



## **Do Noam Chomsky's Foreign Policy Views Still Apply? With Nathan J. Robinson**

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

**Glenn Greenwald (GG):** Nathan Robinson is the founder and publisher of the political affairs journal Current Affairs. He is also the author of several different books, one of which is a newly published book that he has published along with Noam Chomsky, that is largely a critique of US foreign policy by Noam Chomsky throughout the years. It's entitled *The Myth of American Idealism: How US Foreign Policy Endangers the World*. Nathan has written for a lot of other places, including having been a columnist for *The Guardian*. He's written in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, *Al-Jazeera*, *Salon* and elsewhere. I've known Nathan for a long time. I've always admired what he's done with Current Affairs. And I am happy to speak with him tonight about this new book and related matters. Nathan, it is great to see you. How are you?

**Nathan Robinson (NR):** Hey, Glenn, nice to see you. How are you doing?

**GG:** I'm doing well. So let's talk about not necessarily the content of the book yet, but the kind of process by which you've written it. Because when you look at the cover – and we shouldn't judge a book by its cover, but nonetheless, there is a cover and the cover has both you and Noam Chomsky listed as the authors of the book, essentially. Noam Chomsky first and you second. You wrote the preface to the book, but I'm just wondering what Chomsky's involvement was in the compilation of the book itself. We all know that he has been of ill health for a while. A lot of these are sort of excerpts of things he said and written, but it seems like very much you did a lot of work to make it fresh and new and applicable to current debates. And can you talk about the process of how the book was put together?

**NR:** Sure. You mentioned the publication that I run, Current Affairs. Noam Chomsky became an early subscriber to that, and I interviewed him a couple of times for Current Affairs. And as many people have, I struck up a correspondence with him and he hadn't published a book of original writing in a long time. And it struck me that a lot of his around 2021, 2022, that a lot of his commentary on escalating tensions with China, on the war in Ukraine were still very – I mean, he was 93, 94 at the time – but were still very vital and necessary, and so there was my belief that there should be a new Noam Chomsky book that elaborated these critiques for our time. So I approached him in 2021, 22 and said, you know, would you be willing to

work with me on producing something new? And I said, What I want to do is I want to talk it through with you, what you think your most valuable points are, and I'll help kind of compile them. We can rework them, we can update them, we can add new sources, and we can put out something that really powerfully articulates this message and this warning, because increasingly, over the years, Professor Chomsky's message has been a warning that the world is in great peril from US power. And he agreed to the project. And so for a year we went back and forth. And first I sort of compiled everything he'd said on a topic. And then I went through it with him and said, What do you think is important? What needs expressing? And we finessed these chapters. As you mentioned, he, unfortunately, in the middle of last year had a stroke which has left him unable to complete the book. We were very close to finish, so we had this manuscript. So I had to kind of finish from the notes that we had. And your readers will notice that in the Israel-Palestine chapter – his stroke occurred before October 7th, so he was unable to produce new commentary – so for that chapter I've written in my own voice, not in his voice, a postscript going through what's happened in Gaza in the years since. But up until that, some of it's drawn from things he's written previously, he said previously, interviews over the past few years but edited into a kind of coherent new book. So that's what we did. And I was very fortunate to be able to do that in the year leading up to his unfortunate decline in health.

**GG:** Yeah, I don't think it would take a great deal of work or imagination to figure out what he would be saying about the Israeli destruction of Gaza, the Israeli incursion into Lebanon, especially for someone such as yourself who has been reading and studying and has been so influenced by Chomsky's thoughts over the years. And that's actually what I wanted to ask you; in your preface, you describe the process by which you first became aware of Chomsky's writings, especially on foreign policy, and talk about how it was sort of this transformative, life changing event for you. Something certainly I would say the same for myself. I think actually everybody who has anything meaningful to say as a critique of US foreign policy, whether they know it or not, is influenced directly or indirectly by Chomsky in some way. But what was it about the things that you first got exposed to as a result of reading his writings on foreign policy that were so eye opening or so kind of altering for you of your perspective? What was the stuff that he was saying that you weren't really getting exposed to previously?

**NR:** Well, you know, I was in high school at the time of the Iraq war. I graduated high school in 2007. And you were actively...

