



EXCLUSIVE: Glenn Greenwald on Vaccine Mandate, Civil Liberties, Assange & Snowden

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

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you guys for tuning in today, and welcome to another episode of The Source. I'm your host, Zain Raza, and today I'll be talking to Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Glenn Greenwald. Glenn is the journalist who published the highly classified NSA leaks exposed by whistleblower Edward Snowden. He's the author of numerous books, the latest being *Securing Democracy: My Fight for Press Freedom and Justice in Bolsonaro's Brazil*. Glenn, welcome back to the show. It's been a while. How are you and how's everything in Brazil?

Glenn Greenwald (GG): Well, things are great with me. Thank you for asking. It's always great to talk to you. Things in Brazil are complicated. There's an election rapidly approaching in October of next year. That should be very interesting. But things are generally good, and I hope that's the case on your end as well.

ZR: All good here in Germany, except we are heading to another lockdown. But that's exactly the issue that I wanted to talk to you about and would start off with. So last year, when we talked in May 2020, the Corona virus was still fresh. It was difficult to accurately assess the situation. Back then, I specifically asked you about civil liberties and you stated, and I'm paraphrasing here, that although the government can be justified in some of its measures to ensure the protection of health and safety for its citizens, it is vital for citizens to remain vigilant during these times as these laws could become permanent. By the way, just as a side note, the video that I'm referring to was immediately taken down by YouTube. Anyways, getting back to the issue now, almost 19 months later, we're seeing a completely different landscape. In many countries digital vaccine ID's have been implemented that involve the corporate sector. We are seeing measures such as COVID passports and vaccine mandates being instituted. In Germany, for example, restrictions to many public jobs or services are being expanded to only vaccinated or those who have recovered from COVID-19. Chomsky even stated that unvaccinated people should voluntarily isolate

themselves and food supply is their own problem. An essence for the good or bad reason we have a divided society. What is your assessment of the situation now? Is the government justified or do you think it has gone too far?

GG: I think I would say that with any kind of questions involving a conflict between public safety on the one hand and civil liberties or government power on the other, a good framework to use is what happened after 9/11. In part because it was such a vivid example from which we've all learned so many lessons. Maybe it's also because it was the event that propelled me to leave the practice of law and start writing about politics. And so it's the starting point I use. But what happened there, I think, is very instructive. Which is, there really was an actual threat that was invoked to justify what was done after 9/11. The threat of terrorism was real. There were two passenger jets flown into two enormous office buildings in downtown Manhattan, and it killed 3000 people. Another was flown into the Pentagon. There was a fourth that was shot down. There have been terrorist attacks over the years that have involved mass casualties in the United States and outside, so it wasn't that the threat was fake, it wasn't that it was not something we should be concerned about. The question was, are we allowing the government to go too far in exaggerating the threat and claiming powers for too long a period of time that exceed the actual threat? And I think most of us concluded the answer was yes. And so many of the things that happened right after 9/11 that were told we're going to be temporary just until the crisis was controlled, things like the Patriot Act but many other examples as well, are still with us 20 years later. 20 years later, even though there's basically no more al Qaeda. Osama bin Laden is dead. ISIS is defeated. So I think the lesson is that once you empower governments and states and officials and other power centers to obtain authorities in the name of fighting a particular threat or crisis, they don't go away. And here we are at the end of 2021 now. Though, the interview we did was 18 months ago, and not only are all of those powers, I was worried about back then still with us, we're talking about even greater powers, still more lockdowns, talking about people who refuse to comply with health protocols, being separated from society, denied jobs and denied the right to travel. And what's amazing about that is when we did our interview and I was worried back in June or whatever it was of 2020, there is no vaccine, there were no treatments, we understood very little about the virus. Here we are 18 months later. Where by far the most important thing that has changed is that there's a vaccine that's universally available that really does protect you against serious sickness and death in almost all cases. And yet there's almost like no recognition that that is a very significant change. And I think that shows you that a lot of times this inertia just continues on its own. As to the question of how we treat the unvaccinated and the Chomsky idea that they ought to be basically put in camps, that's more or less what he said, they ought to be isolated and shunned and just prevented from doing anything other than leaving this physical space. And then kind of at the end, he said, I guess we should bring them food the way we bring prisoners food. But other than that, they should be denied every right and every privilege. You know, I think it makes no sense from any kind of perspective of morality or ethics or science for two reasons. One is that if you believe in the efficacy of the vaccines, as I do, I believe that me, being vaccinated, protects me from

