



Gaza and Syria: a Geopolitical Analysis - Interview with Dr. Kevin Barrett



What happened on October 7th has massive implications for the entire world. Find out what Middle East expert Dr. Kevin Barrett has to say about this fateful day. A little more than one year later Assads Syria suddenly falls. Was there a deal behind this? Why did the Syrian army stand down? Find out Dr. Barrett's analysis in this timely interview.

Interviewer: Well, we're very happy and privileged to be here with Dr. Kevin Barrett. He's coming to us from Morocco. Dr. Barrett, thank you so much for coming on.

Barrett: Hey, good to be with you, Dan.

Interviewer: So, could you briefly tell us a little bit about yourself? What's your line of work? What field did you get your doctorate in? And what are you doing in Morocco?

Barrett: Well, it's kind of a long story, so I'll give you the short version. I'm just one of those sort of slightly overeducated Americans. I got into literature after I did my undergraduate work in journalism, discovered that careerism in journalism is really not what Woodward and Bernstein appeared to be at first glance. And so I got interested in literature because that's reading fun stuff. So I got three degrees. Graduate degrees in literature, culminating in a doctorate in African literature with Arabic being my main African language, so -called, and a focus on North Africa and Morocco. And I thought I'd probably be spending the rest of my life teaching things like maybe Arabic language and Islamic studies and North African literature. Then 9 -11 happened, and my first sense, like all of my colleagues, was, yeah, this is awfully convenient. This is awfully convenient for the Israelis, but we'll probably never really know what happened. And so I was just finishing my PhD at that time. And then a couple of years later, at the end of 2003, I heard David Ray Griffin was writing a book that would be called The New Pearl Harbor about 9 -11. So I had tremendous respect for Dr. Griffin. I looked into that and was shocked at how obvious it was that we had been lied to about 9 -11. That the buildings in New York had obviously been blown up. They didn't just fall down from plane crashes. And whatever happened with the planes on 9 -11, it was certainly not anything done by human hijackers. And indeed, the guys they blamed were obviously not on the planes. So that shook me up a bit, and I got involved in the academic wing of the 9 -11 Truth Movement. That led to my being selected as the whipping boy for Scholars for 9 -11 Truth in spring 2007. I was ambushed by a talk radio host in Wisconsin, and then they sprang a publicity bomb on me the next morning. Next thing I knew, I was on Fox News being attacked by Sean Hannity and Bill O' Reilly and people like that. And my 15 minutes of fame stretched out to about six months from July through December of 2006. And since then, I've been basically unemployable in the Western Academy. But quite employable in the alternative journalism, publishing, and commentary world.

Interviewer: When you say you were selected, were you selected by your side? Like, hey, you're the guy that's going to take the heat?

Barrett: Hardly. No, I think I was selected by people like Karl Rove and Lynn Chaney. Lynn Chaney was the head of a group called ACTA, which was basically a sort of thought police group that would police the Academy. And so they came after me. With a lot of backing from various funders. I noticed early on that Zionists were coming after me, even though I wasn't saying much about Israel or Zionism. I was really blaming 9 -11 on Bush and Cheney and Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz. And, you know, and that got me curious about the Zionist connection. And I ended up concluding that 9 -11 was, in fact, done primarily by the state of Israel and its American agents. I didn't realize that during the first few years.

Interviewer: You know, that's interesting. It's almost like. It's one of those. Why doth thou protest so much?

Barrett: They protested way too much.

Interviewer: I haven't even gone there yet. So what. But thank you. Right.

Barrett: Yeah.

Interviewer: I'm broadcasting here from Montana. Have you ever given a speech here at the University of Montana by chance?

Barrett: Yes, I actually did. And I forget which year precisely that was, but I think it might have been sort of 2009 ish or something like that. Maybe.

Interviewer: OK, because it's Saturday morning right here and we have a Saturday morning group at at my church, a bunch of men get together and talk about current events and so forth, have a Bible study and one of the guys in our group, actually, the guy that does a lot of my tech work, he says, when I mentioned to everybody, I'm going to be interviewing Dr. Barrett, he says, Kevin Barrett. I said, yeah, he says, I went and listened to him at the right up here in Missoula at the University of Montana. And then I bought his books. He's great.

Barrett: Well, that's very kind of him. Yeah. Well, yeah. Right.

Interviewer: So before we get into the Middle East and the wars and all that. Can you tell us a little bit about being canceled? I understand that you were sort of in a way canceled on Substack. What what exactly happened?

Barrett: Right. That's just my latest cancellation. I've got such a long list of cancellations. I can hardly keep track of them. But, yeah, this most recent one from a month ago involved Stripe, which is Substack's only payment processor. So if you want to get paid through Substack, you have to use Stripe. And that's a weakness of Substack, which, of course, is ostensibly devoted to free speech. But with a payment processor that's not devoted to free speech, it kind of doesn't work out so well for people like me. And, yeah, so Stripe just canceled me. They've stolen 7700 dollars or something like that, which they refuse to pay out. And so ultimately, you know, I'm going to have to do. And eventually I'm probably going

to have to tell people to charge back Stripe and all this kind of stuff. And it eats up a lot of time. And every time I get canceled, it's a big pain. But it also makes me angry. And so they're not going to stop me by canceling me. And I've already been canceled by YouTube, by Facebook, deleted my main account. YouTube deleted my main account. Patreon canceled me for political reasons. And all of this is coming from the Zionists. And these are the people who started attacking me when I said Bush and Cheney were involved with 9 -11. And, you know, why do the Zionists hate me so much? Well, I don't think they wanted a close look at what really happened on 9 -11. And once I figured out that they were involved, that made it even worse. And so I really kind of feel like I've gone up against this monster money machine with a lot of power. But, you know, they if they're just going to deplatform me, at least they didn't shoot me.

