**“Glen’s Parallax Perspectives”** is a series of TV programs offering fresh ways for people to see issues such as foreign policy, social and economic justice, governmental functioning, the environment, and so forth. We provide voices and viewpoints that are rarely heard in mainstream media.

**Mainstream media, politicians, and culture see the world in conventional ways. Therefore, in order to solve problems, we need to see things in fresh ways.** Glen Anderson created this TV series to help people see things differently so we can solve problems at all levels from the local to the global.

This series title refers to “***parallax***“ – the view you get by looking from a different perspective. For example, put one finger in front of your nose and another finger farther away. Close one eye. Then open that eye and close the other. Your fingers will seem to move. This is called a “parallax” view. **This TV series invites you to look at issues from fresh perspectives.**

Each program airs three times a week (currently every Monday at 1:30 pm, every Wednesday at 5:00 pm, and every Thursday at 9:00 pm) for the entire month on Thurston Community Television (TCTV), channel 22 for cable TV subscribers in Thurston County, Washington. TCTV is part of Thurston County Media. You can see their schedule at [**www.tcmedia.org**](http://www.tcmedia.org)

**You can also watch the program described below through your computer** at [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org). All episodes of “Glen’s Parallax Perspectives” are posted on this blog’s “TV Programs” part and also in one or more of the categories listed in the right side of the computer screen. Also, see much information at the issue category headings at [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org).

🡪 Please invite other people to watch this video and/or read this thorough summary at the
“TV Programs” part of [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org).

🡪 In addition to summarizing what we said during this article, this article also includes some ideas we did not have time to mention or discuss. Explicit notes identify those as such.

**The FIRST HALF of the interview we conducted on November 14, 2019,
is the December 2019 TV program for cable channel 22 in Thurston County
– and also on Glen’s blog. (*See information above*)**

**The SECOND HALF is the TV program for February 2020 – and also on the blog.**

**PART 1 of “Nuclear Weapons: Updates on the Crisis and Opportunities”**

by Glen Anderson, the TV series’ producer and host
(360) 491-9093
**glenanderson@integra.net**[**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org)

**Glen introduced the viewers to this interview topic:**

He said this month’s interview on “Glen’s Parallax Perspectives” provides information about nuclear weapons that most people do not know. When the Cold War ended 30 years ago, tensions eased, but recently the danger of nuclear war has increased again, so this hour provides important new information.

This interview reports on the growing dangers and also some exciting new efforts to restrain and reduce nuclear weapons – and some efforts to abolish them altogether.

**Three knowledgeable guests (Bob Delastrada, Joanne Dufour and Mark Fleming)** bring us up to date with information, insights and opportunities that you will find interesting and exciting.

**Experiences from 1940s, 1950s, 1960s:**

All four of us – and many of our TV viewers – have memories of the “duck and cover” drills from going to school in the 1950s. Bob shared some experiences and insights from that era. He said that when he was a kid he participated in two kinds of “duck and cover” drills. One was under their desks, and the other was up against a wall.

He said another experience was more memorable. As a kid he had a sign or flag that he used to help younger kids cross the streets. He said that in St. Paul, Minnesota, on the first Wednesday of each month at about noon the air raid sirens blew. It was an eerie, horrific sound. The sirens came from giant megaphones mounted on top of structures that looked like oil rigs. The megaphones rotated around and around, so the sounds would get louder, softer, louder again as they rotated around their cycles. When he was standing at the street with his flag to help kids cross, he kept wondering, “What if this is real?” If this was really happening how could he help kids cross the street?

Now – 60 years later – he said that when he and other members of the Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons hold our big banner saying **“ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS”** on an overpass over I-5 in Olympia WA, he wonders the same thing. His flashbacks ask him now, “What would I do if I saw a mushroom cloud out on the horizon?” He said he looks toward the direction of the Trident Nuclear Submarine Base at Bangor in Kitsap County. He said his earlier memories still stick with him.

Glen added that one of the members of the Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons – the late Chris Carson – used to tell her memory from 60 years ago when their nuclear weapons drills forced the students to go to their classroom’s cloakroom and stand next to the hook on the wall where their coats were hung up. Above each coat hook was the name of the student whose coat belonged there. Chris said that when she was in elementary school she figured that they were told to stand next to their names so that – when the atomic bombs fell and the students were turned into piles of ashes – people would know which pile of ash used to be which kid because of the names posted above the ash piles.

Mark added that some communities actually issued something like dog tags for kids to wear for that purpose.

Glen said people in our age bracket have these kinds of traumatizing experiences, but people who are substantially younger were not traumatized in these ways.

Bob added another experience from that era: movies about “the friendly atom” which is used to generate energy. The movies used ethereal music to convey the image that atomic energy was a good thing as it showed the famous drawing of an atom with a nucleus and electrons circulating around.

Glen said that during the 1950s President Eisenhower promoted nuclear power – euphemistically promoted as “Atoms for Peace” – in order to spin nuclearism into a positive image for the public – “a public veneer of acceptability” – in order to deceive the public with a plausible “cover story” while the U.S. government actually was vigorously escalating nuclear research and building more dangerous nuclear weapons. The public had recoiled in horror from the August 1945 bombing of Japan, so the “Atoms for Peace” propaganda was intended to be a humane façade – “a propaganda scam” – for escalating nuclear weapons.

Mark added another propaganda angle that he experienced in his town. The government promoted fear that the Russians were coming to get us, so we need something to protect us from them. He said the experiences we’ve been mentioning were “all part of a package.”

We did not have time to make this additional point:

During the 1964 presidential campaign people worried that if Barry Goldwater were elected President he would be too willing to launch nuclear weapons, so Lyndon Johnson’s campaign aired a TV ad with a girl and a sunflower. She picked off the sunflower’s petals in the familiar one-at-a-time way, but then the narrator began to count down to zero, and the TV screen showed a nuclear mushroom cloud. You can watch that famous 1964 TV ad at this link: [**https://www.google.com/search?q=1964+daisy+girl+political+ad&oq=1964+daisy&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5817j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8**](https://www.google.com/search?q=1964+daisy+girl+political+ad&oq=1964+daisy&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5817j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8)

**Since 1945 the U.N.’s “First Committee” has been working for disarmament:**

Glen said that when World War II ended in 1945, people really wanted peace, and the United Nations was created to promote peace. However, he said that most Americans – and even most of us in the peace movement – know very little about the United Nations or its efforts for peace, which began with its founding in 1945.

