



FULL AFTER SHOW: Glenn Responds to Viewer Critiques on Our Israel-Gaza Coverage | LOCALS Q&A

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

Glenn Greenwald (GG): Good evening, everybody. Welcome to the live aftershow here on Locals. I am joined tonight as my quite canine co-host Sylvestre who is looking elegant and tranquil as always. Look at him with those eyes just very focussed, very at peace as well. And then here on my lap is the more agitated co-host, but his energy is crucial to the show, and that is Kane, who is also ready to go as always. So we asked for a lot of input in the Locals thread and we had more than 300 comments or close to 300 comments, and a lot of them were great. So I'm going to try and get through as many of these as we can and I purposely picked a couple of critical ones to start off with because our coverage, like pretty much the entire debate since three weeks ago, has been polarising to some of you. Although it is interesting, I think the majority of our audience has been very supportive, including people who are on the Israeli side in this conflict. And I think in part because we've focussed mostly, not entirely, we've done a lot of coverage on the conflict itself and what I feel is the wildly excessive use of force, to put that mildly, in Gaza. Obviously we began by condemning vehemently the Hamas attacks, which I still stand by. But the kind of freedom of speech and discourse and calls for censorship and cancellation that have arisen around it and I think even a lot of people who support Israel are bothered by that. And so we always try to make that a unifying feature of our show is a belief in free discourse and the importance of free speech regardless.

So let me start off with a critical comment from Vrooman who says: "Glenn! Will you please be fair and show the other people on the right who are not asking for censorship? There are so many of us and you are purposely choosing the whackos who stand for all kinds of bullshit. Think about it, Nikki, Tim and Ron are freaking neocons who love war, I would expect them to have disgusting attitudes on just about anything. I know this subject brings out the worst in

everyone. I'll never understand it, but you are stoking the fires of hate by calling everyone on the right liars and hypocrites. Look at what you are doing. I'm watching you change right before my eyes."

Okay, so first of all, I think we've been very careful to note from the beginning, and I actually have noted at least on several occasions that there are major figures on the right who support Israel, but do not support cancellation and censorship. In fact, one of the most prominent disputes happened when Vivek Ramaswamy came out and denounced the attempt to get students fired who have been expressing pro-Palestinian views. And in response, Megyn Kelly attacked Vivek and said, This is disgusting what you're saying. I think these people are terrorist supporters and if you want to hire terrorist supporters and Hamas fans, feel free, but the rest of us normal people aren't going to do that. And in response, Candace Owens inserted herself into that thread to respond to Megyn Kelly and essentially called her a hypocrite for supporting censorship and cancellation. Exactly the kinds of things the American right has been doing. And we featured that exchange on our show and I've mentioned Candace Owen and Vivek on several occasions as examples of major conservative voices who are not doing this sort of thing.

Now, we also just put on the show and obviously this comment or I think this comment was posted today, didn't know we were going to do that, in fairness, but we just had a conservative voice, a conservative pundit and author Brad Palumbo, a conservative writer and journalist who vehemently condemned Ron DeSantis. And we had him on our show. And I said, here's a conservative who is extremely principled on this issue. And we interviewed him and gave him the floor, and he explained why he thinks what the people on the American right who are calling for censorship are doing is so dangerous. So we just got done featuring a conservative who is not doing this as a way of saying, it's not all the American right. And I think I've been extremely careful, extremely careful to say these are not all the people in the American right. These are some of the people on the American right, because I want this split on the American right to be understood and seen. I don't want it to seem like everybody in the American right is calling for censorship, in part because it's not true, as this commenter correctly points out, but also because I want people on the right to see it. And to be on the right doesn't mean you have to call for the censorship of pro-Palestinian speech. You can support Israel and still support free speech. I want those people to be examples of what I hope other people will follow.

