

Col. Jacques Baud: Trump Just Pulled His Last Card... And Israel Is in SHAMBLES

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, June 1st, 2026. And our dear friend, our brother, Colonel Jacques Baud, is here with us. Welcome back, Colonel.

#Jacques

Hi, and thank you for having me back on your show. Thank you.

#Nima

Colonel, I want to start with the situation and what's going on between Israel and Lebanon, because we know one of the main points of the talks, of the messages between Iran and the United States, is the situation there in that region. Moments ago, we've learned that Israel has just announced a statement that the people in the southern part of Beirut, in Dahieh, should leave their homes because they want to bomb. They want to destroy everything, it seems. And at the same time, the frustration comes from the ongoing conflict in the southern part of Lebanon, that Israel has not been able to defeat or control Hezbollah because of the FPV drones. And the most important part is the northern part of Israel. The settlers cannot get back. This is the main problem with Benjamin Netanyahu and his administration. Your understanding of what's going on?

#Jacques

Well, first of all, when you say that the settlers cannot go back, this is partly true. The settlers could live there for years without any problem. The problem started when the Israelis started to invade and occupy the southern part of Lebanon, and that started in 1982. And later, after the—not destruction, but displacement—because the purpose of the 1982 invasion was to destroy the PLO. Eventually, the PLO moved to Tunisia, and things became calm at the northern border of Israel, to put it very simply. And the settlers would be very quiet if Israel wouldn't incessantly attack the southern part of Lebanon. So that's the first thing. Israel is always trying to portray Hezbollah and the Lebanese as an entity that has claims over Israeli territory. This is wrong.

The Palestinians have a claim over Palestinian territory that includes the current location of Israel. But these are the Palestinians. Hezbollah has a completely different approach. They defend their own territory, which is the southern part of Lebanon. And as long as Israel occupies this territory, Hezbollah will exist and will, of course, attack those outposts that are on Lebanese territory, but also those, especially signals intelligence and electronic intelligence structures, that are just at the northern border of Israel. So that's the first thing to put very clear. The second thing is that, as you just pointed out, Israel is threatening Dahiya. Dahiya is a very well-known area because that's where, in 2014, Israel created, if you want, the so-called Dahiya Doctrine.

The Dahiya Doctrine is the conscious use of disproportionality in order to scare people. And that's the reason it has become very famous. The idea is that whatever reaches the Israeli forces or Israel, even the smallest incident, may trigger a massive disproportionate response. And in 2014, they completely destroyed this area just because they were attacked by Hezbollah people. And remember that these were attacks initiated from Israel, so it was essentially Hezbollah acting in self-defense. So the attack on this southern suburb of Beirut by Israel has a symbolic value, in my view at least, in addition to the humanitarian and human dimension that it has. Now, what are the Israelis?

Because it's very interesting that so far the Israelis have tried to move towards the Litani River in the southern part of Lebanon. They reached the Litani River in a place where the Litani River is very close to the border between Israel and the border between the two countries. So that was the closest part. But for the rest of the Litani River, there is a long way to go for the IDF forces. In any case, they reached the Litani River. But if you look at all the strikes that are performed by Israel, they are performed well away from that, I mean, up in the north of Lebanon. The thing is that Israel is trying exactly what it tried to do in Gaza by bombing civilians and in a disproportionate manner. They want, in fact, to press the Lebanese to get rid of Hezbollah.

So it's a way of destroying and attacking Lebanese civilians, medical facilities, and things like that in order to create a kind of revolt from the Lebanese against Hezbollah. The idea is to make Hezbollah responsible for Israeli attacks. And you have exactly, by the way, the same process that you have in Ukraine and Russia, where you have all these attacks on civilians. These attacks have absolutely no operational purpose. The only purpose is to create a situation where they shift the responsibility of the strike to the Russians in Russia or to Hezbollah in Lebanon. So that's the idea. So in fact, they are also doing something that is against international humanitarian law, which is to hold a population, an innocent population, responsible for the activities of a group that has been artificially and arbitrarily designated as terrorists.

But that's the whole thing. That's exactly what the Israelis have done in Gaza. That's part of the reason why the Israelis, when they found that they could not get a read from Hamas as such, started to bomb the population with the idea that the population would then turn against Hamas and hold Hamas responsible for the situation. And we have exactly the same strategy today in Lebanon. The problem is that, again, as it is in Gaza, by the way, we have movements that resist an

occupation. And the whole thing in the narrative of the Israelis is to make the occupation legitimate. And that's very interesting, by the way, that if you look at European countries—well, the U.S., it's obvious.

But European countries—no country has, in fact, condemned the invasion of Lebanon. None. So the invasion of Lebanon is legitimate from a European point of view. Therefore, Hezbollah is not legitimate, and therefore Israel has the right to bomb the civilian population to make them turn against Hezbollah. That's the kind of calculus that the Israelis have. And that's something that strikes the, I mean, honest minds. But interestingly enough, absolutely no European government has reacted to that, although that strategy is well known. We have seen that, as I told you, in 2013 in Gaza. We have seen that before, by the way, because, again, this is not completely new. That happened in Gaza well before October 2023. So that must be absolutely clear.

