

Col. Jacques Baud: Trump's Final Move Just WIPED Israel's Plans Off the Map

Follow me: Substack: [https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?](https://substack.com/@dialogueworks?utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page)

utm_campaign=profile&utm_medium=profile-page X (Twitter): https://x.com/Dialogue_NRA

Patreon: [https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?](https://patreon.com/Dialogueworks?utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=)

utm_medium=unknown&utm_source=join_link&utm_campaign=creatorshare_creator&utm_content=

#Nima

Hi, everybody. Today is Monday, May 11th, 2026, and our dear friend, our brother, Col. Jacques Baud, is here with us. Welcome back, Colonel. Hi, and thank you for inviting me again on your show. Thank you. Let me start, Colonel, with what Benjamin Netanyahu said during his interview on 60 Minutes, which came out yesterday. He was asked, is the war with Iran over? And if it isn't, who will decide when it is? And he said, I think it accomplished a great deal, but it's not over because there is still nuclear material and enriched uranium that has to be taken out of Iran. There are still enrichment sites that need to be dismantled, and there are still proxies that Iran supports, ballistic missiles they still want to produce.

You know, looking at the way that he's picturing this situation right now, he said that it accomplished a lot. What did it accomplish so far? Because I don't see the uranium... they're going to get the uranium. Or when it comes to the nuclear program, or the axis of resistance, this war started because it's all about disarming Hamas and Hezbollah. That's not happening anymore. And Iran today is different from what it was before this war started. I don't know the assessment on the part of the Israelis, but I don't see Israel or the United States gaining anything through this war against Iran. Your understanding, and the way that Netanyahu is trying to say on one side it accomplished a lot, on the other hand, it brings out all those main, you know, sort of rhetoric they had before this war started.

#Jacques

First of all, we have to remember that this is the fourth attack by Israel against Iran in the last two years. And that means that even in this case, we have a real war happening between the US, Israel, and Iran. Meaning that the only accomplishment I can see from this war is to convince the Iranians that they need a powerful deterrent. That's what they have done. And because so far, and I would say even before last year, there was a sense that things could be solved through negotiation, through diplomacy, and through good relations. In particular, the JCPOA was an example of that. And the JCPOA, in fact, was very successful. It reached its objectives. The fact that Donald Trump went out of the treaty, in fact, made the treaty invalid to some extent.

And in the current situation, we have exactly that, because the Israelis and the Americans failed to follow the path of diplomacy. I remind you that early in January this year, Israel had asked to have a non-aggression pact with Iran, and that was at the request of Israel, and there were negotiations under the auspices of Russia. Later, in February, you had another set of negotiations between the U. S. and Iran regarding the nuclear issue. So we had two negotiations proceeding as the Israelis and the Americans started their war against Iran at the end of February, meaning that those two countries, Israel and the U.S., undermined the diplomatic process they started.

So, meaning that for Iranians, solving a problem through diplomacy, through negotiation, has become something extremely suspicious. They don't trust the Israelis. I mean, I'm not sure they trusted the Israelis very much before, but this time it was very clear that you cannot trust the Israelis, and you cannot trust the Americans either. And remember, that's not the first time. We had, on the three previous instances, the Americans and the Israelis, by the way, attacking in the middle of the negotiation process that was previously regarding Palestine and all that. So, meaning that these Iranians now definitely think that the diplomatic process will not lead to a solution.

And they need to have something that, in fact, they need to coerce both the Israelis and the Americans into a peace process. But they have to coerce that. And besides this, they also need to protect themselves. And there's no other way to protect themselves since diplomacy doesn't work. And even if they have a treaty, by the way, as in the JCPOA, they had a treaty. They had a treaty about enrichment of uranium and things like that. Then you have one party, namely the U.S., who withdraws from the treaty, and therefore the treaty is not valid anymore. So what's the point of signing a treaty when you know that your partner may exit the treaty at any time?

So the only possible solution to solve this situation is to have a powerful deterrent. Now, we know that Iran has, for years now, in fact, officially since 2003, renounced having nuclear weapons. But of course, since you have this aggressiveness of Israel, permanent, because you have absolutely no threat from Iran against Israel whatsoever. I mean, there is not a single example that we can draw in the last 40, 50 years when Iran threatened Israel. But the opposite, in fact, has been constant. Remember that between 2003 and 2006, Israel killed almost 600 scientists — not only Iranians, but also Iraqis.

#Jacques

And you had hundreds of Iranian scientists who have been killed, assassinated. And this has been documented in documents that were published about 20 years ago or so. So nothing new there. But that shows that the aggressiveness of Israel has been permanent. We have discussed many times the issue of Hezbollah, which exists only because Israel attacks Lebanon. Hezbollah has no claims over Palestinian territory whatsoever. Whatsoever. It only claims Lebanese territory, and because Israel tried several times to invade Lebanon. That's the reason, the rationale behind the existence of Hezbollah. We have also seen the issue of the Palestinian territory.

