



The Doomsday Machine  
Interview with a Former Nuclear War Planner & Whistleblower - Daniel Ellsberg

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

**Zain Raza (ZR)**

Thanks for tuning in and welcome to the source. A program dedicated to whistleblowers, former insiders and policy experts. My name is Zain Raza.

Today I'm joined by former United States military analyst from the RAND Corporation, also known as the Research And Development Corporation. In 1971 he exposed highly classified documents known as the Pentagon Papers which exposed the US government for systematically lying to the public about its wars in Southeast Asia. He's also an author and the book that we will be talking about today is called the *The Doomsday Machine: Confessions of a Nuclear War Planner*.

Daniel Ellsberg, thank you so much for your time.

**Daniel Ellsberg (DE):**

Thanks for the opportunity. Thank you.

**ZR:**

Before we get into your book, I want to talk primarily about your biography, because we have a big following of young viewers that may not be aware of the Pentagon Papers that you released in 1971. Talk about your case: why you decided to become a whistleblower, the information that you released, and how the U.S. government reacted to it.

**DE:**

Well Zain how long an answer do you want? I've written two books on that subject. I guess very briefly. I have worked on the escalation of the war in Vietnam reluctantly, I didn't really believe in it, but it was my job in the Pentagon in 1964 and '65. Once we were committed to a large war, I wanted to see it up close and see if the reporting was accurate, what could be done. I had been a Marine Company commander in peace time in the 50s and so when I got to Vietnam as a State Department official I used my training to walk with troops in combat and observe the war up close. I did that for two years, evaluating pacification in 38 of the 43 provinces of Vietnam, so I had a pretty good widespread view of what was happening in the

war, and I understood that there was no prospect of any progress toward any of the US aims - whether they were legitimate or not, and I assumed they were at the beginning, they were not as a matter of fact, but it took me a while to learn that.

What I did learn was that they were not going to be achieved whatsoever and that people were being killed on both sides to no end, to no good, and there was no excuse for it. After two years I came back with hepatitis, so I couldn't be in the field anymore, and I began advising people inside the government of my view that we should extricate ourselves from that war, that we should get out of it. And many people agreed with that, but the question was what to do about it. What I was doing was talking to insiders and they were going along with the war. Their jobs depended on it, just as mine had earlier, and the war did go on. I was then assigned to a study of decision making in Vietnam, which had hoped would reveal how we'd gotten into such a debacle and done so badly. It was known as the McNamara study or history of U.S. decision making in Vietnam from 1945 to 1967. Actually we continued working on it through 68. It actually ended in early 68 in the belief that President Johnson meant to end the war. He had gotten out of the campaign and had proposed negotiations with the North, and most people took that as the beginning of the end of the war. It wasn't in fact. The war went on seven years longer, and it would have gone on even longer than that if a number of very unusual events hadn't intervened. One of which was my release of this Top Secret History of the War in 1971, but that didn't end the war by itself, by any means. The war had four years left to go. So many other people had to behave in unusual ways, doing whistleblowing, telling the truth, making decisions they weren't expected to make. It made it possible to face President Nixon with impeachment and get him to resign, and that made the war endable. What I'd learned by that time was the war was not going to end while Richard Nixon was still in office and in early 1973 he had just won a landslide election. It seemed quite impossible that he would be out of office before 1977. So that seemed the only way to bet when the war would end. Nevertheless a lot of us kept working, doing our best to try to shorten the war. And rather miraculously that did come about in the war did end in 1975 instead of 1977.

Meanwhile, I had been put on trial facing a possible 115 years in prison, 12 felony counts -- in a federal courthouse covering almost two years in court -- for having copied the Pentagon Papers, and there was scheduled to be another trial for the distribution, in which I'd also been involved. It so happened I had also copied many papers relating to our nuclear policy, and it was my intention to put those out after the Pentagon Papers trial; that became impossible when a hurricane dispersed the field in which they'd been buried. A crashing actually, and we couldn't find the papers again. But Nixon did fear that I had information on his nuclear threats which the public was entirely unaware of. Obviously the North Vietnamese, the Russians and Chinese were not unaware, because he was making the threats to them. But it was a secret from the American public and he feared I not only knew it, which I did, but that I had documents on it, which was plausible, but in fact I didn't. And that led him to try to keep me from releasing those documents by blackmailing me, even incapacitating me. At one point he sent 12 people out to incapacitate me totally, at a moment when he feared I would reveal his nuclear threats. And these were crimes, which when they came to be known (which was unlikely) faced him impeachment or even prosecution, and led to his resignation.