serious illness let alone death. And there's no reason why I should view the unvaccinated as a danger or as a threat. Whom are the unvaccinated a danger? If you believe in the vaccine, they're not a danger to vaccinated people. So why do you need to fire them and punish them and put them in camps? Secondly, if you're worried about people transmitting the virus to you, we know that people who are vaccinated often do contract COVID anyway and transmit COVID. There's more and more breakthrough cases. I think in several states in the United States, 25 percent of all COVID deaths are vaccinated people. It stands to reason that even a higher percentage of the cases are vaccinated people. So given that vaccinated people can get and transmit the virus to us along with the unvaccinated, what is the reason we ought to continue to look at these unvaccinated as these threats, as these people who need to be punished and deprived of basic rights? I think it's really become this kind of almost punitive approach like this almost religious fervor that people who are vaccinated are clean and blessed and good. And the people who disobey and don't get the vaccine are sinful, dirty, are disease carriers. Really a dangerous kind of rhetoric, if you look at how that rhetoric has been used in history and it's increasingly concerning me.

ZR: Many progressive organizations of Germany's primary task is to weigh the pros and cons of government policies have voiced little to no concern when it comes to the cons, in other words, the negative effects on society due to the government lockdown or vaccine mandates. On your platform, you look at the history of government public vaccine campaigns voluntarily and forced mandates. What were you able to uncover?

GG: So I think politicians who have been in favor of vaccine mandates and implement them in various cities bizarrely celebrate the success in the sense that if you tell people the only way they can keep their jobs in the middle of the pandemic is if they obey, there's going to be a large number of people who obey because they're afraid of losing their jobs and not being able to support their family. That makes sense. That kind of coercion might work in the sense that you get people to do what you want, but it's a very brute tool. It's a really coercive weapon to tell people that the only way they're allowed to have a job or travel or leave their homes is if they obeyed the health mandates of the state. So, you know, you could round up every citizen if you want who's unvaccinated and forcibly vaccinate them. That would get the population to 100 percent vaccinated. But I don't hear many people favoring that because we realize that there has to be a balance between people's liberty and public health. And as I said before, given that, I don't see any reason any longer to view the unvaccinated as a danger in a post-vaccinated world. What is the rationale of forcing people to take a vaccine, whether it's physically using the police to inject their arms or against their will, or being almost as coercive by telling them they can't work if they don't take the vaccine? It doesn't make a lot of sense to me. It might work, as I said, in the sense that you get people to comply, just like sending the police to their house would work. But I think it's a really grave infringement of people's liberty to force them to inject into their bodies a substance that they don't want. There may be times when it's justified if it's a highly contagious disease that cannot be transmitted by people who are vaccinated. But that's not the case here. Or if it's a disease for

which there is no effective vaccine, you know you could force people to engage in public health measures to avoid contaminating other people. That's also not the case. So, yeah, I'm becoming increasingly worried about this coercive mentality, which, as I said before, you know, we're creating new bureaucracies. If we look at every university, every company, they now have five to ten to twenty COVID officials, an office of COVID Management. Once you start creating bureaucracies like that, it never goes away. So even if tomorrow there was an actual cure for COVID, you could easily see these bureaucracies turning into, say, you know, the Office of Infectious Diseases and continuing to assert the same powers in the name of public health generally. Maybe the flu, maybe other Coronaviruses. I think what we're doing is very reactionary, and I think it's being done by telling people they can't look at the other side of the ledger. That the only thing that counts is avoiding COVID and all the other costs that come from things like school shutdowns or societal disruptions. We shouldn't assign those any value.

