



The Iran situation & why the media is now supporting Julian Assange

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

Zain Raza (ZR): Thank you guys for tuning in for part two of the discussion with Paul Jay, Paul Jay is an award winning documentary filmmaker, journalist and the founder of theAnalysis.news. Paul, welcome to part two again.

Paul Jay (PJ): Thank you very much.

ZR: Let us begin with Iran as a topic that you have been covering for many, many, many years. There was a lot of hope when President Biden came into office, when he was voted in, that the JCPOA [Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action] will be revived. Now we are seeing the situation in Iran, the state turning towards its people. There's a lot of human rights violations happening. There's a lot of conflicting reports as well, because a lot of the mainstream media is exaggerating the figures and the numbers. We don't know the exact situation. But what we do know is that the people are rising up. They're fed up with the authoritarian, religious, theological regime of the Iranian state. And now certain reforms are coming to place as well. But the US is stating that the sanctions that it's imposing and also the moratorium on the JCPOA is due to the fact that it's concerned about the human rights situation. Are you convinced with the State Department's justification? Are they really concerned about human rights? And how do you assess the stalemate concerning the JCPOA?

PJ: I'm not sure there's a way to characterise the question because you know how much I think the State Department is concerned about human rights. I lived in Baltimore for almost ten years. If they're concerned about human rights, how about starting with their own cities? The Department of Justice investigated the Baltimore police force and in their report stated that the constitutional rights of ordinary black Baltimoreans are violated every single day of the week in Baltimore. Poor Black people and Hispanic people and white people in many parts of the United States, but particularly Black people, have no democratic rights in the United States next to none. You know, arrested without probable cause, thrown in jail, beaten the shit, murdered, tortured. So if the United States government actually cares about

democratic rights, you would think they would at least start at home. And they don't do that. Of course, they couldn't give a damn about democratic rights in Iran. And the obvious, if they cared, they wouldn't be kissing the a-holes of the Saudis. I mean, the United States will never have an iota of credibility about democratic rights in the world as long as they're in alliance with the Saudis. And they wouldn't anyway. I mean, this is a country that supports dictatorships all over the place. So, of course, it has nothing to do with it. Okay. Why isn't the nuclear agreement being reinstated? Well, my understanding is when the agreement was being negotiated and when Obama was fighting for this agreement, it is one of the few things I give credit to Obama for, in fact, when he was elected, I never drank the Obama Kool-Aid. I was very critical right from the beginning that this was just another centre and even centre right Democrat. I would say centre, centre right is not fair, a centrist Democrat. But I had one hope for Obama that he would be rational on Iran. And he was. And so was Biden. Larry Wilkerson tells me that when they were fighting to get this.

ZR: Larry Wilkerson, can you just briefly...

PJ: Larry, who I interview all the time, and you just interviewed recently, was the former chief of staff to Colin Powell. He says that when they were getting ratification for that treaty and support for the treaty in Congress that Biden fought for that. He was a real proponent of the nuclear treaty with Iran. And I remember even in the vice presidential debates in the election, Biden was very rational about Iran. But not now. So why? And I think because the real objection to that treaty from the American hawks and certainly from Israel and certainly from the Saudis- who maybe even at least were, I don't know, it's somewhat changes a little bit, but the Saudis were the most provocative about wanting the Americans to attack Iran- is not the nuclear missiles, not the potential nuclear weapons in Iran, of which there's no evidence they were ever building any anyway. I mean, zero. You know, the national security- I can't remember the name of it.

ZR: National Security Intelligence Estimates.

PJ: Yeah. They said the Iranians had stopped any attempt at building a nuclear bomb prior, what was it 2003? And there's not even hard evidence they were even doing it then. And even if they were enriching uranium, it looked more like just some threatened leverage. But all that being said, everyone knew that if Iran had a nuclear weapon, it would only be for defence. Like for North Korea. Why aren't they being more aggressive against the West, against North Korea? Well, because they got nuclear weapons. I mean, there's evidence. I mean, if Ukraine had a nuclear weapon, would Russia have invaded? Not very likely. I mean, the truth is there is a deterrence to some, you know, having a nuclear weapon or two. So if it wasn't really about Iran having a nuclear weapon, which, you know, they're not throwing, and why would Iran send a nuclear weapon to Israel? I mean, it's insane. The Americans would take Iran out the next day, so would the Israelis. I mean, it's only for defence. So what are they really were...