**GG:** I graduated high school in 2006, So, we are basically the same age.

**NR:** Well, so you remember the poisonous discursive environment of the time in which kind of we were saturated with jingoistic messages, post-9/11, very similar to – I just heard Rudy Giuliani talking there. And you mentioned that Rudy Giuliani is still singing the same song that he sang after 9/11, but then he was pretty uncritically celebrated by everyone in the country.

**GG:** He was America's mayor, America's mayor.

**NR:** He was America's mayor. He was considered the front runner for the Republican nomination in 2008 at one point, I believe. And that kind of rhetoric about the terrorists wanting to kill us all, they're raised from birth to try and destroy America, all they want to do is kill Americans, I mean, that was everywhere. And one of the things that Chomsky does so skilfully is to unravel propaganda and to show you that what you're seeing is propaganda and to excavate all of the real facts. I mean, he has had an immense command of source material. So this book has 80 pages of endnotes, which is very typical for a Chomsky book. And he goes through mainstream media sources, sources in the foreign press, and shows that everything you're told often times, and not just about the Iraq war, which I think a lot of Americans came to understand was deeply immoral and understood that they'd been lied into, but even the Afghanistan war, Chomsky was showing that we were being lied to about, right? And there was information, like the fact that the Taliban had shown a willingness to turn over Osama bin Laden. This was something that Americans were never told. They were never told of possible alternate paths that could have averted the catastrophic war. They were never told that Afghan opponents of the Taliban hated what the United States was doing in Afghanistan. And so there was all sorts of information that was concealed that basically you could only read in the works of Noam Chomsky and a few other people on the left. But, I mean, he was finding this stuff. And when you read it, it really transforms your understanding. I mean, I went through a lot of his Vietnam War writings for this book and he flips your understanding of the Vietnam War on its head. You still hear people like Democratic Senator John Fetterman saying that the Vietnam War was a war for democracy. And Chomsky just explodes all of this with with all of this documentation.

**GG:** I found it so interesting, this incident earlier this year when a bunch of young people who either weren't born or were way too young to remember the time after 9/11 and they all remember from having absorbed in the culture that 9/11 happened because these terrorists hated us because of our freedoms. And they discovered the bin Laden letter – went super viral on TikTok – and they were all saying, Oh my God, there's like this other way to look at why 9/11 happened. It wasn't necessarily because they hated us for our freedom, it's because all the things we've been doing in their region. And this was so dangerous that they actually had to ban the discussion of it on TikTok, remove the bin Laden letter from The Guardian's website, so no one could longer read it...

**NR:** Yes, my former employer.

**GG:** And it really shows how despite – yes, your former employer who became your former employer because of your own views on Israel that they thought were outside of the scope. And you kind of realise how even though Chomsky began talking about how constrained and constricted our political discourse was back in the 70s and 80s when all you had was three networks, a few national newspapers, pretty much all of the same ideology, there was the sense first that cable news and now the Internet would wildly expand the scope of it because of how easily we could expose ourselves to other alternatives and other ways of looking at things like Chomsky did for you and so many people. And I'm wondering what you make of how much that's become true? Whether there is this sort of attempt to ensure that the

proliferation of platforms and views on the Internet does not actually have that effect of being able to expand the scope of ideas to which people can be exposed?

**NR:** Yeah, I mean, that's a hard question because I think there are multiple tendencies here. On the one hand, it is true, and you and I kind of proof that it's true through our work, right? The fact that we both now have platforms where we can express these critiques to an independent audience. And when you look back at what Chomsky was doing in the 70s and 80s, basically he was completely shut out of the mainstream media. The New York Times just wouldn't review his books. And if The New York Times didn't review your book, nobody would pay attention to you and you would be consigned to little, tiny, tiny, tiny circulation lefty journals that would reach a few thousand people. And it was really, really hard to get these critiques in front of eyeballs. And now it's better, but it's not that much better. And your example of the bin Laden letter is a great example. Because on the one hand, because TikTok exists, people could find this and they could say, wow, this perspective, right – and we don't agree with bin Laden necessarily – but the fact is that letter begins: Why did we attack you? We attacked you because you attacked us. And he cites the US support for Israel. He cites a massacre in Lebanon that Israel committed in the 1990s. He cites US support for Arab dictatorships.