ZR: In Germany your opinion would be perceived by many who support government policies as being anti-vax and therefore immediately fall into the conspiracy theory realm. In the worst case, you could be labeled as supporting an opinion that is killing or promoting the far right, killing people or promoting the far right. Can you talk about the term anti-vax and the doublespeak involved and what it actually means or should mean?

GG: Yeah, it's bizarre. I'll be using myself as an example, but then I'll give you another one. I went on many, many shows, some left wing shows, some right wing shows before I was vaccinated while I was waiting for the vaccine to be available in Brazil for people of my age. And I said every single time I went on shows, including Fox News, that I believe in the vaccine, that I intend to be vaccinated the first day it's available for me. That I encourage other people to be vaccinated when they in fact ask me for my opinion. When I was vaccinated, I went on social media and those same shows and I said, I've now been vaccinated and I got my first dose. I got my second dose, I got my booster. So I'm somebody who has been vaccinated, who has repeatedly affirmed my belief in the science of vaccines, who has publicly encouraged others to be vaccinated. And yet, I can't tell you how many times I've been labeled anti-vax because I don't believe that the state should be forcing other people to be vaccinated. It's similar to people claiming that if you believe someone should have the right to express an opinion, it must mean that you share that opinion. I think most rational people, I've come to understand, that defending the right of somebody to express a certain opinion doesn't signify you agree with that opinion. It's obviously the same in this case. The fact that I don't support forcing people to be vaccinated doesn't mean I'm against the vaccine. It means that I believe in the right to choose for me. And my own view is that I very much believe in the science of vaccines. And just recently in the UK, we had a very similar example with Jeremy Corbyn, one of the most admired and beloved figures politically on the left internationally, who came out against two different measures sponsored by the conservative government of the United Kingdom, by the Tory, Prime Minister Boris Johnson, one of which was to force public health care workers to be vaccinated or to lose their jobs.

And the other was to require vaccine passports for anyone who wants to enter large events. And Corbyn was opposed to both, in part because the unions which he listens to as he should as any of his would, said, we don't believe our workers who have been on the frontline fighting this virus for the last 18 months should be forced to get a vaccine. Some of them have natural immunity from having gotten COVID. Some of them are young. But they should not have their jobs conditioned on getting a vaccine. Jeremy Corbyn is somebody who has gotten vaccinated publicly. He's done public service announcements urging people to get vaccinated, and yet he now too is being called anti-vax simply by virtue of opposing this forced, obligatory government power. I think what's extra ironic about it is that I think the people who are anti-vax are the people who keep insisting that we can't return to normal, who keep insisting that we need the government to fire everybody who is not vaccinated. The reason why I think we're ready to return to greater normalcy, the reason why I don't look at the unvaccinated as threats to me is precisely because I believe in the vaccine. I believe the vaccine protects me from COVID. I actually believe that. That's why I got the vaccine. That's why I encourage others to get it. The people who seem to me to be disseminating an anti-vax message are the people who keep saying, we can't go back to normal yet, we have to keep schools closed. We have to restrict travel. We have to treat the unvaccinated as dangerous. They're the ones who seem to be saying that they don't really believe in the vaccine and its ability to keep us safe when they go around calling everybody anti-vax. You know, it reminds me a lot of the way people call everyone who criticizes Israel anti-Semitic as a weapon to force them into agreement, that's how anti-vax is used. Anyone who disagrees with me is anti-vax. I think I have the most pro-vaccine message, not just because, like Jeremy Corbyn I got vaccinated, I'm encouraging others to get it, but because all of my policy views on how we should treat the pandemic are based in the view that the vaccine works.