Joanne shared some of her extensive knowledge of the United Nations. She said that when the U.N. was created in 1945 – and there were 51 member nations – they started by figuring out what to do. They figured they should create committees to work on important matters, and the very first committee it created focused on disarmament. The world had just emerged from World War II and the U.N. wanted to end war. At their very first meeting they created a committee to work for disarmament. It was called “the First Committee” because it was the first committee the U.N. created.

They also figured that this new international organization should pass resolutions. Their very first resolution urged disarmament. They absolutely wanted no more atomic attacks, such as occurred just a few months before in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After passing this resolution calling for disarmament, they realized they needed a committee to implement it, so that’s why they created “the First Committee,” to work for disarmament. The U.N.’s disarmament is still referred to as “the First Committee.”

Joanne added that now – 74 years later – disarmament is still a very important part of the U.N.’s work. Its scope has expanded far beyond nuclear weapons. This committee continues to meet, including an important annual meeting in the autumn of every year when the U.N. starts its new year.

We did not have time to make this additional point:

“Reaching Critical Will” is the disarmament program of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF, [**www.wilpf.org**](http://www.wilpf.org)), the oldest women’s peace organization in the world. WILPF’s “Reaching Critical Will” deals with WILPF’s disarmament program and the U.N.’s “First Committee” [**www.reachingcriticalwill.org**](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org) and **http://reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/unga**

**Cold War policies, MAD, First-Strike, “arms control,” etc.:**

Glen introduced this next topic by saying the Cold War was a truly crazy time, not only because of the “duck and cover” drills and other fear-mongering, but also for crazy federal policies. He gave two examples:

1. In the 1980s when President Reagan was escalating the nuclear arms race and pretending that nuclear war would be OK, one of his top experts said that a nuclear war might kill 50 million Americans, but that this would be a victory for the U.S. if we killed MORE THAN 50 million people in the Soviet Union. Decent Americans opposed that madness.

2. Glen showed a book titled ***With Enough Shovels*** and explained the book’s title. He said T.K. Jones was President Reagan’s Deputy Under-Secretary of Defense for Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces. This top expert in Reagan’s Pentagon said that if a nuclear war became imminent, each person should: “Dig a hole, cover it with a couple of doors and then throw three feet of dirt on top…. It’s the dirt that does it…. [i]f there enough shovels to go around, everybody’s going to make it.” The plan was utterly preposterous for so many, many reasons!

Mark summarized some of the Cold War’s nuclear issues, policies, and strategies. He said the U.S.’s official policy for many years has been that it’s perfectly reasonable to possess nuclear weapons – and also to launch them and cause a nuclear war. The U.S. dropped atomic bombs twice in 1945, so the Soviet Union recognized that – for their own national security – they needed to have their own nuclear weapons too. In 1945 the U.S. had a monopoly, but soon afterward there were two nations with nuclear weapons. Then in the 1950s several other nations also developed their own. We developed more and bigger weapons, intercontinental missiles and submarines to deliver them, and everything escalated.

Mark said the rapid escalation of the nuclear arms race throughout the 1950s was perceived as “just the way things are,” so very few people seriously questioned that reality. He said during the 1950s we moved from “fission” weapons (A bombs) to “fusion” weapons (H bombs), which are exponentially more destructive than the A bombs.

He also said that in the 1950s the Eisenhower Administration tried to figure out how to counteract the Soviet Union’s on-the-ground superiority in Europe (many troops, many tanks, etc.). The U.S. – instead of sending an equal number of hugely expensive number of troops, tanks, etc., to Europe – devised the “massive retaliation” policy of countering a Soviet conventional attack on Western Europe with many, many nuclear weapons attacking the USSR with U.S. bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and nuclear submarines. President Eisenhower’s Secretary of State John Foster Douglas said launching many nuclear weapons would be cheaper than fighting the USSR in a European land war.

Mark said it just kept building and building. The public became alarmed when the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis occurred, and when people discovered strontium 90 in milk and elsewhere throughout the U.S. that occurred because nuclear weapons were being tested in the atmosphere and those nuclear explosions released huge amounts of radiation and deadly chemicals throughout the U.S. and elsewhere (South Pacific islands, etc.).

These caused people to recognize that an endlessly escalating nuclear arms race was NOT a reasonable policy after all, so the public pushed for – and accomplished –several treaties to restrain nuclear weapons. A 1963 test ban treaty, the 1970 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and other accomplishments eased tensions.

Mark also said President Nixon sought to further ease tensions with his “détente” efforts, but Glen said Nixon did not do that voluntarily because he had a long history as a vigorous Cold War hawk. He said Nixon sought peace only because a strong peace movement had been growing, so public pressure forced him to seek “détente.”

Mark said the nuclear peace movement started in England with the Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (CND,) and they devised the well-known peace symbol, which combines the semaphore flag symbols for “N” (Nuclear) – one flag upright and the other pointed straight down – and “D” (Disarmament) – both flags pointed at angles downward – enclosed in a circle.



The thinking about nuclear weapons continued to evolve, and – increasingly – even some people inside the “national security” Establishment saw problems with nuclear weapons. Bob read a short quotation from General Lee Butler, after he retired from a top position over nuclear weapons -- Commander in Chief of the United States Strategic Command for Nuclear Forces. General Butler spoke publicly for abolishing nuclear weapons altogether. Bob read this quotation from General Butler:

“We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of our existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it. We cannot sit in silent acquiescence to the faded homilies of the nuclear priesthood. It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason, and the rightful interest of humanity.”

Bob added that General Butler identified “the nuclear priesthood” as the military-industrial-political complex.

