

## Europe Builds a Sanctions State. He Fights It. | Col. Jacques Baud

Neutrality Studies, 16 Feb 2026  
rush transcript

Timestamps:

00:00:00 Introduction  
00:01:29 Sanctions as extrajudicial punishment and dangerous precedent  
00:06:26 "Now, are there any updates on the legal front... Anything that you can share with us?"  
00:10:02 "They can only use publicly available sources... Is that the case?"  
00:13:23 "What can the council's legal department do and what can they not?"  
00:18:13 Humanitarian derogation and frozen accounts  
00:24:43 Sanctions as foreign-policy weapons turning inward  
00:36:27 Hybrid warfare narratives and the Gerasimov doctrine claim  
00:44:46 Ukraine war lessons, systems thinking, training mismatch  
00:57:07 Outro

06

Pascal Lottaz:

... and today I'm joined again by my compatriot and friend Colonel Jacques Baud, former colonel of the Swiss Army, intelligence officer and since December 2025 also a persona non grata or a person on the EU sanctions list and we've talked to Jacques before. he's given us quite a bit of explanation on this channel. He's on the channel of Nima Dialogue Works [<https://open.spotify.com/show/2we2aPzld9U5k3JvKs7eJS>] and the I mean his case I think your case, Jacques, is now well known and I'm I'm happy to report that also in Switzerland -where I'm visiting right now- your case is being discussed in this in the circles that I've that I've been with -on the left, on the right- and your case is having quite an impact on the discussion about the future of Switzerland, the future of Europe in general, and I'm very glad to have you back on the channel.

1:02

Jacques Baud:

Yeah. Well, first of all, thank you very much for inviting me again. Thank you for all the support and all you have done for me in favor of my case. I know all the efforts you have made in the recent in the last two months about this and I am really grateful about everything you have done and all you have also triggered and helped to do to improve my situation. But as you rightly said my situation is my situation of course but it has it entails an a danger for others as well. I mean it is my case is a precedent or is a possible precedent for other cases in the future and I think a lot of people have understood that that we are in the case of extrajudicial type of punishment and this is something that goes against any rule practices and even values that we have in Europe. I mean the history of democracy in Europe is based on the -on those- principles of habeas corpus, the rule of law, and when we say rule of law that means that everything is ruled by law and here in my case we have exactly the opposite that you have people who rule without, outside of the law and that contains a very, very significant danger, because and especially because the Europe European the Europeans -let's let's put it that way- have not realized that aspect because so far these the measures I am under are foreign policy measures.

So they they were designed to reach

3:18

people outside of the limits of the European law if you want. So if I can put it that way. So it's for people living outside of the EU and therefore this is exactly the same thing. I mean you can compare in war you have the right to kill people but when you are not at war you are not allowed to kill somebody. so that's why there is a differentiation between foreign policy in which I include war or at least not internal wars but external wars and and domestic policy and in domestic law you are it's it's forbidden to kill but in foreign policy you may have this right under certain circumstances of course so that's exactly the same thing here and when we start to confuse law and and not no law, then we start to be in a in a situation that extremely concerning. That's exactly I mean you you have made a video about the the issue of legality extra not illegality oh illegality extra legality and and out of law that's and we are exactly in this case so it's extremely concerning and as I I see that more and more the people start to understand that which at the beginning was not the case when the sanctions were issued. Nobody understood. Some people thought it was a sanction, a normal judiciary decision, but it's not a judiciary decision.

It's

5:05

an extra judiciary decision and that's the problem. So that's that this is I think just a few thoughts about what you just said and I think this that should guide in fact the whole issue. I mean, obviously I'm in in the center of the problem today, but what happens to me today can happen to anybody tomorrow, and that's something that nobody wants. No, that's that's definitely not what we can want. And this regime is, if it doesn't stop, it will it will be expanded. I mean, it is a tool and at the at the moment, it's a tool that's being used experimentally, I would say, to to see what's possible. And you can also see how there was a progress right of using sanctions against states only first and then against entities then against people who were close to the entities then against especially in in in Russia right but then against people inside Russia who who did who were connected somehow journalists journalists who reported from Donbas and so on and then against individuals inside the European Union.

PL:

you are

6:15

not a EU citizen as a Swiss but Hussein Dogru is and he's in Germany and you can see how this how this how this there's this experimental phase and if it doesn't stop here it will go it will get worse now are there any updates on the legal front like with your lawyers or with the people that you talked on how you are approaching the legal battle against this ... anything that you can share with us because obviously maybe not everything can be made public.