ZR: Usually even if the supporter of certain government policies always kept its criticism on corporate influence and structure that influenced its policies. So just to quote some random examples, even though lefties don't advocate against driving trains or using cell phones or laptops they voice criticisms of corporations that produce these goods. And the similar thing is with this vaccine, I mean, there's one thing being able to talk about the science, and there's one thing to talk about the corporations that are producing the vaccine. And if I take it up one step further, when a natural disaster like COVID occurs, market conditions naturally change, which could lead to the formation of natural monopolies or oligopolies, cartels. Leftists were traditionally, in this case, argue for the government to step in, nationalize these industries to ensure that no exuberant profits are made and that our power does not accumulate in the hands of a few corporations that could lead to more political power. However, in the case of COVID we see the left totally silent on these parts of the political economy and developments of big pharmaceutical companies. And if you now criticize these big pharmaceutical companies, you're calling conspiracy theories. No differentiation is made between the goods produced and the political and economic structures behind these big pharmaceutical companies. Why do you think the left is so afraid and has abandoned its criticism of the political economy surrounding big pharma and the immense power it has

accumulated?

GG: It's a great question. It reminds me a lot of what happened during the Trump years when the entire scandal that dominated the headlines for four years in the United States and parts of Western Europe about the threat from Russia, about the collusion between Trump and Russia emanated from the CIA was a CIA created story. They're the ones who leaked it. They're the ones who disseminated it and partners at the NSA and other security state agencies. And yet, in major parts of the left, it became off-limits to express skepticism of that story. You weren't allowed to express skepticism of claims emanating from the CIA or even question their intentions. The hero of the left became this former director of the FBI, Robert Mueller, who was George Bush's FBI director after 9/11. He was the one who rounded up Muslims in the United States. He was the one who advocated for the invasion of Iraq. Claiming that there was definitive evidence. These were the people who we were told we had to get behind and cheer for. And that questioning them was off limits. Now you have Pfizer and Moderna, some of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world, and I'm not saying we should immediately discount what they're saying, but we should recognize that they have an enormous profit motive in not only hyping the vaccine in all of its benefits, but now insisting that not just the two shots we were originally told were needed to make us fully vaccinated, but the third booster, the fourth booster, which certainly going to be the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth, are all necessary as well to be considered fully vaccinated. The question you asked me before about how we treat the unvaccinated; three months ago, the unvaccinated meant something different than it means today. The unvaccinated three months ago meant somebody who has not gotten two shots. Now it means someone who has not gotten two shots, plus the booster. Three months from now, it's going to mean somebody who hasn't gotten four shots. And there seems to be almost no space on the left to wonder whether or not claims that are emanating from big pharmaceutical companies and their allies in the public health and scientific industry are to be doubted or questioned. And also what you pointed out that during the pandemic, the story of the pandemic has been that the largest corporations have consolidated their wealth. You know, you can use any metric. The top 200 billionaires in the world have had their wealth tripled or quadrupled because the largest corporations, which they founded and owned, like Amazon and Google and the rest have all grown dramatically because of our reliance on them, while small businesses have increasingly disappeared as a result of lockdowns and quarantines and economic disruption. So the oligarchy that we already had prior to the pandemic is infinitely stronger than it was two years ago as a result of all these restrictions. We're becoming weaker and weaker in terms of our ability to challenge these corporate giants. And yet the ethos seems to be don't question any of that. Our enemies are not big corporations, big pharma, big government or the security services. Our enemies are, you know, ordinary citizens who, for whatever reason, don't want to get the vaccine. Those are the people who are supposed to hate and focus on and for everybody else obedience, submission and gratitude are what we owe. And it seems to be a very aggressive inversion of leftist values to me.

ZR: I want to switch gears here and now focus on Julian Assange. Before I start digging deeper into the topic, I just want you to talk about how culpable the media is in today's- the result that has come out that Julian Assange would be extradited to the United States? What role have they played so far?