It didn't work out, but that became a massive strategy in Gaza. And now they are applying exactly the same strategy in Lebanon, with the consent of countries such as France, Germany, the European Union, the UK, Switzerland, and others. None has reacted to that. None. So that means that we accept this strategy. We accept this idea that Israel has a right over the southern part of Lebanon. And again, we are in this kind of loop that, in fact, has been here since 1948, that everything we accept from Israel leads us to a further breach of international law. And we are now in a situation where Israel occupies the Golan. Nobody—nobody—and even Donald Trump validated that occupation, but it's absolutely illegal.

But no European country puts that in the balance. The occupation of the West Bank is illegal, as ruled by the International Court of Justice in July 2024. Not a single European country has reacted to that. Not a single one. And by the way, the ruling of the International Court of Justice is not just about the West Bank, but about all the Palestinian occupied territory, meaning the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip. But since then, since July 2024, although the International Court of Justice requested all the countries to help Israel comply with international law, not a single European country has applied this decision or complied with the decision of the International Court of Justice.

So, in fact, the Europeans—and again, you know, I make a difference here between the US and the Europeans. The US, for some reason, have as their national strategy or national security strategy to support Israel. Okay, fine. I'm not saying it's right, but that's their strategy. So it means they are working in accordance with this strategy. The Europeans do not have this strategy. So why are they accepting this situation? You see, I mean, I'm not exonerating the US, obviously, but at least they have a consistent strategy. You can blame them for that and all that. I completely agree with any blame on that strategy, but at least they are consistent. But the Europeans are not even consistent with what they think. They always claim about European values, the rule of law, international humanitarian law.

When it comes to Ukraine, every single event receives European unanimous condemnation. But when it comes to the Arabs, nothing, zero. And that's where you see this. It's not just hypocritical,

it's perverse. Simply because that means that as long as it concerns Arabs, Palestinians, Lebanese, everything is allowed. You can massacre them, you can destroy them, you can torture them. That's fine. This, in fact, underlines the fundamental racist approach of the foreign policy of the European Union. If they were working for humanity with a sense of values that personally I expected from the European Union, then I would help the European Union to protect those values. But what are those values exactly? We never define them. They have a variable geometry. It depends who is the actor.

Whether it's Russia, everything is bad. But whether it's Israel, everything is OK. This is not the way. Values are values, and that's a situation that personally disturbs me — the total absence of European reaction. I'm a European, and that's the reason why I'm saying this — the total absence of any reaction from Europe to those war crimes. Looking at it from a U.S. perspective, as I said, the U.S. has the protection and defense of Israel as part of their national security strategy. OK, but we are now in another situation. We have a situation where, because of the conflict with Iran, the U.S. strategy should be to have more stability in the region, probably to stabilize also the oil market, stabilize the relations in this part of the world, including stabilizing the relationship between the U.S. and its Arab partners.

So in that sense, I would expect, in the sense of the U.S. national security strategy, that they would take action to prevent Israel from further deteriorating the situation. Because, as we discussed before, I have presented only the Israeli point of view when attacking Lebanon. But now, if we look a little bit from higher, the idea of Netanyahu is that, first of all, he is against any agreement with Iran. And since he has no means to attack Iran directly, or not enough means to have a substantive result against Iran, they attack Lebanon with the idea that this would make any agreement between Iran and the U.S. collapse. Again, we are in a warmongering strategy, nothing else.

Israel is a country that has lived since 1948 exclusively out of war. War has been the rationale for the country to exist. And I say that because without war, they would probably not have the material, military, political, or strategic support from the United States. This is this artificially created insecurity of Israel that keeps the Americans in the region. And Netanyahu would like to go a step further. They don't want to have only the political support or the military material equipment support from the U.S. They also would like to have the U.S. military presence in the region. And that's the reason why Israel asked the U.S. to attack Iran.

That's the reason why we have seen all these provocations made by Israel during the ceasefire—I mean, those so-called ceasefires that we had—against Lebanon, because Israel doesn't want to have a stable situation around its border. That's the strange thing. I explained on your channel many times the difference between the concept of national security or the security policy in Switzerland and in Israel, because they are two very small countries surrounded by large countries. In Switzerland, since the early 20th century at least, but we can even go back to the 19th century, but formally at the beginning of the 20th century, the Swiss security policy is based on the stability of its environment, and its diplomacy works for having a stable and constructive relationship with its neighbors.

That's the foundation of the Swiss security policy. Now, in Israel, they went out from a completely different point of view. They considered that they had huge countries around them, and the best way to achieve the security of Israel was to have those countries internally, domestically divided and fighting against factions within themselves. That's why Israel created—I mean, sponsored to some extent—well, we can say sponsored—the conflict in Syria, for instance, but also in Lebanon. All the antagonism was fueled by Israel between the Christians and the Palestinians in the 70s and early 80s, and things like this.