We know since the decision of the International Court of Justice—well, we knew before, but with the International Court of Justice ruling of July 2024—we know that the presence of Israel in those territories, Gaza, East Jerusalem, and the West Bank, regardless of where in those territories, this presence is illegal. Military or non-military, there should be no Israelis there, period. We know that. So therefore, since they are there, and it's a fact that they are there, it's logical that you have a resistance organization to defend these territories. So we have a constant aggressiveness of Israel all over the Middle East that prompted others to defend.

The problem with what Israel is trying to do with Iran is to remove Iran's right to have, it wants to remove Iran's right to defend itself. That is what Israel wants to do. But in fact, the only country in the Middle East that has consistently attacked its neighbors since the late 40s is Israel. So there is a very strong incentive for Iran to keep a powerful deterrent. Now, as I said before, Iran has renounced the nuclear weapon, but it has its missiles. And in fact, it is the technology developed with the hypersonic missiles and other technologies that creates a deterrent now.

That's its deterrence policy. And now, of course, Israel would like Iran to disband its missiles. They want Iran to remove any kind of deterrent solution. An additional deterrent that is under discussion now is, of course, the use of that, which is mostly valid against the U.S.—the threat of Hormuz. That used to be free, and before February this year, the traffic through the strait was absolutely free. But today, as we have the situation now, not just with the U.S. and Israel, by the way, but with all the GCC countries that participated in the aggression against Iran.

Therefore, for Iran, the limitation of the Strait of Hormuz is not just a matter of national pride or some kind of policy. It's a matter of self-preservation because you cannot allow your adversary, your enemy, to use their navies inside the Persian Gulf in order to strike at you. And that's exactly what the U.S. tried to do by trying to force their way into the Persian Gulf with a couple of warships just a couple of days ago. So here, the idea that the Strait of Hormuz needs to be managed, as was said by Foreign Minister Arakchi, has to be managed in order to prevent the U.S. from militarizing the Persian Gulf and militarizing the Hormuz Strait. So the Israelis, I mean, the Israelis, the U.S., and the GCC, in fact, created a situation in which Iran is constrained to manage this strait because it has been attacked.

Once those countries make a declaration that they are at peace with Iran, that they have no intention whatsoever to support any further attack against Iran, probably the situation may evolve from that point. But at this stage, I think it just makes sense from the Iranian side to prevent any use, any military use, of the Persian Gulf and of the Strait of Hormuz. By the same token, of course, they can exert pressure on the Western economies, including, of course, the U.S. economy, in order to force the U.S. to engage in some kind of dialogue or at least a treaty that solves the conflict once and for all. This is also something that is very important to understand. The Iranian—and this is a very similar situation to the one we have in Ukraine.

I have mentioned that a couple of times. The Russians and the Iranians don't want a ceasefire. They want a solution. A ceasefire is a temporary measure, and that's not what the Iranians want. They want a permanent solution. That means they need a commitment from the U.S. to stop trying to solve the problem militarily and to have a commitment from the U.S. that any further discussion or conflict that may arise in the future will be solved through diplomatic means and not through direct action as they have done so far. So it's a situation that has been created from scratch by the U.S. because everything we know from the rationale—I mean, the official U.S. rationale—behind the conflict, such as nuclear bombs...

So we know, and even the U.S. intelligence said that Iran didn't want to have a bomb. So what's the purpose of this conflict? We knew they didn't want a bomb. We knew they didn't have any capability or capacity to produce it in the short term, at least. I mean, they probably had the intellectual capacity to make it, or capability to make it, but we know also that they didn't want to, they had no intention to do it. We also know that, regardless of what we read in the European media, the enrichment has never reached the military-grade type of uranium, and all the enrichment activities of Iran have been within the limits of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Based on that, the best way to achieve strategic success or achieve security, if you look at it from the Israeli point of view, the best way is to have good relations with Iran and not to create an incentive for them to go beyond what they have done so far. But so far, there was absolutely no—I've never seen any document or declaration whatsoever from the Iranian government that they wanted to go beyond the provisions of the NPT. So the whole purpose of this conflict is just a fantasy. But this is exactly what we hear from Netanyahu on the 7th of October, 2023. It was an attempt to destroy Israel and to, you know, to make a genocide even, they said. Well, I'm not sure with the handful of fighters of Hamas if you are able to make a genocide, but that's what the Israelis said. So we just create or tell lies, you know, to justify operations, and then they get caught in their lies. That's exactly what we have now.

#Nima

Colonel, we've learned that the British government, together with France, is trying to send an aircraft carrier to the region to help the United States. And on the other hand, Macron, after Iran's threat to hit a French ship if they enter the Strait of Hormuz, said France has never considered deploying a warship in the Strait of Hormuz for now. But other reports show that the French aircraft carrier Charles de Gaulle was spotted in the Red Sea on May 8th. What is happening with Europe, and how far would they go to help the United States in the case of the Strait of Hormuz?