**ZR:**

I want to begin with your book now: *The Doomsday Machine: Confessions of a Nuclear War Planner*. Could you talk about the underlying assumptions and principles on which the US nuclear war plans - that you also helped build - were based upon?

**DE:**

Yes I had, early on as a young man, in the late 50s who had been working on the command and control of nuclear weapons and the design of nuclear war plans for the RAND Corporation as a consultant to the Defense Department. And in the course of that I had learned a great deal about our war plans to see how they might be implemented (or not implemented) under enemy attack. So I was perhaps uniquely familiar with the plans as a civilian at that point, they were closely held among the military. I became aware of very grotesque aspects of the plans, but let me sum up with what I saw in them then and what continues to this day.

The fact is that, without intending to, both the U.S. followed later by the Soviets, had constructed what can be called Doomsday machines. That is, elaborate systems of men , hardly any women at that time, machines, computers, communication networks, airplanes, missiles, warheads, submarines -- all wired together to accomplish, if they were launched, if the system were launched into action at the orders of the president or someone else -- to accomplish the death of nearly everyone on earth. Half of them within days, hours, weeks of the attacks, and the other half suffering starvation over the next six months as smoke from burning cities covered the entire globe with stratospheric smoke. It would cut out most sunlight and kill all harvests.

We didn't know that at the time that I was working on the plans in the early 60s. It was 20 years later, 1983, when scientists discovered this effect. But that was 35 years ago and the situation remains the same. Each side retains the ability to destroy most life on Earth, retains a doomsday machine and far from dismantling it, either unilaterally, which they should, or together, which they also should, each of them is modernizing that machine at a cost of over half a trillion dollars in the next 10 years and over a trillion dollars (perhaps 2 trillion dollars) over the next 30 years; rebuilding doomsday machines.

Now these should not exist. They should never have been imagined. They should never have been built, should have never have been maintained on either side. Other countries have the capability of annihilating people at a lower scale. No one can produce the full scale nuclear winter that we can by burning so many cities but they can produce a mini nuclear winter that would kill perhaps a third of the Earth's population by starvation. And I'm talking now of the arsenals of India and Pakistan who are recurrently we are at war with each other, and who are holding about a third of the earth's population hostage to their decision as to whether to go to war or not. That would seem intolerable.

It would seem that any country on earth has the right to tell either Pakistan India or both: "You don't have any right to threaten each other with the rest of us as collateral damage, as

hostages that will be killed in your conflict, without having any part of it". But of course that applies a 100-fold over to the US and Russia. India and Pakistan together have less than 1 % of what the U.S. and Russia have. And then we have China with some 300 warheads. It takes about 200 to produce this nuclear winter. So they have more than they can really justify by any means but still less than one-tenth of what we have. So the real pressure is on the US and Russia to spare the world this threat that they have hanging over everyone else on earth. What John F. Kennedy called a "sword of Damocles, suspended by a thread". All the people of the earth are subject to that accident.

One of the things that can trigger - and the most likely thing - that would trigger either of these doomsday machines is a false alarm from their warning system that warns them that an incoming attack is on the way, when it isn't. That has happened recurrently and very convincingly and it's been a miracle that none of them has reached the point of response that has destroyed us. We wouldn't be here without that kind of luck, and going up to 70 years with that kind of luck seems almost miraculous. It's not impossible, it's just very very unlikely.

So it's very urgent for the people of the world really to recognize the position that the US and Russia put them in, and to a lesser extent the other nuclear states, and demand that this threat be lifted. There's not the remotest justification for using the threat of doomsday as an instrument of policy or preparing to carry it out. And yet that is the highest scientific and military task of these super powers.

**ZR:**

Could you talk briefly about the principles (in other words the) reasoning on why this was all justified?

**DE:**

Well the basic justification to the people involved inside, and they do need some explanation for what they're doing, little as they may know of it; it is not a justification that is spelled out very much to the public because it's all kept generally secret from the public. But what the two explanations share is the notion that the only way to deter a nuclear attack on oneself is to have the capability to retaliate with a nuclear attack. And that is plausible actually. It has undoubtedly played some role in the fact that there has been no nuclear war. I say some role, because it's not at all clear what might have happened if there would have been a major war without nuclear weapons. But undoubtedly their existence has contributed to the lack of a major war between the US and Russia in these last 70 years. That's a benefit purchased at the cost of a possibility of blowing up human civilization, which fortunately is a cost that hasn't yet been paid, but could eventuate almost any time; even as we're talking.