All that was fueled by Israel because they considered that the instability of their neighbors is part of their own security. So it's a security policy concept that is completely different from the Swiss one. That's the reason why it shocks me very much. And that's also why I can say as a Swiss that Israel is definitely not on the right track if it wants to last for centuries. Switzerland has lasted for 700, almost 800 years—no, sorry, not 80, 800 years, sorry. And Israel, if it wants to last that long, has probably, in my view, to change its view and to have a policy that favors stability, dialogue, negotiation, and diplomacy instead of having a policy based on eternal confrontation and creating chaos around them.

#Nima

Colonel, I think Israel is in a situation where they cannot live without having wars. The society—if they stop attacking other countries—the society somehow is collapsing from within, because they have to keep all these people together. They have to... If there is no war, what would happen to Israel today? What is keeping all these forces in Israel together, the Netanyahu administration in power? Because they have, I would say, the war against Iran—as we talked about before—Netanyahu wanted this war for such a long time. What is the main reason for that? If there is no war, can they survive?

#Jacques

We have to make a distinction here between Netanyahu and his specific situation. The particular situation is that he's indicted, and he needs to stay in power in order to escape justice. And therefore, in order to stay in power, he wants to create a war, with the sense that if there is a feeling in Israel that they're attacked from all sides, of course, you have this idea that all the people need to stick together against external enemies and things like this. And that is the strategy of Netanyahu for himself. But I'm not sure this is—and although he is supported by 80% of the population in that situation—but let's assume we would go from another point of view. I'm not sure that Israelis, as a population, as a people, are a people that want war all the time.

Of course, as long as their enemies are weaker than they are, that's how they've lived for 80 years. And it's fine, because when the others are weaker, you can impose yourself, and that's fine. The problem is that today we have enemies—I mean, Israel has enemies—that are stronger than they

are and probably more determined to react. And that changes the equation. And again, putting Netanyahu aside, stepping back a little bit and looking at Israel as a country, as a nation, why would peace be a problem for Israel? I mean, essentially not. I mean, again, of course, they would abandon the idea of Greater Israel, the Eretz Israel, which would pledge for an expansion of Israel.

#Nima

Carl, do we know—sorry for interrupting—do we know how many of those people who are supporting the Israeli genocide in Gaza are supporting Greater Israel? How many of those people? We have Ashkenazi Jews, we have Mizrahi Jews, Sephardic Jews, if I'm not mistaken. Sephardic or something like that.

#Jacques

Sephardi. Sephardi are those people who originally came from Spain, and then they were expelled from Spain in 1492 and scattered around the Mediterranean. And in 1948 and 49, and in subsequent years, they came into Israel. So these are the Sephardi. Ashkenazi Jews are the majority of the Jews in Israel. They have nothing to do with Palestine. Zero.

#Nima

The majority of the people who are running the government, or the majority of the people in all of Israel?

#Jacques

The majority of the people in all of Israel. You know, when the Israelis say, "Well, we were here 2,000 years ago," that's wrong. I mean, those who are entitled to this idea of 2,000 years are the Mizrahi. These are the Israelis, the Jews, actually, who lived there 2,000 years ago. And it's a very tiny minority. And they lived with the Palestinians, by the way. The Palestinians have been in Palestine even longer than the Mizrahi, in reality.

#Nima

You mean Mizrahi Jews are from Iraq?

#Jacques

Mizrahi from... Well, the history with Iraq is different because you know that the Jews emigrated to Baghdad for decades and then came back to Israel. But that was 2,000 years ago. I mean, again, I

don't want to go into specifics. I'm not a historian either, but it's important. Jews lived in that area. They were a very small minority, but they lived there. And then came Islam in the 600s and 700s, and a lot of Jews became Muslims.

#Nima

These are Arab Jews, then.

#Jacques

These are Arab Jews or Muslims. I mean, they were no longer Jews, but they were inhabitants of the area. You know, all of them have the same roots. They're all Semitic. When you say anti-Semitic, we tend to say it's anti-Jews. But in reality, Palestinians, Jews, I mean, Israeli Jews, are Semitic people. These people originated in this area that had no real borders. But this is the area between Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and part of Egypt. So these were all the same civilization or society or nation, and they were divided into tribes and things like this. But Mizrahi, essentially, as the Palestinians, were the original inhabitants, if I can put it that way. Ashkenazi are not part of the original inhabitants of Israel.

Ashkenazi derived from a region which is in Central Europe. Essentially, the countries that are today, we would say Ukraine, Belarus, Poland, the Czech Republic, and part of Hungary. So these are the... to some extent, but only lately. The original was more centered on this part. Basically, these were populations that were sandwiched between the Orthodox Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire, let's put it that way. And in fact, in 700, 750 or so—again, I'm not a historian, I may be wrong with the dates—but around the year 750 or so, the king of this area decided, in order to escape the pressure of the Orthodox in the north and the Ottomans and the Muslims in the south, he decided to convert the whole population to Judaism.