**GG:** The regime in Iraq that killed hundreds of thousands of people.

**NR:** That's right. And so on the one hand, people are able to find, that people are able to spread that, but on the other, as you point out, there are mechanisms that quickly come into place. And you saw US officials quickly saying quite openly that one of the reasons they had to get TikTok out of Chinese hands was so that we would have more control over the content. And it was pretty clear that there was a direct link between kids discovering the truth about Gaza or discovering that there is another side to US wars. That there are people with different opinions around the world and different motivations and you're going to hear from them and actually they have arguments. And it was pretty clear that that was so frightening that we had to – now, we haven't succeeded so far in taking TikTok out of Chinese ownership. And it's true that you and I do have the platforms that we have. But I think you're right that there are powerful – the institutions that Chomsky identified as the manufacturers of consent, they're still there and they're still very powerful. And what gets printed in The New York Times still in many ways determines what anyone with any influence is going to think of as the basic facts of the world.

**GG:** Yeah, I mean, for me, the Internet, you know, because it sort of emerged in the early part or middle part of my life became this kind of instrument that I thought could be in a very unprecedented way, expand the scope of ideas to which people would be exposed and therefore automatically expand the range of ideas that were not just permitted, but that you could actually reach people on a large scale basis. And it's one of the reasons why I regard this attempt by states or corporations to kind of commandeer control of the Internet and reduce the range of ideas that can be heard or at least can be reached by a meaningful audience to be so menacing. Let me ask you, earlier today, I had, by coincidence, a root

canal. So I knew that any interview that I did with you was going to be very pleasurable, at least in comparison to what I was suffering five hours ago.

**NR:** I'm glad.

**GG:** And whenever I go to the dentist, what I try and do to distract myself is I just listen to long lectures that are like an hour, an hour and a half. A lot of times Chomsky ones, but other ones as well. And I listened to, and I think in anticipation of you coming on, an interview, that was actually the full interview that was used for *Manufacturing Consent*, the book that he wrote, and then the great film that was made based on the book from 1989. It was the kind of raw interview that he did. And there were a couple of sections that I found very interesting that I wanted to play for you to get your reaction to. And it was basically...

**NR:** Oh, yeah, let's do it.

**GG:** ...talking about – just to set up the context – how it is that the media and again, this is actually 1990 or 1989, talking a lot about the invasion of Panama, the invasion of Grenada. And he was specifically talking about why it is that he spends most of his time attacking not conservative voices in the media, but left liberal voices in the media. And here's what he has to say. It's about 2.5 minutes, but I really think it's worth listening to so we can talk about it. All right. Let's play these.

**Noam Chomsky:** And what that means is that the role of liberalism is to set bounds on discussion. There's supposed to be a spectrum of discussion and that's very crucial if you want to establish illusions. You've got to make it look as if there's a debate going on. But you have to ensure that that debate is within very specific bounds and the bounds of the debate, the assumptions of the debate, that's the propaganda system. Now, unless you accept those assumptions, you are not part of the discussion, the assumptions are the United States has the right to do anything. It feels like we are, stand for right and good is defined as what we do, except we're allowed to make mistakes sometimes because nobody's perfect. We are free and democratic. Whatever we have is basically perfect, aside from some mistakes which we can fix up. That's the bounds of the debate. If you accept that you're part of the debate and then you can be either a conservative who says, you know, let's be more brutal and harsh, or a liberal who says, well, you know, maybe it will cost us too much unless we're a little softer. But you have to accept...

**GG:** All right. So that's the first sequence. I just want to play the other two quickly, that were very much part of his answer. We just sort of edit it for...