Interviewer: Yeah, I mean, boy, do I hate paperwork and boy, do I hate dealing with conflicts like that. And I feel for you have to go through all that stuff. I can't imagine being deplatformed the way you have been and demonetized. But at least you can take heart. You know what they say that if you're not causing your enemies to hate you in some way, then maybe there's something wrong with your approach.

Barrett: Yeah, if you're if you're getting flack, you're over the target. And I guess I must be over the target because, yeah, I've been like attacked by the president of France and his biggest his think tank. And I've, you know, I've been attacked by this long list of people. And of course, I've collected this huge collection of ADL fatwas against me. The ADL has attacked me so many times I can't keep track of all of them. So it's and it's funny because I'm not really pro Nazi or anything like that. Yeah, usually they go after conservatives. I'm not even really a conservative. I think it's just I'm very strongly opposed to this Zionist genocide of Palestine. And I'm appalled at the way Israel has terrorized and taken over the United States of America. You know, it's not just the genocide of Palestine, but it's the takeover of the United States that offends me. And I'm not shy about pushing back against it verbally. And they don't want that.

Interviewer: Yep. Yep. I would say they're they're attacking you because you're effective. Let's get to war in the Middle East, our main topic. And of course, I want to talk about both Gaza and Syria. But let's let's start with Gaza. You've called I think I heard you call in a different interview, Trump genocide Don. So could you back up that thinking? Is it a genocide what's going on in Gaza?

Barrett: Well, if this isn't a genocide, then the word genocide doesn't really have any meaning. You know,

Interviewer: What does it mean? Can you define it?

Barrett: Right. I mean, the international law definition of genocide is the attempt to eradicate a people. And that doesn't necessarily have to be through mass murder. There are a long list of things that would be: making life unlivable for people to get rid of them, attacking their sort of sacred symbols and so on and destroying and desecrating their sacred symbols. And there's this long list of things that can be done to attempt to destroy a people. And so the this genocide of Palestine has been going on for, well there's been an intended planned genocide of Palestine for more than a century. The early Zionist founders are on the record. They didn't broadcast it all the time, but they did make enough remarks that got on the record that

we know that they knew that they were going to have to get rid of the people who were living in the Holy Land if they were going to realize their dream of a Jewish state there. So they were planning genocide all along for more than a century, according to the International law definition. Now, what's going on today in Gaza is really worse than genocide. It's just unbelievable, just live streamed, deliberate butchering of civilians in horrific ways. That is, they're deliberately bombing civilian housing units to bring down the vast amounts of rubble on the heads of these women and children. The ratio of civilians to military fighters that the Zionists are killing is somewhere not that far from, like, about 100 to one. You can argue a little bit about it, but it's in that neighborhood. So clearly they're not deliberately fighting a war against warriors. What they're doing is exterminating, murdering a civilian population. And in 1948, they did something like this. They would go to villages and then, you know, rape and then bayonet people, raping and murdering people. Focusing on women and children, doing it in a really horrific way, allowing a few survivors to spread the tale. And then they would go around to other villages and neighborhoods with sound trucks, vaunting what they did, to terrorize people into fleeing before they met the same fate. And in that way, they were able to send more than three quarters of a million Palestinians fleeing into exile while being strafed from the air as they went. Many of them didn't arrive. It's still disputed how many people were murdered in that genocide in 1948. And since then, there's been a slow motion genocide. The Zionists have been trying to terrorize the Palestinian population into leaving by making their lives unlivable. The vast majority of the population they did force into refugee camps and other forms of refugee status. And now today, what they're doing to Gaza, well, , they've destroyed most of the infrastructure, most of the buildings. They've deliberately blown up hospitals full of patients and doctors. They've deliberately been targeting the journalists. They've murdered maybe 170 journalists so far. Most recently, there was, I forget her name, a female journalist was just murdered with her entire, her kids, her little kids. And, you know, they're not even shy about bragging about it. And so this is the best documented genocide in history. And there are many thousands of war crimes that they have posted online and that are now documented. And we have the faces. And with facial recognition technology these war crimes perpetrators, genocide perpetrators are going to be tracked down, from now until the end of their lives. But in the meantime, it's still happening. And nobody can stop it because the United States government is paying for it and supporting it. The rest of the world is strongly opposed to it. But the United States has been captured by wealthy Jewish Zionists who are the strongest force among the oligarchy that runs the United States. And they're all pro-genocide. And so there we are. It's an unbelievable situation.

Interviewer: Is it, if not spoken openly, is it at least understood tacit Israeli policy to take over all the lands belonging to the Palestinians, all the property belonging to the Palestinians, boot them out, and make the whole place Israel?

Barrett: Yeah. And by the whole place. You know, we're not just talking about the current borders of Israel. Whatever those borders are. We don't know what they are. Israel refuses to define its borders.