#Jacques

Well, in fact, after the threat issued by the Iranian government, Emmanuel Macron responded while he was in a press conference in Kenya, if I'm not wrong. And he said that the idea of moving the

aircraft carrier group—because it's not just the aircraft carrier, but also all the different support ships that go with it—was to pre-position the Charles de Gaulle in the area, I mean, the Indian Ocean area. You never know with Emmanuel Macron. You remember that he said exactly the same thing regarding Ukraine. He wanted to deploy a contingent in Ukraine, but not for fighting, just in case there was an agreement. And it's exactly the same thing here. He just wanted to send the Charles de Gaulle, not to use it, but just to make it ready in case there was an agreement. But this is Emmanuel Macron. Again, we are facing a kind of childish foreign policy actor where you don't even understand what the purpose is.

#Nima

Sorry for interrupting you, because as you've mentioned, it's the same sort of mindset in Ukraine and right now against Iran. If they reach an agreement, why do they need French soldiers to be in Ukraine? Why do they need the French aircraft carrier to be in the region?

#Jacques

That's exactly what I wanted to say. I mean, if there is an agreement, this agreement will be between the U.S. and Iran. What the French are doing in that equation, I don't understand. And as we can see at this stage, I mean, today we had a U.S. proposal and the Iranians have rejected that proposal. Then the Iranians have sent their own proposal, a kind of nine-point plan, if I remember well. In any case, this was also rejected yesterday by the Trump administration. So as of today, we have two parties that have their own proposals. Each proposal is unacceptable for the other party, and therefore there is no agreement.

But the interesting thing is that regardless of who accepts which proposal, we understand—and that's, I think, I could say a common understanding in the West—that Iran has the upper hand in that issue. And that the U.S., they can do some bravado here and claim whatever they want. The fact of the matter is that they haven't reached any of their objectives. They have suffered a lot of damages, and every day we learn more about the damages they suffered. We don't know much about Israel because they don't even dare to show their damages, because apparently they have been quite severe, although we don't hear of any civilian casualties. And that's very interesting.

In any case, what we see is that Iran has a much cleverer approach to conflict, has in fact reached its objective, while the U.S. and Israel haven't. Meaning that, again, I don't have any crystal ball at this stage, but I mean, at this stage, I don't have any crystal ball, period. But we can assume that probably Iran, in some way, will prevail. And if they prevail, I don't see how France could enter the equation here. And that's exactly the same thing between Russia and Ukraine. Russia clearly has the upper hand, and that makes the Europeans and Ukraine very uncomfortable to engage in negotiation because they know they have no cards. And so, therefore, how come a French contingent could enter the equation if they want to impose on the Russians some kind of peacekeeping force?

#Jacques

And assuming the Iranians and the Russians would accept a peacekeeping force, why would they take a peacekeeping force made up of their enemies or adverse forces? I mean, I can assume that if I were a negotiator in Russia or in Iran, if I would accept a peacekeeping force, this must be a neutral and impartial force. Maybe made up, I don't know, of the Kenyan Navy or Tanzanian Navy, or maybe Indian Navy, maybe, or things like that. But why would you select to have the French as peacekeepers while they are a party in the conflict? So this is completely delusional. I mean, a peacekeeping force—and I remind you that I was head of the policy and doctrine of peacekeeping operations in the UN—the characteristics of a peacekeeping force are that it must be neutral and impartial. It cannot be a party to the conflict in any way.

So even if there would be an agreement to have a peacekeeping force, there's absolutely no chance that the French would be part of it. But again, this is part of this kind of bravado that you have in France. Macron wants to show that he is an important actor, that he can do something. In fact, he achieves absolutely nothing. I think he would be better inspired if he took care of his own country before taking care of the countries of others. And that would probably be the safest advice for him. So I don't understand the rationale behind it, but it's exactly the same with Russia and Ukraine. Why would Russia accept a contingent made up of British and French troops? They're already there to fight the Russians. So why would you take them as peacekeepers? It doesn't make any sense. And this is where you see that Western diplomacy is totally failing.

This is a childish people with absolutely no thinking whatsoever. When you hear the foreign ministers of all these countries, you see that those people have absolutely no intellectual depth. They have no historical depth. They have absolutely no strategic depth in their thinking. And that's exactly the problem. They react as teenagers in high school. This is just that: you did that, so I do that. This is the kind of thing you can see on social networks, on TikTok and things like this. You just react like a teenager. But diplomacy and peacemaking don't work like this. And I don't see here, unless Macron wants to show how strong he is, and he may then use force against Iran just to show that he is in charge of something. But when it comes to being part of a peacekeeping force, I don't see it. If it's a rational process, I don't see France playing any role in this issue.

#Nima

Carl, the New York Times reported that the title of the article is "Long Overlooked, Caspian Sea Provides a Strategic Trade Route for Iran." And they're basically talking about the communication lines between Iran and Russia and how these two countries are helping each other. And we've learned that before with the case of the war in Ukraine. Right now, they're talking about how Russia is helping Iran, and it says Russia is quietly supplying military and other goods to Iran, helping the IRGC restore its combat capabilities. You know, I think in the mindset of the Russians and Iranians, they see all these wars as one war. They don't see it differently. And, you know, when the war in

Ukraine started, I remember Iranian diplomats were pressured, were asked how Iran is helping Russia. They said that they're not doing that much to help Russia.