**Noam Chomsky:** The fact of the matter is that by and large, the media do represent sort of liberalism, like I suppose most journalists vote Democratic, so that I agree with. But I think that that completely misunderstands the function of liberalism in a system of necessary illusions. In fact, if you look at my work, I mostly criticised the liberals, even the left liberals. I don't waste much time discussing George Will. It is a joke. But what's interesting to me is people like Anthony Lewis and Tom Wicker and the whole liberal establishment, what's

called the liberal establishment at times, The Post, and so on. And I agree that they do generally represent liberalism. Their liberalism is, well, let's take the Vietnam War again. There were hawks who said, if we try harder, we'll win. And then there were doves, the liberals who said, well, it's costing us too much and probably it's not going to work, so let's not win. Now, personally, I'd much prefer the hawks, at least they're honest. The doves are just totally dishonest. They basically agree with the hawks. They just say we're not going to get away with it. In fact, someone said it explicitly like, say, Arthur Schlesinger, a leading liberal historian and spokesman. His view was, well, you know, I hope the hawks are right, but I don't think they are. And if they are right and we can win, even though we'll leave ruin and destruction, he says, we'll all be praising the wisdom of the American government. It's just it doesn't look like it's going to work.

**GG:** All right, Nathan, so there's a lot in there that with which I empathise a great deal. I'm wondering, I have a lot of specific questions, but I'm just wondering in general what your reaction is to his view about why it's more important to critique and to dismantle the kind of propagandistic framework of left liberalism and the left liberal wing of the media than it is the right wing or conservative faction?

**NR:** So he, in pretty much every US war, from the Vietnam War to the present day, he articulated some version of this. And it's really powerful and important because once you see it, it's very illuminating, right? He says look for the spectrum of debate. And in the Vietnam War, as he said there, it was between those who said we can't win versus those who said we can. And he goes on to say that what about the position that we shouldn't win? Because the war is fundamentally immoral, that we have no right to impose upon Vietnam a government of our own choosing, that we believe that the will of the people of Vietnam should determine the government of Vietnam. And the same is true, he pointed out, in the Iraq debate, in the Afghanistan debate. And I think today, and this goes to why it's so important to analyse liberal premises, as you look at the war in Gaza, you have people on the right, like Rudy Giuliani, who, as he said, are quite honest. They say, well, you know, we have to support Israel no matter what, even if they want to wipe the Palestinians off the face of the earth, the Palestinians are terrorists, and that's basically justice. But I think you would find – I mean, we don't know, I don't want to say what Chomsky would say if he could be analysing the present war. But consistent with his prior analysis is, if you look at the Biden administration, and Biden and Harris, the way they talk, he was talking there about how the liberals are more dishonest. And the Biden-Harris administration has been insisting that it is pushing for a cease fire, that it laments the war. But this is, of course, completely dishonest. We know this from the State Department officials who have quit. We know that the Biden-Harris administration could at any point have stopped the war and has chosen not to. So there is that deeper dishonesty. And that's what requires exposing, right? That's what requires some work. Because Rudy Giuliani is not lying. There's nothing to expose there. And once you see the falsity of the liberal narrative, then you see what the shared premise is and you see the spectrum. And the spectrum runs from being dishonest about supporting Israel's genocide in Gaza versus being honest about supporting Israel's genocide in Gaza. But it's really, really

important to expose the dishonesty because then you see that there is a shared premise across the political class of support for a monstrous atrocity.

**GG:** Yeah, what he says in this other clip, which I'm not going to play, I'll just summarise what he said because I find it so enlightening, is that actually by calling the media the left, or calling them the liberal media or whatever, or calling Joe Biden or Kamala Harris the left, which no leftist does, but a lot of even mainstream media discourse refers to the Democratic Party as the left, what it basically means is, the crazy leftists like Kamala Harris and Joe Biden occasionally pretend to push back a little bit on the worst of the humanitarian crimes committed in Gaza. I heard Matthew Miller today saying we're very much against this bill to ban funding for the UN agency, that is the only one that can distribute food, we want more food to enter northern Gaza. So if that's the most left liberal position, then someone like yourself or like me who just say the entire Israeli war is fundamentally unjust, we shouldn't be paying for it, we should be doing everything to stop it, seems almost out of the frame, like not even something that people can begin to comprehend. Is that something in your own work that you think that you do or try to do? In other words, like one of the things that drives me crazy is this Republican attack, this Trump Republican attack that somehow Joe Biden and Kamala Harris have abandoned Israel, when in reality, Joe Biden is easily one of the most pro-Israel politicians in Washington and has been for decades, and they are funding and arming the entire war. So part of what I want to do, as you said, everyone knows that, you know, Trump is out there funded by Miriam Adelson, saying we're going to make Israel great again and we're going to do everything for Israel and let them go, and everyone understands that. But what they don't understand is that Biden and Harris and their supporters are maybe not rhetorically identical, but in fact all but identical. So is that something that you prioritise as well, this idea of kind of trying to shed light on what left liberalism, mainstream left liberalism and the United States is really about?