And that's the reason why today you have all these leaders. You take Netanyahu, Smotrich, Ben Gvir. All these guys—Shimon Peres, Golda Meir, Ben Gurion—all these people come from the same region, which is between Ukraine. I mean, Golda Meir was born in Odessa, so in Ukraine. As an example, Ben Gurion was Polish. The same as, I think, Netanyahu is originally from Belarus. So these people have nothing to do with the Semitic people of the Bible. They have nothing to do with that. This is something completely, totally different. They have a completely different origin. They converted to Judaism just for political reasons in the 8th century. But that's it.

Now they claim ownership of this territory, but in fact, they don't belong to those sons or the descendants of Abraham that were given this. They're not even the chosen people in reality. So this is the interesting thing in this situation. And today, almost 80% of the Israeli population, in fact, comes from Central Europe or Russia. And I think Russian may be the second most spoken language in Israel. So this idea that this part of the world belongs to them for 2000 years is a historical fantasy, let's put it that way. And even biblically, because they were not part of this. They came

much later. So they are not part of this heritage to some extent. But that also explains the way they behave.

#Nima

You know, when you realize how many of these people are supporting Greater Israel, which is the main agenda.

#Jacques

Well, you know, the Greater Israel—first of all, you have a different definition of the Greater Israel. Let's put this very simply. The Greater Israel... I don't know if I have here—maybe I can explain that. I have a document probably here that I can show you. Yes, I have it. It's a leaflet, it's a leaflet from the early Haganah, and I show you here—it's a leaflet of the Haganah. And you see here the Greater Israel that is part of the ideology of Netanyahu. And if you look at this, the logo here, you see Israel here in that part, and you see here Jordan on the right-hand side of the rifle. Now, this is very important because the movement from which Netanyahu comes from is a movement that was created in the late 1920s by Jabotinsky.

Jabotinsky was Russian or even Ukrainian, I think. And he created the so-called Zionist Revisionist movement. And why revisionist? Because in the early 20s, as the British received the mandate for the administration of Palestine, they decided—although legally they should not have done that, but they did—that they gave the part of Palestine which was called then Transjordan, which is called today Jordan, to the Hashemites. The Hashemites were a tribe that had been expelled from Saudi Arabia. The Hashemites were responsible for the custodianship of the Muslim holy places like Medina and Mecca. And after a feud that happened in the early 20s, the Saud family became the custodian of the holy sites and the Hashemites were expelled from Saudi Arabia.

And they had no place to settle, and the British decided to give them Transjordan. But by giving this part of Palestine to the Hashemites, the British cut Palestine, in fact. And Jabotinsky, with his guys, who were, by the way, supported in the 30s by Mussolini—they even had a military base in Civitavecchia. So, you know, they were very close to the fascist movement. And they decided, by creating this revisionist movement, the idea of the revisionists was to oblige the British to revise their decision to give Transjordan to the Hashemites and to keep Palestine as a complete entity. And this movement evolved. It settled in Palestine and was one of the most virulent combatants against the British during the Second World War. Against the British, remember?

So I don't want to tell you from whom they were allies, but they were fighting the British. And the Likud, the current faction of the Likud, which is headed by Netanyahu today, derives from this movement. That means for them, the Greater Israel would be to have the current Israel with Jordan. So that's their view—to annex the territory of the current Jordan. That's the minimal, I mean, it's a possible understanding of the word "Greater" or the expression "Greater Israel." But currently they

know that they cannot annex Jordan. That means they want to annex everything which is within their reach. And that's the reason why annexing the Palestinian territory, annexing the Golan, annexing the southern part of Lebanon is part of the current definition of the Greater Israel.

That's the idea. If you go to the biblical definition of the Greater Israel, then you go to something completely different. I don't know if I have, but no, probably I can't show you here because my settings do not allow that at this stage. But I can probably show at another time the map of this. The biblical definition of the Greater Israel would be, according to some rabbis, from the Nile River—that means part of Egypt—up to the Euphrates in Iraq. Nota bene that today we tend to portray the struggle against Iran as part of the Israeli struggle for the Greater Israel. I am not of this view, again, although this is disputable, because Iran has never been part of the Greater Israel, even in the biblical definition.

The biblical definition goes from the Nile to the Euphrates. But again, there are probably different views on that, and I am not expert enough to discuss all that. But the reality is that, realistically, with the current data we have—let's say the current situation—we can say all the territories that have been annexed illegally, I underline this, illegally, by Israel since 1948 are this small Greater Israel, if you want. The ideology of Netanyahu would say that Jordan should also be part of this Greater Israel. This is the current setting, I would say, just to make things clear. And today, a large part of the population, which comes from the Ashkenazi, are in fact those Zionists who support Netanyahu. The policy of Netanyahu has about 80–82% of supporters. That's just given by the polls done in Israel.

So that's the reality as we have it. But again, this is also due to the fact that Netanyahu can only survive in a situation where his country is at war. Had we another leader instead of Netanyahu, I can assume that those people would probably support another policy. I mean, that's my assumption again. And I'm sure that had we a sensible new leader who is not bound to have war in order to survive politically, probably we could have something more peaceful and a more stable Israel. I'm not sure that Israel, as a population—the population itself—needs war to survive as a nation. I'm not sure. War is certainly needed for the political survival of Netanyahu, that's for sure. But I'm not sure it's considered a necessity for the survival of the Israeli population.