Joanne added that even while the United Nations’ First Committee promoted disarmament, the U.N. Security Council’s five major nations – which each as veto power over the Security Council’s decisions – each developed their own nuclear weapons. Now nine nations have nuclear weapons, but the first five nuclear nations were the most powerful nations on the Security Council.

**What happened after the Cold War ended:**

Mark explained that when the Cold War ended three decades ago – and the Soviet Union dissolved – the world’s nuclear weapons did not go away. Russia and the U.S. still had nuclear missiles aimed at each other. The problems changed in several ways. Some of the former Soviet republics (Kazakhstan and Ukraine, especially) got rid of the nuclear weapons that the Soviet Union had based there. Also, he said, South Africa stopped its plans to develop nuclear weapons.

But, he said, we still had two superpowers aiming nuclear weapons at each other. The nuclear weapons “priesthood” still remained, so their entrenched power continued.

But, he said, leading up to the end of the Cold War, there was a movement to reduce the nuclear weapons stockpiles, so we went from having tens of thousands of nuclear warheads down to several thousands of them – but several thousand nuclear warheads are still vastly more than enough to destroy life on this planet.

Glen said that some of our top nuclear strategists have repeatedly said that – if we want a credible deterrent – we need only about 100 or 150 nuclear weapons, not the thousands that still exist after the Cold War. Keeping thousands of them is beyond reason. Mark agreed. He said the U.S. had a credible deterrent in the mid-1950s.

Joanne said that in 1982 the world had 80,000 nuclear weapons, and that provoked a million people to gather in New York City to protest nuclear weapons in 1982. Glen said that was the biggest protest ever in U.S. history.

Mark said now the U.S. is provoking a new nuclear arms race. It had escalated in the 1950s and 1960s. Then some efforts to de-escalate occurred in the 1970s and 1980s. Now the newest technology is making the new arms race even worse. Even with smaller numbers than at the peak, the weapons are more dangerous in several ways: more accurate, designed to be “more usable,” faster delivery systems, etc., make new weapons more dangerous.

**Several past efforts for disarmament:**

A few minutes before, Joanne had told us about the United Nations’ “First Committee” and its work for disarmament. Glen said that the United Nations and other international entities have been working hard for disarmament – getting rid of not only nuclear weapons, but also other kinds of weapons. Unfortunately, most Americans know very little about this progress – and they know very little about what the peace movement has accomplished. He said that the world’s success in abolishing certain entire kinds of weapons (land mines, chemical weapons, biological weapons, etc.) really provides role models for how the world could abolish another whole kind of weapons: nuclear weapons.

Joanne explained that the United Nations’ disarmament committee dealt directly with these other kinds of weapons (land mines, chemical, biological, etc.). She said that a century ago after World War I the world recognized that mustard gas was too horrible to allow as a weapon, so the world outlawed it. The world decided that it was wrong to use mustard gas to hurt the bodies of soldiers and civilians.

This kind of consciousness revived regarding these other kinds of weapons, and the world took action to ban them. The world recognized the cruelty of certain kinds of bullets, such as those that expand and fragment when they enter a person’s body, and cluster bombs that fragment into many small bombs.

Land mines are still dangerous many years after they were planted, because nobody has the maps of where they had been planted, so even now – decades later – children playing outside and farmers working in their fields are suffering when land mines explode and blow their legs or arms off. She said the world recognized the horror of these weapons and passed treaties outlawing them.

The U.N. disarmament committee accomplished these treaties. She said the treaties hold individual nations accountable for the number of banned weapons they have, how rapidly they are destroying them, and so forth. She said the U.N. has held nations accountable for chemical weapons to such an extent that nearly all have been eliminated. The progress has been so huge that – on the rare occasion when a chemical weapon is used – it makes the news worldwide. It makes the news only because it is so unusual. This is a great sign of our success.

Glen expressed appreciation for the U.N.’s success in abolishing entire categories of weapons, and he said we need to also abolish the entire category of nuclear weapons too.

We did not have time to make these additional points:

Joanne wrote a relevant article for a blog she maintains. Read her article about banning chemical weapons – and nuclear weapons – at this link: [**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible)

The world actually did outlaw war in 1928 through the Kellogg-Briand Pact. We did not have time to discuss this topic, but you can learn about it by searching the internet for “Kellogg-Briand Pact.”

**Our feelings about what happened decades ago, our needs and values, and also our feelings of fear and being overwhelmed and powerless:**

Bob noted the irony that – after scientists had developed the atomic bomb (the Manhattan Project) and escalated the technology further – many of those scientists recognized that they had “let the genie out of the bottle,” and they started organizing opposition to those dangerous weapons. Some of them created the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and their famous Doomsday Clock. (See much information at [**www.thebulletin.org**](http://www.thebulletin.org)) Glen also said the Federation of American Scientists ([**www.fas.org**](http://www.fas.org)) also brings scientists together to oppose nuclear weapons.

Glen said the problems we are discussing are not only “out there” in the world around us, but are also related to things going on inside of us – our feelings, and so forth. He said the war-hawks who want to build more nuclear weapons have been deliberately trying to promote fears among the public because they know that when we are afraid we think less rationally and we let the war-hawks frighten us into spending many, many billions of our tax dollars to build more nuclear weapons. Certainly the businesses that manufacture nuclear weapons also push to make us afraid so we will buy more and more of what they produce.

When we were preparing for this interview, Bob had talked about a “fear-driven political agenda” that has embedded itself deep into our politics and our culture. Now he described fear as “one of the baser instincts that drive and control our behavior.”

He said, “in the first place, it’s all about money.” He said “it’s wanting to harness those emotions in people that allow the people who want to make money to be able to do what they want. … If you can frighten people enough – and offer what appears to be a solution – you have them tied around your finger.”

Joanne added that the concept of deterrence comes into play – but deterrence is a myth.

Glen said the concept of deterrence is “a reckless experiment in applied psychology” that is not really proven. He said the deterrence myth is like somebody playing Russian roulette with a bullet in only one chamber of a revolver. Aiming at your head and pulling the trigger – without being shot – does not prove that Russian roulette is safe. No, the odds are against us in the long run.

