

LOCK THEM UP? Glenn Reacts to Hillary's Deranged Censorship Dream

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

Glenn Greenwald (GG): We had this Hillary segment, this segment on Hillary's comments on Rachel Maddow last night planned. We, as suspected, didn't have time to get to it because we had to end the show at eight to go do that fantastic and thought provoking program on Fox. And so I just want to go over a little bit, show you what Hillary said, because it's really just – I mean, every time she sticks her head up and why is she sticking her head out, by the way, she's still completely hated. I'm sure if I were Kamala, the two things I want most would be to have Joe Biden stay underground, which he's pretty much doing, not by choice, but just because he's underground in every way except physically and keep Hillary Clinton off the TV. I mean, she's so hateful. She's so hated and she's gotten so much more bitter over time. Eight years later everything is about her loss. She just wants to destroy and imprison everybody she blames for that loss, increasingly, people in the United States. So she went to the Rachel Maddow show last night for that one on one Rachel segment. Rachel is only on one night a week now on Monday. And so she had Hillary Clinton on. And here is one of the things that Hillary Clinton decided to share with the audience and with Rachel about what she's hoping to achieve.

Rachel Maddow (RM): Speaking of dictators, the Justice Department and the State Department have taken a number of actions in the past several weeks, striking actions to both call out...

GG: Quite appropriate, and I am sure she did not intend it, she is speaking of dictators, the Justice Department and the State Department, and that's an excellent segue, although, of course this is not what she means. Let's play that from the beginning.

RM: Speaking of dictators, the Justice Department and the State Department have taken a number of actions in the past several weeks, striking actions to both call out and indict and take action against the Kremlin for their attempts at interfering in yet another presidential election cycle on Trump's behalf. The State Department has put out a \$10 million reward for information about entities that are trying to illegally interfere in our election. We've seen these dramatic indictments from the Justice Department, including for paying millions of dollars, the Kremlin paying millions of dollars to pro-Trump influencers. We've seen the

Justice Department seize web domains where the Kremlin had set up news sites, what looked like news sites, looked like versions of American news sites, but were secretly operated by the Russian intelligence services or by the Russian government. Do you feel like the US government is sort of starting to figure out how to do this and taking this seriously enough, or do you still think there's a far distance to go?

Hillary Clinton (CH): I think there's a far distance to go. I applaud the actions taken by the Justice Department and the State Department. I think that they're very important. But truly, we are just at the beginning of uncovering everything that Russia, but not just Russia, other countries have done and are doing to influence our election. If you focus on Russia, I commend you, Rachel, for your new movie, because we are only at the beginning of understanding the whole iceberg here. What the Russians started doing in 2015 and 2016, what they continued doing. They've gotten more sophisticated. They aren't even pretending anymore. Their international news operation, Russia Today, RT, is an arm of the Russian government, an arm of its intelligence operation. It's basically an extension of their spying efforts. They are using Americans, both those who are witting and willing and those who are unwitting and are just so surprised they're getting, you know, \$400,000 a week or \$100,000 a podcast to parrot Kremlin propaganda. And we know from what even Republicans have said, the chairs of the Intelligence Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and other Republicans who are currently in office have said that Republicans go to the floor of the Congress and they parrot Russian talking points. So I think it's important to indict the Russians. Just as Mueller indicted a lot of Russians who were engaged in direct election interference and boosting Trump back in 2016. But I also think there are Americans who are engaged in this kind of propaganda and whether they should be civilly or even in some cases criminally charged is something that would be a better deterrence because the Russians are unlikely, except in a very few cases, to ever stand trial.