I'm not sure of that. Again, this is debatable and subject to discussion, but I think the real, the key, or the center of gravity of the whole problem—the center of gravity in the Clausewitzian term, in strategic terms—is Netanyahu. He is the whole, the center of all the problems of Israel. And would Netanyahu disappear, that would probably solve all Israeli problems. So that's my personal view. And I'm sure that had we another leader, there's a chance that Israel could. And I hope, by the way, that what we see today—because the polls show that Israel is now, and recently you have the Democracy Perception Index that was published, and you have a study about the perception of different countries around the world, and among them you have Israel.

And now you see that in the latest edition of the Democracy Perception Index, Israel is the most hated country in the world, in absolute terms. And this is a situation where I hope that the Israelis understand that. And you see, we have more and more videos that have become viral, by the way, where you see Israeli tourists in Spain, in Italy, or elsewhere, who are just expelled from restaurants and things like this, because the owner of the restaurant says, I don't want customers who approve genocide. So you have these kinds of things. And this is sad. This is certainly sad, but I hope it will—I hope, but again, it's only a hope, and with all the weaknesses of the word hope.

But I hope this would help the Israelis to become aware of what they are doing and to understand that what they are doing, even if they consider it correct, right, and lawful, is not accepted in the rest of the world. In that sense, I think what's happening is sad. But if the Israelis are intelligent enough, they should understand the lesson and use that lesson to change their leadership and to change their policy. I'm convinced that Israel could have had a very prosperous existence had it respected the law, international law, since 1948. And I'm equally convinced that Israel will not survive as a state, as a society, as a nation, if it continues constantly to breach international law, to behave as a thug—there's no other word for that—by accepting, legalizing torture, torture of prisoners, killing of children, destroying medical facilities.

As long as Israel does that, I cannot predict a very long future for Israel. And I think that should be the lesson that they learn—to realize that probably there is something in their official behavior that has to change in order to be better accepted in the world, but also in their neighborhood. Because, as I explained, Hezbollah has no claims over Israel. They don't want to set their capital city in Jerusalem or in Tel Aviv or wherever. They just want to have the Israelis out of their borders. The same as the Syrians in the Golan. They don't claim Israel as their property. They don't want to have their capital city in Jerusalem. They are happy with Damascus.

But Damascus is their capital city, not Jerusalem. And that's the reason why the Golan should return to Syria as it is. It has been decided by the United Nations. The same applies to the Palestinians. They were here before the Israelis. Formally, in any way you can look at it, they were here before, in a state that had the name of Palestine. Here, another document—here you can see, "Government of Palestine." Let me bring it up here—yeah, "Government of Palestine" here. So this was a state. This is dated April 1945, the Government of Palestine. This was a state before Israel. So the right of these people who have been dispossessed from their territory must be acknowledged.

And that part, I think, is the situation that we know in the Middle East since October 2023, which in fact is only a prolongation of what we have seen in the last 80 years. And in reality, you see here exactly the purpose of this operation—the Palestinian operation in October 2023—that was precisely to raise the attention of the world on a situation that was existing beforehand. And they achieved that. The Palestinians achieved that. They suffered a lot of losses. They suffered a lot of casualties, fatalities. A lot of children killed. A lot of people tortured. But that only helped exactly the point of the Palestinians.

They wanted to raise the attention of the world to their situation. And it has completely worked. The problem is that Israel was taken into this cycle of violence, and in fact, they could not stop themselves from being violent. And after Gaza, they needed to address the West Bank and then Lebanon and things like this. Because this is the sad reality—that Israel needs war for its regime to survive. But again, the regime, not Israel. I mean... I hope so. And that's what the Israelis have to realize. That's what the world has now realized—that what happened in October 2023 was not the start of a war, but just a small part of a war that started long ago.

And it was a war that Israel has declared not just against the Palestinians, but against international law—the international law system that was established in 1945 with the creation of the United Nations, with the Nuremberg Tribunal, and things like this. So this is exactly what Israel is fighting against. And now they have, and that needs a collective effort. I'm not sure we, our diplomacy, and in particular European countries, and even the US—but the US is probably something slightly different in nature, because the support of Israel by the US is also very much religiously colored, and that gives another flavor to this whole support.

That's something we don't really have with Europe, and that's where I see the failure of Europe in that situation, because European countries, which are important economic, cultural, trade partners of Israel, could use their influence to help Israeli society understand this situation—to understand that Israel can only survive if it complies with international law. And it's very sad from the Europeans that they don't dare to address this question. And of course, you have all these countries that were actively involved in the Holocaust during World War II, namely Germany and France in particular, because they were the most active during World War II in promoting the Holocaust. The other countries, as you can see—Spain, Italy—are more critical towards Israel.