Mark said, “The fear is really what drove the acceptance of nuclear weapons in the U.S. He said that in the 1950s and early 1960s the American people accepted nuclear weapons as just “a given” – just the way things are. He said the movement against nuclear weapons really started in England and then came to the U.S. and grew.

Glen added more about the political uses – and abuses – related to provoking fears. He said Trump has tried to make us afraid of Muslims, afraid of immigrants from Latin America, and so forth. Trump wants us to be afraid of many kinds of people, and he promotes himself as “the big, strong guy who will protect us” from Honduran children and other demons.

Glen said a later part of our interview will explore how we can free ourselves from being overwhelmed with fear – and how the peace movement can empower people to take positive actions. [*That topic will occur in PART 2 of this interview. That TV program will air in February 2020 on TCTV cable channel 22 in Thurston County WA, and it will appear on Glen’s blog,* [***www.parallaxperspectives.org***](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org)]

Bob said that during the time (1982) when Nuclear Weapons Freeze campaigns were happening across the U.S. he was living in Minnesota. He said that he and other supporters of freezing nuclear weapons went to his U.S. senator’s office and spoke against nuclear weapons. Bob said his senator was Jewish and had lost many family members in the Holocaust. When they asked the senator to cut nuclear weapons, the senator replied, “Never again.” In his mind he was connecting the need for many nuclear weapons as a way to protect people from what had happened to his family during the Holocaust.

Bob said during our interview that those two issues are really not connected, but Glen said that when people are trapped in fear they do illogical thinking, such as disconnecting things that really are connected, and also reconnecting them to other things to which they are not really connected.

**The U.N.’s ongoing work for several kinds of disarmament:**

Glen said one remedy for reducing fear is to take strong actions to reduce the dangers that make people afraid. He said both the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross are doing excellent work toward nuclear disarmament, so he asked Joanne – who knows a lot about these organizations’ work – to share more information.

Joanne said what’s important is “to educate people with the realities.” She said the new United Nations Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is a major accomplishment, and the International Committee of the Red Cross is strongly supporting this treaty.

She said she remembers when she was a teacher in the 1980s and she felt resistance to teaching about nuclear weapons. She remembers feeling afraid to raise such a scary topic in the classroom – fear about telling students about the huge numbers of nuclear weapons – because that might cause the students to feel fear. But now she says we must combat that resistance by helping people understand that the world does not have to be this way. She said we need to learn that lesson now and act upon it so we can promote alternatives to nuclear weapons.

Now the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Secretary General of the United Nations, the pope, and other people are coming out strongly and alert the world to the current realities and – instead of bogging down in fear – push hard to educate people and push hard for peace without nuclear weapons.

Mark added that the nuclear weapons priesthood keeps saying there is no alternative to nuclear weapons. Joanne pointed out that – unlike the “nuclear weapons priesthood” – the Jesuits and other priests strongly oppose nuclear weapons.

We did not have time to make this additional point:

Joanne’s blog featured a 2018 statement by Mr. Peter Maurer, President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, which has been appealing to all States, global leaders and citizens to act on the increasing risk of the use of nuclear weapons. Here is the link: [**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe)

**Daniel Ellsberg’s book *The Doomsday Machine*:**

Three of us in this interview have read the powerfully informative 2017 book ***The Doomsday Machine***, which was written by Daniel Ellsberg based on his high-level access to secret information about nuclear weapons.

Half a century ago Daniel Ellsberg became famous for releasing the Pentagon Papers. Those were internal federal government documents proving that the government was lying to us about its war in Vietnam.

Now his 2017 book about nuclear weapons also exposes much information that the public does not know about the explicit – and implicit – policies that make nuclear war more likely and more dangerous.

Mark mentioned just a few points from the amazing information Daniel Ellsberg wrote about in ***The Doomsday Machine***. He said during the early 1960s Ellsberg was working for a Pentagon contractor, doing highly confidential high-level research on the U.S.’s nuclear policy. Ellsberg discovered that the U.S.’s plans routinely assumed that we would kill 600 million people. This was so astounding that he kept digging deeper and deeper into the actual policies and actual procedures related to conducting a nuclear war.

Mark said a crucial issue is the “command and control.”

He said the popular notion is that the President has a device that only he is authorized to activate in order to launch nuclear weapons. What Ellsberg discovered is that many “fail-safe” precautions that the public was told to trust did not really exist! Some of the security codes were set to 0000 in order to make it easier to remember – and easier to launch – so if my code was set to 0000, and my co-worker’s code also was set to 0000, then either of us could launch nuclear weapons without the other person’s knowledge or consent.

Mark said that what’s even more frightening is the level of command authority over nuclear weapons. The government wants us to believe that only the President can authorize a nuclear war. That is not true. Ellsberg found that under some circumstances, air commanders – and even bomber pilots – can launch them. He said the part of the 1964 film “Dr. Strangelove” in which a U.S. bomber pilot proceeds into the Soviet Union and drops bombs without legitimate authority could actually happen.

Glen added that Ellsberg says in his book that the “Dr. Strangelove” film is not fiction; it’s a documentary! Ellsberg’s research had discovered exactly those kinds of “command and control” problems! It really is possible for one military officer to go crazy and – on his own wacky initiative – launch nuclear weapons that escalate and blow up the world.

Joanne added that when the U.S. government developed its nuclear war-fighting strategies, they always assumed that the enemy was the Soviet Union, but when the strategies took the next steps China also was included for nuclear war targeting. This was because China was Communist, so – because our nuclear war would be against Communism – we had to target China too.

Mark agreed that this was the U.S.’s plan. The reason for this was that having only one plan was simpler than having two separate plans – one for the USSR and another plan for China. He said the U.S. locked itself into attacking China along with the Soviet Union “because that’s just the way it is.” He said this is one example of what he called the “really bizarre” logic that directed U.S. nuclear war planning.

Glen added that Ellsberg’s ***The Doomsday Machine*** reports case after case of truly frightening realities that the American people do not know (and had been prevented from knowing until this book came out in 2017). We really do have a “Doomsday Machine” – in the technology and in the policy.

