



## **YouTube Censorship & the threat of Nuclear War | With Paul Jay**

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

**Zain Raza (ZR):** Thank you, guys for tuning in today, and welcome to another episode of The Source. I'm your host Zain Raza and today we'll be talking to journalist, filmmaker Paul Jay. He's also the founder of the independent media network theAnalysis.news. Paul, thank you so much for joining us today.

**Paul Jay (PJ):** Thanks very much, Zain.

**ZR:** It's been a while. Let us begin with theAnalysis.news that you founded last year. What is this platform all about?

**PJ:** It's basically not respecting any of the rules of the road and how you're supposed to do video interviews on the internet, which is kind of shorter and punchier and all the rest. I decided I would do something that I just found interesting myself, which is to go deeper analytically. So, there are longer, and I hope in terms of understanding things from the point of view of class and real, when I say historical context, I mean, historical context through the view of class that we get a little deeper than a lot of other things that are around. And number two something, I'm pushing in the direction now, I want what we do to be more connected to people who are organising. I mean, really in the ground, like I'm going to go in January, I'm going to go down to West Virginia and do some stories about people organising amongst West Virginia coal miners. I have a series running now with a woman named Jane McAlevey, who actually does a lot of work in Germany and does a lot of training for organisers funded by the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation. I have a biographical and also series about how she's learnt how to organise to win power, she says. And I think that's really critical to what I hope theAnalysis does, is that it orient viewers not just towards understanding things, but also with an eye on changing who has power to whatever extent that's possible.

**ZR:** What sort of obstacles have you faced so far? So, for example, acTVism Munich this year we have won zero subscribers. We started this year with 95000 subscribers and we have now 95000 subscribers. And this has never happened on YouTube. And every year from 2013

onwards, we've always won hundreds, if not thousands, so for example, in 2020 we won 5000 subscribers, which was a really good year and this year it's been really difficult. Are you facing similar problems with reach and subscription on your channel?

**PJ:** More than subscription. We were growing over the course of the first year with our videos, doing 40, 50, 60, 80000 views, regularly more than ten to 20000. Then when I did my reports on the events of January 6th, which essentially all of what I said later turned out to be true, which was that the events on the 6th were the final act of an attempted coup and that there was a real attempt, by Trump and others, to involve the military. And that January 6th was supposed to be the excuse for a military intervention. Pence was supposed to refuse to certify Biden's election. And essentially, there would be a putsch. I said all this stuff and YouTube took down my stories. They took down the first one. They took down a second one. They banned me from all advertising on all Google platforms forever. I did another story which wasn't even about January 6th, it was about the growth of Christian fanatical nationalism in the armed forces. But actually, I shouldn't say it has nothing to do with January 6th. That's actually the real story of January 6th. That's why they thought there could be a coup, because these Christian nationalists are not only in the lower ranks, but in some of the very highest ranks of the armed forces, especially in the Air Force. So, I won't get into the detail of the January 6th story unless you want to, but in terms of YouTube, I had a warning, then I had a first strike, they kept accusing me of spreading misinformation about the 2020 elections. In other words, claiming they had been won by fraud, which all my stories were the exact opposite of that. All my stories were a denunciation of Trump. So I was, you know, one away from being banned on YouTube. Matt Taibbi wrote an article about, and he has a regular thing called the Censored, and he got hold of YouTube PR people and told them he's writing this piece about the censorship of theAnalysis and then knowing his column was coming out, and he's got a big following, they backed down and they put back my stories, they took away my strike, they didn't take away the warning. They gave me back the great privilege of buying ads on Google. But since then, my views have gone down to next to nothing from in the thousands and tens of thousands, I'm lucky if one of my videos now does even 2000. It's complete ghosting. I almost never get a video recommended. And I don't know, you know what we can do about it other than start building our email list and getting people to go directly to our website theAnalysis.news, because clearly, YouTube has it in for us. And you know, I can't prove this, but there's two events that put me on the radar of the American security agencies. The first was during the Freddie Grey uprising in Baltimore. You know, I was based there doing TheRealNews, we were right in the thick of the uprising. In fact, our building was practically ground zero for organising as much as that was organised because a lot was spontaneous. We're right next to City Hall, where a lot of the big protests and rallies were taking place. And we were doing really the best coverage of what was going on. Much more than coverage, we were really connecting the Freddie Grey murder by the police to the reasons for chronic poverty. Not just saying, Oh, people are poor, but saying the issue is the relations of production. It's about people own stuff and the concentration of ownership and the imposition of chronic poverty on Baltimore for the sake of low wages.