JB:

Yes, there are obviously some things

6:47

that I'm not allowed to say publicly at this stage. we have received my lawyers and me of course have received the documents that were the base of the decision to put me on sanctions. So we know what is the substance of the accusation if you want. unfortunately we are not able to share that and even if you were allowed I would not do that because that will be part of the I mean that will define the strategy we will have to go against the the sanction decision. It's important to realize also some people say well in in in Belgium for instance there's a a professor of international law that is well we are in a rule of law because now it can it can go against the decision. Well this is not the rule of law this is just we are just attacking if you want if I can summarize a little bit the strategy is that we cannot go against the decision itself. we can only attack the the Council of the European Union [Rat der Europäischen Union] and say well they took the wrong they they took a decision they shouldn't have taken. people that's it so this is it's not a defense in the legal sense of the word it's an attack if I can put it that way and that that means means that we will base our strategy on the substance of the accusation for Zandi that's German sorry obviously and but what I can say is that in all the documents I received none of them none of them cite a direct quote I shouldn't have I shouldn't have made. None of them put a direct quote and it's always hearsay - what people have told about me or think - like that. There is no direct quote of me.

PL:

Hey, very brief intermission because I was recently banned from YouTube and although I'm

9:12

back, this can happen anytime again. So, please consider subscribing not only here but to my mailing list on Substack. That's pascallotaz.substack.com. substack.com. The link's going to be in the description below. And now back to the video. I I was told by by Hussein Dogu that actually the the accusations are the council refuses to the council has doesn't have the power to do criminal investigation. So they are they can only use publicly available sources to create the case against you. the so they they base all of their stuff on on what has been published before and they use secondary sources as if you know magazine X said the following about Jacques Baud, therefore you know the accusation stands, right? Is that is that the case is that the thing

10:04

JB:

yeah it's absolutely that it's absolutely that and and that's even more shocking because I don't want to discuss the case of others because obviously each case it's specificities but in my case everything I have said is in my books you know there there is no it's written somewhere so you can check if I in an accusation or somebody said I I said this or that you can verify everything is verifi verifiable but there's absolutely no verification done by the EU so they selected They select specific information just in order to substantiate the the accusation but they don't check all the information. So it's it's cherry-picking. It's it's in technical word cherry picking is a nice word but technically speaking this is like you built up a conspiracy theory. What the EU does is they build up a conspiracy theory. That means they never go to the original source. They never go to the original document. They just take what people have understood or said about it and that's it. They make their case with that. And that's that's extremely that's extremely interesting. I I think when the whole thing will be done I mean I will certainly I mean when all that can be made public I can tell you that's that will that will be extremely extremely devastating to the European Union because if you have if they had taken one of my books

12:06

and said well in your book you say this and that you can say okay I have said that it's written no problem I I can justify it but it's not even that as I said there is not a not an a not a single direct quote of me and they even they even take an article in the press where I said that I was going against Russian propaganda So I was not even endorsing. I was saying I I just set facts saying that Russia was saying the things to my in my opinion the Russia should not have said. So sometimes you don't understand. They probably just picked article just where they saw the name Jacques Baud. They just picked it and that's it.

13:04

PL:

That's Yeah. You know, but we what what's the challenge for us now is to figure out how the process in the background works because that might give us clues about how to most effectively then challenge this the buildup of this of this sanctions internal sanctions regime right and one of the things we seem to not now understand is that the the Council of the EU and it's not I must repeat it's not the Commission it's the Council the Council I mean according to my information. They they now have this they have a legal department and you guys are now in in touch with the legal department, right? And they are now basically is is that is that the case? The legal department of the council.

13:47

JB:

Well, this is I'm I'm not exactly aware about who exactly my lawyers will address. I don't know if it's the legal department of the European Council or if it is the European Court of Justice. there might be a slight difference there. Again I but I don't want to discuss those details. They might be very but I'm not able at this stage to give more details about this because right now we are working with the lawyers to we we are I'm sorry I'm I'm mixing. I just I have spoken so much German in the recent days that I'm I'm confusing German and English. I'm sorry about that. And but the thing is that we are not elaborating a strategy and we we we are analyzing the documents that were provided to us which are called working papers. That's the the technical word expression for those documents. So we are working on these checking exactly all sentence by sentence everything.