Mark provided more information from the book. Ellsberg reported on serious problems with training regarding nuclear weapons. In one instance, a number of nuclear-armed bombers were taking off one right after another and far too close together for safety because the drill was to get many nuclear bombers into the air quickly.

He also said that although the government wanted nuclear missiles to reach their targets with great accuracy, the plans to launch many into a given area meant that they would interfere with each other’s trajectories, so they would not be as accurate and the damage would extend over a much wider area. Bob added that that problem had existed even with the older atomic (fission) bombs, before the newer hydrogen (fusion) bombs.

Mark said many problems exist all the way up to today. Just recently a scandal was revealed in which the military officers who needed to be tested periodically for re-certification to be launch officers had been discovered to be cheating on their tests. Some nuclear commanders also had acted irresponsibly.

Mark also reported that a friend of his used to be a nuclear missile silo officer, and the enlisted men who worked there were terribly bored, so they played “quick-draw” with their handguns, and one of the enlisted men shot another.

Glen concluded that the list and variety of problems just goes on and on.

**Trump’s Nuclear Posture Review and other recent changes:**

Glen said that when a new President takes office, the President’s top people revise the U.S.’s overall policies about nuclear weapons and produce a report called the Nuclear Posture Review. The Nuclear Posture Review states how the new president wants nuclear weapons to fit into our foreign policy, when and how we might use them, and so forth. Trump’s 2018 Nuclear Posture Review alarmed people around the world.

Mark summarized some of the main points in Trump’s Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Obama produced his NPR in 2010, and Trump produced his in February 2018.

Mark said Trump’s differed significantly from previous ones. Obama’s NPR said the U.S. would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear nations that were part of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Trump changed that and said he is willing to use nuclear weapons against **anyone**. Also, Trump widened the occasions when he would launch nuclear weapons. Instead of launching them in case of nuclear attack, Trump said he might launch them in case of **any** significant attack (*e.g*., an attack on our electric grid or our computer systems). Mark said the threshold for launching nuclear weapons is much lower in Trump’s NPR.

Mark said Trump also continued Obama’s policy of “modernizing” the U.S.’s nuclear arsenal, and Glen fleshed out more information that this “modernization” would completely replace all of our thousands of nuclear warheads, thousands of land-based missiles and submarine-based missiles, all new bombers, and all new submarines with totally new ones – at a horrendously expensive cost of close to **two trillion dollars**. Glen said that in order to pay for this, Trump and Congress would have to slash spending for everything that helps people and the environment: Social Security, health care, education, and everything except the military – or else run horrendously huge deficits or raise taxes.

Mark said the term “modernize” is a euphemism for the decision to build all new nuclear weapons. Glen agreed that it’s a euphemism and said the peace movement is not against being “modern,” but rather the reckless escalation of the nuclear arms race.

Mark and Glen said that when Obama was trying to get the Republican-dominated Senate to approve the START Treaty, he foolishly caved in to Republican obstinacy and agreed to completely replace the U.S.’s entire nuclear arsenal. The irony is that Obama – in order to get Senate Republicans to support a treaty **reducing** nuclear weapons – actually let the Republicans bamboozle him into **actually building more** nuclear weapons!

The START Treaty went into effect in 2011 for ten years and will expire in 2021. Trump seems to OPPOSE renewing it, but the “modernization” of building all new nuclear weapons will continue. Both halves of the Obama/Republican bargain are making things worse now: new nuclear weapons without a treaty to reduce them!

Mark said Trump also wants to add additional kinds of nuclear weapons that will be more likely to start a nuclear war. The proposed “low-yield” nuclear weapons (less destructive power than the really big ones, but still more than the Hiroshima-sized warheads) are not a step toward peace, but rather a deceptive way to start a nuclear war by pretending that it won’t be very destructive. But, Mark said, putting the “low-yield” warheads on Trident nuclear submarines would be very provocative, because if an adversary sees the U.S. launching missiles from a Trident, the adversary will not assume that they are “low-yield,” but rather the adversary will need to assume the worst (Trident’s hugely destructive warheads) and retaliate with their biggest nuclear weapons. The “low-yield” weapons would rapidly escalate into all-out nuclear war.

Mark also said that some of the new weapons will be worse in other ways. They are more accurate – and therefore more threatening as first-strike weapons (designed to begin a nuclear war). They are faster – and therefore they reduce an adversary’s time for making decisions, and this would increase the likelihood that an adversary will react abruptly without enough valid information.

Glen added that the U.S. decision to build all new nuclear warheads will generate even more nuclear waste, despite the fact that nobody has been able to figure out a way to safely store nuclear waste for the past 75 years.

Also, the U.S. is committed to building the nuclear warheads at its “architecturally obsolete” plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, even though it is on a seismic fault and the building is not safe from earthquakes.

Bob added that the government’s attempt to use “Artificial Intelligence” puts another risk into the mix. Joanne expressed concern about taking the human element out of it and letting computers make the crucial decisions.

Joanne said her recent research found an expert at the U.S.’s nuclear weapons lab at Los Alamos, New Mexico, who had suggested in the year 2000 that the U.S. should design “low-yield” nuclear weapons but then downplay nuclear weapons and give more emphasis to conventional weapons. But she said the U.S. – especially Trump’s Nuclear Posture Review – is far too heavily committed to nuclear weapons. She said some people in the military would rather use conventional weapons instead and get rid of the nuclear weapons.

Mark said his research also showed that some people in the military are thinking that way.

But he also said that earlier in 2019 the Joint Chiefs of Staff produced their Nuclear Operations Plan. This is a very detailed document about using nuclear weapons. The document says every military combat plan should include a component about how to use nuclear weapons for achieving the military goal. For example, if the adversary is overwhelming U.S. forces, that would be a time to use nuclear weapons against them. Glen said such a plan would have led the U.S. to use nuclear weapons in Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. Bob added “Berlin after World War II.”

