



Vijay Prashad – US-UK cruise missiles fired at Russia, ICC warrant for Netanyahu & Trump's victory

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

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you for tuning in today and welcome back to another episode of The Source. I'm your host, Zain Raza. If you're watching our channel regularly, you know from our content that YouTube is owned by Google. And Google has a long history of shadow banning and censoring content. If that day ever comes that our YouTube channel gets shadow banned or censored, we won't be able to reach you even with an announcement. So we are asking all our viewers as a precaution, to join our alternative channels on Rumble, Telegram and our podcast called Podbean. You will find the links to all of these platforms in the description of this video. It takes you only a few minutes and costs you nothing, so please subscribe today. Today I'll be talking to Vijay Prashad, who is an author and historian. Vijay has written more than 30 books, one of them being: *The Withdrawal: Iraq, Libya, Afghanistan and the Fragility of US Power*. Vijay, welcome back to the show.

Vijay Prashad (VP): Thanks a lot.

ZR: I would like to start the interview with the US election and the landslide victory of Donald Trump over Democrats and Kamala Harris. After revelations about Joe Biden's health issues earlier this year, there was a lot of optimism when Kamala Harris emerged as the presidential candidate. Not only was she younger than Donald Trump, but pre-election polls showed her running neck to neck with him and in some cases even slightly ahead, with the US corporate media presenting her as a beacon of hope for women and minorities in the US. Nevertheless, with 312 electoral votes and 77 million votes against Harris' 226 electoral votes and 74 million votes, Donald Trump's victory is seen by some as a landslide victory, if not a historic one, as Trump was elected out of office in 2020, only to return as president elect despite a plethora of legal troubles ranging from falsifying business records to election meddling. Trump won the presidential election by beating Kamala in all seven swing states of Arizona, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Georgia, North Carolina, Wisconsin and Nevada. According to AP News, Trump was able to make significant gains among Black and Hispanic voters as well as women compared to the 2020 election. For example, about half of Latinos voted for Trump and about three in ten African Americans under the age of 45 voted for Trump as well, roughly doubling the number of 2020. In your opinion, does this election result say more about Trump's victory, or does it say more about the failure of the Democrats

to find a viable candidate against Trump? Or do you think it's a combination of both? What is your assessment?

VP: Yeah. You know, it's an interesting moment because the election was much anticipated. Polls showed it very close, they were very tight in most states. There were extraordinary revelations coming out about Mr. Trump and so on. It was a big circus in a way. But in fact, the actual election might be more mundane than you imagine. You know, right after the election, people in our institute at Tricontinental put three different data points onto one chart. What they looked at was the inflation line. So imagine the inflation line is somewhere in the middle of this screen. Real wages were beneath inflation almost through the Biden presidency and the S&P 500, which was the stock indicator, was above the inflation line right through. So when Kamala Harris was going to the people and saying, look, the economy's doing great, she's right. It was doing great. But for the people who were mainly making income and so on in the S&P range. People who were relying on their wages were not doing great. And I think that's a real indicator of where the election went; people were voting effectively because their life situation was pretty miserable. Now, it's also wrong to say that people voted in a reactionary way, that they voted for Trump because they don't understand or things like that. That's not true. In ten states, there was a ballot initiative on the right of women to control their own bodies, you know, abortion and so on. In ten of those states, Donald Trump won the election. So in ten states there was a ballot, a question about abortion. Trump won all ten of those states. But in eight of those states, the ballot question for the right of women to their health, won. That means people who voted both for abortion rights and for Donald Trump. In other words, there's, of course, people of the hard right, people with racist attitudes and so on might have voted for Trump, but so did a lot of working class people who felt that their wages were not adequate. And indeed, as I said, it shows that the wages are not adequate. This is a problem across the Western world. Whether in Western Europe or the United States, food price inflation, fuel inflation, these things are quite damaging to the wider population. In Germany, for instance, the government of Mr. Olaf Scholz ran into trouble. I don't think because of X or Y issue, you know, that is marginal. He is running into trouble because inflation cannot be controlled and people's wages are not doing great. And as a consequence of fuel inflation, factories are closing down. Volkswagen shut down again. This is the reason why people are turning away from people like Scholz, Macron and indeed, Joe Biden and his person who ran for election, Kamala Harris, who didn't break from Biden. In other words, she didn't break from Biden-nomics. She held on fast to it and said the economy is doing great. This was not something that people took lightly because their own experience was contrary to that. Mr. Trump, on the other hand, was going around saying people are doing worse than they were when he was the president. Now, whether this is strictly accurate is not the point. The point is that when he says people are doing worse than they were when I was the president, in a sense, he's saying you're not doing great right now. And that won him the appeal of people. They said, well, maybe we'll bring Trump back and he'll tighten tariffs, and so on. He kept saying, tariffs are a beautiful word. Maybe that's the solution. So I understand this election as really an economic election, not a cultural issues' election.