ZR: And Pakistan has nuclear weapons. The country that I'm from.

PJ: Yeah. I mean, nobody's sending nuclear weapons aggressively right now because anyone you'd send them to, the only place where there really is a threat is against a non-nuclear state. And we can talk about that as a separate subject matter, because that's the problem with the development of tactical nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. And that is a real threat. But let's back up here. So what's really holding this up? The Americans' real opposition, the Israelis, the Saudis, is the Iranian ballistic missiles, non-nuclear, but they now have very sophisticated ballistic missiles that can strike targets very smartly, as they did after the killing of the Iranian general. They threw one missile near an American base. That's just to show what they got. So they want ballistic missiles to be included in any agreement. But why should Iran include their ballistic missiles? They're not nuclear. I mean, Iran, according to the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency], almost entirely, if not entirely, has lived up to the non-proliferation agreements. But ballistic missiles, non-nuclear ballistic missiles, have nothing to do with it. Iran has a right to arm itself every bit as much as any other state has. And there's no evidence the Iranians are using their military might, you know, aggressively. Yeah. Okay. Maybe they have some presence in Iraq, but nothing compared to what the Americans did in Iraq. Maybe the Iranians have something going on in Syria, all right. Well, it's in their damn neighbourhood. And whatever the Iranians have done in Syria is nothing compared to what the Americans did in Syria and the Saudis and the Qataris and the Turks and the Russians, I mean, go on and on. So that's what's holding up that agreement. And it's B.S. because the original agreement should simply be lived up to. It was the Americans that screwed it up, not the Iranians. And the Americans should simply do what they agreed to do. Just because Trump was a maniac doesn't mean they have to continue in the maniacal way. But the pressure is coming. The right wing hawks in the US, the Saudis, the Israelis and so on, they just want to drag this out. Now the whole thing's nuts. If in fact- and this comes back a bit to the Ukraine conversation too- if your primary geopolitical "adversary"- I love the term- is China, then why the hell are you pushing Russia into China's arms? Why are you pushing Iran into the Russian- Chinese orbit? It's insane from an American geopolitical perspective if you really believe China is your adversary. And I think that's a stupid equation anyway. But that's how they're pivoting and positioning. Why are you strengthening all these allies with China? And it's clear because and this is the most important thing to get about all of these questions, monopoly capitalism is not a rational thing. It's rife with internal contradictions and competing interests. Like I'll give you an example: Boeing. Taiwan is not one of Boeing's top ten customers, but it might be in the top 20, military, for military sales, an important customer. But guess who's the number one at least in 2020? And now I don't know. Guess who's the biggest purchaser of Boeing domestic aircraft? China. One company is completely schizophrenic on whether to boost tensions with Taiwan or be friendly and sell to the Chinese domestic aircraft market. One company. Now extend that out. You know, the tech industry, they want to squash Chinese competition. They want access to the Chinese market. It goes on and on. You know, even between Germany and the United States; you know I