Those who are not are those who feel guilty. This is why they don't dare to talk frankly to Israel. But should they understand what is at stake and understand, educate, or try to educate the Israelis to respect international law, that would help for the survival of Israel. Interestingly enough, they are not doing that at all. I would even say provocatively that they were anti-Semites during World War II, and they are still anti-Semites. Because everything they do is to help Israel to continue to be hated. They are not trying to prevent this hate. Because, as I said many times, I think we are no longer in this idea of antisemitism, the traditional definition of antisemitism. Antisemitism is basically being anti-Semitic. As I said, Palestinians are Semitic and Israelis are Semitic.

Anti-Semitic theoretically should address also the Palestinians as well as the Israelis. In that sense, the Europeans are anti-Semitic, 100%. But let's assume anti-Semitism is just about the Jews. This is the commonly accepted definition. Antisemitism is a form of racism that addresses—I mean, basically it's defined as the hate against people because of what they are, not because of what they do. If you are colored, black, whatever color, or Jew, or Hindu, or Christian, or whatever, that's what

you are. Racism addresses what you are, not what you do. And my personal understanding of the current variants, if you want, of anti-Semitism—I'm not sure that people hate the Israelis because they are Jews. They hate the Israelis because of what they do.

They hate the Israelis because of their behavior, not because they are Jews. And I think nobody—I mean, there are probably some people who hate people just because they are Jews or just because they are Muslims. This definitely exists. But when it comes to the increase of anti-Semitism that we have witnessed, especially after October 2023, it's not related to the fact that the Israelis are Jews. It's related to the fact that the Israelis misbehave. So I'm not saying that if Israelis behave better, anti-Semitism will completely disappear. But you will at least remove this part of what we call anti-Semitism, which in reality is anti-Zionism. Because Zionism is not what you are. Zionism is a political doctrine. It's exactly what I explained before.

It's a Jewish nationalism, if you want. That's probably the best. As Islamism is a nationalist doctrine for Islam, for Muslims. So Muslim nationalism is Islamism. And Jewish nationalism is Zionism. We can simplify things like this. It's a little bit more complicated because you also have Christian Zionism. So if you are anti-Zionist, are you anti-Jewish Zionist or anti-Christian Zionist? You know, you have those people like Joe Biden, for instance. He said himself that he was a Christian Zionist. So when you are anti-Zionist, are you anti-Semitic? No, you're anti-Zionist.

So basically, that means you are against a doctrine. You're against a political posture. That's the rationale behind that. That's the reason why I think the idea of confusing anti-Zionism and anti-Judaism is totally wrong. These are two different things. Antisemitism is to be against those people because of what they are. Anti-Zionism, again, has to do with the doctrine that is managed or used by the Israeli government. And again, everything is related to the behavior of Israel, not to what they are. Of course, some people may argue that they are brutal. They are. So we can have a discussion on that.

But to remain as objective as possible, antisemitism today has more to do with the misbehavior of Israel than with the simple fact of Judaism. And again, you may define the Palestinians as you wish and as you want, even as terrorists and what you want, but again, the law is the law. It's not because someone is defined as a terrorist that you can be a torturer and things like this. We have this tendency in the West, especially that comes from Israel, by the way. The US has adopted that from Israel, and then the Europeans have taken over that from the US to define people as terrorists, so then you are allowed to do anything.

You can kill populations, you can kill civilians, you can bomb them, you can do everything, you can use torture, you can use whatever you want, as long as people are defined as terrorists. That's the reason why we tend to define terrorists. Interestingly enough, by the way, as the West, because the French, for instance, have decided that the IRGC, the Revolutionary Guards in Iran, were defined as a terrorist organization. Because that allows you to do anything. Then you can do everything you want. Now, Iran has defined the French armed forces as a terrorist organization as well, meaning

that in theory, a French soldier could be considered a terrorist. And the word "terrorist" has no international value.

It depends on the country that decides. And that's why I think personally that these games are stupid, because we don't know. Nobody can define exactly what a terrorist is. And today, for instance, the German government defines Hezbollah or the Palestinians as terrorists. And in fact, the German government does today exactly what it did during World War Two against my uncle. My uncle was a resistant in France. He was considered a terrorist. And today the German government has exactly the same definition: if you are a resistant, you are a terrorist. And that shows the contradictions of all these words. We should get rid of all that.

We should start to fight wars as we used to fight them, with honor, with discipline, and according to the law of war, which today is called International Humanitarian Law, according to the Geneva Convention and all that. That should apply to all parties, all armies, all armed forces—American, Israeli, European—whoever should comply with that. We have seen during the prisoner exchange that we had between Hamas, or the Palestinians, better said, because it was not just Hamas but the Palestinians and the Israelis in 2024 and 2025. We have seen that the Israelis who were prisoners of the Palestinians were properly treated by the Palestinians, while the Palestinians who were prisoners of the Israelis were mistreated.