ZR: Donald Trump has repeatedly spoken out against US interventions and wars in the past and presents himself as an antiwar and anti-interventionist figure. Regarding the war in Ukraine, for example, he stated that he could end the war between Russia and Ukraine in a day if he's reelected as a president. Although he has not brought back traditional neoconservatives figures such as Mike Pompeo, Nikki Haley and John Bolton, he has nevertheless nominated a number of candidates who send a mixed message. Let me just name a few: Marco Rubio has been nominated as Secretary of State and is known for warmongering and interventionist stance, whether in relation to Latin America, Ukraine, Iran and is known to support Israel's occupation and apartheid. Elise Stefanik has been nominated as UN ambassador and is known for a pro-Ukraine and pro-Israel stance. Mike Waltz as national security adviser who is also pro-Israel and initially called for more US support with regard to Ukraine, but recently stated that a reassessment was needed. Pete Hegseth as Secretary of Defense, who is skeptical of supporting Ukraine but is fully committed to providing Israel with unfettered support. Then we have Tulsi Gabbard, director of national intelligence, who supported Israel's assault on Gaza, but on the other hand, is quite critical of US intervention in Ukraine, Syria and Iran. All these candidates still have to be confirmed by the Senate. On the one hand, there's this talk of Trump's betrayal towards his anti-war base, but on the other hand, although there were many warmongering and neoconservative figures in this first administration as compared to these nominations, Trump still avoided a war in his first term. Therefore, it is assumed that he himself will largely determine US foreign policy and that these figures would simply fall in line. What do you think of these nominations and as well as the contradictory views on Trump's foreign policy and anti-war stance?

VP: I mean, firstly, let's stay with Ukraine for a minute. There's a debate in Washington, D.C. around how to maintain US supremacy around the world. This debate has been there for several decades. One of the people who entered the debate was Henry Kissinger many years ago when he wrote a very large book called *China*. In that book, Mr. Kissinger argued that one of the dangerous features of the post-Soviet world would be if China and Russia got together, became closer, because they would then be able to marginalize the United States and Europe and so on. So Mr. Kissinger argued that the US government needs to make an alliance with the Chinese and marginalize Russia. That's the way to maintain US supremacy. In a sense, Donald Trump is the reversed Kissinger. He would like to befriend Russia to marginalize and isolate China. That's his approach. To that end, Mr. Trump is eager to sort of slow down or end the war in Ukraine. And also because of, in this period, the close relations between Russia and Venezuela, to some extent Russia and Cuba, if you want to make nice with Russia, it's going to be hard to overthrow the government in Venezuela and Cuba. So Mr. Trump is going to be caught in a series of contradictions. If he wants to drive this Russia strategy, number one, contradiction. Let's take the case of Ukraine, just, you know, a very short time after the election, Joe Biden and Keir Starmer both allowed the Ukrainians to fire intermediate range missiles into Russia, which then the Ukrainians did. The Russians responded. Now, it's interesting; the worry was that Russia would respond by striking a NATO country, since these were NATO's missiles hitting Russian territory. But instead, Russia fired an intermediate range missile with six different warheads into Ukraine as a demonstration of what kind of military force it has, which it has not been using. This was

