

Hillary Clinton clamors for more war in Munich

The Grayzone's Max Blumenthal and Aaron Mate discuss the ghastly reappearance of Hillary Clinton on the global stage. ||| 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

Hillary Clinton was also in Munich. And this is why it's impossible for anyone within the party ranks to question the Ukraine policy, which is shoveling tens of thousands of men into the slaughterhouse with no results. I need to reiterate that.

#Speaker 02

At the heart of that—because, first of all, the Ukraine war started after Trump left—anything he said on social media that got him kicked off for a while had nothing to do with Ukraine. There is a plan. The plan is to give the Ukrainians Tomahawks, give them more missiles for their Patriot defense systems, allow them to inflict more damage beyond the border into Russia. That's when they began to actually think about coming to the negotiating table—when Ukraine was able to reach targets inside Russia. Inflict enough pain. I mean, apparently it's not enough pain to have hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers killed and injured. That's not enough pain for Putin. But inflict pain on the refineries, inflict pain on the missile sites—inflict pain that will actually create the conditions for a better negotiation.

#Max

Psychotic. "Inflict pain"—how many times can you say "inflict pain"? This is someone who's never been to war, never served in the military. Inflict pain, bomb, commit acts of terror. She's calling for terrorist attacks on infrastructure in Russia and saying hundreds of thousands of deaths are not enough. And she still sort of occupies this senior role within the party, despite all the disasters that unfolded under her watch. As Secretary of State, there was also the comment by Hillary that mass migration, or mass immigration, has been destabilizing. What actually happened during the Clinton administration that was destabilizing was NAFTA, which caused mass migration from Mexico. The coup in Haiti was destabilizing.

Hillary condemned Trump for setting up concentration camps for migrants. What happened at Guantanamo Bay under Clinton with the Haitians? There was a concentration camp. The Honduras coup, which she signed off on in 2009, was destabilizing and caused caravans to the U.S.-Mexico border of desperate Hondurans. The Syria dirty war, which she backed to inflict pain on the government in Damascus, was destabilizing and flooded Europe with the largest migration crisis since World War II. The Libya regime-change war, which was Hillary's personal passion project, was destabilizing to Europe and flooded Lampedusa and the island of Lesbos with boats full of migrants, and destabilized the Sahel across Africa, fueling Boko Haram all the way into Mali.

That's her legacy. And yet she's calling mass migration destabilizing as if it just emerges from a vacuum. That's what I hate about that class in Munich—they're always condemning authoritarians, condemning their wars, calling them imperialists. And you're never allowed to discuss context or history with them, or acknowledge why Putin might be popular, why people might support him in the Donbass. You're never allowed to ask why with them. There's always this built-in assumption that these liberal transatlantic elites control reality, and anyone who questions it is a conspiracy theorist.

#Aaron

Yeah, and they blame other people for problems they create, with no self-awareness. Like Hillary Clinton saying, you know, mass migration—okay, fine, it's a problem—while, of course, never acknowledging all the ways she fueled mass migration with her policies. And, you know, on the Tomahawks—like, first of all, putting aside whether you have a moral conscience or not, which clearly people like Hillary Clinton don't—it's not even popular politically anymore. I mean, one of the reasons Trump won in 2016 and 2024 is that he pretended to be anti-intervention.

And he directly criticized things like the Libya war, the Syria war, the Iraq war—all of which Hillary Clinton supported. I just wish there could be a Democrat who, even if they don't have a moral conscience, and even if they don't share our full analysis of the dangers of imperialism, could at least recognize the political benefit of putting some kind of critique forward. But no one has emerged in that field yet. It's almost as if the Democratic Party just won't allow it to happen. And people like Hillary Clinton keep making sure it doesn't.

#Max

No. And I mean, if a Democrat gets in—Gavin Newsom, for example—I always feel like when a Democrat is in office, we face harsher attacks because we have an audience that's considered left-wing, and that threatens them more. They need to isolate voices like ours. Whereas with the right, they can just say, "Oh, those are right-wing QAnon conspiracists." It's harder for them to deal with their own base, which not only sees through their hollow politics now but is really cynical, especially after the latest Epstein release. You've got Tom Pritzker resigning from Hyatt Hotels—he's the first

cousin of J.B. Pritzker, who I think, other than Newsom, will be the frontrunner. And then you have that whole class of podcasters—Cenk Uygur coming out and questioning whether 9/11 was an inside job.

Anna Kasparian apologizing to you on Syria and sounding like us two years ago, but maybe we're a little less telegenic. Crystal Ball—she used to be just a Democratic consultant, and that didn't work out. Now she's moving closer and closer to the anti-imperialist camp. You can kind of see that whole podcast world, that class of influencers who are much closer to the Democratic Party and the Bernie wing than we are, sounding much more adversarial on foreign policy and questioning things more than they ever have before. Maybe it's because Trump is president. Kyle Kulinski too. Maybe they'll just fall back into line and wind up circling the wagons for a Democrat, but I don't think so. I think it's going to be much harder for a Democrat to govern on these issues. The consensus has collapsed.