With possibilities of new conflict in Syria, by the way, let's think how many nuclear powers have been involved in conflict in Syria in the last decade or so, mostly and in varying combinations and alliances. Russia, the U.S., Britain (nuclear power), France (a nuclear power), Turkey; not a nuclear power but a member of a nuclear armed alliance; every

member of which, including the nuclear powers, Britain, France and the U.S., are committed to defending Turkey. So I think we can count them as invoking nuclear war. Well that's five. Let's see: Israel. Let's put six in there. So six of the nine nuclear states are involved in the ongoing conflict in one state. Who does that leave out? India, Pakistan so far, and North Korea. The other six all involved.

Is that dangerous? How can it not be seen as other than incredibly dangerous? Even if the likelihood is low of an all-out nuclear war resulting. It is not zero. Absolutely not. And it should be. Of course it should be. How could the possibility of who rules Syria justify the risk of ending human life on Earth. And yet that's where we are.

**ZR:**

In your book you talk about your time as an analyst where you uncovered a lot of procedural and structural problems when it came to nuclear planning. Just to quote a few facts that you uncovered:

- There was a problem of delegation and more emphasis to assure that a reliable first strike happens instead of preventing unauthorized action.
- You also talk about a lack of real situation practice drills due to safety issues.
- There was no stop order
- Discrepancies in the two- man rule; where two people need to put the code in simultaneously
- And no alternative planning.

Can you talk about these points that you uncovered back then, briefly?

**DE:**

Well Zain, you've just you've just told the audience I think the points very well. You're right. You read the book well and that is what is described in there. But just to focus let's say on one of them. Many people in the world tremble at the thought of our current president Donald J. Trump being capable of setting a doomsday machine in motion by his single will, not susceptible legally or constitutionally, to challenge by any other American. If he decides to do it, there is no arrangement for anyone countermanding the commander in chief, the President of the United States. So when we look at him on Twitter or YouTube or press conferences today, we're looking at someone who could choose to end life on Earth if his mood so took him.. And that is hardly reassuring, I don't need to go into that.

But where people have a false reassurance is that they believe that only the president can set that machine in motion. That has never been true. It has never been true that there is only one finger on a nuclear button, whether it's Trump or anyone else. And the same is true of Russia and almost surely true (though we don't know the details) in every other nuclear state. Very simply, if it were true then a simple assassin's bullet or perhaps one bomb on the capital would paralyze the retaliatory capability and the deterrent capability of the nuclear state. A simple terrorist weapon, let's say, could could make the nuclear state totally vulnerable to any attack, if it were the case that only the president or the head of state could

send them [the nuclear weapons] off. Having said that it then seems very obvious that each state has made arrangements that that can't happen, by delegating that position - if not all the time- to at least situations where there are indications of an attack or communications are out with the capital [Washington]. And that's true very commonly for atmospheric reasons, for technical reasons, failures of various kinds, that commanders with nuclear weapons are out of touch with their capital and it has been arranged that they're on their own. It's also possible that they can launch their weapons without assurance that they're on their own just because they decide that the time has come to do it.

Just yesterday as we speak, one of these leaders Donald Trump sent out a tweet about Turkey with pretty much the words: "*If I in my great and unmatched wisdom (Ellsberg comments in between quoting Donald Trump: 'sounding like a Persian emperor or 2000 years ago, Ptolemy perhaps') decide that Turkey is off limits" (Ellsberg comments in between quoting Donald Trump: and he doesn't define even what the limits are) "I will totally and entirely destroy, not Turkey, but the Turkish economy"*.

But he could just as well have said, "the Turkish people". Of course in doing that, the radioactive fallout would involve far more than Turkey. And for that matter, destroying the Turkish economy would damage far more than Turkey. So that's the mood that he is in: his godlike power of annihilation.

What I'm saying is, there can be other people in the system who say: "It's not only Donald Trump my president who has great and unmatched wisdom? I have as much wisdom as Donald Trump". That's a low bar actually, many people match the wisdom of Donald Trump - all too many - and they may choose to act on his grandiose manner as he [Trump] does, as little as they are justified in doing so. So it's a dangerous world very much and it has been made so by decisions of president after president, and in Russia as well, where a dead hand exists; arranging for missile commanders to have the ability or even to be countermanded by electronic signal in the event of Moscow is destroyed. That reflects our own arrangements. So both sides have provoked the other into an extremely unstable and dangerous thing where a mistake doesn't just mean, let's say an embarrassment. but the end of the world.