GG: Well, so a lot of you probably know that during the Trump years, one of the main concerns the media expressed was whether press freedoms would be attacked by Donald Trump. The Washington Post very early on in the Trump presidency, adopted a new motto or corporate motto that appears at the top of the page that says democracy dies in darkness. There were a lot of claims that Trump was a grave threat to press freedoms because he would often be critical of the press. He would insult the media. He called the press the enemy of the people. The gravest threat to press freedom that happened during the Trump presidency by far, by far, not even close was the indictment of Julian Assange, where they're trying to charge him with 18 felony counts under the Espionage Act. The same law they used against Edward Snowden, the same law they used against Daniel Ellsberg, the leaker of the Pentagon Papers in 1971, to say that he committed crimes in connection with the publication of those documents provided to him by Chelsea Manning in 2010. It doesn't have anything to do with the 2016 election or his role in that, at least formally. There's nothing in the indictment that has anything to do with that. But the argument is that by publishing those documents and working the way he did with Chelsea Manning, he became a criminal. So the theory used to criminalize him, if adopted, would essentially criminalize all investigative journalism because everything he said to have done that makes him a criminal, namely, helping Chelsea Manning try and evade detection, encouraging Chelsea Manning to provide more documents, soliciting materials from the public and encouraging people to hand over classified information, are things investigative journalist, if they're good, do all of the time. And I talked before about how the first article I ever wrote about the dangers of the Assange indictment was in May of 2019. In June of 2019, I, with my colleagues in Brazil, started a year long investigative exposé showing the corruption on the part of high level officials in the Bolsonaro government. And in January of 2020, I was criminally indicted by the Brazilian government, using exactly the same theory the US government was using to and is using to prosecute Assange. The Supreme Court intervened in my case and essentially issued a ruling that said that would be a violation of my press freedom. That the only reason I'm not arrested and imprisoned is because of that ruling. But this theory is incredibly dangerous to anyone around the world who does journalism. And remember, one of the things that makes it extra dangerous is: Julian Assange is not an American citizen. He's not on U.S. soil. The U.S. is reaching across the world to try and nab him and bring him back to the United States, a country to which he has no connection. Which I presume means that if the New York Times publishes secret documents from Iran as it's done, or Russia or China, any of those governments under this theory would have the right to extradite those reporters to their countries and charge them with harming national security or espionage. And yet you hear almost no complaints, no concerns, no warnings from the American media. They were hysterical every time Trump would tweet an insult about some TV personality, as though that

was a grave attack on press freedom. Here you have an actual attack on press freedom. Some of them, when Trump did it, came out in defense of Assange. But now that it's the Biden administration that has picked up this case and is aggressively pursuing it and refuses to drop it, there's almost no coverage of the case at all, let alone denunciations about what the Biden administration is doing. Because the American media hates Julian Assange so much. They hate him for personality reasons. They hate him because of jealousy, that he's broken so many stories more than they ever have or will. They hate him because they perceive that he helped Trump in the 2016 election by reporting accurately on Hillary Clinton. So the hatred level for Julian Assange is so great that almost nobody in the American media is even covering this story, let alone objecting. And that, of course, is a major reason why the U.S. government is getting away with trying to drag him back to the United States and keep him in prison forever.

ZR: So Julian Assange was spied upon while he was in the Ecuadorian embassy. In addition there were plans discussed by the CIA and other government actors to assassinate him. Lastly, the star witness of the US was a documented history of several convictions for sexual abuse of minors and even for committing financial fraud admitted to fabricating key accusations against Assange. These facts received little to no attention in the German media when the verdict came. It was just presented very objectively. So in your assessment, why do you think these facts were not given the weight that they deserved in the British court? So, for example, if Navalny was tried in Russia and all of these things were done by the Russian government, we would have seen a big coverage and weightage put on these facts. Why do you think these developments were just simply thrown out by the British court?

GG: You know, it's amazing. I visited Julian Assange in I believe it was 2018 in the Ecuadorian Embassy in London. I visited him as a journalist. I visited him with my husband, David Miranda, who was a member, an elected member of the Brazilian Congress, who's a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and was traveling on a diplomatic Brazilian passport to London. We went there to do an event together about what happened at Heathrow Airport during the Snowden reporting to David [Context: David Miranda was held up at Heathrow in 2013 under counter terrorism laws] and we went visiting the embassy and we were among the people who were spied on by this private contractor hired by the CIA, as are many other people. An incredible breach of diplomatic protocols of press freedom, of privacy. Beyond that, you know, he is suffering greatly inside of that embassy or inside the prison where he is. His doctors have said that his physical and mental health are deteriorating rapidly. And yet there's very little coverage of it. And what you have instead is the American media, the German media, the British media, they love to accuse other countries of attacking journalists. They love to talk about what Putin has done to Navalny, what China has done to journalists. All of which may be true. But what standing moral credibility does the United States and the UK have to condemn other countries for punishing journalists or attacking press freedoms when the person who I would argue is one of the most consequential journalists of our generation, if not the most consequential, is imprisoned by both of those