**Debunk myths (deterrence, adequate controls, etc.):**

Glen said that earlier in this interview we mentioned myths such as the theory of deterrence, the problems in “command and control” systems, and so forth. Our conversation has produced more information so now we can dig deeper into these and other myths and problems. He said that ever since the 1940s, the U.S. government has been deceiving the public – and sometimes outright lying – about nuclear weapons:

* The government says these weapons protect us, but actually they endanger us.
* The government says they deter other nations from attacking us, but actually our weapons are designed to be so accurate (*e.g.*, launch from Chicago and land inside Pasadena’s Rose Bowl), that they are designed to destroy another nation’s missile silos while their missiles are still inside. Ironically, the U.S.’s first-strike weapons are provoking other nations to strike us so we won’t be able to destroy their missiles while they’re still in their silos.
* The government says our weapons are safely under control, but actually many accidents have occurred and nuclear explosions could have resulted.

Joanne said China has a “no-first-use” policy, and Glen said the U.S. has never had such a policy but instead has practiced a “first-strike” policy – and designed our missiles to accomplish that – since the 1960s. Now some members of Congress have introduced four “No-First-Use” bills. S. 200 and H.R. 669 are companion bills, and S. 272 and H.R. 921 are companion bills.

Mark provided a blunt reality check by saying that merely possessing nuclear weapons is an attempt to legitimize them.

Bob provided another blunt reality check by saying nuclear weapons have caused a lot of damage even without being “used.”

Joanne said the U.S. has damaged the areas where we have tested nuclear weapons.

Each of us mentioned other kinds of damage throughout the entire cycle: causing many cancers among uranium miners and people who live near uranium mining areas (especially several tribes of Native Americans whose lands were especially abused), dealing negligently and recklessly with nuclear waste, deliberately releasing radiation from Hanford in Eastern Washington and sickening many people who lived downwind, and so forth. Mark added that uranium mining dirt waste (“tailings”) was piled up, and people hauled it home to use as fill dirt near their homes. Joanne added that the U.S. tested nuclear weapons 67 times in the Marshall Islands and terribly sickened the people who lived there.

Glen said people think we used the atomic bomb only twice – on civilian populations in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Actually, the U.S. government has been using these weapons **continuously** since then.

Mark agreed and said, “We don’t have to set them off to use them. The fact that we have them constitutes a threat. We have them, and they’re always in the background. If you don’t do what we want, then we can use them. Another country always has to think about that. Since the U.S. won’t disavow first use, at a certain point perhaps the Americans will use them.” This danger from the U.S. might cause another nation to think perhaps they should use their nuclear weapons first.

Glen added this analogy: In our nation’s criminal law, someone who threatens another person with a gun in order to rob them is guilty of “armed robbery” – even if the robber never pulls the trigger – and even if the robber did not actually have a gun, but only claimed to have a gun. Similarly, the U.S. is “using nuclear weapons all the time because we’re always threatening other nations.”

Mark said this is a key point in Daniel Ellsberg’s ***Doomsday Machine*** book. Ellsberg points out a number of ways in which the U.S. has done exactly that.

Bob added that the U.S. has military bases in approximately 86 nations around the world, and the U.S. has Trident nuclear submarines roaming the world’s oceans, “so nobody is safe if we chose to attack.”

Glen added that accidents can happen in any of the places where our nuclear weapons are located. We’ve had many accidents, including one in 1961 in North Carolina where a bomber carrying nuclear bombs crashed, and 5 of the 6 safety switches snapped, so only one switch protected much of North Carolina from nuclear destruction. Mark said it was near Goldsboro NC, about 60 miles from where he lived, but he did not know it at the time. Actually, the government and news media prevent news coverage of such accidents.

**U.N. Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons:**

Glen said ordinary people around the world have been paying attention and taking positive actions to reduce the danger of nuclear war. The 2017 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), [**www.icanw.org**](http://www.icanw.org). ICAN was a major organizing force that moved the United Nations General Assembly – in July 2017 – to overwhelmingly pass the U.N. Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Joanne explained the origin of this historic effort. She said that at one of the review conferences for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) some of the nations without nuclear weapons expressed strong concern that they felt they were being held hostage by the nations that do have nuclear weapons. They objected that if any of the nuclear nations detonates their weapons the non-nuclear nations would be destroyed, but they have no voice – no power – in the decision to use nuclear weapons. They would be merely powerless victims.

That consciousness among non-nuclear nations continued to grow, and it was discussed among themselves, even though it was NOT on the official agenda of the NPT review conference. Non-nuclear nations decided to meet elsewhere and figure out how to address the possibility of banning – getting rid of – nuclear weapons. She said the discussions continued, and ICAN started facilitating those meetings in 2013, 2014, and 2015.

By 2016 they had so many nations participating in those meetings that they decided to develop a worldwide treaty. Writing the treaty took only seven months – an amazingly short time – and was presented to the United Nations General Assembly in July 2017. The treaty was written by the ambassador from Costa Rica, a nation that does not have a military.

She said that early in the process North Korea expressed support for the treaty, but after a while North Korea joined with all of the other nine nations that have nuclear weapons in opposing ICAN’s treaty. Other opponents included the nuclear nations’ satellite nations, such as the NATO nations where they are based or are dominated by the big nuclear nations.

In July 2017 when the United Nations General Assembly voted on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, 122 nations – the vast majority of the world’s nations – voted to pass it, and this huge majority was big enough for victory in passing such a resolution through the General Assembly.

She said that Pope Francis had already been vigorously stating that nuclear weapons are immoral, and the world should not be held hostage to them. Pope Francis threw his weight into support for the Treaty.

Also, ICAN had 540 local groups in countries throughout the world urging their respective governments to support the Treaty. All of this generated pressure to help the General Assembly to pass it overwhelmingly in July 2017.

Then, in September 2017, the treaty opened for nations to sign on to it to show their intention to pursue ratification. Dozens of nations promptly signed and started working through their respective governments’ procedures for ratifying treaties.

As of November 2019, 80 nations have signed on, and 34 nations have ratified it. Ratifying a treaty brings that treaty into becoming a part of a nation’s domestic law.

Joanne said this is amazingly rapid speed for creating a treaty for significant international law.