But during the war, we've learned that because Iran doesn't want NATO on its borders, Russia doesn't want NATO. Both of these countries understand what's at risk for the region to have these sort of created forces like HTS and Daesh. This is the same fight for Russia and Iran. These are not different fights. And who's supporting, who's behind all of this sort of chaos, is the United States supporting Ukraine and supporting Israel, and right now directly attacking Iran. But the irony here is that they thought that with this blockade in the Strait of Hormuz, they could put an end to everything for Iran. They put a lot of pressure on Iran, while they know the Caspian Sea is, on the other hand, something they can use. And this is the geography of Iran. But they're talking about it in the New York Times as though it's something new that was created in the aftermath of the war. What do you make of it?

#Jacques

Well, in fact, we are in the same situation that we had, you may remember, in 2022, as the West started its sanctions against Russia and asked China to contribute to these sanctions. And the interesting thing at that time was the Chinese foreign minister, Wang Yi, who said, why should we follow the sanctions and follow what the Westerners are telling us, since we are the next in line to be under sanction and attacked by the West? So, in fact, the fact that we have all this rhetoric against Iran, China, Russia, and, in fact, the most powerful countries of our region, this Eurasian region, the fact that you had all this rhetoric at the same time against all these powerful actors has moved these actors closer to each other and has reinforced, in fact, the ties between them.

And incidentally, you have, on the one hand, China, which is, without any question, the largest manufacturer in the world; Russia, which is one of the largest energy providers in the world; and Iran, which is probably one of the most important actors on the Persian Gulf, which is a strategic region. And the action of the West has moved all these three actors closer to each other. And we have seen recently that you had the visit of Lavrov in China and the visit of Arakchi in China, underlying that all these three countries are very, very tightly related. And none of them is completely isolated either, because they also have a lot of contact with the rest of their neighbors. I mean, you can block the Strait of Hormuz, but Iran has borders with other people — with Pakistan, with Afghanistan, with Tajikistan, Russia, and others.

I mean, you even have this — I mentioned, I think — this railroad, this huge railroad that stretches from Kuwait to China, that allows the transportation of oil or whatever. So, meaning that those countries are not isolated. Even if you would completely block the Strait of Hormuz, it would be almost impossible to isolate those three countries from the rest of the world. Not to mention the fact that by doing so, the West has become even more unpopular and has lost credibility. Europeans are

nonexistent on the diplomatic scene. The U.S. is less and less credible on the diplomatic scene. It's still a powerful actor — that's the reason why we still talk to this actor — but in reality, the credibility of the U.S. is extremely questionable because it changes its mind every single day.

#Jacques

The thing is that the strategy, the global one — that's why I don't think there is a single strategy for that, to be honest — because others, the Russians, the Iranians, and China may see that as one war. My personal view — but I'm not in Russia, I'm not in Iran, not in China — but my view from outside, as an outsider, is that we are talking about three different conflicts which are poorly coordinated, which don't belong together. You may have commonalities between them. You may have aspects and probably some strategies that were used against Russia that are still used against Iran or China. You may have commonalities in that. But the fact of the matter is that these three conflicts are not seen from the West as one conflict, and therefore there is very poor coordination.

There is no real objective for this. You know, if you want to address Iran, okay, you may have an objective, let's say, regime change, which, by the way, was not achieved. Okay. You may have a similar objective with Russia, for instance. But we see that here also it has not worked, simply because there is no—how to say that—there is no coordination in that. There is no... despite the sectorial commonalities, you don't have a common approach to this global conflict. And the West is lost again. Instead of fighting at a strategic level, they fight at a tactical level. It's a small conflict. I mean, small—it's a conflict in Iran, another against Russia, another against China, another here, another there. We're attacking Mali.

So there are different... but the sum of the conflicts doesn't make a big victory against those three countries. They are just a sum of small conflicts. Strategy is not the sum of tactical actions. Strategy is more than the sum of tactical actions. This is not an arithmetical addition here. If we want to achieve strategic success, you don't need to have the sum of tactical actions. And that's what the West has not understood. It still thinks at the tactical level, maybe the operational level, if you want to enlarge a little bit the scope. But it's not strategic. It doesn't. It fails. It may achieve operational objectives such as the destruction of a headquarters or the killing of a high-ranking officer or things like this.

But all that doesn't achieve strategic success. These are tactical successes, period, nothing more. And with that, you are not achieving anything. The only thing you achieve is to enhance the resolve of those who defend themselves, namely Russia, China, and Iran. That's what you achieve, but you don't have a real success. That was exemplified with Iran, where the killing of Qasem Soleimani, in fact, didn't weaken the country at all. On the contrary, it stimulated the defense of the country. It made the whole population stick together in response to this very cowardly attack against the leader. So we are back to the same problem that we have discussed many times about Ukraine.