quite a shocking display of power by the Russians. But if this then stops the escalation and provocations, this might give space to Mr. Trump in January to try to open negotiations between Russia and Ukraine. If this allowance by Biden as a lame duck president to strike inside Russian territory escalates, then it's going to be hard for Trump to pause this war because the escalation will not be easy to dial back. On the other side, Mr. Trump would not be able to overthrow the government in Venezuela given the relationship between Russia and Venezuela. This puts Marco Rubio in a complicated position because, well, what is he to do now as Secretary of State? I think this is a kind of wicked trick that Trump is playing on sections of the Congress. He is putting Rubio in a position where he won't be able to exercise the kind of politics that he normally drives, you know, to overthrow the government in Cuba, Venezuela. If you do that, the Russians will be outraged. So I don't think that's going to happen. I think also time has passed and Russia and China have come too close together. Neither the Kissinger strategy nor Trump's reverse Kissinger strategy will necessarily come to pass. I just don't think they're going to be able to split Russia and China. On the other hand, they are going to try that strategy. Let's see what happens. But yeah, I agree with you. There's contradictions, but not so great.

ZR: I would like to now discuss the impact that the Trump presidency can have on Europe. European leaders are bracing for a Trump presidency who has been quite clear about his American First agenda, and that, as you have mentioned, can include tariffs on European industries, particularly the automotive and agriculture sectors. The German automotive industry is particularly at risk at the moment as it is already facing a severe downturn due to already rising energy prices, falling demand and competition from China. Volkswagen, for example, as you mentioned, announced for the first time in its history that it may have to close three of its plants. In the military aspect, Trump is expected to demand an increase in NATO contributions from European countries that are part of the alliance, which could further squeeze the economies and indirectly affect their ability to spend money on the social infrastructure. The German economy is expected to shrink as the year ends and is facing rising energy prices, low investment, too much bureaucracy, and many other issues. On the other hand, Germany has pledged €100 billion to a special monetary fund, which would meet the 2% threshold of NATO. And according to a Reuters article, half of that fund is likely to go to US defense companies, for example, to buy F-35 fighter jets, heavy transport helicopters and other modern equipment. When it comes to cutting costs or finding ways to revive the economy, this budget does not even appear in political discourse or media debates. In your view, was Germany and Europe's decision to go along with the US in terms of geopolitical positioning now finally backfiring given the change in political winds? And do you think Europe, in particular Germany, can chart an independent course? And if yes, what could that even look like?

VP: If I could answer this question, I should run for chancellor of Germany. I mean, it is **the** question right now. Volkswagen has for now at least two decades put its stock on the US market; initially thinking with the diesel car, and then you got what was known as Dieselgate, where it looked like Volkswagen was trying to cheat the regulators. Then secondly, the electric cars. That was the whole thing, electric cars from Volkswagen are going to make a