They had disease. They had suffered injuries during their detention. They had suffered malnutrition and all that. Nothing like this with the Israelis that were under the custody of the Palestinians. On the contrary, they were well fed, even if there was obviously a food shortage provoked by Israel, by the way. Those prisoners always had enough to eat. They were properly treated. They were protected by the Palestinians, as opposed to what happened. So we see here that we can call the Palestinians terrorists, but we see that they behave better than the Israelis. And I think that shows where the sense of honor is. And my personal view is that the Palestinians will probably suffer much more casualties, fatalities, than the Israelis.

But they fight with honor. While the Israelis will probably kill more people, they don't fight with honor. As a military, that seems to me extremely important. The way you win, the way you lose is equally important. You can lose with honor and win with dishonor. That's exactly what we see in southern Lebanon and what we see in Palestine. And that's something that is, in my view, extremely concerning because at the end of the day, the Israelis, they are Europeans. And we see that the Europeans behave exactly like the Israelis. They never condemn the Israelis. They behave exactly the same way. The so-called values are no longer values. They are just political alibis to do something or not do something. And that's all.

#Nima

Karol, before wrapping up, you mentioned something about Benjamin Netanyahu. I think he's so important. Israel as a country, as you just mentioned. This is not the problem with Benjamin

Netanyahu. We have many people in Israel who believe that their survival, the Israeli survival, is in continuous wars. One of them is Jonathan Pollard, an Israeli spy who was received by the Netanyahu administration as a hero in Israel. And here is what he said about the next round of wars.

#Speaker 03

We don't think geostrategically. Forget about Jolani. Forget about Donald Trump. I am principally worried, first of all, for the welfare of our Druze brothers across the border, but secondarily, if Jolani and his Islamists actually reoccupy that area, we will have the Turks right on our border.

#Nima

We eventually will.

#Speaker 03

We eventually will, and I'm not so sure that we will have as easy a time with the Turks as we've had with the Iranians. I've been following Turkish military doctrine, and the storm is coming in the Middle East. The storm is coming. Yes, of course. And they're a member of NATO. And even worse, they're a member of NATO. So I look at Iran as a problem we absolutely have to finish. And I'll explain what I mean by that. Gaza, same thing. And Hezbollah. Why? Why am I fixated on this now? Because we have to be prepared for the next war, which will probably be against Turkey and Egypt. I hope not also. But we hope you remember it was the last demon out of Pandora's box. And there's a reason for that.

#Nima

Karol, two points. One of them is he said that we're going to—I'm going to talk about this situation against Iran. And in the other part, when it comes to Iran, he mentioned they can use nukes against Iran. And he reasoned that. Go ahead.

#Jacques

Well, first of all, we have to understand who Jonathan Pollard is. He used to be a member of the intelligence community in the U.S. He was not a Jew, by the way, and he tried to betray the Americans by providing sensitive and even secret documents to Israeli intelligence during the 70s and 80s. He was eventually identified, arrested, and condemned to a life sentence because essentially he was a traitor, period. And he did that on his own. He was not a spy as such; he was just a guy who gave trade secrets to Israeli intelligence. He converted to Judaism in detention, by the way. So he was not a Jew before; he became a Jew. And then part of the idea of converting to Judaism was to ask or to allow Israel to ask the U.S. to release him.

And in fact, Benjamin Netanyahu, since the early 90s, has systematically requested his extradition to Israel. And every single president of the United States has refused—Bush, Obama, all of them. The only one who accepted was Donald Trump, during his first mandate. And eventually, Jonathan Pollard was released and extradited to Israel. So he's an extremist, there's no question about that. Now, the whole issue—and of course, there are probably many people who think like him—and that's the reason why I was talking before about this idea of educating the Israelis differently. Because he is typical of this doctrine that I explained before, that they consider the security of Israel as security through confrontation. It's security through chaos outside. They don't even—and if you listen to him, he doesn't even consider having a good relationship with Turkey.

He considers that it's given, it's almost given by God, that Turkey will hate them, that Iran will hate them, that everybody hates Israel. But that's not the reality. This is not just a given fact that people hate Israel. People hate Israel because Israel misbehaved. Remember that in the 90s, Turkey was probably one of the main allies of Israel. In the 80s, Iran was one of the main allies of Israel. So Israel made the situation such that those people became enemies. But in fact, those countries have basically nothing against Israel. So again, this is part of this view of Israel, which again, as a Swiss, disturbs me because I think that especially for a small country, if you imagine or if you think that your security can be enhanced by making wars with people who are stronger than you, it's stupid.

If you are in a situation such as Israel or Switzerland, the best way to deal with your neighbors is by trying to have good relations. They never tried so. They never did that. And even if they were in good relations, they even managed to bomb them, to kill individuals that they didn't like, and things like this, instead of cooperating with them. So this is—and you can have the same thing with Egypt and things like this—you know, Israel is a country that thinks, as a principle, that people hate them, period. And therefore, they have to fight the rest of the world. But it's not the reality. And again, that's why I was talking before about this idea of helping the Israelis to understand that it's not the case.