The West lacks a strategic understanding of the war. They do a lot of operations, but all these operations cannot be added into a strategic success whatsoever. That's the difference with the Russians, for instance, or even the Iranians. The Iranians don't need to kill a lot of people to have a strategic success, and that was demonstrated here. I mean, Israel needs to kill a lot of innocents in order to claim a success, while in Iran, you don't need to kill a lot of innocents for that. And that shows the difference. Iran has a strategic approach. Israel has always had a tactical approach, and that's exactly what you see wherever they are, whatever they do.

And this kind of approach, in fact, has worsened the image of Israel and the U.S., by the way. Both have—their image has been considerably worsened by this action, including by those who were ready to accept the U.S. as a dialogue partner, namely, for instance, Russia, who were quite happy to have the opportunity to have an opening with the initiatives that you could see early last year, I mean last year, regarding the solution or a possible solution of the Ukrainian conflict. But now we see that the approach that the U.S. had towards Iran shows the Russians that the U.S. is not a credible partner for a dialogue, because it changes its mind every single day. So what's the point?

You may talk, and by the way, the Russians experienced that after the summit in Anchorage. They discussed something, everybody agreed on a possible solution and on a path towards dialogue and peace. And who left the path? The U.S. And that was even more obvious in February this year with Iran. So how can you achieve something, or think that you may achieve something, with Israel and the U.S.? And therefore, the image of Israel in particular, even more than the U.S., has quite suffered from it. Because you add all the massacres, all the infringements of international humanitarian law that you see constantly, every day, every day. I'm not even mentioning the desecration of the churches in South Lebanon and things like this, which is something that now even the Christians understand how the Israelis are.

It's not just an issue between Muslims and Jews. It's an issue of the Jews against everything that surrounds them, regardless of what they are. When you see all those videos that previously nobody showed—by the way, I have shown—but you have those Hebrews or Jews spitting on priests in Jerusalem, also on Christians or spitting on churches, this is something that probably existed for a long time, but nobody had shown that so far. But now we see them repeatedly on YouTube and other channels. And that shows that our perception of Israel has considerably changed. And the respect for Israel, the respect that the Jews had after World War II, after suffering the Holocaust and all that, this respect has completely vanished now.

And of course, we are also in generations that have not experienced that whatsoever. I mean, not those who have experienced it, but if I take my example, my parents never—they were not Jews, and they were Swiss, so they didn't suffer the Holocaust. I had part of my family which was in France, and they suffered the German occupation. But that's something different. That was as

resistance, not as Jews. In any case, my parents, even if they had not been concerned—I mean, not directly touched or concerned by the Holocaust—they were sensitized about this. And I was educated with respect for the Jews because they were innocents touched by the Holocaust.

And I was raised with that idea. Just after the war, my father helped Jews to settle in Switzerland and things like this because it was part of this kind of compassion that we had towards the Jews. But that's my generation. Now we have another generation, and their parents didn't have the same experience. So we can say that today, all the conditions to have that kind of compassion for the Jews have totally disappeared. In addition to that, we see all the exactions, crimes, and massacres performed by the Jews. And now you have people saying, well, probably that explains what happened during World War II. You know, again, we are moving backwards somehow.

And that's precisely because of—and not again here, I just want to open a parenthesis, because we have an increase of antisemitism in Europe. And some try to put everything into that. Antisemitism, it's very important to understand. Antisemitism is a kind, is a form of racism. Racism is something where, I mean, it's a behavior where you hate someone not because of what he does, but because of what he is. That defines racism—when you hate someone because of what he is, not because of what he does. And the same applies to antisemitism, that you hate a Jew because he's a Jew.

That's the rationale. But today, what we see appearing in the West and in Europe, people are not so concerned about the Jews because they are Jews, but they are concerned about the Jews because of what they do. So we are no longer in the strict definition of antisemitism or racism. People start to hate the Jews not because of what they are, but because of what they do. And I said the Jews and not the Israelis, although those who perform the crimes are Israelis, obviously, which is not the Jews, because you have many Jews—and I know many Jews here in Brussels—and they obviously even condemn those actions.

But again, here we have so many people, and recently you had in France even a parliamentarian who tried to pass a law that makes the distinction between antisemitism and anti-Zionism disappear, meaning that anti-Zionism equals antisemitism. Zionism is a political doctrine, while Judaism is a religion. So Judaism refers to what you are, while Zionism refers to what you do. And merging the two creates exactly that confusion. And we become more and more confused because we want to have the same definition for the two, although every effort should be to separate them. And we create thus a new kind of antisemitism, which is based on what the Israelis do, not what they are.