big push into the US market. And then when the Ukraine war came and the expense of the plants seemed unviable, three plants were closed. So Volkswagen still had hopes that the US market could pull them out of this problem. Mr. Trump comes in and he says, look, we're going to put tariffs on exports. Tariffs against China, certainly, but also against anybody in certain sectors, auto being one of them. Secondly, Trump is going to probably junk the green regulations, which means that there's no incentive to buy an electric car. Previously in the United States, when you went in to buy a car, if you bought an electric car, you got a rebate from the government. You know you got a benefit. If they cut all of that, there's no incentive to buy electric cars. You go in and buy a gasoline car. Gas prices are reasonably low in the United States. Why would you bother to buy an electric car? Now, this poses another serious challenge to Volkswagen. Who is going to buy their cars? It was a very bad decision for the German government to throw in its lot with the US market because the US market is extremely, extremely fickle. I mean, it's the reason why the Chinese developed the Belt and Road initiative to get out of reliance on the US market because they understood a decade ago that the US at any point can be protectionist with its market not worth risking. Plus with the fact that wages are stagnant, the US consumer is relying on credit and at some point this is not going to be viable. And so the Chinese are looking for customers elsewhere. The problem for Volkswagen is the cars are too expensive. Those cars can't be sold in other places. The Chinese are clever, they made consumer goods that you can sell in other countries. Most German high tech goods are too expensive for the markets. They are designed for the European and US market. So where will Volkswagen go? It might have been able to sell the cars to Russia because the Russian market is also appealing. No longer. I mean, that's just not going to happen. So there is that economic problem for Germany. The second thing is, is there a way to pivot away from this? I don't think there is immediately. Firstly, the entire NATO project has to be reconsidered. Countries like Germany are trapped by their NATO ambitions. You know what is a NATO for Germany? What's the benefit of it? What's the benefit of a military alliance if you're now going to have to pay more of your GDP into defense? I mean, what are you getting out of it? Well, Germany now has a military base in Latvia. It's not even a NATO base, it's a military base. The German military is going to be sitting at the borders of Russia. Is that a good idea? I don't think so. Can these things be backpedaled? Can Germany come to the table with China and Russia and say, look, we want to reconsider our position? I think it's going to be odd. It will depend on the next Bundestag elections, I think. Because if you have a different character of government, maybe they'll be able to reconsider some of the... But these are fundamental acts of reconsideration. In Italy, the right wing, far right coalition led by Meloni, prime minister Meloni, previously promised to open the debate on NATO, to open the debate on the Ukraine war, to open the debate on trade with China and so on. Once she came to power, there is no debate open. You know she's back to square one. I'm afraid that the European states are a little trapped in treacle. There's very little space for maneuver. And, I mean, that's really a decision that these governments have taken.

ZR: Let's switch to the latest developments in the war in Ukraine. I'd like to first start by recapping some of the latest developments over the last few months, including some of the ones that you just mentioned. In August, Ukraine launched an incursion into Russia's Kursk

oblast and according to the German media, made considerable progress, capturing around 1250km² of territory with 90 localities. In response, Russia has amassed a large force around Kursk to retake that region. According to the New York Times, this could include up to 50,000 troops, including 11,000 North Korean soldiers. This comes as Russia continues to make progress in eastern Ukraine, taking over more and more strategic territory week after week, while Ukraine faces massive shortages of manpower, ammunition, weapons and much more. To address this shortage, Kiev has announced in October that it would draft an additional 160,000 soldiers from its civilian population and put them through a fast track training program so that they could be quickly sent to the front lines to counter Moscow's advance. For a moment, it seemed as if the war would enter a phase of diplomacy with Trump's election victory and the fact that the German chancellor Olaf Scholz recently spoke on the phone with President Putin for the first time in two years, however, the situation quite quickly escalated. At the turn of events, President Biden finally gave Ukraine permission to deploy the Army Tactical Missile System, also known as ATACMS, citing the arrival of North Korean troops. ATACMS is a US made supersonic tactical ballistic missile system with a range of 300km. Shortly thereafter, Ukraine used this cruise missile to attack a weapons arsenal in Russia. The next day, Ukraine fired the British Storm Shadow cruise missile at Russian territory again. Now a debate has broken out in Germany whether to supply Ukraine with the Taurus cruise missiles, which, unlike ATACMS and Storm Shadow, have a much longer range of 500 kilometers and could even hit Moscow. So far, the German chancellor has been quite hesitant. But the Greens and the Christian Democrats have already expressed their support and even stated that if they came to power next year, they would immediately supply Ukraine with these missiles. In response, Russia updated its nuclear doctrine, which now says an attack from a non-nuclear state, if backed by a nuclear power, will be treated as a joint assault on Russia and thus could permit the use of nuclear weapons. In your view, why is the West now escalating conflict further, especially at this moment in time? And do you think these long range cruise missiles will finally turn the tide in favor of Ukraine or at least put them in a better negotiating position if Trump decides to pursue diplomacy?