15:10

PL:

yeah may just jump in. Sorry. The only thing I want to say is that the the way it works I think will be important because there there is a counterparty right and the counterparty the people who execute this are probably the legal department of the council if understood it correctly and they they build the case against you and then the ECJ the European Court of Justice is in the middle right is the one that then has to analyze and maybe they will forward everything but those those are the parties interesting thing to me is like what can the what can the council's legal the department do and what what can they not? So they cannot do a criminal investigation because it's not a criminal process. Hence they have to build their case based upon a specific process internally and that process it seems to be well extremely flimsy because it's an experimental phase for them.

JB:

Well the the thing is again I I don't

16:04

know exactly who built the case because there is not a single legal comment on that. I mean I can say that they provided me with articles taken from internet internet basically without a single comment. Period. So there is no legal comment. I mean they could have said well with through that we decide or we assess that this is propaganda whatever. There's no comment at all. They just sent articles. Period. Some have been translated mechanically and and and and I don't know what kind of software they have because it's extremely poor to be frank with you. it's it's just amazing. and and sometimes even the translation is not exactly contradictory but doesn't reflect what I said in the original language as an example so there is no legal consideration absolutely none - this could have been the work of any individual working I mean it just types Jacques Baud and just collect what comes up. That's all. Period. So that's where we are at this stage. the the my understanding is that my lawyers will address the inter the European Court of Justice. What happens after that is something I I don't know but that will probably be the the the the comment or the pro I mean I don't know exactly how this document will be called but let's call it protest

18:11

let's put it that way it will address to the European Court of Justice or the arguments against or to lift the sanction or things like that. Now just to update you on my situation that the lawyers have also asked to have humanitarian derogation. For me that means that as I have already said I I normally have no access to my bank account in the EU. meaning that since December I'm not able to buy things. I'm not able to buy gas for my car. I'm not able to buy food. I'm not able to spend money that you normally do through your bank account with a bank card or things like that. So through the humanitarian derogation, I should be able to spend money for my essential needs. That means to feed, to pay my electricity bills and things like that.

On the 6th of February,

19:19

the Belgium Ministry of Justice has granted this humanitarian derogation. That means that's 10 days ago, but nothing had happened yet. So I'm at the same point as we had in December. Basically there is an official decision but this has not been implemented so far as I'm as of today it is not the case and say the way the administration work in I mean I don't want to criticize too much Belgium, because Belgian people are nice people but nevertheless the administration works as it works and that means that it's extremely slow and not very effective. And that's exactly where we are. And when this will be implemented, that means I will not have a full access to my bank account. I don't know exactly what the rule will be to be honest. because as I as I said, it's limited to my essential needs and for a limited amount of time. so I will have to renew the request and all that. So this is, sorry,

20:43

PL:

it's part of what makes this so horrible, right. The punishment, the effect of the punishment comes immediately immediately without even without even telling you and the remedies against it and even the humanitarian relief comes over time like slowly slowly slowly

JB:

yeah exactly this is exactly that I mean this

21:00

is something we have already discussed in previous interviews if I remember that they are not limited in time. You know, when you are normally you go on trial for something because you have stolen whatever a car, right? Then you go you you go a sentence and you have a you have to go to jail but for a certain amount of time. It's not unlimited. You have one month, two months, one year, I don't know. But this is a a the judge make a decision and you go for one week, two weeks, but this is your jail time period and once it's done, it's done. Here it's not the case. This is essentially unlimited. Obviously the sanction list is regularly reviewed and my sanction list will be reviewed in October as far as I have as I know may be wrong but I think it will be that it will be reviewed in October and without any other comment it will be extended.

22:15

So this is this is a situation where you are punished but for unlimited amount of time. But again this is very important for people to understand that we are outside of the law and being outside of the law that means the decision is not limited by the law and if I put it in an extreme way and again it's I'm not saying that it will go up to that point but the principle remains the same. The death penalty is forbidden is doesn't exist in Europe because the law in Europe in EU and in individual states say that there is no death penalty. But when you are out of the law, when your decision is above the law, that may that means that theoretically you could decide this. And essentially this extrajudiciary punishment or sanction is exactly what the Americans do when they decide to eliminate someone somewhere. This an extrajudiciary process. is exactly the same idea to have people in Guantanamo so that they escape the law system of the United States because they are on a territory which has which is not under US law. So it's extrajudiciary. So, and the reason they did that way is that because you cannot use torture according to law in the US, you cannot use torture to have information. But when you are no longer under US law, you are in on an extra judic judiciary territory, then you can use torture. And that's exactly the purpose of Guantanamo.