And that's exactly where we are. That's the achievement you were talking about at the beginning of this conversation, about what Netanyahu has achieved. He achieved that. He achieved that—to create the perception that all the crimes that were done in Israel were in fact done not simply by Israelis, but by Jews. And therefore, in fact, Netanyahu has created a situation that is almost impossible for the Jews, even in Europe. And it's very interesting that prior to 2023, you had a lot of Jews in Europe who considered moving to Israel. And now you have a lot of Israelis moving to Europe because they understand that they cannot live anymore in Israel.

So, we are back to this situation that we had in the early 20th century, or end of the 1990s and before, where you had a nation without a country because this country has rejected them. And in fact, they are rejected by their own actions because they behave poorly. They create a situation where you have retaliations, you have wars, and all that. So if you look at it now—because before, when we talked about the strategic situation, we looked at it from the European and US perspective—if you look at it from an Israeli perspective, what did Israel gain? Nothing. They even failed to have the US permanently engaged in the region, and even more damage, because that was probably—I can remove the “probably”—because the policy of Israel since the 1950s has been to have a permanent commitment of the US in the region.

That's a constant of the Israeli security policy. And what you have today is that the Gulf countries are now questioning the fact that the US may be on their territories. Therefore, if you look at it from the point of view of Israel, whose objective was to have more involvement of the US, you may have exactly the opposite happening. The US understands that they cannot attack and achieve a decisive success or victory against Iran. Therefore, it has to find other ways to achieve something they can call a victory. And besides this, they are not sure that those countries where they have all these bases will still accept them after that. I'm convinced that the US will manage to buy their presence in those countries.

But nevertheless, the question is asked today whether it is useful, or if it's a benefit or a liability, to have the U.S. on the territory. So that's what the Israelis have achieved. And it goes even further, because even in the U.S., people are now questioning the implication of the U.S. in Israeli foreign policy, or vice versa. I mean, this relationship between Israel and the U.S. has become a topic, while it hasn't been a topic for 50 years. But today people question that, because people understand—and especially, and that's very interesting and very telling, by the way—that if you read on the website of the State Department in the U.S., when Rubio explains the reasons for attacking Iran, Marco Rubio says very clearly that it was done at the request of the Israelis.

At the request of the Israelis. Meaning that people understand that the U.S. is in a very uncomfortable situation today, and that's because they responded positively to an Israeli request. And that, in turn, questions the whole relationship with Israel. To what point should the U.S. support Israel? Even if Israel wants to wage war and attack everybody and desecrate—I'm not sure of the word now—the churches in South Lebanon and even, by the way, in Gaza, because you had churches also in Gaza and everywhere, destroyed and bombed deliberately, by the way, by Israel. That was at the time documented, and I think it's even in a UN report, by the way. So the U.S., which had a very clear and positive relationship with Israel, understands that today this relationship is toxic.

#Speaker 03

So you ask, what has been achieved so far?

#Jacques

Accomplished? Nothing. Zero. They have even more—created more, let's say—they put themselves in a very bad situation. It's very clear about the U.S., but it's equally clear with Israel, because Israel now is considered responsible for this whole mess. And even now in the EU, you have some countries, I think it's Spain and others, who have asked to stop, because there is a cooperation agreement between the European Union and Israel. And many countries, several countries, have asked to stop this agreement, to withdraw from this agreement.

Now the Parliament, I think the European Parliament, has refused, but in any case, it showed something that we hadn't seen before. So the situation today is much less favorable to Israel than it has ever been before. So the gain for Israel and for the U.S. is zero. They have created a situation that will be very hard to restore. They have created a situation, I mean, a concrete situation in the Strait of Hormuz, that it will take years to restore to normal, because obviously Iran will be very suspicious of any attempt from Israel or the U.S. to enter the Persian Gulf. So the gain for the U.S. and Israel is enormous—it's not zero, it's minus.

#Nima

Carl, I think the point that you've just mentioned is so important, because for many years they have created this propaganda machine that says the only democracy in the Middle East is Israel. And when you look at the way that they're behaving, their behavior toward Christians and Muslims in Israel, and compare it to what I've seen in Iran, for example, you know, we see Muslims, Christians, Jews, all living together for many, many, many years—for thousands of years. They don't have these sorts of issues, you know, spitting at each other. They don't need to do that. They don't need to go that far. But you see, they're all part of the society. They all feel Iranian. They don't feel as Jews living in Iran. They don't feel as Muslims living in Iran. They see themselves all as Iranians. That's the unity that is coming, that we're witnessing right now with the case of Iran.

We had it with the case of Iraq. We know what the Israeli government did to Jewish Iraqi people, to just remove them from Iraq, to send them to Israel, because the only safe haven for Jews was supposed to be in Israel. But this is one dimension of what's going on. But I would say there is something in parallel to what was happening in the case of propaganda of helping Israel. They were trying to demonize the Muslim people for such a long time. These people are going to attack us. They're going to destroy our culture, our freedom. And that is breaking down in the United States as well, because people are seeing that, which was mentioned, by the way, between Tucker Carlson and Megyn Kelly, two of the supporters of Donald Trump in the United States. Here is what they said in the latest podcast they had.

