nothing about it whatsoever. And I think she was very well [inaudible]. I did volunteer for a debate, actually. Just haven't heard anything from her about that. You know, there was nothing.

GG: Maybe Amy Goodman can host it on Democracy Now...

JS: That's a great idea.

GG: All right. Let me ask you as the last question: We've seen Donald Trump now for eight years as a political figure. He's runned for president three times. He was president for four years. For better or worse, we have a pretty decent understanding of who he is, what he

believes, what he intends to do. Kamala Harris, on the other hand, is exactly the opposite. She didn't campaign for a single vote to become the nominee in 2024. She didn't participate in debate. She didn't explain herself to the party as to why she should be the nominee. She was selected by a secret backroom of Democratic Party elites like it used to happen 50 and 60 years ago. And her strategy thus far has been to basically avoid having to say anything about what she believes. Except that there's this whole series of policies that she said she believed in when running for the Democratic nomination in 2019, such as banning fracking and plastic straws and single payer health care. That through spokespeople, she now says, are no longer views that she holds without actually explaining that. The one thing we do know, because she said it, is that she has no differences with Joe Biden at all when it comes to Israel and Gaza, that she would always prioritise using US resources to arm and fund Israel. When it comes, though, to Kamala Harris, I know it's hard to kind of wrap our arms around it precisely because of what I just said. But she has been in elected office for a while. She was the San Francisco district attorney, the California attorney general. She was in the Senate for a couple of years, the vice president for four years. If you look at say what she pretended to be in 2019 when she had to run to Joe Biden's lap because he occupied the mainstream centrist lane and it was the only way she could make space for herself, sort of in between, I'm not as radical as Bernie, but I'm more leftist than Joe Biden, that version of Kamala Harris versus the one that she's now presenting, whatever that is, what do you think is the real Kamala Harris if there is a real Kamala Harris at all?

JS: You know, as is the case for so many Democrats and Republicans, they are what their donors want, it is their donors that give them their firepower. Kamala Harris has more billionaire donors than ever on record. They've been raising money hand over fist at absolutely record numbers. If you saw the footage from the floor of the DNC up there, there was that ring of corporate suites costing anywhere from half a million up to \$5 million per suite. That's where the money is. That's what's driving this bus. And that seems to be kind of the sum total of Kamala Harris's actual policy concerns. She's a chameleon. She's been Kamala the cop. She was extremely regressive. Kept people in jail longer than they needed to be in jail when she was the attorney general...

GG: For non-violent offences...

JS: Exactly. Yes. And she prohibited the use of I think it was DNA data that could have been – and eventually she was forced to actually allow this data to be used to exonerate someone who was on death row. She was actually standing in the way of that. She stood in the way of reforming the cash bail system. She also, you know, safeguarded Steve Mnuchin, who I think had contributed generously to her campaign. She safeguarded him from investigations after the Wall Street bailouts and his hand in the very abusive mortgage policies in California in his bank. She protected him and did not investigate him when there were very compelling reasons to do so. So that's Kamala Harris, who just kind of blows with the wind and goes with what big funders want. And this is not incidental. This is basically what our political system is about. It's about the best democracy money can buy, which is no democracy at all, that has delivered endless war, that has delivered a budget which is consumed by the endless

war machine, which has delivered a genocide which stands in the way of health care as a human right, keeps us mired in the Affordable Care Act, which is not solving our critical health care crisis, which, you know, if you develop cancer, the odds are over 40% that you will have spent down your life savings within two years. And cancers are now skyrocketing among young people as well as just about every other form of chronic disease. So we are in deep trouble in this system, which has basically been hijacked by corporations, billionaires, oligarchs. We do not have a future under this system. The American people have had it. They are tired of being thrown under the bus. They are demanding other options. And the Democrats are trying and the Republicans are really trying to lock down this conversation and prevent the American people from understanding that they do have a voice here. They have a voice. They not only have a voice, they actually have majority power on every one of these issues; getting money out of politics to election reform. There are huge constituencies that can move all of these policies forward. Virtually all of them, you know, enough to in a way that would just totally transform our lives, solve the climate crisis with the Green New Deal, cut the military budget, put those dollars into health care and housing and education here at home. We can do this. We can actually create an America in a world that works for all of us. We have enormous public sentiment to do that. And Democrats are working overtime to try to intimidate people out of casting a vote on their own behalf, really trying to extort the vote to stay the course and talk people into voting for genocide. And we just want to remind people that every vote for Kamala Harris or Donald Trump is an affirmation of genocide. It is an endorsement of genocide. It is holding your nose and supporting genocide. And if ever there was a red line and a wake up call, this ought to be it. We're normalising genocide and the torture and murder of children on an industrial scale and the destruction of international law, which, by the way, we're going to need because we are no longer top dog in this global situation. We're going to need the benefits and the protections of international law and human rights. So there's every reason here to stand up and do the right thing and to reject the propaganda that the Democrats are really trying to force feed us here. We can stand up and demand that there are real choices enacting a much better agenda. And however far we get, we build from there. This is all about building. We don't have to win the election to win the day. However, I wouldn't rule anything out in this completely unpredictable, upside down election. We're going to have three pro-genocide candidates on the ballot in just about all states. That is Trump, Harris and RFK. Maybe they'll be splitting the pro-genocide, pro-war vote and allow the anti-genocide, anti-war, pro-worker climate emergency votes to come together and just really throw them all a curveball that they did not anticipate here.

GG: Well, I would say to people who don't identify necessarily as socialist or leftist, may not agree with you on a lot of issues or some issues, that anybody who's working toward creating a system where we have more choices. Because at the end of the day, what the establishment wants more than anything is an election that is the illusion of a choice but actually isn't. They love things like Mitt Romney versus Barack Obama or Jeb Bush versus Hillary Clinton, which of course, they were hoping for in 2016. Someone like, say, Tim Scott or more Mike Pence against Joe Biden or Kamala Harris, they love to contract the choice as much as possible. And so anybody who's working on behalf of the people to expand that, to make the choices wider, to make the options broader, is somebody who should be applauded. And there

are a few people doing that more effectively than you are. If there's anyone. And I really respect the work that you're doing in that regard. I know you get a lot of attacks for that and the fact that you continue to do it despite those attacks makes it even more admirable. I'm always appreciative of the time you take to come on our show and talk to us and I hope you have a great evening.

JS: Really appreciate it. And just want to mention, jillstein2024.com for people who want another choice and a different way forward. So come and check us out. Thanks so much.

GG: Have a good evening. Thanks.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. Eastern exclusively on Rumble. You can catch the full nightly shows live or view the backlog of episodes for free on our Rumble page. You can also find full episodes the morning after they air across all major podcasting platforms, including Spotify and Apple. All the information you need is linked below. We hope to see you there.

END

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

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

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