PL:

And that's exactly what we have that it's it's very

24:20

concerning because that means that you can apply measures that are normally designed to address issue outside of the European law but now you can apply exactly the same measures to people living inside the European Union. Can we talk about this because I think this is then where the bigger picture also like straight connects to what's happening to you and Nataly also pointed this out. She said she told me look in Africa we've been used to being targeted by European and US sanctions. They've been using this tool against us forever also against just simple activists right who are anti-colonial activists. and what you just described is exactly is exactly the thing. the drone strikes, the Obama, Mr. Obama signing off on the killing of individuals in Afghanistan with drones, even American even American citizens signing off on the killing of them is not a judicial process, right? using sanction using sanctions and in this this power of foreign policy including military deployments part of foreign policy is a way to to fight against enemies and the the the fight against enemies and this this now this turning inward of the weapons that have been used to to fight on the outside this this is extremely is extremely problematic but it's exactly what this kind of mindset does and I mean the colonial mindset that there are there are interests and there are people who are running against these interests and whether they're on the outside the enemy on the outside or the enemy on the inside we will target them and the legal process that we build usually in order to protect us from the state from the Leviathan don't apply anymore because it's you're again you're not inside the system you're you're you're you're taken outside and then you're you're being targeted by the executive

26:23

JB:

well again I don't want to go into the whole issue of colonial anticolonial things like that. This is probably going a little bit let's say not probably not too far but far from my point of view. But the the thing is that sanctions we have to understand that sanctions generally speaking are a way to interfere with domestic policy of of countries essentially states other states. Yeah. of I would say of countries because you can have in the UN system the UN charter allows to take sanctions against a state for under certain conditions, but the UN charter is also at the same time the the legal system or the legal framework that defines that you shouldn't interfere with domestic laws That means that it has the tool essentially to say no you cannot interfere but in certain conditions we can break that rule and that's only under the UN only under the UN system only within the European council system right because they define what you should that you should not interfere but they can define also exception to their own rule and basically when the EU or Switzerland or the United States or whoever decides by itself to apply sanctions then it goes beyond what the UN does because that should be normally done by the UN. Th this issue of interfering or not should remain at UN charter level and at UN level and article 7 and things

28:21

like this like embargos and all that there are measures that are defined in the UN charter and that there are tools to influence a situation where you have obviously a massive human rights u infringements and things like that. But the problem is that the US first but also then the EU and individual countries because I we can even say that when we talk about Russia usually people say that Switzerland has adopted the sanction of the EU and that's partly true but it Switzerland has has also its own sanctions. In fact Switzerland has applied more sanction to Russia than the EU.

29:11

Yeah. You see, so that means that there is it's we are we are going beyond what the UN does and we go beyond even what the EU does. But EU should not my view is that the only and that's the view of many international observers and lawyers and all that that the only legal sanctions are those decided by the UN.

29:39

PL:

Yeah. And and we must be very clear the United Nations themselves they condemn unilateral coercive measures by states that don't do it under the guise of under the control of the security council. And you know, so that's the difference to the to the sanctions against Iran. They were done under the UN roof at the time when Russia and China were still willing to to play along and you know when it before everything changed. And you know also the the sanctions there was this study published in in December just around the time when they put sanctions on you in the Lancet this public health the health magazine right and they they analyzed between 1979 and 2021 the health impact of US and European unilateral sanctions and they came to the conclusion that these two things together kill every year half a million people. Yeah. often keep up every year.

JB:

Yeah, this is something I have pointed

30:38

out in my book governing by fake news. In fact, I mentioned this case of sanctions and when we talk about all these extrajudiciary measures and you mentioned Obama and all that under Obama, it was a study that was made about the effect of those extrajudiciary killings as an example. and they noticed that only 4% of those people killed eventually were really terrorists. 4%. That mean that 96% of those people killed were in fact bystanders, collateral damage, you name it. And again, nobody is accountable for that because it's again it's extrajudiciary. The problem here is in fact I mentioned before what is I mean in very rough terms I explained what is what is in the working papers and you see that the the basis for making extrajudiciary killing is equally weak. We don't know exactly who we are killing. We don't know exactly who we are sanctioning. don't know exactly why what for and other because when you are in the in a judiciary system when you are in the process, a trial you you check the accusation you have a way to verify whether or not the accusation is correct or not. That's why you have lawyers.