GG: So there's a lot of remarkable things there. Apparently, Rachel Maddow has a new film about Russia, which is the least surprising thing ever. I mean, just think about what these two have been doing for eight years, that little duo there. They pretty much thought about nothing, spoke about nothing other than Moscow and the Kremlin and Putin like it's the anchor of their world view. And Hillary Clinton has spent eight years just increasingly bitter and militaristic about the fact that she lost an election eight years ago and doesn't blame herself, doesn't blame her party, doesn't blame her ideology, doesn't blame her skills as a politician or the flaws that she has, she just blames Russia. She thinks Russia took from her her life achievement. She wants to destroy Russia. And this is part of the ethos, by the way, on which people like Ryan Root, the would be Trump assassin, have been feeding. This is exactly what if you listen to everything he said, it's right from Hillary Clinton. But the most notable part about this is that she's saying that she thinks Americans who say things that she regards as propaganda should be civilly held accountable, if not criminally responsible. How would you ever reconcile that with the First Amendment? To be clear, it's not actually illegal in the United States, nor could it be for you to work for a foreign government and disseminate its messaging. All you have to do is just disclose that through a FARA form. And if you fail to

disclose it through the FARA form, that becomes a crime. But it's just a transparency crime that never used to be prosecuted. But people on the right...

Victor Pougy (VP): But that is if you're receiving money to work for a foreign government. If you're just a citizen and you think that Russia should win the war or whatever, you can think that.

GG: Exactly. You could say Russia is in the right. You can say that Russia has a much better influence on the world than the United States does. You can say Vladimir Putin is a good leader. Those are all total protected opinions that you're permitted to say no matter what.

VP: And if you wanted to create a political party and run for president on the basis of supporting Russia, you could do that.

GG: Totally. Of course, but what she's wanting to do and you see these attacks on Jill Stein – and Hillary Clinton hates Jill Stein, too, blames her as well. But it's basically the same thing in her mind because Jill Stein is constantly accused of being a Russian agent or a Russian propagandist. Remember, she wanted to accuse Tulsi Gabbard of that as well, when she thought Tulsi Gabbard was going to run as a third party, and said she was being groomed by the Kremlin. These people have obsessive compulsive disorder and the way in which they now so reflexively want to criminalise speech – but the real point I wanted to make about this, other than the fact that those two just – I mean, they're insane. I mean, I guess when you're incredibly rich and everything else is taken care of, you have the luxury of just blaming Vladimir Putin. We had Jordan Chariton on, who spent many months in Michigan, and as he said, like people are more angry, like, why are we sending all our money to Ukraine about Russia? That has nothing to do with our lives. I think that's how you would ordinarily see it, if you're struggling to pay your bills and take care of your kids and getting health care. But these people have nothing else to do. Everything else is taken care of. They don't care about anything. So they just entertain these big paranoid conspiracies about Russia and Putin and how he's causing Democrats to lose elections, which is the only thing they really care about. But the other thing that I think is so worth noting is that there are few people more than those two, Rachel Maddow and Hillary Clinton, who have spread more toxic disinformation, a lot of which came from foreign governments such as the Steele dossier that have drowned our politics certainly for the four more years of the Trump campaign and then the administration. But even on going with this insanity about Russia, these lies that the Steele dossier, which had all this dirt about Donald Trump, claimed he was in a pipi video, he's being blackmailed – these were all lies that came from foreign governments, including Ukraine, that wanted Hillary Clinton to win because they trusted her more than Donald Trump, that came from British intelligence. This was pure propaganda that came from a foreign source. And it totally...

VP: It was laundered by the media, which is what they're so offended by.

GG: Exactly. You got blundered by Rachel Maddow. And I just want to show you a couple of things as a reminder. Here from CNN in 2022, there you see the headline on the screen:

Hillary Clinton personally approved plan to share Trump-Russia allegation with the press in 2016, campaign manager says. I just need to look at this camera here because that's where the article is. It says, quote, "Hillary Clinton personally approved her campaign's plans in fall of 2016 to share information with the reporter about an uncorroborated alleged server backchannel between Donald Trump and a top Russian bank, her former campaign manager testified Friday in federal court. Robby Mook, who you might remember was the disgraced campaign manager for Hillary, lost to a very unpopular game show host, Donald Trump, "Robby Mook said he attended the meeting with other senior campaign officials where they learned about strange cyberactivity that suggested a relationship between the Trump Organisation and Alpha Bank, which is based in Moscow. The group decided to share the information with a reporter, and Mook subsequently ran that decision by Clinton herself. Quote, 'We discussed it with Hillary', Mook said, later adding that, quote, 'she agreed with the decision'. A campaign staffer later passed the information to a reporter from Slate magazine", Franklin Foer, who, of course, subsequently got hired at The Atlantic, "which the campaign hoped the reporter would, quote, 'vet it out, and write what they believe is true', Mook said". The FBI, as soon as they got that story, understood it was a lie, in fact, they prosecuted Hillary's lawyer who brought that story to them for failing to disclose that he was working for Hillary Clinton's campaign. And here was the story from Slate as though this was an independent article and it got fed to them by the Clinton campaign. Quote: Was a Trump Server Communicating With Russia? And it ended up getting debunked. But it was Hillary Clinton who spread that. Obviously the Steele dossier, which was led by Rachel Maddow, ended up getting debunked. So if you want to create a law in this country that people who spread disinformation or foreign propaganda should go to prison, then lock up Hillary Clinton and Rachel Maddow because few have done that more than them. But I think it's so telling, this kind of instinct, this repressive instinct about how mostly Democrats function now in terms of wanting to criminalise free speech, although obviously Republicans have done a huge amount as well in the aftermath of October 7th.

VP: And there's, you know, a theme that you always call attention to, which is like an expression that got invented recently, which is that idea of disinformation expert or whatever. The other thing that gets real as if it's like a crime on the law, on the books, which is like election interference, which is the idea that like other countries can't have opinions. Like there was a recent election in Venezuela, just to set an example, in which the US had a clear favourite who they wanted to win and they were like...

GG: And they were not just cheering them from a distance. Not only that, just forget even Venezuela. The reason Vladimir Putin disliked Hillary Clinton is because – and this is the thing, I'm not saying that anyone is past lying. We all probably deceive in some way, manipulate a situation, trying to hide things we've done or said...

VP: Not me.

GG: Other than Victor, and our canine co-host, who would never. So just put yourself in Hillary Clinton's position. I know it's revolting, but try. She was the Secretary of State from 2008, when Barack Obama was elected, to 2012. She knows exactly how the State

Department interferes in the internal domestic politics of every other country, including in Russia, where openly arms of the State Department were funding anti-Putin, anti-government activists and trying to sow dissent and destabilise Russia, which we've done in every other country, at a much higher level than anything she's talking about with Russian bots or whatever, or Facebook pages. How do you sit there and act so genuinely indignant about another country interfering in our domestic politics, our sacred elections when she not only knows, but she actually did election interference exactly of that kind to pretty much every other country and far more. You would think there's just some kind of soul or conscience or some sliver of integrity that has been ingrained in us that would prevent you from lying that flagrantly. But I think when these people are immersed in just this kind of eternal quest for power, they lose all their remnants of soul or integrity or conscience. And she's not consciously aware of it. She's convinced that...

RM: Exactly.

GG: It's like what she was doing was good and what they were doing is bad even though they were exactly the same act, except that her interference in other countries was much greater than what she claims Russia is doing.

VP: Yeah, I don't know if she's lying or if she actually believes sincerely that these things happen. I guess there's no difference.

GG: I guess we all know people who like have done something and then a year later or a month later, they'll turn around and like vehemently condemn somebody who did the same thing they know they did. There's just something in the human brain that permits that kind of self-deception. But to see it on such a grand scale, you know, like sometimes you can reach people and say like, hey, you did that same thing. That would be a brick wall trying to convince either of them of that.

GG: The clip you just watched is from the live aftershow we do on Locals exclusively for our Locals subscribers. The live aftershow airs every Tuesday and Thursday nights immediately following our live System Update show on Rumble, which is freely available to everyone. To join our Locals community simply click the join button under each video on our Rumble page or at the link below. That not only entitles you to exclusive access to our aftershow, where we take your questions, respond to your critiques and feedback, and hear suggestions for issues we should cover and people we should interview, but also to the transcripts for each show that we produce, as well as the exclusive written content we publish there. Enjoy.

END

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

BANKKONTO: PAYPAL: PATREON: BETTERPLACE:

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V. E-Mail: https://www.patreon.com/acTVism Link: Click here

Bank: GLS Bank PayPal@acTVism.org

IBAN: DE89430609678224073600 BIC: GENODEM1GLS

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