happened to be in Albania right during and just after the fall of the communist government there, there was fierce contention between Germany and the United States over who would become the dominant Western power in Albania. And I knew a guy who was a secretary to the Central Committee of the party of Labour, not the secretary, but a secretary. And he said there was a meeting with Ramiz Alia and an undersecretary of state from the United States around the time just after the PLA [Party of Labour of Albania] won the first open election, which they did win the first one. And the Americans said to the PLA, to Ramiz Alia, and my guy was in the meeting, that: "Listen, we all recognise your election victory. We'll even work with you"- because they were starting to do some market reforms and things like that- "but on one condition: only us, not the Germans." So even within the NATO alliance, fierce contention. Look at that submarine deal with Australia. The French had a deal and then the British and the Americans stabbed them in the back, taking out their legs to get this submarine deal. So capitalism it's a vicious, competitive system of concentrated pockets, states and fundamentally, about concentrated private ownership. It's not so beautifully rational. So when it comes to Iran, of course, from a strategic point of view, they should suck the Iranian theocracy into the American sphere, as they have the Saudis. Ah, but if you did that, not only would it piss off the Saudi and Israeli elites, but you love this Iranian threat. You know, it justifies antiballistic missile systems in Europe supposedly directed against Iran. And of course, the same thing goes with Russia. Why wouldn't you suck the Russian elite into the western sphere of orbit rather than push them to become what they practically become, a satellite of China. Because it makes money for the military industrial complex in the short term because of this tension, even though in terms of the grand chessboard, it's pure stupidity. There's no great, smart central planning brain here. It's a bunch of contending interests, mostly focussed on short term profit, willing to risk even nuclear war. I mean, they don't want nuclear war, but they're willing to come right up to the edge of risk and completely- they even know climate change is coming. It's not like they don't know the science or don't believe the science. They're so in a bubble of profit making orgy and all the internalised geopolitical nationalist narratives that they won't deal with this. You know, it's like a herd of cattle coming to destroy your town. You know, their own stampede. But you're more worried about: Am I going to make money through my little store today or not? I mean, the whole system is nuts. The monopoly capitalist system is out of solutions. But we're not in a position as progressives to deal with that fundamental problem, which is this concentration of private ownership. We're just not there right now. So while we need to educate people and talk about this all the time we also have to look at some short term demands to at least mitigate the risk.

ZR: One of the things I've noticed is, when we talk about the JCPOA, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which was the Iran deal that was scuttled by Trump and now is put on pause, is that none of the media analysts or articles are written, for example, that we're asking somebody not to produce nuclear weapons while we are improving our nuclear arsenal every year, modernising it. It's similar to somebody who told me Zain, it's like asking somebody to quit smoking while you're smoking yourself. How come our media does not

address one of the most important issues, which is the military industrial complex, the entire nuclear arsenal that's been modernised and improved, submarines, and we're now talking about new jets, F-35s and all of that. Why is there so little critical coverage regarding the military industrial complex and the way we conduct ourselves in the world diplomatically, asking others to disarm while we are arming ourselves to the teeth?

PJ: Well, let me speak to the United States. It's harder for me to talk about Europe, although somewhat similar, I'm guessing, but in the US and Canada it to a large extent goes back even to the coverage of the use of nuclear weapons in Japan. The anti Japanese, anti-communist propaganda was at such a level, during World War Two, towards the end of World War Two, particularly, and as the Cold War begins, the mentality of hating the other. And the fear of being called a traitor. The power of, you know, patriotism and nationalism, this is what mobilises people for war. And it was certainly done during World War Two. They have to justify the use of the atomic bomb, which was totally unjustified, unnecessary. But American official narrative of both the Democratic and Republican parties, and let's remember, it was the Democratic Party that dropped the nuclear bomb, is that that was necessary and it was the beginning of the defence of democracy. So it's very much at the core of the American identity. Next is the Cold War, meaning McCarthyism, the House of un-American Activities Committee that purged American institutions, trade unions, Hollywood gets the most profile, but not just, American government, it purged the progressive left. And greatly weakened the left in American society. Again, you're a commie, you're associated with the party, you're a traitor, blah, blah, blah. And people went to jail. Thousands and thousands of people lost their jobs. You know, maybe there wasn't a Siberia to send people to, but it was as bad, almost as bad, at least as any purge that happened in the Soviet Union. And it puts a tremendous chill in the media. And also in terms of the way the media hired people. They were very careful to hire people that would stay within the lines of what was considered patriotic. Jumping ahead, this takes a leap in intensity after the 9/11 attacks. There's a quote from Dan Rather. Unfortunately, it's a quote he gave to the BBC and didn't say in the United States, but he should have. You know, when he was host of CBS News, he said that after 9/11 to critique the White House would have been akin to being called a traitor in a South African township and having a flaming tire of patriotism put around your neck. Now, Dan Rather says that. So 9/11 created this atmosphere in American journalism, newsrooms. It was very explicitly said in newspaper editorials and by Bush: You are either with us or against us. And it was very specific. If you try to attach the attacks on 9/11 to US foreign policy you're blaming the victims, meaning the people in the Twin Towers. And you're supporting terrorism. It was imbued, that newspaper editorials in the whole Western world said that. I remember it explicitly because I was running the main political debate show on CBC in Canada, and we went on air the day those editorials hit. And I wrote an introduction for our host which said if George Bush had gone on the air a few days ago and asked us to grieve for the people in the Twin Towers, we wouldn't do the show tonight. But he asked us to go to war. And he says, "You're with us or you're against us." So we have a right to debate whether we're going to this war or not. And we had a real debate about US foreign policy in spite of all the attempts to