Interviewer: Well, I've seen that patch on the side of the uniform.

Barrett: Oh, which one is that?

Interviewer: Well, I think it's Eretz Israel. It's the one that goes from the Mediterranean and maybe even part of Egypt. I don't know. All the way over to the Euphrates, basically.

Barrett: Yeah. The Nile to the Euphrates. Right. Yeah. That's actually the real goal of Zionism. And the thing about Zionism is that we're told that it's a secular nationalist project that was launched by Theodor Herzl at the end of the 19th century. And that Israel is a democratic nationalist state like the European countries. But actually, Israel is the product of a project that goes back arguably a thousand years, but certainly 500 years. And it's an expression of messianic millenarian Jewish thought. You could argue that it's heretical. That is, you could say that mainstream Jews ought to be opposed to it. And it's satanic and all of that. But the fact is that Zionism developed from a long series of rabbis who increasingly agreed that the Jewish people should take the return to the Holy Land into their own hands. Rebel against God. Instead of waiting for God to make it happen, they were supposed to go out and fight God, fight God's will, commit abominations in the Holy Land, and essentially, you know, be their own messiah.

Interviewer: I have to ask you, I was listening to a podcast the other day. And a guy made the claim that the Saudi royal family has some historical connection to these thousand-year-old Jews you're talking about. And I often wonder why is it that you have opposition to the state of Israel in a number of Arab states and Iran. And yet they get along so well with Saudi Arabia, it seems and the Gulf oil states. Do you have any comment on that?

Barrett: Yeah, I think that picture is a little oversimplified. But it's not entirely false. There have been kings of Saudi Arabia who were opposed to Zionism. Certainly the people of what's called Saudi Arabia are opposed to Zionism. But it's true that the Ibn Saud family has a very checkered history. You know, that dynasty began as a group of warlords and bandits who preyed on Muslim pilgrims going to Mecca. And so that was their business, was basically killing and robbing pilgrims.

Interviewer: Highwaymen.

Barrett: Yeah, they were highwaymen. They made so much money at it that they became a force to be reckoned with. And then they made a deal with the Wahhabi sect, which is a radical Islamic sect that believes that they have a monopoly on the correct interpretation of God's word. And that everybody else is a damnable heretic who should be killed. And that includes all other Muslims except themselves, meaning 99.999% of the Muslim population. So these extremists were then weaponized by the British Empire and later the Americans against the region and against Muslims. And so that's the background of why the bandit family of Ibn Saud and these Wahhabi extremists have played such a nefarious role.

Interviewer: Okay, very interesting history.

Now. You've made a pretty good case for the fact that what's going on is a genocide. But I still, I'd like you to defend this moniker you've given Donald Trump as Genocide Don. Can we really place so much blame on him? Is he somehow at least partially or in large part responsible for what's going on? Why Genocide Don?

Barrett: Yeah. Well, we've been calling Biden Genocide Joe with good reason. Joe Biden has been supplying the Zionists with the weapons they're using to commit genocide. So Donald Trump, unless he radically changes his stripes, which would be extremely wonderful but extremely unlikely, is as bad or worse than Biden. I would argue worse. It's actually Trump who set the stage for this genocide. If Hillary Clinton had won in 2016, I don't believe this

genocide would have happened. Because the reason that it happened was that Trump, who was bought and paid for by the most crazy extremist wing of the satanical messianic millenarian extremists in Israel, made a deal with those people in the summer of 2016 that they would put him in the White House if he promised them Jerusalem. If he would give the American seal of approval to Israel calling Jerusalem its capital. And also various other things. The approval to Israel stealing the Golan Heights, which the whole world says belongs to Syria, etc. , etc. And then he also promised to strong-arm various countries in the region to try to push through the so-called Abraham Accords, which really should be called the Shaitan Accords or the Satan Accords. Because what that was, was essentially a way of humiliating the leaders of certain countries in the region and sort of using American leverage to force them to basically endorse this ongoing genocide and this ongoing desecration of Christian and Islamic holy sites in the Holy Land. And so the Zionists hijacked the Americans, or hijacked the Trump regime. The Trump regime basically strong-armed them and said, you guys need to do this, and then we'll support you with our money. And in the case of Morocco, where I live today, the Moroccan government was told that the only way that we're going to approve of your territorial integrity over your Sahara region, is if you go along with these so-called Abraham Accords. And so the Moroccan government, which its number one priority is maintaining its territorial integrity, needs to have the U. S. on its side. And so they went along with it. And similar pressure was applied elsewhere. And that's where you got the UAE, Morocco, etc. , signing on to this ridiculous approval of Zionist genocide. And that situation threatened the Palestinians with the regional leaders being complicit in their extermination. At that point, the Palestinians had no choice but to do something like October 7th, or even bigger. And then that, of course, played into the hands of Trump's supporters in Israel, Netanyahu and those people, who then used that as a pretext for massively accelerating their genocide.

Now, if Hillary Clinton had been in office, or any other normal American leader, there is no way that any American leader would have ever endorsed this ridiculous Israeli claim to Jerusalem. That's been off the table for everybody in the entire world since 1967. The whole world agrees that every square inch that Israel stole in its war of aggression in 1967 has to be given back. That's the basis of any conceivable peace. And by breaking with that, Trump set the stage for Armageddon. And we're witnessing the fruits of it now, and probably just we're getting a tiny, tiny bit of what's coming.