And we know that the police organisation in Baltimore was run by something called a fusion centre, which was set up after 9/11. And these are the fusion of all the various intelligence agencies: the FBI, CIA, NSA, military intelligence, local police intelligence, state, all of them to coordinate their activities. And there are a few other reports then by other news agencies about how the fusion centre was actually guiding the Baltimore police on what was happening, including allowing in the beginning of the riots or to allow looting and the burning of buildings to give police the excuse to attack the protesters. In fact, we were one of the only ones that really reported on the fact that, in fact, the police union accused the police chief of deliberately holding cops back. And we reported on the same thing during the G-20, which also, I think got us on their radar, the G-20 in Toronto a couple of years before that, where the police did exactly the same thing. They had provocateurs that started some fires in police cars and instead of, you know, intervening, they actually let the police cars burn. They let a few, you know, a hundred people run around breaking windows, when most of the rally, the anti-G-20 rally, was very peaceful and they arrested a thousand people with the excuse of, Oh, look at these burning police cars. So I think I got on their radar during the Toronto G-20. I got on their radar during the Freddie Grey incident and then when Julian Assange was arrested in his handcuffed hands as he's coming out of the Ecuadorian embassy, he's carrying my book, which is my interviews with Gore Vidal on the history of the national security state. And in fact, I'm going to republish in a few days the video of that interview. After that, Assange was arrested and my book is out there. Well, it went viral. Practically every news organisation in the world carried the story because The Washington Post interviewed me the next day and said, Well, what did you make of Assange carrying your book? What did I make? I didn't even know what had happened until the Post interviewed me about it. But it went viral. So I think I really got on the, not just I think, Ellsberg told my wife the next day, he said, be careful, you're really on their radar now. So what I'm about to say, I can't prove, but this is what I think happens. I think the FBI and this is, they've been doing this for a long time, they used to be COINTELPRO, where the FBI would infiltrate organisations and deliberately cause division and try to split organisations, overthrow leadership. I think I was targeted by something like that. I think that the FBI has algorithms that can intersect with YouTube, where they can flag certain people or organisations and either try to get the channel right off YouTube, but it's just as effective to what they call ghosting and diminish the viewership. And how do you prove that your viewership has been diminished? Well, after they took down my January 6th reports, our views dropped from, you know, thousands, tens of thousands, we're lucky now, as I said, to do 1000 or 2000. It's ridiculous. I know we have far more viewership than that, we can also see from the website. So Big Tech is clearly intersecting with the security agencies.

**ZR:** Yeah, Glenn Greenwald has done a lot of work on that. Basically, they're a network between Big Tech and the national security state. And to touch upon WikiLeaks, this is also what happened, we put a lot of focus last year, we went to London twice and did a lot of work interviewing WikiLeaks directly there, the campaign Don't Extradite Assange campaign, and it was end of this year where if you look at our video production over the last eight years, the

more videos we produced, more readers and subscribers we got now. Now it doesn't matter how many videos we produce, even if we top the last year, it's going exactly the opposite way. We're getting less views and less subscribers. So I do believe, I think they call it shadow banning, which is like they just changed the algorithm so you don't get suggested to new viewership. But I think there's a way out. There's a lot of alternative platforms for developing, Rumble, Telegram. We need to look at that and most importantly, we need to do what we're doing today, which is talk with each other. Anyways I want to switch gears here before we go into other issues and talk about something that's not been deserving the attention that it should, especially now with the Corona coverage taking forefront again, which some people will argue it should. But nevertheless, there's a bigger threat looming, which is the threat of nuclear war. You've been covering this story on your media outlet quite vigorously. Could you talk about the US role in Taiwan and the rising threat with China? First, provide us with some context and then talk about the recent situation.