That's why you have a a general

32:12

attorney and and all that and they present their case. This is discussed and at the end you have the bottom line of this whether there's sanction or no but in essence you have a tool that allows to check the accusation. Here in extrajudicial systems and that applies to sanctions sanctions I'm talking about unilateral sanctions then that means you have absolutely no tool to verify whether your your your decision is based on something solid or not and and that's that's the whole thing you know the UN sanctions when they were -you you mentioned the case of Iran and when the security council decides on sanction- that means that the whole issue has been discussed in the security council and there is an exchange and some people will say that it's right some I don't know and so on and so forth, but at the end of the day you come up with a decision that has been waited by both parties. In the

unilateral sanction system, nobody verifies what you say. It's just merely accusations. And it might be you decide that somebody is a terrorist. What is exactly a terrorist? You know we can -again I don't want to go into the the case of other individuals you have mentioned in- but what is a terrorist? I mean Hamas is considered as terrorist by 30 countries or 31 countries or so in the world but not by 160 countries. So who defines exactly what a terrorist is and think like this? So we and when you start to apply unilateral sanction on somebody because of this criteria is the criteria universally accepted and so, and since there is no trial since there is no process to decide whether your accusation is correct or not, well, you are exactly in the arbitrary decision and that's exactly where we are.

PL:

But it's it's it's even one level worse

34:23

because in the in a in a judicial system everything any accusation has to be an accusation of you preaching a rule and these rules we call them laws right. It's even worse because there are no rules right again propaganda in Europe in Switzerland in the EU is not illegal there's no there's no law that says this this will count as propaganda and this and this is illegal because in order to do that you need to bring it to parliament First you need to decide then then say okay this text going to publish it and anyone who who breaches this is doing something illegal. We don't have that. So and in the EU in the case of the European of the United Nations the whole idea is that the powers check each other right? you make an accusation, you say like this is bad for the UN system and then you check and if all five great powers actually say like "you know what, that's true this is bad" then you use a political process the sanctions in order to to go against what you what you decided is bad and in the EU case what we've have is the member states saying like this is bad for us and we now going to impose this but again without without giving the the person on the on the on the receiving end the chance to actually use the entire entire system of of the law in order to to have a fair trial because it's not a trial.

35:42

JB:

No, it's not. Exactly. No, you're absolutely right. This is something that that brings us back to the 15th century or something like that or in the Soviet Union or under the worst dictatorships. And I say even the worst dictatorship because you may have some authoritarian government, but it may still be a rule of law. The law might be tough. The laws may be difficult and probably unjust but there are laws. while here in the EU there is simply no laws. So we we I mean we are outside of the law. There are laws in the EU obviously but this kind of decision of sanction is out of any law and and again what is propaganda and then people will say well it's hybrid warfare. What is exactly hybrid warfare? Nobody knows exactly what it is. And in fact, what people say most of the time, well, that's a Russian doctrine. It comes off the so-called Gerasimov doctrine. What is the Gerasimov doctrine? Does it does it exist? Well, it doesn't. I mean these this whole issue of hybrid warfare was started off in in fact it started off in in 2013 as Gerasimov wrote an article that was in fact an analytical article about warfare and this was taken by a British expert Mark Galotti who interpreted that that article as an hybrid warfare doctrine for Russia and he called it the Gerasimov doctrine and that is what most people refer to when they talk about hybrid warfare. The problem is that Mark Galotti looked a little bit deeper into his own assessment and came back in 2018 I think probably or 2017 maybe -I don't remember exactly the date- but in any case he wrote an article I think in Foreign Policy where he said I'm sorry for creating the Gerasimov doctrine, it doesn't exist" and he wrote several articles recently to say that in fact he made a mistake. He misinterpreted what Gerazimov said. The problem is that nobody mentioned these articles now. Everybody has gone wild about this idea of hybrid warfare and the Russians have this doctrine things like this. Meaning that the very idea of hybrid warfare now has t taken its own dynamics and everybody is inventing new stuff and all that.

Fact of the matter is that in the -and I wrote an article

38:30

about the Russian art of war recently that was last week last year- and I obviously talked about this issue and there is no hybrid warfare aspect or doctrine in the Russian military doctrine. There is clandestine warfare. There are a lot of things. I have written, by the way, a book about Russian clandestine warfare, which incidentally, that's something that was published in the early 2000s, and incidentally, it was translated in Russian in Ukraine, by the way, just for

39:10

PL:

Yeah, just it's already Yeah, the situation is is the situation would be really funny if it wasn't so utterly tragic and and and devastating. But yes, please.

