



Would Mamdani Arrest Netanyahu?

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

Glenn Greenwald (GG): Good evening everybody, welcome to the Thursday night Q&A. And because that's what it's called, here we are on Thursday night gathered at 7 o'clock PM, which is the normal time, just to give us and you a little of lee way. And we are very excited for many reasons, simply because we love doing this weekly show, but also because we are here in what really is our new studio. A couple of weeks ago I said we had debuted it, but it really wasn't quite ready for prime time, or really for any kind of debut at all, regardless, even at like three in the morning, it wasn't ready for that kind of a debut. And it definitely provoked all sorts of horror and disgust and acrimony and vicious attacks. And I told you, we're not really actually done with it. It was just a way to test it. And now here we are. Are we done with that? I would say we're like 98% done with it. And I think it's only fair that I insist, given how gracefully I took those other critiques the first time that we did it, that you now admit that this is actually quite beautiful. It may not be the most conventional studio you've ever seen. It may not be exactly the kind of decor that you would choose if you were designing it. But I think it's really kind of important to admit that it is really quite beautiful, we wanted to keep some continuity with that Rumble studio we had.

So, a little bit of the color scheme is a little similar but technically it seems to be working great. And the reason why I use this word admit, I use it with my kids all the time, if I want my kids to do something that they don't want to do, you know, like go to a new restaurant or experience some new food like or vegan restaurant that opens when I know they don't like vegan food, I'm like, No, I'm sure you're going to like it. Or if I try and get them to wear some clothing that's different from the clothing they normally wear, and we have a fight over it, I'm like, No, you're going to like it, I promise. And we get to the restaurant and they order and I can see they're eating it and they like it but they don't t actually want to admit it because they were certain they weren't going to like it I'm always like, "admit it, admit, admit that you like it same with their clothes, they get all dressed and look at themselves in the mirror, they're all impressed. I was like, "admit that I picked something good" and then they have to admit it. So that's similar to what I'm insisting on here. I do think it's quite good. We'll see how the tech goes. I think it'll work well. I just know everybody on the internet is a critic. I've never seen a studio that prompts anything close to universal approval. But I think the harsh

ugliness of that first version has clearly been improved, if not entirely resolved. I'm happy with it, and I think at the end of the day, that's all that matters, because if I'm happy with things, you're going to be happy, we're all going to be together. And for those of you who aren't ready yet to admit that you love it, I'm quite certain that very shortly you will.

All right, so we have a lot to get to. Enough of all that chatter. There's a lot going on, including some really interesting political developments this week, leading with the elections that took place in New York City and the kind of earthquake that was delivered to the horrific Democratic establishment, which has been long in need of not just an earthquake, but multiple earthquakes. And they got it this week, whether it's the earthquake that they actually need, whether it's a real earthquake, are all things that remain to be seen. But there's a lot to dig into. And for those of you who don't know this format, we have our Substack greenwald.substack.com, which is where I do most of my journalism. And the subscribers to that Substack page – and if you're not one and you want to become one, you can do so quite easily – throughout the week submit questions, comments, critiques, ideas that they want us to interact with on this show. That's the purpose of it. And we try to get to as many of those submissions as we can in an hour and a half. We try to keep it to that to be able to delve in deeply. The idea isn't to have a speed round and get 111 questions, it's more to delve in deeply to things that are in people's minds and that took place throughout the week.

And so the first question is about this election result from Tuesday night, and it's from Somni. And we obviously had a lot of questions about this. And this one reads, quote: "Do you think the results of New York's recent primaries suggest hope for a diminishing AIPAC stranglehold on government in general, or do you think they were only one-offs?" So for those of you who don't know, in New York City, there were two incumbents, one Congressman Dan Goldman, who is the heir to the billionaire Levi Strauss fortune. And he was first elected only in 2024. So he was seeking his second term. He really got notoriety because he was the second in command of the Mueller investigation, was a high-level prosecutor in the Russiagate investigation, investigating President Trump, became an MSNBC star as a result.