Now, all that said, I think it's difficult to put that mildly, to call people like Nikki Haley, Tim Scott and Ron DeSantis, the wackos, who are basically just marginalised people. Nikki Haley was the governor of South Carolina for eight years and she's not a leading presidential candidate, but she's somebody who's in the top tier. She was also President Trump's ambassador to the United Nations. Tim Scott is currently a Republican senator from South Carolina, and Ron DeSantis is the governor of Florida. And in every poll, pretty much he's either in second place or third place with Vivek. So I don't think I'm nut picking, I don't think I'm reaching for obscure figures on the right, these are representative figures of a part of

American conservatism, the part that's neo conservative. Now, maybe I haven't done enough to emphasise this split, but I think I have been very cognisant to do so because I feel like it's in my interest to do so, meaning in the interest of my free speech clause. So to the extent that we haven't done that, we put on a conservative tonight, sort of on purpose to say, here's how you can be conservative and still support free speech. So, you know, I have to say though, it has bothered me and it's not just these politicians. I mean, there are pundits and journalists. I mean, Dave Rubin was one of my examples. And there have been others who, you know, have been influential, Barry Weiss, and you can call them neocons. I agree that they are, but there are also influential figures on the right who have led the crusade or part of believing their crusade in favour of free speech and against censorship and sort of watch them so flagrantly violate that and become censorship advocates because their allegiance to Israel outweighs their principles has been very disturbing. It's been surreal. I find it shocking in a way that perhaps makes me naive.

Now, other people who are neocons like Josh Hawley, also said the FBI should investigate people who seem to be pro-Hamas. So it hasn't just been confined to the neoconservative wing, but you know, there are people on the right for sure who not only don't support censorship, but don't even support Israel or think the United States should mind its own business and stay out of that. So there is a split on the right over these things. And I think, in fact, one of our shows wasn't even entitled like the split on the right, if I'm not mistaken. Somebody can check that. So I take your point, though, and hopefully if we had been in submission about that tonight, helped rectify it.

Here is a comment from E-crease1 and this is actually left a few days ago, but I meant to address it last night and the last time we had Locals and I didn't have time. But this is the comment and the critique as well, quote: "You have articulated many valid critiques of members of the pro-Israel community, the sweeping accusations that supporters of Palestine are pro-Hamas, the attempts to cancel and censor critics of Israel and the dehumanisation of Gaza civilians. I think you make it seem like the majority of pro-Israel supporters do those things, and I don't think that is accurate, but the critiques are certainly well taken". So again, here, I'm don't think I've ever said the majority of pro-Israel supporters are accusing everyone of being pro-Hamas or are dehumanising Gaza civilians or censoring. Although it's similar to that other critique. So I'll certainly, you know, take it under advisement that maybe I haven't been clear that it's not all conservatives doing these things, but there are certainly influential ones. I tried very hard never to just find obscure people and make it seem like they're more representative or significant than they are. I try and combine myself to people who have influential platforms, who are well-known, whose opinions are listened to by a large number of people. And I think there are a lot of influential people guilty of all these things. Though, again, if I've been not sufficiently attentive to making that distinction clear, I think that's a valid critique. But then it goes on to escalate the criticism and I'll quote: "But I think you've been silent concerning an analogous conduct by members of the pro-Palestinian community, including people you've had on your show and plainly admire, such as Aaron Mate and

Michael Tracey and Jimmy Dore, the sweeping accusations that supporters of Israel support genocide, the justifications provided for Hamas's actions on October 7th and the justification for what happened on October 7th. I know you say no decent or prominent person thinks such conduct is justified, but maybe you haven't been reading Jimmy Dore's Twitter post. This conduct is prevalent by non fringe actors. You ignore these statements and actions and I'm asking why every night since your second show following the October 7th Hamas massacre, you have been focussed on those themes. But if you're going to keep levelling these critiques of pro-Israel supporters without pointing out the same kind of conduct by pro-Palestinian supporters, then you are effectively communicating that you don't find that conduct problematic when voiced by opponents of Israel's current policies. And if that's the case and just say so, I don't think I'm morally inferior or less educated than Aaron Mate, Michael Tracey, or Jimmy Dore, I find their smug judgements about supporters of Israel highly offensive. We are supporters of genocide and ethnic cleansing or we are propagandised."

Okay, so let me start off with this. There was an attempt at the very beginning to essentially equate people who criticised Israel or who even tried to put this Hamas attack into the broader context by pointing out that Israel is to blame, there was an attempt to equate everybody doing that with people who are pro Hamas and supportive of Hamas. In the way that happened was by focusing on extremely obscure and fringe people like some guy at a DSA rally who disgustingly mocked the, quote, "hipsters" who were taken hostage and said, "Oh, I'm sure they're doing well". And then there was a Black Lives Matter chapter that celebrated the paragliding and glorified it, and then later apologised. And there was like an assistant professor who wasn't even tenured who said something like, Oh, this is what resistance looks like, or, This is what de-colonisation looks like. And what I was trying to say was the reason those kinds of people had to be focussed on, people whose names nobody knew, to point out they're celebrating or defending Hamas is because nobody with a platform is actually doing that. Nobody in Congress did that, including probably Rashida Tlaib and Ilhan Omar, the most pro-Palestinian voices. Ilhan Omar, the first statement she made strongly condemned Hamas. And there's nothing Rashida Tlaib said that justified pro Hamas either. And even if they had, they would still be kind of on the fringe of Congress. But nobody in Congress was pro Hamas or saying supportive things of Hamas. No major person with an influential pundit platform at The New York Times, The Washington Post, any of the networks was saying it, and no real independent journalist with a major platform were saying that either that Hamas is justified.