JB:

Yeah, that's this is this is

39:23

that. So, and I I know I'm Russian obviously does a kind of warfare. The problem is that we have so drifted towards our own understanding what is hybrid warfare that we have a completely false view on the actual clandestine warfare that Russia is doing. Russia is not doing at all what we say they are doing. they are doing something other. I mean, and they're probably more effective because in fact, all these people who point out hybride warfare, they are distracting us from the real clandestine warfare which is waged by Russia.. And that's probably the reason why Russia is happy about this. So we are talking about something that is it's it's more subtle that one we we think and again I I remember that in in that was in my book by the way about the art of war in I mentioned an a program by TV5 mode which is a French-speaking program of the various French-speaking countries Canada, Switzerland, Belgium, France and so on. And they made a special program about hybrid warfare and there was an expert from a French institute there. She mentioned five examples of hybrid warfare, Russian hybrid warfare including the cutting undersea cables and things like this. She gave five example. All the five examples, all the five had been previously debunked by by other media because we knew that when the the the the undersea cable that were broken that was the the the fishnetss and things like this. So everybody had already an explanation. And the same with the drones for instance.

We

41:35

have mentioned last year in October November well it's a kind of a drone frenzy although we saw drones everywhere and almost all these cases have been explained and there's a website -an a Dutch website- that has it's called drone watch when I'm not doing they they checked all that and they say well we cannot the these are Russia because they have analyzed all these cases. So meaning that we we are really making up something that serves the narrative against Russia. But the consequence of that is that it may not be the way Russia wages war. meaning that we are simply distracting ourselves from the real war and and this is so it looks good from the outside because it's "oh so we are not naive we fight the Russians and we are strong and all that but in reality we are fighting nothing and we are we are just fighting ourselves but we are not improving our ability to fight the Russians

42:54

If there is a war in if there were at one point if there will be I don't know if it would be a war in Europe against Russia but then would be we would be weak not because we don't have weapons and all that but because we are not able to understand how the Russians think their war, how they think the way to wage war. So sorry.

43:18

PL:

No, but this is this is this is brilliant. And you know, this is exactly why this is such an incredibly dumb process because what you're explaining here is that on the one hand you have the Russian Russians with their doctrines, with their way of approaching things. And we've got other people Andre Martinov, Scott Ritter who also point out look they work like this and they they have like very very u elaborate doctrines and and systems within which this is the Russian Russians. And then you have the European Russians, the Europeans who who portray the Russians as doing this one which is completely different from how they are actually are. And then we we focus all of the attention on how to fight that imaginary Russian, not real Russian. And anyone who tells us that, oh, this is wrong, by the way, we put them under sanctions.

44:07

You are one of the people who can help to actually rectify the analysis and tell them, look, the real threat of the Russians is actually A, B, C. But those parts are now being taken out because they don't they they do not coincide anymore with the European way of wanting to see the Russians which then means that we're setting ourselves up even if it comes to a war to utter failure. It's and it is such a process of stupidity of actually of of narrowing everything down to an ideal instead of narrowing it of of of figuring out what things actually are.

JB:

Exactly. Absolutely right. This is exactly the problem and that's exactly

44:49

by the way what's happening in Ukraine. You know, I have described already in 2022 all the why Ukraine is weak or weaker than than Russia. The weaknesses, better said, and I didn't say why it was weaker. I just explained the weaknesses of Ukraine. because the the at war you don't need obviously it's better when you have more tanks than the other. It's better when you have more aircraft than the other and all that. But doesn't mean that you you can in fact win a war with less equipment than the other, provided you understand how your enemy functions and you can understand how to bypass its own strategy and things like this. But for that you have to understand perfectly what they are doing. And in what we what we have done with Ukraine because we tried to impose Ukraine a certain understanding of the war which is not related to the reality and many times the Ukrainians have complained -and I mentioned that in my books- they've complained many times that they are not prepared for the right war that the soldiers that were trained in France, Germany, UK were not prepared for the kind of war which is fought in Ukraine because it was they were trained by probably very nice officers and trainers and all that but people who had a completely different battle experience. As a result, those Ukrainians came back to Ukraine and said, "Well, we were not trained for the right battle, for the right fighting."