governments?! Maltreated in every way imaginable, his basic human rights and political rights violated for years with almost no objection. It's something that every other country in the world will just laugh at when the US and the UK pretend to be able to denounce other countries for attacks on press freedom. And they should be laughed at because they are among the worst violators.

ZR: An organization called Project Veritas was searched by the FBI for their adversarial work on Biden. Assange is now being extradited to the U.S. for his work with WikiLeaks. We are not only seeing governments going after publishers, but we can see the same trend in the corporate sphere. So let's say YouTube, Twitter, Facebook, content is being deleted or removed from independent and alternative media outlets, whether it's critical of Biden or Corona policies, etc.. So, for example, acTVism Munich, we used to grow every year by thousands and thousands and thousands of subscribers. This is the first year, even though we've produced more videos than last year, where we have won zero subscribers and something has changing the algorithms, we don't know what it is. In light of this, as a constitutional lawyer, I would like to ask you what free speech and press freedom actually means. Is it reserved for only institutional press and credentialed journalists? Or does the definition go beyond?

GG: So obviously, American laws are different from other countries' laws. But in the United States, where press freedom was first protected by a constitution a lot of people mistakenly believe or have been purposely misled to believe that the right of press freedom is available only to this small professionalized privileged group of people called journalists. So oftentimes if you say that the prosecution of Assange is an attack on press freedom, as I said earlier, you'll be met with the objection, while Julian Assange isn't a journalist and therefore it can't be a case of press freedoms being attacked. I have no idea how people decide that Julian Assange isn't a journalist, given that, as I said earlier, he's broken more major stories than all of his critics combined. It looks to me like what he does is classic journalism. He gets information in the public interest from a source that's secret and then goes and publishes it so that the public can understand what their governments or other power centers are doing. That, to me, seems to be classic journalism, but ultimately, who does the left trust to decide who is and isn't a journalist? I mean, who decides that? Is it the U.S. government? They get to say, that person is a journalist. That one's not. I don't trust any institution to decide that, but the much more important point is that press freedom, as it was understood at the time that the Constitution was enacted, was never intended to apply only to a small group of privileged people, like some small priesthood of licensed credentialed journalists. It was a right that was available to all citizens. In fact, what it really meant; people who were using the press. The reason it's called the press is they were literally using a printing press, mimeograph machines and the like. That colonists in the United States, like Thomas Paine and others were printing materials, agitating the public to be opposed to the British crown. And most of them weren't professional journalists. Thomas Paine never worked in a newspaper. He never worked in any media outlet or anything like that. He was just a citizen who had other jobs, but he was using