Now, and I don't really follow Jimmy Dore's Twitter stream much, I don't think he appears much. He doesn't use Twitter a lot. I'm not familiar with what Jimmy Dore is saying on Twitter. I'm more familiar with what Michael says, because we've had him on our show since. And I see his Twitter feed a lot and Aaron's to a lesser extent. I don't think they've defended pro Hamas, but I don't think that's what this comment is suggesting. I think this comment is suggesting that especially Jimmy maybe, but I guess Michael and Aaron as well, are suggesting that everybody who supports Israel is a supporter of genocide and ethnic

cleansing, doesn't care about Gaza, or is propagandised. And I will acknowledge I don't think Michael, by the way, is somebody who is guilty of that. In fact, Michael has been, as usual, very evenhanded. He just like plunges forward without the slightest regard to whose side he's on. And he's offered pretty strong condemnations of people who are on the left or who are pro-Palestinian supporters, who, in his view, became very excessive in their rhetoric. He actually covered a march, a pro-Palestinian march in Manchester, in the UK, and pointed out, documented that he interviewed a lot of the people there, and a lot of them were, in fact, supportive of Hamas or very hateful toward Israel and all Israelis. So, I honestly haven't seen that. I haven't seen these people suggesting that everybody who's supportive of Israel is a supporter of a genocide or wants to extinguish all people in Gaza. And in fact, one of the points I tried making in response to people saying, if you're someone who stands up and calls for the murder of all Israelis, then your speech is too dangerous to permit. I showed that there were a few extremists at these pro-Israeli marches who expressed similar thoughts about people in Gaza. Namely, wipe out Gaza, flatten Gaza, kill all the people in Gaza, turn it into a parking lot. And I really don't think that's what the majority of Israelis think. It is true, though, that the nature in the face of the Israeli government has changed. When we had on the Knesset member he was pointing out that a lot of people in the coalition governing party, the governing coalition, the partners of Benjamin Netanyahu, are people who explicitly say we should push out the Gazans out of Gaza, we should annexe the West Bank. So I don't think it's a fringe position. But I also know a lot of people who are supporters of Israel who don't harbour any hatred for Palestinians and who are pained by the fact that Palestinians are dying. And you even think the Israelis are being too excessive in their use of force. So I know in my own personal life that it's not the case that people who are supportive of Israel all believe in genociding the Palestinians, nor do I believe that they're all propagandised. So that's not something I've said, that's not something I believe. And if I saw somebody prominent saying it, you know, I can't promise you that if I saw Aaron Mate saying it, I would think that that would warrant time on my show to condemn. If it were Ilhan Omar saying that or Rashida Tlaib saying that, or somebody who I thought was more influential and powerful with the congressional seat, I certainly know what I think, I would like to think that I would. But to the extent this is a criticism that I have focussed on the flaws or the excesses of Israel supporters while ignoring the flaws and excesses of pro-Palestinian supporters, I think that's a valid critique. The only defence I'm offering at myself is that I really haven't seen these three people or anybody else I consider influential having done that. But that doesn't mean they didn't do it. Maybe they did it and I just didn't see it. I really don't think Michael would have. I can see Jimmy Dore doing that. I can see Aaron Mate, who I think is very careful usually, but nonetheless very kind of steadfast on the positions he holds very strongly, saying things like that as well. I will actually check. And if it's the case, maybe I'll even have them on and question them about it, because I agree that to generalise about all Israel's supporters, either in Israel or the United States is unwarranted.