But really, he basically won the Democratic nomination 2024 because his family are the billionaires if they are close friends with the Sulzberger family that owns the New York Times being the billionaires that they are. Billionaire Jewish families in Manhattan obviously know each other and operate in the same circles and both are generally pro-Israel. And the New York Times editorial board endorsed Dan Goldman over politicians who had a lot more experience who had probably a lot more command in the days and he just barely won even with his billions, even with The New York Times editorial page, won by a very small margin. And he became very out of step with New York City voters because he always has been and continues to be very pro-Israel. He was adamant that Israel wasn't committing a genocide, was insistent that there be no arms cut off to Israel.

And he got targeted by New York city mayor Zohran Mamdani who, despite himself being very controversial when he was elected, has become a very popular mayor. Well beyond the

voting block he originally commanded when he first won. So he has a lot of political capital. He just won six months ago, this very kind of magnetic media covered victory and people like that aura of a victor. So he's had that, but also he's just really ingratiated himself well in terms of how he's managed the city in these first six months at least. He had some good luck, including the New York Knicks championship that gave a lot of good energy and feeling to a city. And that obviously helps the mayor. And he targeted Dan Goldman with the Democratic Party controller of the city, Brad Lander, who ran originally against Zohran Mamdani. And once Zohran Mamdani became the nominee, he became an important endorsement, as Brad Lander did. Because he's Jewish, he had also been a long time supporter of Israel, but had turned into a critic. He kind of became, I guess, the most prominent New York City politician who was Jewish and pro-Israel, vouching for Mamdani at a time when the attacks on him were that he was anti-Semitic and was going to endanger New York Jews. There was Brad Lander, known to New York City voters, Democratic Jewish voters, assuring them that that was untrue. That became really important in Mamdani's ability to defeat Andrew Cuomo.

And so Mamdani turned around and convinced Brad Lander to run against Dan Goldman. Brad Lander has become, I don't know how sincere it is, but certainly he's become a more aggressive Israel critic, certainly more than Dan Goldman is. And he destroyed Dan Goldman by 30 points. In fact, I think the last time an incumbent in Congress lost a primary by 30 points, you have to go all the way back to Liz Cheney, who got destroyed in her Wyoming primary, largely because she had made herself an enemy of Donald Trump. So it was a huge victory. But that wasn't really the controversial one, because Brad Lander, the way he turned himself into an Israel critic, is a fairly conventional democratic politician. There's nothing really radical about him at all. He's already pledging. He's going to vote for Hakeem Jeffries as probably Speaker of the House if the Democrats were in the midterms.

But the other two victories were definitely more notable, more radical, and more threatening to the democratic establishment. One of them is a woman named Claire Valdez. Claire Valdez is a member of DSA. She's a New York Assemblywoman. And she was running against Antonio Reynoso, who is a pretty left to liberal progressive. He's black, I believe he's Dominican, he was the Brooklyn Borough president – young, kind of hip, dynamic, at least from the Democratic Party perspective, sort of politician, up and coming. I think he's in his late 30s, early 40s. Good looking guy, just a very kind of sleek politician. Not at all, you know, like a kind of obvious democratic old guy – he's not Chuck Schumer, either in appearance or style or ideologically, but he is not particularly aligned with the real left of Brooklyn when it comes to Israel or even when it comes to other issues. He's certainly not a hardcore Israel defender, but he's just somebody who seemed a little bit too safe and cautious and establishment.

And he had the support of the long time outgoing congresswoman who had occupied that district for decades, Nydia Velázquez, who was very popular among the Left. And she handpicked him as her successor, but Mamdani didn't really like him, even though he did support Mamdani. He wanted somebody more aligned with the DSA, much more hardcore on democratic socialism, on Israel. And so he endorsed Claire Valdez, angering a lot of people in

New York City, among the Democratic establishment, including Velázquez and her supporters. And Claire Valdez won by a pretty significant margin as well. So that was a pretty aggressive strike against Democratic New York establishment politics.