Interviewer: Speaking of what's coming, we can make some inferences on what might be coming based on Trump's picks for his administration, for the cabinet, etc. Do you have any comment on those?

Barrett: Yeah, you really can't exaggerate how crazy these picks are. I mean, every single one of them is the most radical Zionist extremist totally sworn to defend the interests not just of the State of Israel, not America, but the most radical, fanatical, pro-Antichrist wing in Israel. I mean, these are all slaves of the Antichrist. Every single appointment of his, with a possible exception of Tulsi Gabbard, basically needs to be described as a slave of the Antichrist. Because the Zionist project is Project Antichrist. Again, the whole point is to put a Jewish military conqueror [Editors comment on „Jewish“ Military Conqueror: Evil people with nefarious plans against humanity have strategically built up a shield for their own legal protection by affiliating with the Jews in general by calling themselves Jews. Many Jews now are hostages to these satanists. These satanists cause public outcry against their evil deeds to be blamed on Jews as entirety. Such a military conqueror will not represent many sincere Jews, much rather he will represent Satan and his death cult. Also see Rev. 3,9] on the

throne in Jerusalem to rule over the world. That's the Antichrist. And so these millenarian messianic Zionists are working on bringing on the Antichrist. And Trump and the rest of the people, all these people he's appointed, are totally on board with that. They are slaves of the Antichrist.

Interviewer: In the same way that 9 -11 was the kickoff for this gigantic, decades -long, expensive, quote, war on terror, could we say that October 7th is the kickoff for the taking over of Gaza and the larger projects Israel has?

Barrett: Absolutely, yeah. That was the excuse. Now, I think there's a difference between the two events in that 9 -11 was attributed to so -called Al-Qaeda. But there isn't really such a thing as an independent Al-Qaeda. And to the extent there is any such thing as Al -Qaeda at all, it had absolutely nothing to do with what happened in New York and Washington in 2001. I mean, that was purely the Israelis that blew up those buildings. And they and their American agents played games with the planes and attacked the Pentagon. So there were no Muslims involved in 9 -11 whatsoever, in any capacity except as patsies.

Interviewer: Would you say it was a combination Mossad -CIA operation?

Barrett: Yeah, but it was the Mossad -owned branch of the CIA that did it, just like with the Kennedy assassination. You know, Angleton was the guy, the main guy in the Kennedy assassination. He was Israel's man in the CIA. So in both cases, you have these people controlled by the Zionist Antichrist in our agencies who facilitate these things. But October 7th was not like that. October 7th was a real raid by the Palestinians, or by Hamas. And it has been grossly misportrayed in the Western media as some kind of horrible, dastardly mass slaughter of innocent people, which it was not. Unlike 9 -11, which was a random slaughter of mostly civilians, like those office workers in the trade towers, really hadn't done anything to deserve that. But this raid, by Hamas on October 7th, 2023, was a very reasonable and moderate kind of response to the genocide that they have been experiencing.

There have been ongoing peaceful protests in Palestine for decades that don't get covered by our Zionist-owned media. And, you know, the Great March of Return continued for over a year as people in Gaza peacefully protested at the apartheid wall that prevents them from going and reclaiming the property that the Zionists stole from them. So they gathered at this wall and, you know, demanded the right to return to their land and get back their property. And the Zionists responded by shooting them down and murdering them. They murdered, I forget how many, dozens or hundreds, and they maimed thousands of unarmed protesters, a great many of them underage. So that's how Israel responds to peaceful protest. They don't get the message.

So that raid on October 7th was completely justified. In fact, something a thousand times bigger would have been completely justified. And it was an attack on Israeli military sites. It was not an attack on civilians. The orders were to take military, number one priority is to attack military sites and take military hostages. Then the fallback was that if, you know, if all else fails, you can grab civilian hostages too. But that wasn't the main goal. And there were no orders whatsoever to harm civilians other than taking them hostage as a fallback.

Interviewer: What about the people who are still claiming that there were rapes, beheadings, et cetera?

Barrett: Liars. Just the most, you know, the Zionists are the world's biggest liars. They lie about everything. They lie like they breathe. And if you do the dig deep on this, you know, dig deep and look into the people who actually investigated it. You know, people like Max Blumenthal, right? The Jewish-American, son of Sid Blumenthal, a very powerful, high - ranking, connected American Jew, close friend of Hillary Clinton and so on. Well, Max Blumenthal, his son, has done a lot of investigative work about what really happened on October 7th. And all of this nonsense about beheaded babies and babies in ovens, it's like the incubator baby story that paved the road to the Gulf War. It's lies, it's just disgusting. Because, in fact, Hamas people that did the raid on October 7th were really about the most moral military force that has ever been witnessed in human history. There's not one shred of evidence that Hamas systematically tried to do anything that could be considered a war crime. And the Israelis have been sitting on thousands, thousands of minutes or whatever of imagery from these cameras. Every Hamas member who participated in this raid on October 7th had a camera on them that filmed everything they did. And huge numbers of them were killed, and the cameras ended up in the hands of the Israelis. And the Israelis have not produced virtually any evidence whatsoever of any documentation of any war crimes committed by these guys whose cameras they ended up with. Because there weren't any. Because Hamas is a very pious and religious outfit that is under very strict orders not to perform war crimes.