46:35

All the all the the the things that when we provided weapons and all that, we

46:40

never thought about the problems it poses to Ukraine and and we have in fact increased. We have provided a lot of weapons, a lot of money, a lot of training. All that is correct. But with no with with no also understanding of how everything we provided could be more effective. And in fact we provide a lot of think but they're not effective as they could be as they should be because we we failed to understand how all that works together. You know the the essence of warfare is not is not the kind of weapon you have is how you use those weapons together. You know I always take the example that the tank was invented in World War I. The aircraft was invented in World War I. Machine gun and all that were invented in World War I. But in World War I was no let's say a major impact on the battlefield. It influenced the battlefield but not major in a major way. What happened during World War II? The German realized that you can use and combine those different tools, those different weapons into one system. This is exactly what you call the Blitzkrieg. And that's exactly why the Germans were effective especially in the first part of the World War II because they managed to put everything together to combine them into one system. not in different you you didn't use tanks here and aircraft there and thing like. No everything was combined into one system under the same command and control system and that gave the efficiency of the whole thing that's why the Germans could defeat the the the French even if they had less tanks than the the the French they are even worse tanks than the French. The French had much better tanks than the Germans but those tanks were used as they were used during World War I, but Germans managed to put that together and combine artillery, tank, infantry, aircraft, and all that into one thing. And that's exactly what we are witnessing in in Ukraine. The Russians have been extremely they've learned from the lessons of World War II especially and they managed to have to make of the armored forces one system and that system works as a body. I mean your left hand or your right hand all that works in a coordinated way. Even if you have a different my right hand is not my left hand but they can work together into one system. That's exactly how the the the Russians have made the army. Because we supported the Ukrainian

49:42

once with a couple of tanks here, once a couple of machine guns there, a couple of missile here and there and all that. the the the Ukraine have never managed to bring all these this support into one system. And and you you may probably remember that when the French proposed to the Ukrainians to provide Mirage 2000, which is one of the best aircraft that the French have. I mean they obviously have the Rafale but Mirage hasn't is excellent aircraft as well but what happened? What did the Ukrainian the the spokesman of the Ukrainian air force he said we don't want those aircraft they will complicate us our life you see so it's we we always see the war like kind of a linear thing I have a kind bigger than yours so I'm winning. You know it's not like this, it's not it's not working and that's exactly what I explained. By the way it's also very interesting: When I wrote my book about the art of war I explained all these differences the weakness and strengths from both sides. Nobody took my book and said "oh, let's try to study what are the weaknesses of Ukraine and try to correct that nobody has done that nobody has even tried to to correct those the mistakes we have done nobody tries to make our support to Ukraine more effective. Nobody has done that.

51:18

PL:

It's it's it's it's kind of insane. You know, anyone will understand that if you build an office or if you build an organization and then you tell them you have to have computers and then you just tell them, "Oh, I'll support you here. Have a Mac and have a Windows and have Linux and and use this USBs, they use that", then you will create a chaos. You will create complete chaos. Anyone understands that. But when it comes to military realm, everybody thinks, "Oh, a new fighter jet. Well, their their fighter jets, right? And you know what you're describing to me the the just a moment ago this problem with like how we imagine the enemy to be, it reminds me so much of an 800year-old European novel, Don Quixote. If you if you if you want to fight a giant and then you you you you get the gear and everything and you charge against it, but it turns out that it's a windmill, you're going to you're going to hurt yourself and we're in that process. We are in an 800y old problem.

JB:

It's exactly. I mean you the

52:20

example you have just mentioned is exactly the point is exactly to the point we are we when we talk about Russia we are fighting about fighting windmills is exactly what we are doing because we have defined -I'm not saying I mean I don't know if we will have once a war against Russia and maybe it may be or not - but regardless of whether it might or not If we consider that Russia might be the enemy, then we have to assess it properly. You see, do you you you cannot just imagine that it could be like this or like that. It is like this or it is not. Period. So this is exactly what you said. I mean it's it's very strange but we are in those times. We are in very irrational times in fact and nobody understands, and that's probably also the reason why we need today more censorship, more narrative control and all that because probably intuitively probably not explicitly but implicitly people realize that the our leadership is failing, is not making the right decisions, and as I always said during the cold war and I'm a cold warrior. during the cold war we we we couldn't we didn't private Pravda comes and all that that you could you could buy them very freely in our news outlets in Europe in Bern, in Geneva in Paris. You could they were not they were not banned. Today we need to ban Russian media, and and the communist I always take also the example of the French Communist Party which was extreme had extremely strong ties with the the Soviet Union Communist Party as an example. It was not banned in France was not banned because we were confident that our decision making process that our system was superior. Therefore, we didn't need censorship. Sorry,

54:40

PL:

you're absolutely right. The thing is that the difference to Don Quixote now is that Don Quixote was one man with a delusion and now you have in Europe 400 or so million people that need to share the same delusion because if they don't then they will start arguing about the windmill and start finding other ways around. So you need to create a common mass delusion and that's a shitty process but it's the process we're in.