But the biggest earthquake by far was Mamdani's targeting of an incumbent congressman who's the chairman of the Latino Congressional caucus. They have these caucuses and the chairs and are just kind of like very powerful people, very protected as incumbents, have a lot of resources, a lot of money. And there he picked a woman who had never held elected office before, Darializa Chevalier. And I would say she's significantly more radical than even Claire Valdez. She was a community organizer, a PhD student. But she has a history of a lot of very hard left statements She had actually posted "Fuck Kamala Harris" at one point, which is not exactly a common sentiment among people who are seeking the Democratic Party nomination in 2026, just two years after Kamala was the nominee. She had said a lot of sort of things about peak woke-ism, about all deportations are immoral, she has identified as a communist – just things that don't quite align with the political moment, even in New York City, that are still much further out there than typically is the case.

She had also, which pleases my heart, expressed serious opposition to funding the NATO war against Russia and Ukraine, which is something that I think the Left is so long overdue to have: a debate about whether they should continue almost unanimously – I mean, Ilhan Omar has started to have a little bit of reluctance on this – but the idea that the Left and the United States should be in favor of every year sending hundreds of billions of dollars into the pockets of Raytheon and Lockheed Martin to arm and fund a lot of pretty radical right wing, even neo-Nazi groups in Ukraine to keep this war going that's already in its fourth full year against Russia to align with NATO, it's a very odd position for the Left to have. So she is actually somebody who has explicitly opposed it. Claire Valdez is somebody who hasn't explicitly opposed it, but has certainly talked a lot about the evils of having all of our money go to foreign wars and to Israel instead of reinvesting them here in American communities for the American working class, almost like an America First or a MAGA message.

And what they all have in common for sure, especially Claire Valdez and Darializa Chevalier is that they are very, very, very hardcore opponents of Israel. In fact, Darializa Chevalier was at an anti-Israel march on October 8th, the day after the October 7th attack. Now they try to make it seem as though she must love Hamas, Israel hadn't really even started to do anything yet, so what was she protesting unless she was just hating Israel and sub-cheering for October 7th? The reality was everyone knew on October 8th what the Israelis were going to do. They had already started bombing. They had already made clear exactly what they intended for Gaza. So I don't think that participating in a protest on October 8th means you were cheering the October 7th attack. I just think it meant that they understood what the Israelis were going to do, which is what they've done for a long time. They were bombing Gaza shortly before the October 7th attack. But these are definitely, even for New York City Democratic Party politics, very unusual candidates, especially Claire Valdez and Darializa Chevalier.

Now, a lot of the energy was obviously driven by anger toward AIPAC, anger toward Israel. I mean, that's why Dan Goldman lost his seat. And the question then becomes: does this reflect what for a long time now has been looking as though what we're moving toward, which is the death of AIPAC? At least when it comes to the stranglehold and has long exerted on both political parties to the point where AIPAC has almost become a poisonous brand within Democratic Party politics. Not all throughout the country, obviously. There's still strongholds of pro-Israel sentiment in the Democratic Party in South Florida where Debbie Wasserman Schultz and Jared Moskowitz and these types are. And you could find a couple other places as well, but by and large, clearly AIPAC and the cause of Israel are becoming radioactive within Democratic Party Politics. And the fact that someone like Zohran Mamdani, who calls what Israel did as a genocide, who had threatened to arrest Benjamin Netanyahu if he comes to New York City, someone who's really far out there rhetorically on Israel, now has candidates that he helped bring to Congress – they're obviously going to Congress, there's no real Republican opposition if there's any – is something that's very alarming to people who are aligned with AIPAC or who otherwise want to maintain pro-Israel sentiment within the Democratic Party.