So to the extent that there were any war crimes, and there probably were, there were either ad hoc situations where there's a fire and the Hamas guys at the fire, they're fighting with guards at the music festival, and they fire wildly and they kill some civilians. So there probably were a few Hamas war crimes like that, even though the Zionists have not documented any that I've seen.

But there were also, non-Hamas people, just random Palestinians, who when the wall was breached, and these people have been losing their loved ones forever. And some of them are very angry. And so some of those people came, got armed, and went through that fence and went and got revenge. So there probably were some war crimes like that. But they weren't really war crimes. They weren't Hamas people. They were just random, angry Palestinians coming in and opportunistically attacking Israelis. So there were some things like that.

But basically, this was a military raid by very, very strict, pious, really good moral people performing a military raid. Scott Ritter has called it the most effective military raid of the century. They won stand-up battles with Israel's best units, defeated them at key military points in the Gaza area. And they got back to Gaza with a bunch of military captives as well as civilians. And if you want to say they shouldn't have taken civilian hostages, okay.

But given that these people are suffering a genocide, to me, what they did on October 7th was like, like I said, like one one-thousandth of what they had every right to do.

Interviewer: Do you think Israel had foreknowledge of the attack?

Barrett: Very likely. Somebody did. I mean, not everybody at Israel. But I think it's quite possible or likely that the faction that was aligned with Netanyahu's goal of working to create greater Israel by starting a big war, getting their revenge against Hezbollah for 2006, trying to take down the Iranian threat and then grab more land en route to greater Israel. There's a wing of people in Israel with that mentality. And I think they might very well, some of those people might very well have had advance word that this was coming and deliberately wanted it to happen and allowed it to happen and then murdered their own people.

Most of the civilians murdered on October 7th were murdered by the Israeli Defense Forces. They came in with Hannibal directive orders to kill both hostages and hostage takers. And so they fired indiscriminately from helicopter gunships. Tanks destroyed that kibbutz. That kibbutz that they showed you, oh, look at this destroyed kibbutz. It's all Hamas's fault. The kibbutz was destroyed by tank fire. You can tell that the light weapons that Hamas carried couldn't have done that damage. So most of those civilians killed on October 7th were murdered by Benjamin Netanyahu and his Israeli Defense Forces, as Max Blumenthal has shown.

Interviewer: Right. Certainly those cars, there was hundreds of cars that were lined up at that open air concert. That seemed to be something pretty high tech there.

Barrett: Yeah, that was helicopter gunships.

Interviewer: Right. Well, let's move on now. Let's move on to Syria, occupying everybody's interest right now. What happened? Why did all of this happen? Why did it happen so fast? How did Damascus fall so quickly, Dr. Barrett?

Barrett: You know, I hate to keep saying the same phrase, but it's an inside job.

Interviewer: Including Assad?

Barrett: You know, I think Russia basically was right up toe -to -toe with the U. S. As Dr. Strangelove put it: „We're toe -to -toe with the Ruskies.“ And, you know, we're like that far from World War III, nuclear World War III. And the Americans are firing these ATACMS missiles deep into Russia. And Russia says, you know, we view this as a direct attack by the United States. And we have the right to respond against the continental United States. So the situation is just very, very, very close to nuclear Armageddon. And I think that a deal was struck that as the Trump administration comes in and is willing to negotiate, for, giving Russia a big piece of what used to be Ukraine, I think that Russia has essentially told the Americans, well, you guys can have Syria. And I think that Turkey was involved in this as well. And Iran, I think, the leadership in Iran's probably split on this. Some of the Iranians wanted to defend the Assad government. And I think that the dominant faction chose to go along with the writing on the wall. So, yeah, I think it's obvious that the Syrian military people had orders to just disperse and not, you know, the Syrian army grossly outnumbered these Al -Qaeda people that just took over. And the Syrian army just melted away because the orders were not to do anything.

Interviewer: So who is in charge now in Syria? Or is anybody in charge? And to what extent are they, are they secretly Western friendly, Israeli friendly?

Barrett: You know, that's a great question. And I don't really even know the answer completely. I have my suspicions, though. I think that Joulani, who is the ostensible face of this new Syrian regime, his background is pretty amusing, right? He was the second in command of ISIS or Daesh under al -Baghdadi. And then he resigned from ISIS and joined Al-Qaeda. And at some point he then resigned from Al-Qaeda and formed his own version, his own Islamic militia, and has apparently mended fences to some extent with the Americans and the Zionists who hated Assad more, wanted to destabilize Syria. So they supported him to do that. But I think Turkey has played a big role. Turkey supported him. And

there are rumors that maybe Turkey sort of jumped the gun and that this wasn't really supposed to happen this fast. But the Turks decided to go ahead and make it happen. And the Americans may have been somewhat caught off guard. Maybe everybody, but the Turks got caught off guard. I don't think, though, that this new regime in Syria is, number one capable of uniting Syria and stabilizing it. And number two, I don't think that it's a reliable partner really for anybody. Certainly not for the Americans and the Zionists. Maybe for the Turks. There are reports that Jolani was just seen driving around Damascus as the chauffeur of the head of Turkish intelligence, which tells you who's really in charge.