VP: I think that this escalation is happening because Trump won the election. You know Trump wins the election and says, I want to bring peace. And these powers, the United States, Germany, Britain, they want to put Mr. Trump in such a position that he cannot extricate the West from this war in Ukraine. This is a prestige issue. And they are willing to basically threaten, I don't know, nuclear war in order to get their way, their prestige. Trump wants to settle the situation in Ukraine. That is very clear. I don't think we need to even emphasize that because he has said that repeatedly. And they are trying to trap him. That's what's happening. That's the one thing. Now, the issue is, will this escalation get out of control and will Trump therefore not be able to act in the matter of just about eight weeks or so when he becomes president?! Firstly, I think the Russians will be quite circumspect. Seeing them launch their intermediate missile onto Ukrainian soil and not on to soil of a NATO country is indicative of the fact that they want to demonstrate: You hit us, we're going to strike you really hard. We haven't used these weapons, say the Russians, now we're going to use them. Imagine if this landed on Kiev, it would be absolute mayhem. So the Russians have sent a

message to Mr. Zelensky. How will Zelensky react? We are going to have to see. But I think the Russians are not keen on an acceleration because Russia has got what it wants. You know, it is now ready and prepared to negotiate something. You know, look, in every negotiation you come with a position. And I think it's really silly to assume that the territorial gains right now will be exactly of what people will leave with at the end. I don't think it's going to be like that. I think the Russians will be willing to negotiate something. Some areas, I think it's very clear, Crimea is not going back to Ukraine. It has not been in control by Ukraine since 2014. It's very unlikely to go back now. It's not an issue of 2022, that went to Russia in 2014. I think the issue is going to be the Donbass region. The issue is going to be Mariupol. The issue is going to be the small areas in the north. They'll have to negotiate that out. But that's what's going to happen. Germany, the government is going to be gone. Let's wait for the Bundestag election. We don't know. We don't know who the German people will vote. You know, is it going to be business as usual? You get the SPD out and then the Christian Democrats come in. Is that what it's going to be? Or will it be something different? I don't know. I was surprised to see that the Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht was able to get 15/ 12% in different parts of the country. Imagine in a Bundestag election if they come up to 20%. Because they are outrightly saying, we want to end this inflation driving war. Then there may be an appeal. What if they get 20%? Will they be able to, you know, a queen maker in Berlin? I don't know. But it's possible. Look what happened in France. In France, there was a legislative election and the left bloc triumphed. I mean, it was the biggest bloc. Now, it's a separate matter that Emmanuel Macron decided to disregard the voters' intent and put Michel Barnier as the president. Totally undemocratic thing. But it's what the French system allows. Kind of Bonaparte's system, you know, a system where the executive can do whatever they want really. Well, in Germany, you have a similar issue. You could have one party winning the largest bloc, but the others all gather together and make a government. It's possible. We don't know. But what we do know is that there is no exit for Germany from inflation, if this war continues. The only way for the German government to control inflation and control a deep decline in public services, the tariffs and so on, is for this war to end. So if there's pressure in Germany – I think this is important – in the United Kingdom, Keir Starmer is not running a democratic government. I mean, he's doing whatever he wants. Today, as we talk, the International Criminal Court has framed warrants of arrest against Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant; all these European leaders implicated in those warrants because all of them basically they endorsed the war, the genocide, that Mr. Netanyahu and Gallant put in place. So Olaf Scholz is implicated in an indirect way. So is Keir Starmer. It doesn't matter what the population thinks. That's the scandal of European democracy today. France, no democracy, because Macron chose Barnier to be the Prime Minister. Germany, this is an unpopular government. Nobody wants this government. The Greens can say whatever they want, but they are going to be wiped out in the next election. And in Britain, yes, it's true that the Labor Party won a large set of votes, but their vote share didn't increase. This was a victory that came out of the deep unpopularity of the right. So, where is the democracy in Europe today? The world is looking and saying, you're not acting democratically. You're doing whatever you want.