And just to underscore that case, already there's a couple of races that seem to be affected. The leading one is the Senate race in Michigan, where there's one candidate who has staked out a very strong anti-Israel position. And then you have two other candidates who are pro-Israel, if we can show that graphic. Yeah, there you see, this is the Kalshi market predictions to show you how public perception is already being affected. And there you see Abdul El-Sayed, who is the candidate, who actually received a lot of attention because Hasan Piker endorsed him and his opponents stupidly tried to make that an issue and brought more attention to his candidacy and in turn it made people actually like him more. He's actually a very talented politician, also quite charismatic, quite likable. He now has a 77 % chance, according to these prediction markets, Kalshi in particular, to win the Democratic Senate primary against a sitting member of Congress, Haley Stevens, who is a very hardcore Israel fanatic. And then also this woman, Mallory McMorrow, something like that. I can't think of her name right now, maybe I'm actually suppressing it because I find her particularly repellent as a politician, as a person. But anyway, clearly that's a byproduct of what just happened.

And then you look at St. Louis, where you may remember that Cori Bush who was the incumbent two years ago, lost her seat to someone named Wesley Bell. And Wesley Bell, I would say, is probably the most bought and paid for member of Congress that you can find almost anywhere. I mean, he basically did not exist. The only reason he's in Congress is because two years ago, AIPAC wanted to remove Jamaal Bowman and Cori Bush, who were two of the leading Israel opponents, and they poured massive sums of money, \$15 million into the race in St. Louis, put it all behind Wesley Bell, promised him they would buy him a seat in Congress, basically in exchange for his pledge to have unwavering loyalty to Israel, which he gave and has since honored. They took out Cori Bush. She's now running in a rematch, hoping that the change in politics surrounding Israel will now be able to return her to Washington. Can we move that back on the screen? The prediction markets for Kalshi, in

light of what happened in New York City, are showing her now with a 71 % chance to win that primary.

There's a couple of other races that have very similar dynamics, where you're talking about trying to remove incumbents because they're pro-Israel, because they've aligned themselves with AIPAC. And now at least the public perception is that after what happened in New York City, this does signify political trends that extend beyond New York City. Now, obviously I'm somebody who has been hoping for exactly this sort of thing, this radical change in public perception for 20 years, at least, when it comes not just to Israel, but especially to the dominance of American politics by people whose loyalties are to Israel. I've been writing about it forever. I've been talking about it forever. I thought Israel was just as heinous and horrific as most people have come to see them as being. And I definitely find this to be – you know, it's the kind of thing that you hope for in politics, but a lot of times what you hope for in politics seems unattainable. And it's not all that often when suddenly a tipping point is reached and everything kind of collapses in the direction in which you were hoping it would collapse. And that's clearly what's happening when it comes to the Israel issue. And we see it all over the place.

And of course, it's just in the Democratic party, but increasingly huge strains of the Republican party are feeling the same way, which is why I think J.D. Vance has come out, clearly because Trump did as well, but J.D. Vance, unlike Trump, is actually looking to his political future, to how he has to position himself if he wants the Republican nomination. And it's clearly calculated that there's enough sentiment in the Republican party for him to be more critical of Israel and the US relationship to it than really anyone occupying the Oval Office has ever been. And he obviously does not perceive that as politically damaging. In fact, he perceives that as politically beneficial because you see the same public opinion changes within the American right and the Republican Party as well.

I certainly don't find any unanimity of agreement with any political faction. And there's all kinds of stuff these DSA candidates believe and say in the way they say them that I do not align myself with. And in some cases I find myself in pretty vehement disagreement with. But I don't really think that's the important question. It's not like these members of Congress are going to get to Capitol Hill next year and start dominating the halls of power and writing legislation. Donald Trump is still president. There'll still be a Republican in the White House, maybe a Republican Senate. I think the much more important implications of all of this is what it signifies about American political trends generally when it comes to not just Israel – let me just make this one point before I move on because I think this is a point that is sometimes getting overlooked. I think with all this focus, this political energy around AIPAC and Israel and Gaza, there sometimes is this perception, even among people who might be somewhat favorably inclined to that view, that, wow, it seems like there's this obsession on Israel, why do we care so much about Gaza and Israel? And I do think there's good reasons to care only about Israel and Gaza – or not only, but to really devote huge amounts of attention to it, obviously I do, because it is shaping and dominating our foreign policy and therefore our country in so many different ways. I mean, we're in the middle of a major war with Iran,

with Israel as our partner. We've spent the last two and a half years financing and arming and diplomatically protecting under two successive administrations, one of the most criminal atrocities of my lifetime, certainly of this century. And that has major implications for the United States, even if you don't really care that much about the moral dimension of it, in a way that it deserves the attention it's gotten. It affects all of our relationships in the Middle East and our standing around the world.