And I think that ultimately this situation might backfire in the Zionists' faces because Assad was a very divisive influence. There's a big chunk, maybe a majority of Syria's population doesn't like Assad. And now that he's gone, who's everybody going to turn against? Who are they going to hate? Well, they're going to hate Israel. Israel just invaded Syria, stole even more of its territory. So right now, the Iranian friends, Hezbollah, the remnants of the old regime, and the new so-called Al-Qaeda people, backed by the Turks, all those people really hate Israel. And Jolani's people are saying, we're going on to Jerusalem. And they certainly would if they could, I think. So yeah, I don't think that they're secretly really controlled by the Zionists. I think they were used by the Zionists. But I think the Zionists may wind up wishing that they had never supported this whole project. They would have been better off just dealing with Assad.

Interviewer: Let me ask you a historical question. We know Syria is an ancient, ancient, thousands-of-year-old civilization. But is modern Syria something that was cobbled together by the British Empire in the same way that Iraq was? Are the borders of Syria something that go back way back into antiquity? Or is it more of a modern thing?

Barrett: Yeah, that's a great question. And actually, today's Syria is just one piece of what historically has been called Shem. And so that's why this Al -Qaeda movement that just took over in Syria is the Tahrir al -Shem, the liberation of Shem. So Shem is the old name for Syria. And it's Greater Syria, meaning basically that whole region. So Shem, which is the historical region, includes Lebanon, what's called Israel today, or occupied Palestine, Jordan and Syria, maybe a little bit of Turkey, a little bit of Iraq. That whole area is called Shem. And it was broken up, of course, after World War I. And the British took Saudi Arabia and what became Jordan. And Palestine, of course. And the French took Syria and Lebanon and broke them into their little statelets. So most of those people would like to reunite, I think. And certainly most of the world's Muslims look forward to reuniting as one super Islamic nation and getting over this whole Sykes-Picot issue of being broken into little countries.

Interviewer: And is Shem the origin of the word Semite?

Barrett: Yeah, I think they have this common origin. That's right.

Interviewer: Do you see a breakup of what is modern Syria into different states with different interests and different alliances?

Barrett: Yeah, I think it'll be like that for a while. When they busted up Libya, it's the same thing, right? You get different factions and warlords and so on. You get chaos. So I think there will be chaos there for quite some time. But that chaos, it'll give Netanyahu his excuse to steal Syrian territory and hold it. But it'll also provide opportunities for a sort of Hezbollah-like movement to grow up in Syria dedicated to recovering the Syrian territories that Israel

has stolen. And that Hezbollah movement in Syria will not be just Shiites like it was in Lebanon. This is going to be everybody in Syria is going to be dedicated to recovering those territories and ultimately liberating Palestine.

Interviewer: What you just mentioned about trouble around Israel, this seems like a classic problem -reaction -solution situation. If you have stable governments surrounding Israel, you don't have an excuse to go into those lands. Destabilize them. When they become unstable, complain that they're destabilized, then go in. Is that the Netanyahu plan?

Barrett: Yeah, exactly. Even the Americans who are on board with Netanyahu are talking out of both sides of their mouth. On the one hand, they say, Oh, Jolani is reformed. He resigned from ISIS. He resigned from Al-Qaeda. He's a diversity-friendly jihadi now. He's probably going to put on transgender spectacles in Damascus. And then at the same time, they're saying, Oh, but he's still a radical jihadi. Therefore, we need to stay in Syria. The US has to keep occupying Syria's best agricultural land and its oil land. And Israel has to occupy more of Syria too. So they're trying to have it both ways, that this new leader is actually okay, but he's such a dangerous jihadi that we have to keep stealing Syrian land.

Interviewer: Do you think that. . . Well, could we say that this guy that gasses his own citizens was actually a protector of Christians in the region? And should we be worried about the fate of Christians right now because of Assad's ouster?

Barrett: Absolutely, yeah. The thing about these Al -Qaeda and ISIS-type so-called Muslims, like this new regime, is that they come out of that tradition I mentioned, that Wahhabi-type tradition of people who are really high on their own supply. It's my way of a highway, right? And they're way too quick to use contempt and force against people that they disagree with. And so they have a terrible record, ISIS in particular, of butchering people and doing terrible things to minority communities, whether Christians or Yazidis or Muslims, the vast majority of Muslims, that they don't like. And so that's a potential problem. I mean, this guy, he claims. . . Jolani claims that he's reformed and now he's a pro -diversity Al -Qaeda, ISIS guy. But, you know, I'll believe that when I see it.

Interviewer: What about the idea that Assad's father, let's see, Hafez al -Assad, what about the idea that his father was an iron-fisted ruler and that's what you needed, kind of like Saddam Hussein in Iraq, to control this diverse population in Syria, and Assad was just too much of a milk toast. He was too much of a British-educated, soft-spoken ophthalmologist and secular, basically. And he just didn't have the character to rally the country behind a more, I don't know, religious movement to defend the country.