But it's very difficult because even in our countries, Israelis have this sense that everybody's against them. But it's not true. I'm sure that a lot of people have no problem with Jews unless they misbehave. And that's exactly what happens. I mean, the Europeans after World War II were very much in favor of Israel at large, and they supported Israel. I may remember, I was very young, but again, during the 1967 war and then the 1973 war, there was huge support in Europe for Israel. Even if Israel, in fact, was the... In 1967, Israel attacked everybody. In 1973, that was Egypt trying to recover what Israel had taken from them. So that was a little bit the response to 1967. But the support for Israel was massive. And today it's exactly the opposite. Fifty years later, people just hate Israel.

Because in the meantime, we have seen what happened. Although during the 80s there were probably the same problems, but at a lower scale in Palestine and all that. And of course, you had the Oslo Agreement and things like this. It didn't lead to something concrete, but at least there was dialogue. There was a dialogue, and the government in Israel at the time was ready for dialogue.

Today, nobody is ready for dialogue. And you have kind of a polarization of the mindset on both sides. You have a country that has become increasingly extremist. And I remember in the early 90s in Switzerland, in the administration, when Israel decided to make torture legal, that created an outrage in the Swiss military. And people said, well, why do we continue to talk to these people?

I mean, we are not talking to people who legalize torture. That's exactly what Switzerland fought against. So why are we accepting that from Israel? And since then, it has been even worse. And of course, these are the 30 years in which you had constantly Netanyahu in power, or more or less constantly. This ideology that is carried by Netanyahu, which is, as I explained before, this kind of revisionist Zionism, which is probably the most extreme variant of Zionism, is in fact harming Israel. And that has to be, in my view, that should be understood by the Israelis themselves so that they can adjust their behavior and understand that the government they have doesn't protect them. It creates more incentive for the rest of the world to attack them.

Now you have some European countries, Spain for instance, that don't deliver or supply weapons to Israel anymore. And you have many other countries that have made similar decisions today. So this current policy of Israel is in fact harming Israel. They are still in the U.S., and even in the U.S., by the way, even though the support for Israel is very strong and you still have those Lindsey Grahams and others who will continue to support Israel whatever it does. But the reality is that the population in the United States is moving, and even the political landscape is moving. You have those extremists, as I just mentioned, but a lot of people in reality, including in the political establishment, are now questioning their relationship with Israel as long as Israel behaves as it does.

Again, everything is related to the behavior of Israel. And I think it would be quite useful to explain to the Israelis that, and to make sure that they understand that in order to improve their security. I repeat, I think with such a doctrine, with such an understanding of security by Israel, they will not survive as a state. They can only survive if they understand that a security policy is based, regardless of the country, on two points: diplomacy, foreign policy, and the military. But first, you have to use diplomacy. First, you have to use dialogue. We haven't talked so much about Iran, but if you look at what is at stake between Israel and Iran, well, basically there is nothing. It's empty. Israel claims that Iran has nuclear weapons, but Iran says, we have none, and we have no intention to have some.

And you don't have territorial claims, you have nothing from Iran. So why would Iran attack Israel? The incentive for Israel to attack Iran is, of course, to have the U.S. on the ground. That's the whole thing, because that's a constant part of Israeli foreign policy — to create a situation where the U.S. would have a permanent presence in the region. And if you have a weak president, as the U.S. has now, that accepts everything he is told to do, well, of course, that may work. And in fact, it worked because they asked him to go into Iran. And just yesterday or the day before, Trump said, we shouldn't have been in Iran. So that means that the Israelis just forced their way, and he was weak enough to say yes.

#Nima

Yeah.

#Jacques

So we are not here with people who have a rational approach. Netanyahu needs war because of his legal situation, period. Nothing else. The security of Israel is absolutely not at stake as long as Israel keeps its borders. And when I say borders — because Israel has officially no borders, that must also be said — Israel has no borders, period. It has just a ceasefire line, the so-called Green Line from 1949. And that's it. Would Israel stay within those borders, this accepted or tolerated border, or the ceasefire line, or the Green Line of 1949? Nothing would happen. They would be very happy.

And is that the Palestinians where they are? Let the Palestinians have a life. Let the Palestinians have their own state. Remove all those people who are illegally settled in the Palestinian territory. That's all. Just comply with international law, period. And that would ensure the safety of Israel for centuries. But if Israel has as a rule or a doctrine, or you can call it as you want, to breach international law because they feel they are above international law, as it was said by Bezalel Smotrich, if I'm not wrong, they say that international law doesn't apply to the chosen people.

#Nima

You said that.

#Jacques

Yeah. So then, of course, from that point on, the security of Israel is not guaranteed. You have to play by the rules. And I repeat, I said it, I think, last week or so — in 1949, as Israel asked to enter the United Nations, the United Nations asked Israel, as a condition to be a member of the United Nations, to make a pledge to respect international law. And Israel did that in order to be a member of the United Nations. Today, we see that with all the resolutions that underline that Israel has not respected its commitment. And some people, by the way, have argued that Israel could be expelled from the United Nations because of that, because they made a commitment. And the presence of Israel in the United Nations is, in fact, conditional. It's conditional. It's not absolute.

#Nima

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

#Jacques

That was my pleasure. Thank you very much for inviting me.