the press to express himself. And that's what freedom of the press means. It's not that there's a certain group of people who are licensed as journalists you get to do something that no one else gets to do. It's the opposite. It's that all citizens have the right to avail themselves of the right to be heard and to inform their fellow citizens using the press. It's something that's available to all citizens, so it doesn't matter whether someone is, quote unquote, a journalist. I think you've put your finger on something very important, which is, look, the idea that some people on the right are opposed to basic civil liberties or free speech is not new to me, that's not surprising to me. What's disturbing is how much support there is for people from the left that seem to want to trust Google and Facebook and Big Tech companies or even the government to police and regulate and censor our discourse. And one of the things I'm trying to do more than anything is to make people understand that the power of censorship or the power to punish journalists is not about left or right. It's about anyone who wants to challenge establishments of power or the narratives of orthodoxy and piety that the establishment disseminates, whether on the right or the left. So you mentioned earlier that videos of yours, even the one you did with me, had been taken down by YouTube. All over the world, leftists are being victimized by Big Tech censorship. The first reporting I ever did on Facebook censorship was in 2016, and it was reporting that I did about how the Israeli government makes lists and gives them to Facebook, a Palestinian journalist and activist which who they claim are inciting terrorism, by which the Israeli government means criticizing Israel. And in 98 or 99 percent of the cases, Facebook takes these lists and bans and removes the pages, the Facebook pages of those people in Palestine that the Israelis want silenced. That's how censorship works. It's a majoritarian tool that is always going to be used against the marginalized. Now, sometimes the marginalized are people who have views that you dislike fringe right wing voices. But if you applaud censorship because it's aimed at some right wing voice that you dislike, the precedent that you're affirming the system that you're upholding is one that says that the government has the right to ensure that anyone on the fringes, anyone in the margins won't be heard from and can be silenced. And the only voices that will be heard are these licensed, credentialed corporate media outlets that do nothing but disseminate and never question, challenge or undermine establishment piety. And that's the whole point of that system, which is why it's insanity for anyone who views themselves as being on the left to support it.

ZR: Our viewership has a very strong interest in Edward Snowden. We interviewed him in 2017. Therefore, I want to ask you, how is he doing and what is his status in Russia?

GG: He's doing very well given the fact that he is a person who is confined to a country that he didn't choose to live in for now eight years and cannot leave that country without facing the immediate and certain threat of being arrested by the world's most powerful government and put in a cage for the rest of his life. So given that highly repressive restriction under which he's been living since 2013, he's doing well. He is married. He had a baby about a year ago with his longtime girlfriend, now wife. He has done very fulfilling work. He works with the Freedom of the Press Foundation, which is the organization I co-founded, along with

people like Daniel Ellsberg, the whistleblower who leaked the Pentagon Papers to the New York Times. Laura Poitras, who worked with me on the Snowden reporting, while she was based in Germany and several other transparency advocates. He's the president of that organization. He wrote a book last year. He does speeches. He's doing very well from the perspective that he has his liberty in Russia and he has his liberty to speak out. And he often does on privacy and surveillance, he criticizes the Russian government, he criticizes the United States government. So all things considered, he's doing quite well. And needless to say, views the choice that he made not with regret, but with great pride as he should, because he knows that it contributed a great deal to the world in letting us know the threats that come from state surveillance.

ZR: To my last question, you left The Intercept last year and now publish your work on other platforms, could you tell our viewers where they can follow your work and why you chose these platforms?

GG: Sure. So I did leave The Intercept in October of 2020, because in the weeks leading up to the election, they tried to prevent me from publishing an article which I wanted to publish about evidence suggesting or raising ethical questions about Joe Biden. And I went to Substack, which is a platform designed to protect writers like myself, who do have anti-establishment views that don't fit comfortably into corporate media and mainstream media to be able to reach large audiences without being censored. And I've been writing there for the last year. I also now do video content and create video reports on a platform called Rumble, which is a competitor of YouTube, but designed to ensure freedom of speech, to not de-platform people like your videos have been de-platform because they cross some invisible line or another set by Google. And I'm also doing podcasts and interviews on a new podcast app called Get Callin, C A L L I N, which has a similar ethos that is designed to ensure freedom of speech. So I think what you're seeing is the emergence of this media ecosystem in this part of the internet that is about independent journalism and that is designed to shield people from the increasing repression of Big Tech and the power of the state to censor. And for me, that has become one of the most important causes for my journalism, which is I'm trying to make sure to do my journalism and bring my audience to platforms that are protecting these values.

ZR: Glenn Greenwald, Pulitzer Prize winning journalist. Thank you so much for your time.

GG: It was great to be with you, thanks for having me.

ZR: And thank you guys for tuning in today. Don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel by clicking on the banner below and to visit our alternative channels Rumble and Telegram. It's also mentioned in the description. Last but not the least, don't forget to donate so we can continue to produce independent and nonprofit news and analysis. I'm your host, Zain Raza. See you guys next time.

END