But I think a lot of this has become a proxy for much broader issues in the sense that what we see is this one interest group, AIPAC, that does not have as its focus the lives and interests of American citizens, but instead the interests of this foreign country. Everybody understands that and everybody knows that. And there's a lot of other lobbies and dark money groups devoted to Wall Street, and Silicon Valley, and crypto, AI, and the pharmaceutical industry that are also very harmful. But AIPAC's become much more blunt about the exertion of its power just entering these races and removing members of Congress at will, spending insane amounts of money. Obviously, they just did it with Thomas Massie as well. And it's not just AIPAC. When we talk about AIPAC, just that group, it's a much bigger and broader and more powerful pro-Israel lobby filled with billionaires and all kinds of tentacles everywhere. They're buying up media corporations and social media outlets with TikTok and CVS News and CNN, Paramount and Warner Bros. as entertainment studios, all consolidated under the control of very pro-Israel voices.

It's consuming our politics and it represents a complete disconnect between the priorities of the political media class and where they want to send resources to and what they want to devote themselves to, which are Middle East wars and Israel and censorship in the United States to protect Israel. It's not people like me or people who are opposed to this who are the ones obsessed with Israel. The ones obsessed with Israel are a political class of Washington, our government. They're the ones who make constant trips, pilgrimages to Jerusalem to kiss the wall and to Tel Aviv to pay homage to the Israeli government instead of going to their own districts to meet with their constituents. They're the ones who are constantly passing resolutions, praising and defending Israel. They're the ones sending billions of dollars to Israel to finance their wars. They're the ones who are insisting that we diplomatically protect them at the UN, that we deploy forces to protect Israel when they have wars with Iran or to bomb the Houthis for them. They're the ones who are doing things every week, every day in defense of this foreign country. And that represents a radical neglect from the perspective of a lot of people who may not really care about Gaza per se that much but who care about the priorities of our government. And it just has become this kind of symbol or this fulcrum for this vehicle for frustration about the way our government works and what its priorities are.

And I think it's both. It's anger over what Israel did in Gaza and the US support for it and the broader wars that it drags us into and all the damage that it does, but also this more kind of far reaching, even if it's a little bit more evasive connection between these policies regarding Israel and Gaza and AIPAC and how our politics work. Or more importantly, don't work for the vast majority of Americans. Whatever is true, it has become an extremely potent political issue. The people who care about it are highly motivated. Obviously in a primary vote, in an

off year, in a midterm for Congress, turnout is crucial, and the people who turn out are those people who are most passionate. And right now the most amount of passion is around this issue. And I do think you're seeing our politics reshaped by it in ways that I consider almost entirely positive, even if you can point to things that one of these winning candidates last on Tuesday night in New York City said that you dislike or some ideology that they've embraced that you think is dangerous – that's not the significant part of what happened.

And I think it's impossible to deny that AIPAC has become so weakened to the point where they're poison and have to start using shell packs that don't have the same name or a recognizable name related to Israel because candidates are petrified of accepting AIPAC money, even if they're willing to accept the AIPAC money indirectly in a way that's not traceable. Already, that's a pretty significant change. And then the fact that you're seeing a similar evolution in the Republican Party, where anti-Israel or at least Israel-distancing rhetoric has now come out of the mouth of Donald Trump in a way that is remarkable, but I think even more significantly since he's actually careful about the things he's saying and thoughtful and contemplative about them, what comes out of J.D. Vance's mouth, I don't think there's any doubt that the politics around this issue is changing and it's changing radically. And I actually think we're closer to the beginning of that change than the end. All right.

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](#)