**PJ:** I'll try. There's a story today of a Chinese submarine surfacing and sailing in the strait between Taiwan and mainland China. And it's a big kerfuffle, why is this submarine, a nuclear powered submarine with ballistic missiles, and they're speculating that perhaps it needs repairs, which is why it's up on the surface. But it's an indication of just how dangerous the situation is. The Taiwanese themselves are planning to build apparently eight submarines. The commander of the US fleet in Japan, where they say they have four or five American aircraft carriers in the region of the South China Sea and off the coast of Japan and Taiwan, he says he wants seven or eight. The Japanese are building their own submarine. The Chinese are apparently building on assembly lines, destroyers and submarines. What are they going to do with all this stuff? What could they possibly do with all these submarines? The only thing they can do is create the conditions for an accident that could lead to a conflagration. The Americans cannot actually go to war with the Chinese over Taiwan without it getting to a point where the Chinese win the ground game and the Americans are faced with the situation- do they allow the Chinese to actually win or do they go nuclear? For people who watch theAnalysis, they know, I'm doing a documentary now with Daniel Ellsberg based on his book Doomsday Machine. And I interviewed him recently and on one of the days we interviewed, he had a document in his hands, and it was a report commissioned by the Pentagon in 1964 of the Taiwan crisis of 1958. And he looks, he says, this is still top secret what I'm about to read to you. I could be arrested, meaning Ellsberg, but so could you, meaning Paul Jay and the crew. Are you sure you want to go ahead with this? And we all said, Yeah, of course we do. So he read from the document. And essentially, it's a report that has minutes from a meeting of the Joint Chiefs and other meetings of top military leaders. About in 1958 Mao Zedong has told the Americans to get out of Taiwan, that it belongs to China. Americans refused, and the Chinese started shelling one of these little islands that are very, very near the coast of mainland China as a sort of shot across the bow that you need to get out of here. And so in the meetings, there's minutes of the meeting, and one of the generals says to the other generals, that President Eisenhower has already authorised the use of nuclear weapons if we can't contain this with conventional warfare. And one of the other

generals says, Well, we know we can't. They have way too many troops. There's nothing we could do to really stop if they want to use military force. And so one of the other generals says, Well, we can't let Taiwan fall, and this is the key line. He says, Our prestige and strategic position in Asia will be compromised. So one of the other generals says, Well, what would the Soviet Union do? And a general says, Well, they've said they will defend Chinese sovereignty, and if we use a nuclear weapon on China, even a small, low yield, whatever, in just off the coast of where they're shelling us from, the Soviet Union will probably have to respond. And what would that response be? Well, they might drop a nuclear weapon on Chiang Kai-Shek in Taiwan. And then one of the generals says, Well, then what? And then they say, Well, then we have to respond. Well, that means nuclear war. And the first general says, Well, maybe, but the alternative is worse. What do they mean? Losing prestige and strategic positioning in Asia is worse than risking nuclear war. So Ellsberg concludes this by saying he does not believe that the plans or psychology of the American military planners has changed. It's still the same. Recently, the review was commissioned of the American Nuclear War Strategy, and the undersecretary, a woman who was supposed to be leading it, was seriously questioning whether the Americans should finally adopt a no first strike declaration. And the Pentagon lobbied to get her removed, and they were successful. She was removed and a retired admiral at the time was quoted, I believe in the New York Times, as saying, Our strategy has been the same for 60 years. There's no reason it should change now. Which is, the strategy is, they're willing to launch a nuclear attack if it looks like they're going to lose a conventional war, which has been the fundamental strategy right from when Ellsberg was working for RAND Corporation. The strategy was, and Europeans pick up your ears, the American strategy in the war plan was and this was an automatic, if one American battalion fought one Soviet battalion in Europe it automatically triggered an all out nuclear attack on the Soviet Union and China, every major city in both countries would be targeted. But while the Soviets had, at least in the early 60, 61, had very limited ICBMs. The ability to attack the United States was very limited. They had a lot of ability to take out Europe. And the American War Plan was: too bad for Europe. And they were literally, there was Curtis LeMay, who was head of STRATCOM, and some of the other military leaders were seriously advocating a first strike on the Soviet Union, which is really was the whole posture of the American nuclear war strategy and always knowing that an American first strike on the Soviet Union would mean the elimination of life in Europe. And supposedly, these Europeans keep saying, Oh, we want to be under the American nuclear umbrella. So what is it really all about? Ellsberg has come to the conclusion, and I'm sure come to the conclusion, it may be even further than Ellsberg, but Ellsberg says that as insane as all this is, the kernel of rationality in this whole game is that it's all about money making. It's not really about anyone wants to go to war. It's about create a rationale for massive expenditure in arms and nuclear war manufacturing. And the Europeans and the Canadians I must say, all want a piece of that arms manufacturing gravy train, and they're all willing to risk apocalypse, for the sake of making profit. It's utterly insane. And the thing is that these geopolitical processes, and we're seeing this now in Taiwan, you got two things happening at the same time. You've got economic relations where the Chinese and American economies are intertwined in a way. The