ZR: I want to switch to the Middle East and focus on Gaza, Lebanon and Iran. First, let me summarize the developments for our viewers here. The war between Hezbollah and Israel in southern Lebanon is in full swing with deadly clashes and rocket fire. The civilian death toll in Lebanon has risen to 3500, according to the Lebanese Ministry of Health. In Gaza, the death toll has exceeded 44,400, with dozens, sometimes hundreds of civilians being killed by Israel on a daily basis in the name of fighting Hamas. Last week, Human Rights Watch published a report holding Israel responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity. The organization added that the governments worldwide should impose targeted sanctions and even halt arms sales to Israel. The same week, Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, who has traditionally remained silent on Israel's occupation and apartheid and even pursued normalization of relations with Israel before October 7th, 2023, accused Israel of committing collective genocide in Gaza. Just today, as you mentioned, the International Criminal Court, ICC, issued arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and former Defense minister Yoav Gallant and Hamas military commander Mohammed Deif. Regarding the arrest warrants for Netanyahu and Gallant, the ICC stated that they are responsible for the war crime of using starvation as a method of warfare and that they are guilty of crimes against humanity through murder, persecution and other inhumane acts. Israel has condemned these warrants, calling them antisemitic. While the US rejected them by releasing a statement just now, quote: "We remain deeply concerned by the prosecutor's rush to seek arrest warrants and troubling process errors that led to this decision", unquote. Let's talk about the ICC arrest warrants first. When the ICC issued arrest warrants for Russian President Vladimir Putin for the crime of unlawful deportation and transfer of children during the Russian war in Ukraine, the US welcomed them and did not question the process or any errors or swiftness that had happened during the process. But now that the ICC has issued arrest warrants for a leader allied with the US, namely Benjamin Netanyahu, the US rejects this one on this basis. Can you talk about these double standards and what this says about the West's approach to international justice?

VP: I mean, look, firstly, it's ridiculous. It's taken months for the ICC to act. First to their defense, they had to deal with jurisdictional attacks that came from Israel. You will notice that in the statement that the ICC made before they talk about the warrant, they say that the ICC rejects the state of Israel's challenges to jurisdiction because that was a real block. And then they issued these important arrest warrants. The issue is the West has never been happy with any international jurisdiction that has interrupted its agenda, never been happy with it. You know, any kind of ruling, whether it's the World Trade Organization Tribunal, if it goes against a Western ally or a Western country, it is rejected out of hand. There's no surprise that they would mock this and say it doesn't apply. Well, one reason is what I mentioned earlier is that they are all implicated in this. The United States has been sending weapons to Israel to do this policy of starvation. The United States has been sending logistics to do this politics of starvation. That's the key issue that the ICC has raised. So has Germany. Germany provides 20% of the weapons to Israel, imported weapons to Israel. They are implicated in this. Of course, they are going to deny that these warrants are legitimate. They are going to say that. But to the rest of the world, people are going to welcome it. And I mean, personally, if I'm ever within sight of Benjamin Netanyahu, I'm going to run up to him and arrest him and

