

# Is Starmer next casualty of Epstein-Mandelson?

The Grayzone's Kit Klarenberg joins Max Blumenthal to discuss the demise of longtime New Labour guru and recalled UK ambassador the the US Peter Mandelson following exposure of his collusion with Jeffrey Epstein. Will Keir Starmer's government fall next? ||| The Grayzone ||| Find more reporting at <https://thegrayzone.com> Support our original journalism at Patreon: <https://patreon.com/grayzone> Facebook: <https://facebook.com/thegrayzone> Twitter: <https://twitter.com/thegrayzonenews> Instagram: <https://instagram.com/thegrayzonenews> Minds: <https://minds.com/thegrayzone> Mastodon: <https://mastodon.social/@thegrayzone> #TheGrayzone

## #Max

Tell us—just summarize this scandal for us, and then explain why Peter Mandelson is such a significant figure. He's someone who hasn't exactly been reluctant to comment in the past and has been the subject of many previous scandals, but this one might be the final blow. So, what's happening, and who is he?

## #Guest

Yeah, sure. So, I mean, first things first, I think this is quite sensational as far as scandals go. And I've actually been somewhat pleasantly surprised by the focus the British media is giving this. Of course, there's a lot of rubbish about how Epstein was a Russian asset, which is completely ludicrous. But the point is that, yeah, the media has been quite viciously going after Andrew Mountbatten-Windsor, the former royal, and Peter Mandelson. I strongly suspect they're sacrificial lambs—that both of them have already been kind of thrown under the bus anyway.

But, I mean, Mandelson's particularly interesting. For viewers and listeners who are lucky enough not to be familiar with this god-awful person, he's kind of like this unflushable turd in British politics. He's been hovering around at the highest levels of the Labour Party, engaged in left-wrecking from the mid-1980s onwards, on and off. He was Tony Blair's close confidant and aide, a minister in Blair's government, and had to resign twice due to corruption allegations. He later returned under Gordon Brown after entering the House of Lords as a life peer.

And it was this period from 2008 until Labour lost the 2010 general election that caused the most controversy in terms of his relationship with Epstein. Because, number one, of course, Epstein was convicted in 2008 of child sex trafficking. And Mandelson always claimed, when their bond was

exposed in 2019, that he had no contact with Epstein after his arrest—which was a barefaced lie. Now, the contact he had with Epstein included a very perverted back-and-forth, with Epstein making lewd comments about Andrew's young daughter, Eugenie, which is just deeply creepy.

At the core of the scandal is the fact that Mandelson was handing sensitive information, including completely secret, classified government communications, to Jeffrey Epstein. This included advance warning that the British government was going to nationalize the banks following the financial crisis—something Epstein could have profited from, or known people who could have profited from. He also passed on information that a bailout was about to be given to Greece long before it was announced. He even boasted about how he got Gordon Brown to quit personally—he kind of forced him to stand down after the 2010 general election. And yeah, this is completely illegal. It's a breach of the Official Secrets Act and the ministerial code of conduct in public office.

You're not meant to do this. It doesn't typically happen—especially sending this kind of information to a private citizen like Epstein, leaving aside any consideration of his criminal past. And Epstein continued unabashed after his arrest, prosecution, and so-called jail time, which wasn't really jail time at all. It was no deterrent. Now, yeah, so Mandelson is in very serious trouble. But as you mentioned, by extension, so is Keir Starmer, because Starmer appointed Mandelson to the position of British ambassador to the U.S. in February 2025. Toward the end of 2025, there was a series of revelations that showed Mandelson had been lying about his relationship with Epstein.

And now there's been this flood of, you know, like three million emails in which Mandelson features quite prominently. It's clear that Epstein loaned or gifted vast sums of money to Mandelson and Mandelson's partner. As I said, Mandelson was passing very sensitive private information to Epstein in secret. It's kind of inconceivable that the British security and intelligence services didn't know. When Mandelson was nominated for this post, it caused a lot of controversy as it was—and that's just based on the publicly available information about his bond with Epstein. So, I mean, this is pretty bad, and it reflects absolutely terribly on Keir Starmer, because there have been numerous attempts to rebrand Starmer, and one of the core propaganda messages about him is that he's very sensible and wise, and also a nice guy.

And I think he's pretty amply demonstrated that he is a complete and utter scumbag. But complicating matters further—and this is something that hasn't got very much media interest—is the fact that, um, Morgan McSweeney, who was kind of this Rasputin-type figure for Keir Starmer and was involved in all these operations to neutralize the left in Labour, whether that's permanently banning people from being members on bogus grounds of anti-Semitism, or—he set up a website called Stop Funding Fake News specifically to take down The Canary, which was this kind of pro-Corbyn, left-wing website that was getting an enormous amount of traction. Stop Funding Fake News basically crippled their business model, and they had to massively downsize.