intimidate us not to. And in fact, Canada didn't enter the Iraq war later. And I think partly because of our efforts, we were on national television. But it intimidated American newsrooms. And anybody who diverged both on 9/11 coverage and then leading up to the Iraq stuff was diminished, fired, not hired. Then the other thing happens over this time period, over the last 20 years, a tremendous concentration of ownership takes place, especially in 07 and 08 where you have these big asset management firms like BlackRock and State Street and Vanguard is one of the biggest. Go look up, who owns the media listed on the stock exchange? It's Wall Street. I mean, 93% of The New York Times is owned by financial institutions. Who owns the companies that make nuclear weapons? Ha ha. Same financial institutions. Aha aha. Who owns Lockheed Martin? Huh? Same financial institutions. Because these big index funds buy the whole index, the whole S&P 500, and they have discretionary money they put in. Who owns the fossil fuel companies? Ha ha. Same big financial institutions. So the media is now owned in a way. There's always been this kind of inner monopoly stuff, but it's at a level now that's never happened before; such concentration of ownership. So it's not that anyone has to even go and say to a journalist, you know, Don't do this, do this. People know how to self-censor. They know the lines to stay with them. Now you get journalists who are just on the ground reporting, whether it's The Washington Post, The New York Times, who often do quite a good job. You know, they see something and they report it and it gets printed often enough. But when there's ever opinion pieces and especially editorial pieces and the overall approach to an issue, there the editorial boards shape it. So the overall coverage winds up being like stenographers for the State Department. So why aren't we on the nuclear issue, which is maybe the most taboo issue of them all- where is there any serious, real serious discussion? You get a report like they were just going to do, this data nuclear posture review as part of this new defence authorisation. And the woman that was leading it dared to raise the issue, one, should we really have a first strike as a possibility? Why don't we at least consider taking first strike off the table, which the Americans have never done. And two, do we really need such a massive new modernisation? Well, with that, within a few weeks, she was gone. They got her fired from that position. There was reporting on it, but why not headlines? Why not? Why? Listen. Why isn't there a public debate about American nuclear war strategy? Because it's taboo. You're not supposed to talk about the fact that ICBMs are useless. They're not in any way a deterrent. In fact, what they are- this is amazing. In this film I'm doing with Ellsberg on nuclear war- I'm going to go to Montana and I'm going to talk to farmers that live near ICBM missile silos. Do you know what the Hawks call these ICBM missiles silos? Nuclear sponges. And there's another phrase there, and it's just escaping me now. But the point is, they want them to be targets because they think if Russian missiles go after the ICBMs, there'll be less Russian missiles to hit cities. So I want to say to some of these farmers living next to these silos, do you know that part of American strategy is to make you a target? And of course, the same thing goes for the Russian farmers. There's absolutely no reason to have ICBMs. The deterrent is in the submarines. ICBMs are absolutely bullshit. What are they? They're part of the trillion dollar military expense, a new expenditure on a whole new generation of ICBMs. So they can be better nuclear targets. I mean, it's madness. And whether it's climate, whether