**ZR:**

One of the things that really shocked me when I read your book is that there is no plan for when a missile is launched or a plane is sent, there is no way to recall them, even in any event where a misunderstanding or miscommunication happens. Once the Single Integrated Operations Plan (SIOP), that you talk about in your book is set into motion, there is no way to call it back. Do you think that's still the case today?

**DE:**

Of course it's always been the case with missiles. What you're talking about: that dangerous system is applied to a period when we relied on planes - bombers rather than missiles - and that kind of arrangement made the plane like a missile, incapable of being called back. In principle or in practice, generally a plane can be communicated with an order to come back.

But once the actual orders had been given and an execute order had been received, the plane should not allow any interference, any signal with someone purporting to be the president. There was no authentication code given them that would identify the president. And that would seem insane and it was insane, but the rationalization was two-fold: the Russians might gain that code and thereby paralyze our response of our bombers. Remember, none of this applies to missiles. Once they go, they can't be called back. Let me put a footnote on that if I may. Strictly speaking, even with a missile you can put a destruct code in it that would destroy it or send it into the ocean prior to its arriving at its target. That is true of every test missile. If it's going off course there is an arrangement to destroy it and either send it down or explode it in the air. You could do that with every operational missile just as well, but that runs into another problem: It's not just the Russians that might get that code, the military are afraid that the lily-livered civilian leader might have "cold feet". To use all the metaphors, and decide to rescind this order once you've given it, so they wanted to assure that no civilian [politician] in particular and they [military leaders] couldn't do it either. They denied themselves but then they didn't expect to want to recall everything. But if a civilian wanted to recall either the missiles or the planes he couldn't do it. Or in future days: she couldn't do it; which would be even more worrisome to them, I suppose. So although strictly speaking in our patriarchal societies, a woman who gets to the highest office will not differ significantly from the patriarchs who've preceded her, in fact she will have to prove that she's as tough as any of the men she succeeded and she's if anything more likely to push a button than even a man might be. That's the world we live in.

**ZR:**

In December 1960 in a Strategic Air Command (SAC) meeting with the Joint Chief of Staff (JCS) you talk about in your book that there was a chart presented that showed a staggering figure of 600 million deaths which would occur if a nuclear strike by the United States takes place. How did they arrive at this conclusion? And what is your assessment of this figure when you were sitting in that meeting, how did you react when you heard about that?

**DE:**

Yes I may have been the first civilian of any status to actually see an estimate or an official estimate of how many people would be killed if we executed our war plans, the war plans I was helping draft guidance for under McNamara in 1961. So since I was in that role, I drafted a question which the president sent to the Joint Chiefs of Staff which was simply, "if your plans were executed as planned" -- and that meant primarily before enemy weapons have launched. The idea of waiting until enemy warheads have arrived in the US and then retaliating was always a worst case that they hoped they would avoid under any circumstances. So the plans were all based on the hope and expectation that our warheads would get off the ground before theirs had arrived. And if that were carried out how many people would die?

And the answer came back in the form of a graph with millions of dead on the vertical axis on the left and time in months on the horizontal axis, because deaths would accrue month by month from radioactive fallout from the initial attacks. It was a very simple chart which told us

that the first death toll in the first days or weeks would be 275 million people; nearly all civilians obviously, since the armies of the world can't add up to that. But this was in Russia, the Soviet Union and China which was at that time planned to be hit under any circumstances. We were fighting Russians wherever, since they [Chinese] were supposed to be or imagined to be part of an indissoluble side of Soviet bloc. Although that was actually no longer true even by 1961.

OK, 275 million with 50,000 more dying over the next six months by radioactivity; adding up to 325 million. But that was just from the Soviet Union and China alone, which is what I'd asked to narrow the task. So we asked how many altogether? And a week later we got a table in the White House elaborating that. Turned out that they had answers to that too: about 100 million more in East Europe, where we weren't actually in theory attacking cities but we were attacking air defenses so that our planes could get in. The air defenses were all next to cities. Then 100 million in West Europe with no warheads landing there from us, but from radioactivity from the east, depending on which way the wind blew which depended on the season to a larger extent. And finally a third addition of 100 million in areas contiguous to the Soviet Union and China like Afghanistan, Austria, Finland – all neutrals as you see – Sweden, Japan and northern India. A total of 600 million: A 100 holocausts.