**NR:** Yeah, because it's a problem when there is a consensus between both the Republicans and the Democrats on something that's false. Right? So the Trump and the right think that Democrats are pro-Palestinian, pro-negotiations. The Biden administration will say, well, yes, we believe in Palestinian human rights and we're pro-negotiations and we have a debate on the basis of that premise. But in fact, the Biden State Department has admitted that, they said, well, actually, we're not in favour. We've never been in favour. There's that quote: "We've never been in favour of negotiations with Hamas. We believe in the ultimate destruction of Hamas". So the actual fact is that both parties have a mutual interest in misrepresenting where the parties stand. And so it's the job of us independent media to say, no, actually, Biden doesn't support negotiations either. He doesn't support a negotiated settlement. They support this kabuki diplomacy, this fake diplomacy where they pretend to be pushing for a cease fire while actually making sure that a cease fire will never happen, that a two state settlement will never happen. And so these facts that are mutually convenient to ignore; that Trump isn't going to mention that the Biden-Harris administration has opposed state settlement at the UN and refuses to recognise a Palestinian state, and the Biden administration isn't going to highlight that fact either. It's just like how neither Trump nor Biden wants to draw attention to how friendly to the fossil fuel industry Biden has been. There's a mutual interest in

pretending these things are otherwise. So we outside of this have to say, no actually, they're both pretending that the world is other than it actually is.

**GG:** So let me ask you about Ukraine. One of the things I'm very happy about is that Chomsky was able to weigh in on the beginning parts of the war in Ukraine, actually for the first year or so. Because I think it was kind of a reminder of how disparate, sort of classic American left critique of foreign policy is, as represented by Chomsky. And a lot of the modern day, even you could call it the left wing of the Democratic Party, for instance, Chomsky was very adamant about the fact that the Russian invasion was unjust, but that much of it was provoked by the United States and by NATO and that a lot of our own behaviour contributed to that in a lot of ways. And yet that view was completely unrepresented throughout the entire Democratic Party from AOC and Bernie Sanders and Ilhan Omar to Joe Manchin and whoever. And you have a section of the book on Ukraine. And I'm just wondering, do you feel like even left wing politics, the mainstream left wing politics, say, the part of it that's within the Democratic Party on the left flank has moved further away from the standard Chomsky critique of foreign policy, of the US security state, of the CIA, of how propaganda works of the US role in the world, or do you think that it's always been that kind of gap? To me Ukraine represents so much how this gap, how wide this gap now is.

**NR:** It's hard to say whether it represents a change because as you pointed out, and as Chomsky has pointed out, the leftmost wing of the mainstream Democratic Party has always been critical of US wars only in a very limited way. And that's been true for a very long time. So many of the critiques that he would make of Democrats on Ukraine, he was making in the 60s of the supposed doves on Vietnam. So I don't actually know whether I would say it's a change, but it's certainly a real tendency. And that is, you know, you could see in the fact that I think when the Congressional Progressive Caucus put out that letter that just suggested that there should be the beginnings of diplomacy with Russia, they were quickly denounced by everyone in the hierarchy of the party, and they had to withdraw, Oh, no, no, we don't actually believe in diplomacy, we believe in endless weapons. And that just became the very idea of diplomacy. That's one of the things that's emphasised in this chapter. And in fact, the Ukraine analysis is one of the reasons why I really, really wanted to make sure there was a new Chomsky book out, because, as you said, he had been talking a lot about that war because it's exactly the sort of issue where his analysis is so crucial. As you mentioned, he doesn't forgive Vladimir Putin at all. He says it was just as illegal as the war in Iraq. And anyone who knows Chomsky's opinion on the war in Iraq knows that that is no defence of it. So he there has a very valuable voice going against, as you say, even those who are considered as far left as you can get within the Democratic Party. And still these basic facts, you know, the fact that credible Russia analysts in the United States diplomatic establishment have been warning for decades that the expansion of NATO was a provocative action that was going to cause a Russian backlash and lead to conflict. These basic facts, or the fact that we avoided every possible opportunity for diplomacy because a war actually was kind of in the United States self-interest, these basic facts that Chomsky pointed out over and over and over were just unable to be stated within the mainstream.