it's nuclear, issues of war and peace, capitalism, it is irrational and mad. Within this madness we need to get ordinary people to see through this stuff. And one, start electing people who stand for a real climate programme, who stand for at least mitigation of the nuclear risks, that stand against an aggressive foreign policy. And in the streets in terms of mass movement and protest. You know, in 1982 or 83, a million people protested in New York against nuclear weapons. We need to merge the climate movement and the anti-war and anti-nuclear weapon movement. It has to be one and it needs to be in the streets and it needs to have an electoral expression. And then one more quick note on Iran. The Iranian people have a right to democracy. And I don't mean B.S. democracy, but still even B.S. democracy is better than none. And I have to say, there's more democracy in Iran than there is in Saudi Arabia. So at least there are some kind of elections in Iran that have some competition. Iran's more democratic than Saudi Arabia; that being said. The people of Iran have a right to rebel. They have a right to overthrow this theocracy if that's what they want. And the Americans just stay the hell out of it. And any support the Americans give to it is only because they want to manipulate it. So I'm hoping the Iranians, the people, wherever this goes, see through the American B.S. and don't allow the Americans to interfere in it. Now, of course, the Iranian theocracy is going to blame the Americans for everything. I saw this morning they just hung an Iranian protester. And so they're starting to actually execute. It's a vicious regime. But you talk to most of the activists, I've talked to most of the people that hate the theocracy, they'll start with denouncing the sanctions, the American sanctions against Iran, they'll denounce American interference in Iran, they want the Americans to stay the hell out of this whole conflict. But the Iranian people have a right to rebel.

ZR: Major media outlets like The Guardian, The New York Times, Le Monde, DER SPIEGEL, El Pais have finally come together and publicly condemned the US persecution of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange. And I quote here a statement that they released: "This indictment sets a dangerous precedent and threatens to undermine America's First Amendment and the freedom of the press." Although all the major media outlets have finally come after 12 years to release a statement like this, yet when we go online every day on their media outlets, they don't, for example, provide the same frequency of coverage, for example, when it comes to Alexei Navalny or other activists in Iran. And I think it's good to provide people who stand up against the government some coverage. But when it comes to our own dissidents, our media does not provide the same frequency and quality of coverage. Why do you think it took so long for the media, for these media networks to band together? And why is there so little frequency of coverage when it comes to the case of Julian Assange?

PJ: Well, there's certain issues. As I was talking about before, there are certain lines that are drawn that you need to stay within if you want to keep your job in most of the mainstream media. And it's under this kind of rubric of patriotism and nationalism and all this. Even now, but for the longest time, you couldn't even talk about the Saudi role in 9/11, never mind the Bush- Cheney role. This story I've told you before. You know, I interviewed Senator Bob Graham, who out loud directly accused Bush and Cheney of facilitating the 9/11 attacks.

Now, whether he's right or wrong, you know, Bob Graham is the former head of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I mean, this is a serious guy. I've got him on camera saying this. I offered it to every news organisation in the US nobody would take it. Well, there's certain lines you don't go beyond or you're looked at having your, quote unquote, "own agenda". You're outside the official agenda and you'll lose your job. Julian Assange is now that. In the beginning when he first released stuff, WikiLeaks released stuff to these major papers and the major papers printed all that he was within the realm. You know, the big major publications wouldn't have worked with WikiLeaks if they didn't consider it credible at the time. What happened afterwards, right or wrongly, there was certainly a campaign to discredit Assange because he kept releasing stuff, the Clinton stuff and other materials. He keeps poking the American eagle in the eye. And it's not like they're not going to fight back. I don't know the truth or not truth of his relationship with- what's his name? Stone. The Trump guy. There's some emails between the Trump camp, supposed emails. There's supposedly something to do with the Russians. I don't know if any of that is real or if it's all bullshit. Honestly, it doesn't really matter. Because that isn't why they're trying to keep Assange in jail, hoping he dies there. Now, I think the last time you and I talked, I think I said this, but I'll say it again. Obama had decided not to prosecute Assange. Because if you prosecute Assange, how can you possibly not prosecute The New York Times, McClatchy and all the other publications that cooperated with WikiLeaks? It's the same principle. I know they're trying to say that Assange was more implicated because he told Chelsea Manning how to make copies of it. But I don't think they even have any evidence of that. And so the Obama administration looked at it and said, We can't go after Assange without going after The New York Times and so on and dropped it. So when Trump starts the prosecution again and Biden continues, if you take the Obama logic then it actually is a threat against these mainstream publications, it is like saying to them, "You, be careful." Because, yeah, we're going after Assange today, but if you work with someone like Chelsea Manning again and you start digging in around the real classified files of the state, nothing's going to stop us coming after you, too. And it took years but finally some of these big publications realised that it's getting closer to maybe actually the deportation of Assange. And this trial actually happening, that they released a statement. Because the Obama logic holds: If you can convict Assange, then, what if it's DeSantis, or some Republican. I don't know if the Democrats would go after The New York Times, but a Republican might. So they finally issued such a statement saying, Okay, enough is enough. And I believe the Australian prime minister just said enough is enough. And I also think the Americans, I think I said this last time, do they really want Assange on a public trial in the United States? Because Assange's defence is going to be to condemn US foreign policy. My defence is your crimes and the people's right to know. Even if a judge tries to limit that and say that's not a legitimate defence because that's what they did against the Chicago Seven, in 1968 was the trial, when they had these protests against the Democratic Party convention, they tried to make US foreign policy the issue. The judge wouldn't let them. It didn't matter. That's all anyone talked about was US foreign policy. The same thing would happen with an Assange trial. That everyone's going to go back and revisit the war crimes that WikiLeaks and Chelsea Manning exposed. Do they really want that? I don't know. Maybe even the Biden