I looked at that as the most evil plan and piece of paper that had ever existed in the history of human wartime planning or any other kind. And even that was a great underestimate of what they were willing to kill because they were deliberately excluding fire: [which is] the main casualty causing effect of thermonuclear weapons (H-Bombs) – and they excluded that because it was too hard to calculate. It depended on wind and on fuel loading and seasons, various things, so they just left that out. To this day [they leave this fact out]. If you put that in, you're up to now over a billion out of what was then 3 billion world population: a third of the Earth's population. Now a willingness to kill a third of the Earth's population; this is before Russian retaliation, which guaranteed 100 million in Europe for example, in retaliation with their short range weapons; demonstrated a kind of morality, or immorality. I don't know anyone else had ever imagined in a human mind or action.

But again, 23 years later in 1983 scientists revealed that something the military had not looked at: fire generated smoke. And firestorms from military weapons which loft smoke into the upper troposphere, the upper atmosphere from which it is further heated, and moves into the stratosphere, meant that a cloud of smoke would quickly surround the globe and not rain out. And would stay what we now know is more than a decade; cutting off 70 % of the sunlight, creating ice age conditions on the surface of the earth, and killing all harvests that year and for the next 8 or 10 years. Meaning that nearly everyone on earth would starve within a year, except scientists say possibly some number of people eating fish and mollusks in the deep southern hemisphere in New Zealand or Australia.

So extinction is not even likely to occur. It's unlikely. But the annihilation of 98 or 99 % of humans within a year, if our plans are carried out as planned. Now with our current weapons, we'll be extinguished. I would think it hardly needs saying that under any system of morality ever conceived, and they vary quite a bit over time and over cultures, I don't think there is one that could say accomplishing this or even planning and creating the capability



for it, is other than ultimately immoral; worse than anything there ever does. It goes beyond any notion of criminality or legality, rationality; it's insane and immoral. And that's what we have now.

**ZR:**

Since the United States has gained nuclear supremacy each administration, and you provide a very lengthy list in your book about this, have used nuclear weapons, not in the practical sense, but in terms of threats. And you go on to provide an example of a loaded gun. Could you elaborate on this example and whether these threats have been effective at all?

**DE:**

There is a misconception that nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945 [when they were used] in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Actually they've been used several dozen times, mostly in secret, used in the way that a gun is used when it's pointed at someone's head in a confrontation; whether or not the trigger is pulled. Actually, the gun is best used is if you get your way with such a threat without having to pull the trigger. And that's basically why you have the gun and why these various countries have acquired the nuclear gun in order to make these threats whether deterrent or propellant or blackmail or whatever.

And those threats have been backed up by a real capability, at least, if not an intention to carry them out if they don't succeed. Almost surely some of the threats have been bluffs. Others were not. And we didn't get a war either because there was no provocation, or the other side didn't intend it at all or backed down. So we've been lucky, I would say. Some of these cases have been very close. The Cuban missile crisis in particular in 1962, but that's not the only one. There was a hidden crisis on the Soviet side in 1983 where Premier Andropov was under the belief that Ronald Reagan was crazy, in a way, perhaps the present president is deceived with his talk of evil empire and his build up of nuclear weapons of the kind that's going on right now - first strike type nuclear weapons. And there was in fact a false alarm on the Soviet side that could very well have ended life on earth if the colonel in charge hadn't decided to lie really to his superiors and conceal from them the degree to which he felt they might actually be under attack.

Now that brings up two issues as to how nuclear war may actually occur. The first is through escalation of a limited war that perhaps goes nuclear on the basis of small nuclear weapons, relatively small, of the kind both sides are producing right now. By the way with hopes of using them in a way that would not escalate, but those hopes are almost certainly to be falsified in the actual event if they [U.S. & Russia] use them against each other. A nuclear weapon against a non-nuclear state like Iran would not blow up the world; it would kill millions of people unjustifiably, but it wouldn't lead to the reciprocation.