#Speaker 04

...defense of Islam, just the blatant attacks on it as a religion. And I also said something that you and I talked about months ago, which was, as I now see what Israel does to you—I mean, truly, like its emissaries for sure have unleashed a vicious campaign against yours truly on social media and elsewhere. It's fine. I mean, we're handling it. But as I now see what they do, it does cause me to reevaluate what other propaganda has been out there that I've fallen for that's coming from a foreign government. You know, you and I discussed this.

And I have been blown away by how openly the Israel First crowd is demanding that I and others hate Muslims or else. I am reevaluating some of the things I swallowed hook, line, and sinker, Tucker, because I now see we've all been manipulated. You have no idea how ubiquitous and powerful AIPAC, Israel, its lobby, its paid agents are. I mentioned Brad Parscale the other day, who's registered as a foreign agent for Israel now and runs Salem Media Group. I mean, there are a lot of those folks in our nation pushing propaganda on us. And I frankly think I've been too trusting.

#Speaker 03

I'm a Christian. On the other hand, I just like reverent people. And anyone who bows down before God and admits, "I'm not God," five times a day doesn't share my theology. We don't have the same view of how you get to heaven. But that person is not, by definition, my enemy. I'm not going to hate you because your parents did something that somebody else objects to. I'm just not playing along with that. And I knew that I would be attacked as, like, a Muslim lover or whatever. I don't know. I'm not a Muslim lover. I'm a people lover until proven otherwise. And I'm just not going to play along at all.

#Nima

Yeah. This is the tone that you're witnessing in the United States, which is something different that we haven't seen before. This is the sea change that is happening, in my opinion.

#Jacques

Well, absolutely. This is exactly what I explained. This is a considerable change. But there's also something behind this that you can read also from that interview, by the way, is that, you know, you may be against Russia and you say, okay, I don't agree with the policy in Ukraine or things like that. You may disagree with Iran and say, well, we don't support this aspect of the policy and things like this. The problem is that the propaganda that we had in the last couple of years—for a much longer time in Iran, but since 2022 especially, I mean since 2014 actually, regarding Ukraine and Russia—the thing is that the propaganda has led us to hate people. To hate people. Not just to disagree with them, but to hate them.

And that's something that appears extremely, and that's exactly what Megyn Kelly is saying. We are supposed to hate the Muslims in order to support Israel, as you are supposed to hate the Russians in support of Ukraine. Remember that those who lead Israel and those who lead Ukraine are of the same culture. So you have to hate your enemy. You cannot just disagree. And that's very telling. And I told you that during the Cold War, as an example, when we used to—obviously, we were against the Warsaw Pact and we prepared for a possible war in Europe and World War III or things like that. But in the military, and not just in Switzerland but in NATO as well, and probably even on the other side of the Iron Curtain, by the way, nobody was hating each other.

We just disagreed with the system. We didn't hate the Russians or the Poles or the Czechs or whoever. We just didn't want to be communists, that's all. We didn't like the system. We disagreed with the system they wanted, or we alleged they wanted to support or to promote. But we were not hating people. During the whole Cold War, Russians were allowed to participate in the Olympic Games, with some exceptions, but the Russians were allowed to participate in the Olympic Games, and East Germany also, and so on. Today, with our ban, we have discussions about whether the Iranian soccer team can participate in the FIFA World Cup in the US. This is the kind of discussion we never had during the Cold War.

We never tried to hate people. We just fought a system. We went against it; we just disagreed on some issues. Today, we rename paintings in the UK because they have the word "Russian." So the painting has to be renamed—a painting from the 19th century. This is just hate. And this is the same kind of approach. And that's the reason why I'm so upset about the approach we have to conflicts, generally speaking, today. It's hate-driven. It's not based on disagreement or analysis. It's not just... Nobody... Nobody tries to tell you that X or Y made a bad decision and probably we should have configured the decision like this or like that. No, you just hate it, period.

He said something, could have said something great, but because he said it, it's negative. The same applies to Iran. And I remember in the late 70s, I was interested in international geopolitics. I was rather young at the time, and I probably didn't have all the information. But for a couple of years, I thought that the regime in Iran was even, I mean, that was the worst you could see in a Muslim country. And later on, when trying to question that, I found out that Saudi Arabia was much worse. But nobody was talking about Saudi Arabia. And the position of women, for instance—society is much more liberal in Iran than in Saudi Arabia, for instance.

But this is, I think most Europeans don't know that. For most people, Iran is the worst you can find in an Islamic society. And I saw exactly the same kind of thing, had the same impression when I was in Sudan. I worked in Sudan for two years for the UN as head of intelligence there, for the UN. And I found out that the society and even the government were very different from what you had in the media in Europe, because it was an Islamic government. Everybody considered it an Islamist government that was almost like some kind of—well, we were not talking about the Islamic State at this stage—but it was almost like this, that the Christians were hated and things like this.

#Speaker 03

And I was totally wrong.