So that was a key form of support for Jeremy Corbyn that was just shattered as a result of McSweeney's covert conniving. But Morgan McSweeney himself is a key acolyte of Mandelson—he

was taught in the dark, dirty arts of politics by Mandelson, who during the '90s was widely known as the Prince of Darkness. Make your own conclusions about why that is. And yeah, Morgan McSweeney remains a very powerful and influential figure in British politics. Interestingly, Starmer's initial response to these revelations about Mandelson was to say, "Oh, well, I'm considering firing Morgan McSweeney because of the close bond between McSweeney and Mandelson."

I might add as well that a large proportion of the Labour cabinet are, like the very creepy, rubber-faced health secretary Wes Streeting, who was pictured grinning on the campaign trail last year during the 2024 general election in the UK. So a large number of senior Labour figures are having to do huge volte-faces and say, "Oh, well, I damn him. I trusted him, and he lied." I mean, you know, the average person on the street could have told them he was up to his neck in Epstein. Some of the photos that emerged of Mandelson in the file—which are obviously heavily redacted—show him getting foot massages.

They show him walking around wearing just a shirt and underpants, which is extremely creepy. It's definitely not the kind of outfit any normal person would choose, let alone allow themselves to be photographed in. Um, so, I mean, there's also tons of weirdness on top of the sexually perverted stuff, where Mandelson clearly has this kind of longing for Epstein's company and was, you know, emailing him, saying, "You don't think about me anymore, I miss you," and, you know, blah blah. It's just really weird. I just find him kind of annoying. Oh, yeah.

Well, not quite as annoying as Elon Musk, who, you know, tried to invite himself to the wildest parties on Epstein's island. And then Epstein had to get Ghislaine Maxwell to make him go away—to the extent that Maxwell was like, "We're thinking he's selling the island." But yeah, I mean, I think Epstein probably didn't have much patience for people. He was inundated on a daily basis, it seems, by emails from the great and the good—or, you know, people who were powerful in politics, finance, and military intelligence.

## #Max

Now, I think there's a chance that the Elon Musk email wasn't authentic. I just want to be very clear about that. And, you know, the Mandelson emails are pathetic.

## #Guest

I think at one stage they were praying for—well, they're very, very creepy. They were praying for a hung parliament. Alternatively, a well-hung young man. What's your take on that one? Well, I mean, this refers to when the general election was happening in 2010, and it was widely predicted that Labour was going to lose. So, I don't know, maybe it was a bit of gallows humour because Mandelson knew he was on the way out. But, I mean, their bond is super creepy. Mandelson comes across as just this sleazy, oily, sinister presence, kind of hovering around like the ghost at the feast.

I mean, there's a wider point to be made here, and it's quite serious. There's a kind of through line in a lot of Epstein's released emails: he and his associates seek to profit from misery and destruction overseas. So, there's an email from a Rothschild in March 2014, right around the time of the Maidan coup, where this Rothschild says, "You know, there's a lot of opportunities here." And in 2011, just before Gaddafi fell to the rebels, an associate messaged him to say, "I'm working with MI6 and Mossad veterans to asset-strip Libya."

## #Max

Here's that email you mentioned. It's from Ariane de Rothschild to Jeffrey Epstein. Epstein responds—this is after the Maidan coup—"Ukraine upheaval should provide many opportunities, many." Well, the Biden family certainly got the message there. Hunter Biden was basically running a parallel kind of Epstein network through Ukraine. That's what I think the real value of these emails is: they show you how business gets done. For example, a mineral-rich, gas-rich, impoverished country that had just come under de facto NATO and EU control—like Ukraine—that's how it gets done, through these power networks.

## #Guest

Yeah, well, I mean—sorry, go ahead. Yeah, well, no, I mean, yeah, it's quite clear that one of Epstein's core interests was, you know, what events are happening around the world, how can I profit from them, how can my friends profit from them? And I might add as well, there are some exchanges with Peter Thiel where Epstein is discussing how chaos is a deliberate strategy of the U.S., and that creates opportunities for them because, you know, if half the world's on fire, one way or another, in the spirit of disaster capitalism, you make a mint off it—whether directly or not. But yeah, I mean, Mandelson's clearly, you know, an informant. Who Epstein passed this information on to isn't necessarily clear. But, you know, we've reported at The Grayzone that he did have contacts with a number of foreign intelligence services, including Mossad, and he would routinely pass information to them.