JB:

Yeah, this I mean

55:08

behind I mean we started this discussion about my sanctions and obviously this this an Erscheinung, the appearance appearance of the problem or what what we but there is something much deeper I think that we need to be concerned about and that affects all countries EU and non-EU that

concerns also Switzerland is the quality of the leadership in general the way we take decisions all that is to me a very source of concern. We have more and more people who take we are our leaders are hip shooters. You see we are no longer people who have thorough thinking analysis before taking decisions. They just decide out of the blue they have to react. It's a Twitter type decision. you know what you received information what's your reaction and within minutes without having heavy thinking analysis and all that you have to react and that's why you have people notably notoriously Emanuel Macron who said one thing on one day and something totally different the next day and all that because we are always in this kind of dynamics that the reaction time is more important than the content of what you say.

PL:

Yes, it is. Yes, it is. And Jacques, look, this is always very very

56:41

valuable your your analysis and your explanations. I am very sorry that you're now in the place that Hanna Ahrend once called, you know, this is horrible moment when the political starts crashing into the personal for for us, you know, who are not sanctioned, these are two levels. For you, it's now one. But thank you for for talking about this and for continuing also the intellectual engagement with what this moment means.

is there anything that you would like to add or any place where you would like people to go to read about this?

57:13

JB:

Well u we are now I mean some friends of mine in Switzerland are building up or establishing a support committee where people will go. I will I'll give you the the the contact: nous sommes Jacques.ch It's now being built up. I'll give you the Oh, that's that's one part of it. Absolutely.

57:31

PL:

We are Nous sommes Jacques. Exactly.

57:37

JB:

And there are some actions that have been and I will keep you posted on this. But beyond this, I would like to thank all of you including yourself by the way because with your website, I mean your program I think you had done you you were instrumental in supporting me. But there are many others also who appear also on your show by the way from time to time who have supported me. But beyond I mean all these are prominent figures but there are a lot of thousands hundreds of thousands of people who expressed their support to me who have who feed me some of them. but I can tell you that it I can hardly get out of my home or my house here without having been being greeted on the sidewalk by someone who supports me. It's it's I I mean I in the recent time I've I've never been outside of my home without being greeted by someone who wants to express his support and that that's that's absolutely fascinating because I before my sanctions that was not the case. I mean obviously I was known but probably not in the in the same way and today I I receive support from everywhere, literally. A lot of people write letters to my publisher, to me emails, SMS, you name it. I just had last week two Swiss guys that I who I didn't know before they they called me and say "well, we want to show our support and they came here to they just departed 4 in the morning from Switzerland. They came here and then went back the same day to Switzerland. So 1,800 kilometers just to provide to bring me some Swiss food, the Swiss specialties, greet me that, this kind of thing. And I have I have literally hundreds of requests of that and that shows two things. first of all that you still have people who have who understand what's going on but also have heart which is also important. and but it it shows also that there is a disconnect between -because the idea of a sanction is to make you invisible, to discard you, to put you out of the society- and you see that is exactly the opposite that happens that I have countless requests for shows, for interviews and all that in alternative media and all that. So meaning that these sanctions do not even reach the objective they might have that people understand that and I they understand more and more that our leadership, the establishment generally speaking, is going beyond where it should and and that is we're going beyond rationality. We are going beyond humanity. We are going beyond the values we tend to advocate. Now Europe I can say the European Union is in fact -and that's a fact- is doing exactly the same that we wanted to fight when we fought against the Warsaw Pact of Soviet Union 30 40 years ago. They do exactly the same thing. It's exactly the same thing that happening now. You take decisions without regards to the law. That's

1:01:25

that's the kind of thing that should be a source of concern for everybody. And therefore all for all who resist to that. And when I said the word resistance, I I have to say I come from part of my family was in the French resistance during World War II. And sometimes when people come and bring me food, they say, "Well, I'm" they feel like resistant like during the World War II is exactly the same feeling. It's very interesting because this is something that is very unexpected. But that's exactly the feeling of some people. They are resistant and to resist -remember that's at the end at the end of World War II- the resistance won and they were the ones who have praised for the who were praised for their courage, for the determination and for the rational approach to the problem. And so we are here in the same situation.

PL:

Yep. Yep. And I see it exactly like that. This is an it's an act of

1:02:27

resistance that's now needed and the more resist the more the higher the chances that it will succeed. So everybody watching thank you very much for the support. Thank you very much for the collective thinking about this and for the collective resistance against what we all know and feel is very negative. Colonel Jacques Baud, thank you for your time today.

JB:

Thank you very much for inviting me. Thank you.

-----  
Version: 19.2.2026

[Address](#) of this page

[Home](#)

[Joachim Gruber](#)