Glen said a huge amount of information is available – more than we could say orally during this interview – so he will type up links to many sources of information and list them at the end of the thorough summary of our interview, and post this to his blog, [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org), at both the “TV Programs” part and the “Nuclear Weapons” part. The blog post will include a link for watching this TV interview, as well as the thorough summary of what we said and links for many sources of information. **See the information below.**

People can get information about the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons at [**www.icanw.org**](http://www.icanw.org)

**Many excellent organizations work to reduce the danger of nuclear war:**

It is easy to find excellent sources of information – including many non-profit organizations working to reduce the danger of nuclear war and to abolish nuclear weapons altogether.

Glen Anderson’s blog – [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org) – has a category for “Nuclear Weapons” information. It includes dozens of blog posts relevant to various aspects of nuclear weapons and related issues. It also includes links so you can watch our Dec. 2019 and Feb. 2020 TV interviews with these knowledgeable guests and also some previous TV programs about nuclear weapons. The blog posts for these TV programs also include thorough typed summaries of what we said during the interviews – and links to many sources of information.

We did not have time to list many organizations orally during the TV interview, but I am posting links here. Many of these work specifically on nuclear weapons, but some of these organizations work on other aspects of peace issues:

**American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)** [**www.afsc.org**](http://www.afsc.org)

**Albert Einstein Institution** [**www.aeinstein.org**](http://www.aeinstein.org)

**Arms Control Association:** [**www.armscontrol.org**](http://www.armscontrol.org)

**Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists** [**www.thebulletin.org**](http://www.thebulletin.org)

**Campaign for Peace and Democracy** [**www.cpdweb.org**](http://www.cpdweb.org)

**Center for Public Integrity** [**www.publicintegrity.org**](http://www.publicintegrity.org)

**Center on Conscience & War** [**www.centeronconscience.org**](http://www.centeronconscience.org)

**Code Pink** [**www.codepink.org**](http://www.codepink.org)

**Committee Opposed to Militarism and the Draft (COMD)** [**www.comdsd.org**](http://www.comdsd.org)

**Courage to Resist** [**www.couragetoresist.org**](http://www.couragetoresist.org)

**Creating a Culture of Peace** [**www.creatingacultureofpeace.org**](http://www.creatingacultureofpeace.org)

**Federation of American Scientists** [**www.fas.org**](http://www.fas.org)

**Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL)** [**www.fcnl.org**](http://www.fcnl.org)

**Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR)** [**www.forusa.org**](http://www.forusa.org)

**Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space** [**www.space4peace.org**](http://www.space4peace.org)

**Global Zero** [**www.globalzero.org**](http://www.globalzero.org)

**Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action** [**www.gzcenter.org**](http://www.gzcenter.org)

**Institute for Policy Studies** [**www.ips-dc.org**](http://www.ips-dc.org)

**International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN)** [**www.icanw.org**](http://www.icanw.org)

**Just Foreign Policy** [**www.justforeignpolicy.org**](http://www.justforeignpolicy.org)

**Lutheran Peace Fellowship** [**www.lutheranpeace.org**](http://www.lutheranpeace.org)

**National Priorities Project** [**www.nationalpriorities.org**](http://www.nationalpriorities.org) **and** [**www.costofwar.com**](http://www.costofwar.com)

**National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund (NCPTF)** [**www.peacetaxfund.org**](http://www.peacetaxfund.org)

**Nonviolent Peaceforce** [**www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org**](http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org)

**Nuclear Age Peace Foundation** [**www.wagingpeace.org**](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

**National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee (NWTRCC)** [**www.nwtrcc.org**](http://www.nwtrcc.org)

**Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance (OREPA)** [**www.orepa.org**](http://www.orepa.org)

**Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons: (360) 491-9093** **glenanderson@integra.net**

**Peace Action** [**www.peace-action.org**](http://www.peace-action.org)

**Peace Alliance** [**www.peacealliance.org**](http://www.peacealliance.org)

**PeaceWorkers** [**www.peaceworkersus.org**](http://www.peaceworkersus.org)

**Peace and Justice Action League of Spokane (PJALS)** [**www.pjals.org**](http://www.pjals.org)

**Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR ) www.psr.org**

**Rachel Corrie Foundation for Peace & Justice** [**www.rachelcorriefoundation.org**](http://www.rachelcorriefoundation.org)

**Union of Concerned Scientists** [**www.ucsusa.org**](http://www.ucsusa.org)

**Unitarian Universalist Association’s disarmament blog** [**www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament**](http://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament)

**Veterans for Peace – Olympia chapter 109** [**www.vfp109rcc.org**](http://www.vfp109rcc.org)

**Veterans for Peace** [**www.veteransforpeace.org**](http://www.veteransforpeace.org)

**War Resisters International** [**www.wri-irg.org**](http://www.wri-irg.org)

**Washington Against Nuclear Weapons** [**www.wanwcoalition.org**](http://www.wanwcoalition.org)

**We Stand for Peace and Justice** [**www.standforpeaceandjustice.org**](http://www.standforpeaceandjustice.org)

**Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF)** [**www.wilpf.org**](http://www.wilpf.org)

**World Beyond War** [**www.worldbeyondwar.org**](http://www.worldbeyondwar.org)

**Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility (WPSR)** [**www.wpsr.org**](http://www.wpsr.org)

**War Resisters League (WRL)** [**www.warresisters.org**](http://www.warresisters.org)

**Many other excellent sources of information exist. Here are just a few:**

15-minute video from 2014 about the danger of nuclear war: It is serious but with a lot of wit too: [**https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Y1ya-yF35g**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Y1ya-yF35g)

[**Amazing Grace: The Role of the Holy See in the Treaty to Ban Nuclear Weapons | Disarmament | UUA International | UUA.org**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/amazing-grace-role-holy-see-treaty-ban-nuclear-weapons)

Avoiding a global catastrophe (nuclear weapons): [**www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe**](http://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe)

Back from the Brink: To sign up for Back from the Brink's email list or endorse as an organization, please click here: [**www.preventnuclearwar.org**](http://www.preventnuclearwar.org) AND [**https://www.preventnuclearwar.org/take-action**](https://www.preventnuclearwar.org/take-action)

Disarming Our Planet: See many resources at this blog, including [**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/listening-our-neighbors**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/listening-our-neighbors) and [**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible) and [**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/amazing-grace-role-holy-see-treaty-ban-nuclear-weapons**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/amazing-grace-role-holy-see-treaty-ban-nuclear-weapons) and[**https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe**](https://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/nuclear-weapons-averting-global-catastrophe)

Drones can be militarized. We must prevent drones from becoming part of our nuclear arsenal, and stop militarized drones altogether. Information about the videos “National Bird” and “Unmanned” comes from the Interfaith Network on Lethal Drones, [**www.interfaithdronenetwork.org/films.html**](http://www.interfaithdronenetwork.org/films.html) The Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons might show it in the Olympia WA area in early 2020.