Soviet and American never were. And even now, with all the tension over Taiwan, Apple just gave a major contract to a Chinese company for the next generation of their cell phones, and at the same time they gave one to Taiwan. They gave a major- BlackRock, the biggest asset management firm in the world. Ridiculous. They have something like eight, I think it's eight trillion dollars under management now. They just made a big investment in China, creating a big index fund and other investment funds. So you've got on one side, you've got an intertwining of the capitalist economies. You have this geo military tension over Taiwan because the arms manufacturers, the more tense things are, the better it is for them. And they create, they keep amping up the tension for just what I said off the top. But these submarines, which Taiwan and others are building, the United States is building something like 12 or 13 Ford class aircraft carriers at the cost of something like 14 to 16 billion \$ each. More than a dozen. I saw a really interesting interview the other day David Frum, the guy he used to write speeches for George Bush, interviewing another big neocon brain. I forget which, it may have been... I can't remember which one it was, but one of the big neocon brains. Even, he says, aircraft carriers are absolutely useless. Both the Chinese and Russians have missiles that can take out aircraft carriers in minutes. They're literally pointless if there actually is a real fight. They're gone. The only reason to build these things is the amount of profit being made. And you know the whole irrationality of capitalism, which is the underlying real issue here, is so crazy. Like who are the biggest owners of the companies corporations that make atomic bombs that are making the Ford class aircraft carriers, who are the biggest investors? The exact same financial sector that's putting money into China. It's entirely irrational, except that it's all about profit making. But it's so damn dangerous because they're playing with literally ending life on Earth. Because one damn accident and there's been a few over the years that have come within a hair of blowing us all up. And like Ellsberg and others have said, it's a complete miracle that we're still here. So, you know, as much as it's important to focus on the question of climate change, and there's no doubt it's an existential threat, nuclear war is also, and in some ways, even more immediate existential threat. So, yeah, we really need to talk about all this and the idea of people in the climate change movement and activists. We all have to, no matter what people are involved with, we need to be educating, organising around both climate and the issue of nuclear war.

**ZR:** So Paul, let us conclude part one right here and focus on Julian Assange and foreign policy in part two. Thank you so much for your time for part one.

**PJ:** My pleasure. If you can call talking about nuclear war a pleasure.

**ZR:** And thank you guys for tuning in. Don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel so you can watch part two where we will focus on Julian Assange and also more on foreign policy and to donate so we can continue to produce independent and non-profit news and analysis. I'm your host Zain Raza. See you guys next time.

**Speaker in Video:** These are the building blocks that make up our organisation and the goals we would like to achieve in order to continue our journalism until 2022 and realise these values fundamental to our democracy we need 1000 supporters in our crowdfunding campaign, donating only five euros or dollars per month via Patreon or bank account. Right now, we have only 200 supporters and are not able to take the next step. Our future is in your hands. Strengthen independent journalism and be part of meaningful change.

**END**