So let me just postpone that criticism and try and look around and see if there are things that merit my critical attention. Here is Ruby C. Kinglet, who says: "Do you think Dave Rubin,

who I believe is the creator and perhaps majority stockholder in Locals, will continue to allow voices with differing perspectives on Palestine and Israel to receive funding here? I support you by paying my subscription to your channel through the Locals app. Dave Rubin has pitched the site repeatedly as a free speech platform, and I believe he means it. In the context of free speech there always seems to be the caveat of no dissenting voices regarding Israel. Rubin has in recent days made it very clear that he applauds the censorship of anyone speaking out against the bombing of Gaza". In fact, we criticise Dave Rubin explicitly on our show. That was one of the first examples we cited of somebody who has built a career defending free speech and opposing cancel culture and when it was announced that the French had imposed a nationwide ban on all pro-Palestinian protesters, Dave Rubin said, Oh, maybe there's hope for the West after all; meaning the key to saving the West. Which he always said was eroding and decaying because of its lack of free speech now he seem to be saying the key to saving the West is to censor and ban pro-Palestinian protests. I think what he actually means is that these immigrant populations inside Western Europe need to be treated like a menace and an enemy. And he saw these bans on pro-Palestinian protesters finally clamping down on these groups. And that doesn't make it any better, in fact, on some of what makes it worse. And we were very critical of Dave Rubin.

And in fact, I asked Dave Rubin to come on my show to talk about that. I didn't want to just criticise him. I've been on Dave Rubin's show once when I was in Milwaukee to cover the presidential debate. He had a booth at Locals and I didn't have any booths available to do my show. So I went on Dave Rubin's show first with Jordan Peterson and Michael Malice and then we went live afterwards. So I didn't want to just criticise Dave Rubin on Twitter, which I did on my show, which I did without inviting him to come on. But he couldn't come on, I guess. He stated some family issues, but then it didn't work out, I guess, after that either. He's certainly welcome on. But no, I don't think Dave Rubin – first of all, I don't want to say things I'm not sure of, but my understanding is that Rumble purchased Locals. So Locals is now part of Rumble and subject to its management structure. So I don't think Dave Rubin has managerial control over Rumble. I know the CEO of Locals, rather, sorry, I don't think he has managerial control over Locals. I know the CEO of Locals. I believe he reports to the CEO of Rumble, who is Chris Pavlovsky, who would never, ever allow censorship on the Israel Gaza question or any other question, I believe. I haven't seen him. And in fact, I've seen him do the opposite. Stand up to the French government, stand up to the British government when trying to pressure him to censor. So I trust Chris a lot, and I've never seen any suggestion or indication that Dave Rubin would either. Obviously, if that happened, I'd have a gigantic problem with that. I would not be part of a platform that would start censoring that way, let alone allow my own show to be subject to censorship. So all I can tell you is I appreciate the concern and I can promise you that if that happened, I will pound the table as I did when I was at The Intercept. But I haven't seen that or anything like that or any suggestions that that might happen yet.

[inaudible] everywhere, I just want to say I [inaudible] flowers are my favourite colours,

Glenn; with a lot of nice emojis. Thank you, that is super nice. Guest suggestion, Dan Schmachtenberger. I'm not familiar with who that is, we can definitely take a look. All right, last comment. There are a lot of good ones here. I'm trying to pick and choose, but we're almost out of time. I'll even try and go through that Twitter thread and entrance to that Localstread and see if I can answer some. I think it's a good way to interact and provide some additional interaction. I don't want to promise that, I am travelling next week actually, we have some interviews planned for you, by the way, including one with John Mearsheimer. Another one we did with David Talbot, who's the author of *The Devil's Chessboard*. Then we have a very special one, we're recording tomorrow that I will not preview for you, so it can be a surprise and I want to make sure we do it before I announce it. So I don't want to promise that because I am travelling throughout the week. But we're going to have shows, if not every night, almost every night because of the ones we've taped, and I'll probably do at least one from the road, but I'll try and answer.

But here's the last one: "I have been appalled at the coverage of the Israel Gaza conflict given by the US mainstream media. This morning, Al Jazeera's English *The Listening Post* explained just how bad the censorship really is. The 26 minute video can be found [here](#). *The Listening Post*, by the way, which is part of Al Jazeera English, is excellent". I've been interviewed on that show before. They do deep dive 20 to 25 minute documentaries about issues. They're extremely careful with the facts, but they're very in-depth as well. And then it says, "here is one example of censorship, which was how these three prominent MSNBC hosts, Mehdi Hasan, Ayman Mohyeldin and Ali Velshi had their shows taken off the air". I think that was a little cloudy because none of them ever spoke publicly about that report. They didn't deny it, but they didn't object either. But I do think their shows, the ones they host, weren't aired even though they themselves are part of panels and I think that their shows are now back on. But there's no doubt that this censorship is exactly like what happened in the wake of 9/11 and then George Floyd. And on some level, I find it even more pernicious because you're seeing now not just proposals, but in the case of Governor Ron DeSantis, an actual use of his state power. He shut down a Palestinian group, a pro-Palestinian group on campus. That is insane. And you have a lot of calls for censorship and everyone is petrified politically of looking like they support Hamas. And so nobody wants to even dissent on any level who has any political power, with a few exceptions. And I really do actually worry about that.