Barrett: Well, yeah, I would hate to say that what was needed was a brutal dictator like Hafez al -Assad. Because, you know, that is the kind of thinking that has led to the situation where half the country or more really hates the Assad dynasty. And, you know, so what would have been needed would be somebody who could somehow unify the country in a way that's principled but also pragmatic enough to survive, which is a tough task. Because, you know, like Hezbollah is ostensibly based on a Shia interpretation of religion, and the Shia communities are the backbone of Hezbollah. But Hezbollah has been very, very good at working with other groups and respecting the rights of other religious groups. And I think, you know, the kind of leadership that could have survived in Syria would have involved a group

like that. Not necessarily from the Shia side, though. But, the thing is that the Ba' ath Party ideology that was the, you know, under the foundation of the Assad regimes has really worn itself out. It's the secular Arab nationalism that says, hey, we're all Arabs, Christian, Muslim, whatever. We're all nationalist Arabs. We want to create an Arab nation. And we want to, of course, we want to support the Palestinians, which is good. But that ideology never really kicked in. Like most people don't really think of themselves as Arabs. And the brutal leadership of these Ba' ath governments didn't really do their cause any favors. So I think it was doomed. You know, I think that in the long run, trying to rule a country where the majority of people really hate your family's dynasty is kind of a fool's errand. And, you know, not that there was any obvious good alternative. It's a tragic situation. If the Zionists weren't there causing trouble and creating all these wars, things might have evolved differently in a much better direction. But the Zionists are there. They're the spear in the side or the thorn in the side of the region. And there's going to be chaos until that thorn is removed.

Interview: Okay. I want to finish up with Syria now. And I want to deal again with the issue of a deal with Putin and Assad leaving the country, going to Russia. And humor me. I'm going to tell you my conspiracy theory. And I want to see what you think about it. So if it's true that Putin would be given this section, the Donbas, whatever, the regions in eastern Ukraine in exchange for a hands -off in the Middle East and we get Assad out of there. What about this possibility that all the powers that be are in on this and Trump gets into office and since Putin signed his deal, since the deal was signed on Syria, Trump steps in and makes good on this promise of ending the war in Ukraine. And then let's say the war in Syria goes down. And let's say he does a few other things, say, domestically to improve the economy, whatever. And then he can claim to be the golden king ushering in the new age. And Zionist Christians are going to look at me and say, see, I told you so. You were wrong about Trump. And then he'll have the legitimacy to really do what his backers want him to do. What do you think about that conspiracy?

Barrett: Well, that sounds like what my friend Ralph, who's a big Trump supporter, might put forward as a possibility. I mean, I kind of hope you guys are right. That wouldn't be the worst of all worlds, that's for sure. And there are definitely some positive things about the Trump phenomenon. And the fact that he's putting people like Tulsi Gabbard and RFK Jr. in significant positions speaks well of him. I mean, you could do worse than that, I guess. But I would be kind of surprised if it plays out that well. Because Trump, just like in 2016, Trump is being installed in the White House by the most extreme wing of the anti-Christ Party. And he signed off on, well, we're told he agreed with Mariam Adelson to take that \$100 million and in return to recognize Israel's annexation of the West Bank, including all of Jerusalem. And that's a non-starter with the whole region, with two billion Muslims around the world, and with all the Christians who are really Christians. So I have a hard time. It looks to me more like the anti-Christ wing is going to use Trump to create a bigger war in the region, maybe attack Iran. You know, I don't see how there could be anything but chaos in Syria. And I don't see how there could be anything but a united anti-Israel militancy given this genocide. And now that Assad's gone, the whole region is going to unite against this genocide. And then Trump is an enthusiastic supporter of that genocide. So I don't see how that could possibly resolve well. But if Trump were able to break his ties with the party of anti-Christ and tell the Israelis, OK, you've had your fun. Now pull back to those 1967 lines like you promised you would, back at Camp David and allow for that rump Palestinian state that you guys promised you would allow in the early 90s. Give back the Golan Heights and everything in Syria. You know, give Lebanon back the part of Lebanon that you stole. And accept the peace that everybody

in the region will give you if you do that. If Trump could actually say that, then yeah, then he could prevent this huge war that I see erupting in that region. But I don't see that. And then secondly, there's China. Trump's people are pretty anti-China. I'm convinced that Trump's administration attacked China as well as Iran with COVID, which is where COVID came from. And I wouldn't be surprised if there are more attacks on China, although maybe they learned their lesson and they won't do another biological attack like COVID. But yeah, I think the good things about Trump are kind of superficial things because he's basically a wolf in sheep's clothing, whether he knows it or not. And his role is to basically be controlled opposition. And so I hope I'm wrong. I hope you and Rolf are right.

Interviewer: Yeah. Okay. Well, you're not real sanguine on Trump becoming the peacemaker in the Middle East. So two questions. Do you think that he's going to do his best? Do you think he's going to get us into a war with Iran? And speaking of China, is China and is Russia, are they going to back Iran and not like drop the ball like they did in Syria? At least Russia and get us into a larger conflict between superpowers, basically.

Barrett: Yeah. I don't know what's going on behind the scenes. I mean, maybe there's some kind of deal being worked out there. You know, maybe Russia has facilitated North Korea giving Iran some battle-ready nuclear weapons. I wouldn't be surprised if that's already happened, which would maybe deter the war. You know, that might be the best thing that could happen would be for, you know, for that kind of deniable way of making sure that Iran is nuclear armed and then, have it be sprung as a surprise so that there can't be some big attack to try to take it out. And at that point, you know, you have to make some kind of a deal. That might be the best way to get a deal.

But it looks to me, though, like Trump has basically been paid off to expand the war against Iran and against everybody else who's standing up against the Zionist genocide, which means the entire region.