**GG:** Let me just push a little bit more on this, because it's something that really interests me. So during the Vietnam War, which obviously was begun under and then prosecuted by two consecutive Democratic Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, but then also by Richard Nixon, there was a lot of mainstream left liberalism that agreed with Chomsky, maybe didn't go as far as he did in terms of how he framed it as it being an attack on or invasion of South Korea, but nonetheless, there was obviously a massive anti-war movement that was not just based on what liberal columnists at The New York Times and The Washington Post were saying, which is that we should stop because we can't win, what was based on the immorality of the war itself, or how many people we were killing or how many people were dying. And then you look at the 1980s, and one of the things that surprised me when I went back and looked at some of these Senate debate was that the main foreign policy debate under the Reagan administration was all these dirty wars in Central America, in Nicaragua and Guatemala and El Salvador, and if you listen to Democratic senators at the time, they were trying to do everything they could to stop Reagan's funding of a lot of these terrorist groups or coup governments that they had installed, and they would even do it by, say, implementing legislation that banned the funding of terrorist groups. So they were calling US allies in the region terror groups. And it was a pretty radical critique of Reagan's foreign policy, I think throughout the 70s and 80s, because of things like the Church Commission and a lot of the understanding of what the CIA was doing, very much embedded in at least left wing politics, mainstream left wing politics with their critique of the US security state. I know when I did the Snowden reporting, there was a lot of left wing support for the critique of the NSA and concerns of what they were doing. To me, it seems like a lot of that has dissipated, if not gone away completely. I think you rarely hear that sort of critique anymore in left politics, at least as it's defined by the mainstream left in the Democratic Party. And I think it's true for a lot of reasons, including some reactionary stuff involving Trump, but I'm wondering if you see it the same way, if you see that it has always been the same or some kind of change in that way?

**NR:** Well, it's true that, you know, one of the things that is so admirable about Chomsky, in my opinion, is that he's always been a principled, civil libertarian. He's always been someone who has championed free speech. He's even been someone who has gotten into an awful lot of trouble over it, as when he's been defending the Holocaust deniers right to free speech. And I do think that the basic civil libertarian argument, the freedom for the speech that we despise and the warning that even if government power you can use towards your ends now, there's still a major danger in expanding the use of government power, and you still need to take into account the fact that empowering a censor is a great risk, even if the censor is on your side in the short term. These are arguments that I do think Chomsky is probably more alone in making in the latter ten years of his life. I do think that civil libertarian leftism is incredibly important. Chomsky always identified with the anarchist or libertarian socialist tradition. And you do hear a lot of casual demands that the government police hate speech and without recognition of the concern of the risk of that. So I think there is a civil libertarian tradition on the left that he represents that I don't know how strong it ever was, but you're right to identify that in the 1980s, the push back on the Reagan administration in Congress was a lot stronger than you're seeing like with the Gaza situation, right? Democrats just lining

up to condemn anything perceived as anti-Semitism to almost complete consensus for increased weapons aid to Israel, almost no dissent on Ukraine. So that is a change. And it is something that I think that obviously Chomsky would be incredibly critical of. And I do suggest that people go back and listen to the parts of his critique that are discomfoting because they're the parts where he defends the rights of those you don't like.

**GG:** Yeah, I mean, he certainly thought for as long as he could speak for himself that Trump was extremely dangerous. But I remember him telling me, I don't know if this is consistent with what you've been talking about as well, that a lot of times the Democrats seem to be most angriest or find most objectionable the parts of Trump that actually you could look at as almost being a positive; such as a desire to foster better relations with Russia and not to be as antagonistic. What he thought Trump was so dangerous on was things like climate change. And I think that principally was the argument.

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:**

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

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