I notice here, it's true, there's people who still ask about this podcast that I did with Ben Mora, I guess more than a year ago now. It was called *Glenn and Ben's After Hours*. It was sort of like a dark version of a podcast because it was much more informal. Ben Mora is this hilarious gay former Sanders campaign aide who got fired because as a campaign organiser for Bernie Sanders because he got caught or *The Daily Beast* outed him as having maintained a secret private Twitter account just for his friends, where he said incredibly bitter and insulting things about Hillary Clinton and Liz Warren and Pete Buttigieg that were hilarious in this very kind of I can't be aggressive, bitter, snide, gay, humorous way. But it's obviously

not something a campaign could be associated with. Some scumbag at The Daily Beast thought that even though it was a low level campaign manager, he should be outed. He got fired, and he and I did this podcast about four or five episodes, and it was a little strange. The dynamic was difficult. We had chemistry. We used to talk on the phone for an hour and that's when I said, Look, these conversations are hilarious. I really enjoyed them. Let's bring them to podcast. I think the glare of the light made the chemistry a little bit more difficult. So we were struggling to figure out how to make it work. It started working and then he decided he was a little bit too... It was just too stressful for him because there was so much negative feedback from his friends for doing a podcast with me, as well as just the pressure of knowing that everything you were saying was going to be heard by a lot of people. People still ask about it. It's kind of like it had a cult following. I think the episodes are still up on Substack.

Oh, good. The person to whom I responded, E-crease1 just said, "I tried posting this but I don't see it. So I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your thoughtful response. That means a lot to me that you did because I'm such a big fan. I don't have to agree with you on everything, and it's probably best that I don't. I'm just happy you responded in a thoughtful way". I honestly feel the same way. I'm thrilled, genuinely, when... Obviously, we get a lot of praise and a lot of compliments for our work from our viewers. And I'm obviously very gratified by that. But I'm also very happy when we get thoughtful, good faith critiques, even if they're spirited, because I want to have an audience that still watches, that still respects the work I do, even knowing that sometimes we are going to disagree. And I don't think everything I do is perfect, and everything I say is perfect. And I don't get defensive or I try not to, especially when viewers and subscribers in good faith say, I think this is wrong, what you're doing. So I'm glad to hear that comment and I feel the same way. I appreciate your thoughtful critique. It's very valuable for me. I consider the show kind of a form of journalistic accountability. That's what I've always said. When I started writing about politics and doing journalism, one of the most valuable assets I had was the comment section to my blog where I would spend a lot of time. I would post my article, and then an hour later I would go into the comment section. There'd often be, you know, supporters, readers who would say, Oh, I think you made a mistake here. Oh, this argument doesn't really have as much logical validity as you think, or there's an evidentiary hole in what you're saying or this article that you cited doesn't really support. And a lot of times they were right. And it strengthened my work as a journalist, it made me more careful. It made me more rigorous. A lot of times I corrected it. So I learned very early on not to get defensive about criticism, but to see them as an asset and a value. Obviously bad faith ones, ones that just tell you that you suck aren't very valuable, but the ones that take the time to try and express their critique based in good faith for what you're doing, there's few things more valuable.

All right. So we're going to call it a night. We are very appreciative of the comments, people leave for that reason. I consider this a really important part of what we do here. So thank you so much in the most sincere way possible for supporting our community, for participating in

it. And we hope to see you back tomorrow night at 7 p.m. We're going to have shows most of next week, if not all of next week, despite the fact that I'm travelling. And we'll be back tomorrow night at 7 p.m. Eastern. Obviously next week we won't have Locals shows because I'll be travelling. But then we are way back at our normal time Tuesday and Thursday the week following. Thanks so much and have a great evening.

The clip you just watched is from the live aftershow we do on Locals exclusively for our Locals subscribers. The live after show 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 transcript for each show that we produce as well as the exclusive written content we publish there. Enjoy.

END