#Jacques

I mean, you had Christian services in Khartoum every Sunday, and you had Christian Sudanese, a Christian community going to church with the whole family and with nice clothes, as we used to do in the West when I was young. I mean, you had your clothes for Sunday to go to the religious services. You put your best clothes for the religious service. And you had exactly the same in Khartoum. And there was absolutely no incident. I never saw a single incident involving a Christian service or something like this in Khartoum, although it was officially an Islamic state.

There was a lot of tolerance, despite the fact that you had an Islamic government. And that shows the weight of propaganda in order to shape or to brainwash literally all societies to hate Muslims. Everything that is not in line with Israel or the U.S. must be brainwashed. And that's what people start to understand. And that's what, in fact, Gaza has demonstrated. Because here, despite the propaganda, what we have seen since October 2023 is something that you had even before October 2023. Since 2006 or 2005, since this territory was vacated by the Israeli settlers, you had in fact this kind of occupation from the Israelis, from outside—an occupation from outside. And I remind you that according to international law, even if the Israeli forces were not in Gaza itself, the fact that the Gazans could not have free movement, could not do whatever they wanted because they were monitored from outside, like in a prison—in reality, this is considered an occupation. This was an occupation, legally speaking, and you have assessments from both the International Red Cross Committee in Geneva and from the UN that support this designation of occupied territory, even if you had no troops within the Gaza Strip.

In any case, you had, every single day, the Israelis raiding the Gaza Strip, even before October 2023. But because our media refrained from informing us about this, we had the feeling that October 2023 was something that came out of the blue, because suddenly Hamas decided to make a pogrom. And this is totally wrong. This is, historically, negationism, literally. This is negationism. But again, the propaganda we have tends to push us exactly into the same situation that probably the Germans were pushed into in the early '30s, where you had Untermenschen—literally, that means subhumans.

And I remind you that this was a terminology used by the Nazis during World War II regarding the Jews, and that the Israelis have taken over to designate the Gaza population in 2023–2024, when they designate those people as subhuman. And so the whole propaganda is about hating those people. It's not just about making... I mean, you can argue whether the strategy of Hamas was

good or bad, but it's not the point. It's not about whether they had a good strategy or not. The point is that you have to hate them. Same thing with the Russians in Ukraine. The question is not whether they had a good or bad strategy, whether they made a good or bad decision.

#Speaker 03

It's just about hating the Russians, regardless of where they are.

#Jacques

Not just in Ukraine, but you hate them in France, you hate them in Germany. And that's an official government policy. I mean, in France, just to give an example, if you have a name that sounds like Russian, that ends with -ski, for instance, -ski or whatever you may have that ends with -ski, when you have this kind of sound, a bank may be allowed to debank you just on that criterion. And some people have been debanked because their name sounded Russian, even if those people were not Russian at all, even if they probably had ancestors that maybe 100 years ago might have been Russian, maybe, I don't know. But regardless, even if they have no relationship with Russia whatsoever, a French bank can just debank you just on that criterion.

So we are exactly in that logic that you need to hate people. And that's something that is completely new to me. And I mentioned that several times on your channel also, that during the Cold War, we never hated people. We just didn't want to be communist. We didn't want to have a communist system. I mean, I live in Switzerland, where obviously we could call it a capitalist country. It's not as wild as in the US, but it's the European way, but still a capitalist country. But certainly, we didn't want to have a kind of communist system like you had in the Soviet Union at the time. But we never hated the Russians. We just hated the system. And that's a huge difference. And today, it has become almost a norm to hate people.

And we have this policy of hating people, which is sponsored by our governments, and most and foremost the European Union, which in fact, with the sanctions and all that, creates a situation where you have to hate people just because of what they are, not based on what they do, but on the basis of what they are. And we are exactly in this way. That's exactly what I explained with anti-Semitism—when you have racism not based on what people do, but based on what people are. And that's exactly what we do with Iran, that's exactly what we do with the Russians, and to some extent with the Chinese. It's not as extreme with the Chinese as with others, but it's very clear.

#Nima

Yet.

#Jacques

Yes, absolutely. That will come. It's already starting, by the way. We already have policies where you're discouraged from having contact with Chinese companies, for instance, or things like that, because there might be a security risk, even if we have no indication whatsoever that it might really be the case. But just as a matter of precaution, you shouldn't talk to them. And we are in the first step of hating people based on what they are and not on what they do. And that's exactly where we are—countries like Germany, France.

But remember, France was the best supporter of Germany during World War II. And Germany is back to the old demons. We are exactly today in Germany, we see exactly the same indicators as the ones we had earlier, I mean, one century ago. Exactly the same, with the same expressions, the same kind of behavior from the government—censorship and all that—if you don't agree and all that. So we are back to something that we thought we got rid of in 1945 or 1946 after the Nuremberg trials. Well, maybe we probably need other Nuremberg trials today. I don't know.

#Nima

Thank you so much, Col., for being with us today. Great pleasure.

#Jacques

That was my pleasure. Thank you for inviting me.