But any talk of first use against each other by the U.S. and Russia, which does occur right now as a possibility and which we're prepared for, is nothing other than a threat to blow up the world. Even though the initial move may be much smaller than that with a weapon smaller than [the one which was used for example in] Hiroshima. But the likelihood of

reciprocation that actually goes upwards in a spiral, a spiral that ends in a full scale attack is extremely high. So first use threats and the possibility of these being carried out are an extreme danger to this world and should be refused. The world should demand that nuclear threats be eschewed before long in the various states. Only China and India to some extent right now has a commitment to no first use. That should be the case in all of the nine nuclear states and their allies, the NATO allies first.

The second point is a long-term delusion that although a nuclear war would in any case be very very calamitous and catastrophic, it never says so, there are degrees of catastrophe and a first strike is less damaging to the attacker than a second strike, than waiting to be attacked. So if you have indications that the other side may or is about to be attacked in the short run, or perhaps is on the way to doing it, both sides are readied on a [hair trigger's](#) notice, in a matter of minutes of warning, to launch their own forces so as to get a pre-emptive attack first.

This is entirely delusional. There will be no difference between a first strike and a second strike. Once the clouds have reached the stratosphere and destroyed all the crops. The attacker's people will starve just as the people attacked and everyone else. In other words, the whole world is hostage to an attack between the U.S. and Russia in particular, and to a lesser extent, between India and Pakistan. And there is no excuse for this, conceivably, for this situation to arise.

So again, the world should demand that this delusion of damage limitation by striking first be abandoned and recognized as a hoax as it is. The reason that isn't done is that pursuing that capability, that supposed capability of striking first, is very profitable on both sides. Russia after all is a capitalist country too now, they have a military industrial complex that profits from making new missiles on top of the old. Just as the US does. And Boeing, Lockheed Martin. Raytheon and Grumman competing to build new missiles which are nothing other than [hair triggers](#) to a doomsday machine and should not exist, nevertheless [generate] profit [for these companies]- until the Holocaust actually happens - and then they don't lose more than anybody, everyone loses everything.

So the incentives are there to keep it going, and of course on both sides they [private military corporations] can buy votes, they can bribe politicians with campaign donations. There are jobs at stake and the trade union is even involved, don't want to lose their jobs making parts of the doomsday machine. And all of this is so much built into our political economy that it is in fact very hard to change, even though there is no national security benefit. On the contrary, the existence and these plans these delusions of damage limiting in a war, where, let me put it this way - nearly everyone recognizes that the profitable making of anti-ballistic missiles is a total hoax, a pork barrel, for the purpose of profits and jobs, but it cannot possibly work.

What's less obvious is that the idea of destroying the other ICBMs by attacking them. The counter-force action is also a hoax because submarine missiles which can't be targeted this way are more than enough to destroy the attacker's society and the rest of the world. So this profitable hoax, it as if for example the pyramids have been on the one hand a source of

profit. I don't know how that worked in the economy of Egypt. And if they were made of dynamite some up with the possibility that lightning would destroy the country . That's the kind of self-destructive behavior we've been involved in for 70 years. It must stop and it is up to the world. And just as the world is waking up to the existential danger of climate change to which all countries are contributing somewhat but ours most of all, I hope that they will wake up to the other existential danger of piling up warheads and missiles that could destroy life.

**ZR:**

You just mentioned climate change. There's so many movements emerging on the climate front but none of them have taken any significant steps in addressing militarization, let alone the nuclear threat, that we talked about today. Which threat would you classify as higher? And what can individuals do to influence significant change on the nuclear issue?

**DE:**

The climate movement which is growing now in particular that worldwide movement led by Greta Thunberg: a great hero of mine now, who I met in Sweden. I would say take it as the example to follow in the case of [nuclear issue] - by really expressing to grown ups and to the world that the situation is intolerable, is dangerous, and intolerable can change and must change. And I think, Greta Thunberg's method of inducing people to strike on a weekday, not just the Saturday demonstrations, but a call of cooperation of work, from classes and from work on a weekday, is a very powerful method. A general strike. Notice it has not yet had a noticeable effect on climate and perhaps nothing will, but it is to me the most promising approach that has been used and I would like to see that applied. so I take encouragement. From that one small person, but it took root and achieved the way of mobilizing resistance to an intolerable status quo.

**ZR:**

Daniel Ellsberg thank you so much for your time.

**DE:**

Thank you.

**ZR:**

And thank you guys for tuning in today. If you like this sort of content be sure to click on the "Subscribe" button below and to donate so we can continue to produce independent and non-profit news and analysis. My name is Zain Raza. See you guys next time.

*END*