So, I mean, this is highly substantive. And I might add that there's now an official investigation into Mandelson's wrongdoing. Initially, Keir Starmer tried to fudge it so the Parliament's Intelligence and Security Committee would restrict what documents are released, but that got voted down amid some controversy. So it looks like there will be a significant disclosure. It probably won't be complete, and it's likely there'll be some degree of whitewash. But it's pretty bad, and no one's coming to the rescue. I think hence his rather pitiful pleading letter saying, "Oh, leave me alone."

You know, I mean, he was trying to invoke powers under the press code, which are usually extended to the grieving families of murder victims. Of course, Mandelson is no victim at all—he's the perpetrator. But yeah, I mean, this could result in the end of Keir Starmer. He's already the least popular prime minister in British history. Starmer gave this very bizarre speech where he looked like he was on the verge of tears, claiming—oh, he took the standard line—"Well, Mandelson lied to me,

and it was an error of judgment on my part. I wish I'd never met him," blah, blah. I mean, it's not going to wash. I think particularly now, it's interesting.

## #Max

He knew, I guess, what everyone knew about Trump—which is that he knew Mandelson was deeply involved with Jeffrey Epstein all along. None of this was surprising. And for all we know, he knew that Epstein was provided by Mandelson with advance info about the collapse of the Gordon Brown government. I mean, it wouldn't be surprising. Let's watch this exchange again. In Question Hour, this is the Tory leader, Kemi Badenoch, taking down Keir Starmer. And he's sort of shaking, he's stammering—he's Keir Stammerer.

## #Speaker 03

I asked him at that dispatch box—he gave Mandelson his full confidence at that dispatch box, not once but twice. He only sacked him after pressure from us. I'm asking the Prime Minister something very specific, not about the generalities or the full extent. Can the Prime Minister tell us: did the official security vetting he received mention Mandelson's ongoing relationship with the paedophile Jeffrey Epstein?

## #Speaker 04

Prime Minister?

## #Speaker 03

Yes, it did.

## #Speaker 04

Various questions were put to him. I intend to disclose to this House the national security prejudice to international relations on one side, but I also want to make sure this House sees the full documentation, so it can see for itself the extent to which, time and time again, Mandelson completely misrepresented the extent of his relationship with Epstein and lied throughout the process, including in response to the due diligence.

## #Speaker 03

Mr Speaker, I think it is shocking what the Prime Minister has just said. How can he stand up there saying that he knew, when he just asked Peter Mandelson if the security vetting was true or false? This is a man who had already been sacked from Cabinet twice for unethical behaviour. That is absolutely shocking. And that is why, later today, my party will call on the government to release all

documents relating to Mandelson's appointment, not just the ones the Prime Minister wants us to see. Because this government is trying to sabotage that release with an amendment that lets him choose what we see—the man who appointed Mandelson in the first place. Labour MPs now have to decide whether they want to be accessories to his cover-up. Can the Prime Minister guarantee that he won't remove the whip if they refuse to vote for his whitewash amendment?

## #Speaker 04

Prime Minister, Mr Speaker, the first exemption is in relation to anything that could compromise national security. That is not a small matter.

## #Max

So he's citing national security as the reason for not releasing the full truth about Mandelson's relationship with Epstein. Is that right?

## #Guest

Yeah, and I might add that I think he expanded on that when he said Starmer claimed full disclosure might threaten our relations with our closest ally—which was code for the US—and a third country, which presumably means Israel. I mean, whether this is a psyop, I don't know. But the media is now taking the line that the Trump administration might be offended if there's full disclosure, and that's another reason not to release the files. I mean, it really does seem that the IFC is pushing full steam ahead with this.

I might add as well, the IFC is meant to vet the work of MI5, MI6, and GCHQ. Its members have a long history of complaining that the agencies don't tell them anything and that they have no idea what's going on. Last summer, the head of the IFC made a series of extremely angry statements saying their funding had been slashed so badly they couldn't properly do their job, while billions were being spent on spying operations at home and abroad that the IFC knew nothing about. Starmer had promised to give them a cash injection, but then didn't.

So, I mean, I strongly think they're out for revenge to an extent, and this could be very, very damning. But like I say, I think this is still, to an extent, a limited hangout—although it's somewhat of an improvement on a DOJ spokesperson saying that nobody's going to be prosecuted as a result of the files, despite acknowledging that they contain images of death and rape. And they've had this information for God knows how long, and they've not done anything with it, despite the fact that there are many prominent people who are openly named in them. Some of the names are redacted, some aren't.