administration may want some of this pressure to build and not deport Assange. What the Biden administration, I shouldn't say the Biden administration, it's the whole American state. But certainly the Republicans are even more gung-ho. I mean, there's the story of Pompeo and Trump talking about finding a way to kill Assange. They want Assange to die in jail. That's what they want. But it may be the legal processes are getting to a point that they're going to have to put up or shut up and either bring him and put him on trial because he's not dying yet. So maybe things are converging that maybe they will at this point drop it, maybe. I don't know. But you're asking why it took so long. It took so long because the Americans were hoping he'd be dead by now.

ZR: Yeah and the other point is that they've already punished him. I mean, it's not like the process has not punished him. 12 years plus we're talking about, with no sunlight, with no interaction with his family outside of the embassy and then later in Belmarsh Prison. And to the other point that you made, as far as I know, he will be tried in a district court in Virginia and you're not allowed to make a public defence, so you're not allowed to erase, for example, the importance his work had for the public interest. And that might be a problem. And I've also heard that specific court, I can't recall it, has like a 99% rate against whistleblowers, against investigative journalists and always in favour of the military and similar. So let's see what's going to happen with that trial. There is some movement happening right now in Latin America. The Brazilian parliament, I think, has just come out in favour, the Australian prime minister, as you just mentioned as well and the major media outlets have just released a statement. So there is some public opinion changing in this matter. To close this interview, I would like to just ask you about what we talked about off camera, your documentary that you were just recently producing with Daniel Ellsberg. Can you tell our viewers a little bit more about that?

PJ: Yeah, a little bit. It's called How to Stop a Nuclear War. And it starts with Daniel's history of the madness, the complete irrationality, driven by profit making of nuclear American war strategy and plans right from the end of World War Two on. The big lies. The missile gap was a complete lie. You know, 1960, 61, Kennedy was talking about how the Soviets were surpassing the US in ICBMs and claimed they had a thousand ICBMs. It turned out they had four- count them, four- this is part of what led to the Cuban missile crisis, which is going to be part of the film. But the structure of the film is about what needs to be done now. For example, eliminating ICBMs, which are just extremely dangerous. I just remembered the name, they call them nuclear sinkholes. In other words, they're meant to attract if there's a nuclear war, Russian missiles. Meaning wiping out whole sections of Montana, I think North Dakota, Nevada and Montana is one of the biggest; right near the Canadian border. So any Canadians listening to this, like Winnipeg's gone. You know, one of these nuclear sinkholes, maybe it will take missiles away from cities, but some major Canadian cities are toast, literally toast. And so are the rest of us, because, I mean, it's all going to wind up in nuclear winter anyway. There's no winner. There is no winner with a nuclear war. But ICBMs are a total boondoggle for Lockheed Martin, which just got another multibillion dollar contract to