make an arrest as a human being on behalf of the ICC. Because the interesting thing about the ICC is the ICC mainly says that they are arrest warrants and says that these warrants can be executed. I can do it. You can do it. A country can do it. Anybody can do it. Mr. Netanyahu could be arrested in Israel by an Israeli and turned over to the ICC. You know, of course, it's logistically impossible. I'm never going to be able to personally arrest Mr. Netanyahu. But this is a statement. Many countries are not going to permit him to travel. Netherlands has already come out and said that they will act upon this warrant and arrest him if he arrives. Dearborn, Michigan, a city in Michigan, has said that if Mr. Netanyahu comes there, they will hand him over to the ICC. Now, of course, again, logistical challenges. You can't fly him out of Dearborn. You have to go to an airport outside Dearborn, the U.S. government would free him. But here comes more delegitimization for Mr. Netanyahu, Yoav Gallant and this war. And it's interesting, it's very important to understand this, this is not just a warrant against Mr. Netanyahu. It's also a warrant against Gallant, who claims to be his opponent politically in the country, that Mr. Gallant is not going to be allowed to come back into the fray at the next election and lead a coalition against Netanyahu because he also has an ICC warrant. Both the political forces in Israel, Likud and Labor, well, whatever they are now, the conservatives and the non conservatives or the less conservatives, both the leaders of the factions have ICC arrest warrants. This is interesting. This tells you a lot about Israel today. You know, Freedom House in Washington, D.C., considers Israel by its index of democracy a free country. Really? It's a free country led by a war criminal. Is that going to change Freedom House's designation of Israel? I'm not sure.

ZR: To my last question, we know that Donald Trump has taken \$100 million from Miriam Adelson during his election campaign with the promise that once he comes into power, he will annex the entire West Bank. Also, all the figures that he's brought into his cabinet, actually nominated into his cabinet, if there's anything in common between them, it's their outspoken support for Israel, including its assault on Gaza. Is there any hope and chance for a Palestinian statehood or at the very minimum, that Israel's war in Gaza comes to an end under Trump's presidency?

VP: Yeah, I mean, it will be interesting. And I don't want to jump ahead of this, but I am interested to see how Mr. Trump reacts to this ICC warrant. You know, Haaretz ran a story right after the warrant was released saying the ICC just issued Netanyahu's arrest warrant, he's counting on Trump to save him. I don't exactly know what Mr. Trump can do to save Netanyahu from a universal jurisdiction arrest warrant. I mean, he travels to any country, there's a risk that he'll be arrested. The US government, the US Congress, can't override this. Now, of course, they can provide a certain level of immunity. They can say, look, if Mr. Netanyahu goes to Germany and the German government threatens to arrest him, the United States government will sanction Germany. They can provide forms of immunity. Yes, I know. But they can't have the warrant withdrawn. That'll be more complicated. So, it really depends; what will Trump do? Look, you don't need Donald Trump to have the West Bank be annexed, the Israelis are already doing it. You don't need Donald Trump to help with the ethnic cleansing of Gaza, the Israelis are already doing it. You don't need Donald Trump to have the Israelis produce second class citizen status for Palestinians within Israel, they've already done

it. It's the apartheid system. So I don't see what Mr. Trump is going to be able to do that is more than what the Israelis are already doing for themselves. I think there's a little too much at stake in what people are saying about Miriam Adelson's money that she's given to Trump. I just don't know what more the United States can do. You know, they've provided the bombs. They've provided diplomatic support. They've provided the verbal backing for the genocide. I just don't see what Mr. Trump can do more unless he sends in US jets to start bombing Palestinian towns in the West Bank. That's the more... But what's the point? The Israelis could do it. They don't need Mr. Trump. They haven't started bombing these cities from the air in a sustained way. There have been examples, but not a sustained way. They don't need Donald Trump. Honestly, I don't see what Donald Trump can do extra for them. He may be more comfortable for Mr. Netanyahu. That's a separate issue. But with the ICC warrant, I think it may complicate things even for Donald Trump. Let's see how he reacts to that.

ZR: Vijay Prashad, author and historian, thank you so much for your time today.

VP: My pleasure. Great to be with you.

ZR: And thank you for tuning in today. If you're watching our videos regularly, make sure to take into consideration that our independent journalism depends only on you to continue. This is because we have enshrined principles in our organization that refrain us from taking money from corporations or governments. We don't even allow advertisements, all with the goal of providing you with information that is free from external influence. So if you want us to continue with our independent journalism, make sure to support us via a small donation, via Patreon, Paypal, Betterplace or directly to our bank account. You will find the information to all of these donation platforms in the description of this video. I thank you for your support and for tuning in. I am your host Zain Raza, see you next time.

END

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

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)

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