Interviewer: Would China risk war with the U. S. in order to keep flowing the oil they need for their economy from Iran?

Barrett: You know, I think China probably could find workarounds. I don't think that getting Iranian oil cut off is going to be an existential issue for China. So, no, I don't think China would go to war with the U. S. over Iran. Although it's always possible that China would use the chaos of a failed U.S. attack on Iran. Or a bogged down, U. S. -Iran war to take back Taiwan, which then might lead to that kind of U. S. -China war.

Interviewer: Well, from my Saturday men's group, one of the questions I got, and I don't know much about it. I don't know if you do, but one of the guys says, ask Dr. Barrett about the drones, all this drone attack going on in New Jersey. And the Iranian mothership, he calls it the mothership motif. Like this will be used as some sort of trigger or catalyst to get us into war with Iran. I don't know what's going on.

Barrett: If this is the best trigger they can come up with to get into war with Iran, they need to go back to the drawing board. You know, the Iranian mothership thing is so hilarious. It's also like, to me, that Trump blaming Iran for assassination attempts and all that sort of thing. I mean, the whole thing has this element of sort of Laurel and Hardy farce. You know, I don't know how closely you've looked at what really happened in Butler, Pennsylvania on July 13th. But to me, it's just overwhelmingly obvious that Trump was never hit by a bullet. And he

lied and said he was and probably popped a blood capsule on his totally undamaged ear. There's not one shred of evidence that his ear sustained any damage at all. And as I see it, that was like the ear nick of the mark of a slave of the Antichrist. That was a ritual to nick Trump and to show that he's the slave of the Zionist Antichrist. As well as a publicity stunt saying, you know, hey, there really are people who would like to kill you, Don. So let's preempt that by, you know, doing this staged production where you get to jump up after you're nicked on the ear and shake your fist at the flag. I mean, that whole thing was so ridiculous. There's no way that the Secret Service would ever allow a former president to jump back up into possible harm's way after he's actually been hit by a bullet. It's ridiculous. I mean, how can people fall for this stuff? And then they put Hulk Hogan on at the convention to basically brag about it and say, hey, this is pro wrestling. And, you know, Donald Trump just did his thing with a blood capsule. It's ridiculous.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's shocking. I was talking to one guy. And as far as he is concerned, the proof that it was legitimate was the fact that innocent people in the background got killed.

Barrett: No, that isn't proof. That's the proof that it's fake. You don't think that they kill people? Give me a break. They didn't kill anybody on 9 -11? I mean, come on.

Interviewer: Right. Yeah. Yeah. Well, Dr. Barrett, this has been great. We're just about up on our hour. But I wonder if there's any last words from you. What can people who are lovers of peace do from this end forward besides just, well, we need to educate ourselves and enlighten ourselves. What is a good M. O. for us peace lovers? Concerning the Middle East, concerning Trump, everything.

Barrett: Yeah, boy. You know, I think, you know, going to war, not necessarily militarily, against the mainstream media is probably still a pretty good strategy. Ron Unz wrote a piece about this years ago saying that, you know, you want to go for the enemy's most vulnerable point that's the center of his power. And these people keep control of the world through imposing their mainstream media narrative on us. And so anything to chip away at that, anything to get people doubting the mainstream narrative is a plus. Now, doing it in such a way, you know, presenting solid interpretations of things rather than ridiculous ones is probably a good idea, too. Because, you know, what the mainstream does is then they fight back against us by putting out all kinds of conspiracy nonsense. So the normal person just sees all of this stuff that's just non-mainstream conspiracy stuff and doesn't know what's true and what isn't true. But so anything that's going to ultimately take down the mainstream media as a source of authority, especially among the better educated and more powerful element of society, is a good thing. So basically, yeah, declare war on the mainstream media. Do everything you can to humiliate it. Yeah. And ultimately disband it.

Interviewer: Very good. Very good. Dr. Barrett, how can people find out more about your work?

Barrett: I'm at, I have a Substack, kevinbarrett, all run together, . substack. com. And then I also have truthjihad. com. That's all run together as well.

Interviewer: Okay. That's B -A -R -R -E -T -T, correct?

Barrett: That's correct. That's right.

Interviewer: Okay. Well, thank you so much for your time with us. It was a pleasure. And I hope we have a chance again someday.

Barrett: Okay. Likewise. Thank you.

from dw.

Sources:

<https://substack.com/@kevinbarrett>

This may interest you as well:

Kla.TV – The other news ... free – independent – uncensored ...



- what the media should not keep silent about ...
- Little heard – by the people, for the people! ...
- regular News at www.kla.tv/en

Stay tuned - it's worth it!

Free subscription to our e-mail newsletter here: www.kla.tv/abo-en

Security advice:

Unfortunately countervoices are being censored and suppressed more and more. As long as we don't report according to the ideology and interests of the corporate media, we are constantly at risk, that pretexts will be found to shut down or harm Kla.TV.

So join an internet-independent network today! Click here:

www.kla.tv/vernetzung&lang=en

Licence:  Creative Commons License with Attribution

Spreading and reproducing is endorsed if Kla.TV if reference is made to source. No content may be presented out of context.
The use by state-funded institutions is prohibited without written permission from Kla.TV. Infraction will be legally prosecuted.