build these new ones. So one, get rid of ICBMs completely and Americans don't even have to negotiate it. They have enough capacity in the submarines to have a deterrent. I mean, that's the fundamental thesis of what needs to be done. Every country should get to a level where the nuclear capacity is at the bare minimum for the deterrent. Yeah, we'd like to get rid of them completely. It's beyond imagination that in this kind of world, we can get rid of them. But let's focus on the issue of actual deterrence, not first strike capability. Like Pakistan and India. Way beyond deterrence in terms of the number of weapons they have. What's the point? And the same thing goes for Russia, for the US. China was the one until recently that had stayed at the level of deterrence. I think they were under 200 missiles and even that's probably significantly more than necessary to be a deterrent. But now, because of this massive new build-up by the Russians and the Americans, China is now starting to expand again. And of course, China has its own military industrial complex. You know, it's not like, you know, any benign players here, but the Chinese were more rational about this until recently. And it looks mostly under US and Russian pressure- and let's not forget, as much as Russia's being pushed into the Chinese orbit, there is contention between Russia and China in many parts of the world for influence. This goes back to this interim perilous complication. So the film is structured around the need for renewed negotiations. It doesn't matter what's going on in Ukraine. There should be a treaty negotiated. You know, in two years there will be no nuclear arms treaty at all. Zip. Unlimited ability. And the previous treaties actually did work. The mutual inspections between Russia and the US even to today apparently, the inspections are still going on. So the nuclear treaties actually were effective. The number of weapons there were reduced. So we need to demand elimination of ICBMs. We need to get first strike off the table. We need to get rid of first strike weaponry off the table; like anti-ballistic missile systems or this new thing the Americans just announced a few days ago. A new B-21 stealth bomber with nuclear weapons capacity. So imagine that. They could take a new ultra hyperspeed- stealth can't be seen on radar- with nuclear weapons. What does that do now? Forget Ukraine. That would be terrifying sitting in Moscow. Now you're starting to talk; existential threat. Not NATO and Ukraine. The B-21 is an existential threat. Now, of course, when Putin was asked if there was a nuclear strike on Russia and were deciding whether to have a second strike, knowing it would be the end of the world, not just with the first strike, but anyway, he was asked: "Would you launch the second strike knowing the world would come to an end?" Then his answer was: "What's the point of a world without a Russia?" Well, the Americans think the same way. I mean, it's insanity, man. So the film is about demands the people should make that are even within the realm of what could be accomplished in today's world. Because the truth is, as much as there's a lot of money making driving nuclear war plans, it's actually not that much money. Like when you look at BlackRock and the big financial companies that, as I said, were the big owners, the amount of money that goes to their bottom line from the manufacturers and nuclear weapons is actually very small. So, you know, if there's any rationality left in capitalism and in some areas there are some because their own arses are on the line, even for pure self-preservation, there are steps that could be taken. But it goes back to another point you made. There is so little public debate about nuclear war planning. I don't know, in the Catholic Church, you can't question

the pope. I don't know. You can't talk about it. So this film is meant to be and we have actually- I'll tell you, because it hasn't gone public yet but I'll tell you. We have our narrator now, it's going to be Emma Thompson. So it's a big name. So the film is going to have a lot of profile. And if people want to support the film, they can donate to theAnalysis.news because theAnalysis.news is driving this film.

ZR: We will put a link in the description of this video.

PJ: But I got to say one more thing. You got to donate to acTVism Munich, to you guys. You got to donate to these guys because they do great work and they're doing interviews a lot of people aren't doing. And so as much as I want you to support the film and whatever, first give Zain support.

ZR: Paul Jay, award winning documentary filmmaker and founder of theAnalysis.news. Thank you so much for your time today.

PJ: Thank you, Zain.

ZR: And thank you guys for joining us in our discussion with Paul Jay. Don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube channel and our alternative channels on Rumble and Telegram and to donate to our crowdfunding campaign. Without your support, we cannot continue our journalism going forward in 2023. I'm your host, Zain Raza, see you guys next time.

acTVism Munich: These are the building blocks that make up our organisation and the goals we would like to achieve in order to continue our journalism and realise these values fundamental to our democracy. We need 1000 supporters in our crowdfunding campaign donating only €5 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