During the 1964 presidential campaign people were worried that if Barry Goldwater were elected President he would be too willing to launch nuclear weapons, so Lyndon Johnson’s campaign aired a TV ad with a girl and a sunflower. She picked off the sunflower’s petals in the familiar one-at-a-time way, and then the narrator began to count down to zero, and the TV screen showed a nuclear mushroom cloud. You can watch that famous ad at this link: [**https://www.google.com/search?q=1964+daisy+girl+political+ad&oq=1964+daisy&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5817j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8**](https://www.google.com/search?q=1964+daisy+girl+political+ad&oq=1964+daisy&aqs=chrome.2.0j69i57j0l4.5817j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8)

Federal legislation about nuclear weapons: Some U.S. Senators and Representatives have introduced some pieces of legislation to reduce the danger of nuclear war. Glen Anderson created a two-page fact sheet and posted it to his blog at [**www.parallaxperspectives.org/urge-congress-to-pass-this-good-legislation-to-reduce-nuclear-weapons-dangers**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org/urge-congress-to-pass-this-good-legislation-to-reduce-nuclear-weapons-dangers)

Interfaith Network on Drone Warfare: [**www.interfaithdronenetwork.org**](http://www.interfaithdronenetwork.org) Also see: [**Films - Interfaith Network on Drone Warfare**](https://www.interfaithdronenetwork.org/films.html)

International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN): This worldwide organization generated an international movement that convinced the United Nations General Assembly to overwhelmingly pass the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in July 2017. [**www.icanw.org**](http://www.icanw.org)

Is nuclear disarmament impossible? Could advances in international law help to abolish nuclear weapons? Some kinds of weapons (land mines, chemical weapons, etc.) have been abolished worldwide. See this: [**www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible**](http://www.uua.org/international/blog/disarmament/how-impossible-became-possible)

State legislation: Our statewide coalition, Washington Against Nuclear Weapons (WANW) is urging the Washington State Legislature to pass SHM 8006 and HJM 4008, so the State Legislature can urge Congress to reduce the danger of nuclear war. (These are the bill numbers for the 2019-2020 legislative session, but the bill numbers are likely to change in future legislative sessions.) See information at [**www.wanwcoalition.org**](http://www.wanwcoalition.org) and at the Legislature’s website, [**www.leg.wa.gov**](http://www.leg.wa.gov)

***The Doomsday Machine*** (2017) book by Daniel Ellsberg is fascinating, informative, and highly readable.

The Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) has information about “Reaching Critical Will” and the United Nations’ First Committee. See [**http://reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/unga**](http://reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/unga)

UN General Assembly First Committee: A good source of information is “Reaching Critical Will,” which has actively provided reporting, analysis, and documentation archives from the UN General Assembly First Committee on Disarmament and International Security since 2002. [**www.reachingcriticalwill.or**g](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org) and [**http://reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/unga**](http://reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-fora/unga)

Washington State legislation urges Congress to take action to reduce the danger of nuclear war. In the 2019-2020 legislation session the Senate bill is SJM 8006 and the House bill is HJM 4008, but those bill numbers will likely change in future legislative sessions. Info: [**www.leg.wa.gov**](http://www.leg.wa.gov) and Glen Anderson (360) 491-9093 **glenanderson@integra.net** and Washington Against Nuclear Weapons [**www.wanwcoalition.org**](http://www.wanwcoalition.org) (206) 547-2630

Watch this **3-minute video** for compelling information about nuclear weapons – and why we must stop them. It focuses on the danger of an accident or mistake causing a nuclear war – and the “Nuclear Winter” that could destroy earth’s food system and kill most people on earth. Here is the short video: [**https://youtu.be/qRnU0bqsyq0**](https://youtu.be/qRnU0bqsyq0)

**Glen’s closing encouragement:**

Glen thanked our guests for sharing their knowledge and insights:

* Bob Delastrada
* Joanne Dufour
* Mark Fleming

He also thanked the people who have been watching this interview!

Our world is in extremely serious danger because of two crises that threaten our existence. The climate crisis and nuclear weapons could destroy much life on earth. Grassroots movements to protect us from these crises have been growing, but the dangers are escalating, so the grassroots movements for both crises must grow rapidly and become more effective.

Please share information with your friends. Urge them to watch this interview and/or read the more extensive information I’m posting to my blog. I’ll post a link so you and your friends can watch the video of this interview. Also, I’ll type up a thorough summary of what we said and include links to many sources of information. You can see the links to this interview video and the thorough summary by visiting my blog, [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org) and clicking either the “TV Programs” part or the “Nuclear Weapons” part. I hope you’ll share those links with your friends.

Please share these resources and links with your friends. You can help spread the word about this great progressive solution to several problems.

You can get information about a wide variety of issues related to peace, social justice and nonviolence through my blog, [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org) or by phoning me at (360) 491-9093

You can get information about a wide variety of issues related to peace, social justice and nonviolence through my blog, [**www.parallaxperspectives.org**](http://www.parallaxperspectives.org)or by phoning me at
(360) 491-9093 or e-mailing me at **glenanderson@integra.net**

I end each TV program with this encouragement:

**We're all one human family, and we all share one planet.**

**We can create a better world, but we all have to work at it.**

**The world needs whatever you can do to help!**

**This is the thorough summary of the December 2019 TV program
based on the first half of our November 14, 2019, interview.**

**The rest of that interview became our February 2020 TV program
and is thoroughly summarized in a separate document.**