

Garland Nixon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The Collapse of Geopolitics and the Emergence of the New Paradigm

The following is an edited transcript of the February 19, 2025, weekly Schiller Institute dialogue featuring Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and leader of the Schiller Institute, and Garland Nixon. Mr. Nixon is a veteran Washington, D.C.-based political analyst, journalist, and talk show host. Subheads have been added. The video is available [here](#).



Schiller Institute

Helga Zepp-LaRouche



Schiller Institute

Garland Nixon

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Good day, good afternoon, good morning, depending on where you are. I'm very happy to welcome political analyst Garland Nixon, who is also a very popular radio talk show host in Washington. I'm very glad that you're here, Garland, because we have a very, very fascinating, changed situation in the world, where the trans-Atlantic alliance is not going in the same direction any more, which I think is a very good thing. Or, in other words, that the phone call that happened between United States President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin, and subsequently the meeting which took place in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, between U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio and Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov—and they also had some other people in the delegation—has led to a situation where President Trump is clearly looking for an end to the Ukraine war in the short term, and the Europeans are completely freaked out.

Now, I personally think this is a long-awaited meeting. It was urgently timed. This war should not have happened in the first place, and it went on much too long, because a settlement was possible already in March 2022, which was then sabotaged by then UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson. This is a really, very, very important development, and I would be extremely interested in how it looks from your perspective, given

the fact that you are a very acute insider into American politics and international politics. So, what do you think?

Garland Nixon: I think there are a number of angles you could take to look at this, at what's going on now. One of the things I find interesting, is the reaction of the Europeans, particularly the Western European powers, and in particular, the UK, and I'll tell you why: It is my belief that after World War II, as the British Empire began to recede and, some may argue, collapse, that it attached itself to the U.S. empire, and from my perspective—There was a popular song, and the song went like this, "I've got the brains, you've got the brawn, let's make the money"—right? And that the Brits, basically, the UK saw themselves—that the United States is kind of strong, and they got some brawn; we know how to do empire really well. Since we don't physically have the empire any more, we'll attach ourselves to the U.S. empire and to some extent guide them to the imperial things that need to be done around the world and, effectively, still be an empire.

What we're seeing now, I think, at a very important time, is that the British Empire is going to be forced to come to grips with the reality that it's no longer an empire; it's no longer an imperial power. The Brits,

they have the accoutrements of an empire, right? They have someone they can put a robe on, they can put on a crown, with stolen jewels from Africa, and they can have the changing of the guard at Buckingham Palace—all of the things that look like an empire. But as the U.S. separates from them, as the U.S. sees them as problematic, as not a valuable asset any more, the UK now has to face the reality, for the first time in many, many centuries, that it's not an empire, they don't rule the waves, the Sun sets on the UK.

Let me add this, too; I think this is important: From the perspective of your organization, the Schiller Institute organization, I think one of the things that has happened over the past is, the imperial power had to ostracize, attack, isolate your organization, because you were one of the few organizations that were wise to exactly who they were, and you were talking about, "This is who the British Empire is, and this is what they do." And as the British Empire starts to come to grips with exactly the reality they're dealing with now, I think the necessity for going after your organization will recede, and I think your organization will be able to flourish and do some of the really good work that you're doing more in the open, and not be as pushed into the shadows as you have been.

The 'LaRouche' Issue

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, that's very good news! I hope you are right. As a matter of fact, it is quite amazing that all the trouble we had, really, in our almost half a century, longer than half a century of political work, did come from the Anglosphere. It came from Washington, naturally. I could give you a list of people over the decades who have told us that they liked our ideas tremendously, that they were totally enthusiastic and thought this was a fresh new way of approaching things—who then were contacted by embassy officials, by representatives of consulates, and they were told, "If you don't stop working with these people, you will have a loss of business, your name will be ruined." And the worst of all was the prosecution of my late husband.

And I hope you're right, because, as I told the [famous tribunal](#) we had in 1995, together with many



CC/A.C.K.

The changing of the guard at Buckingham Palace looks the same, but the British may have even lost the ability to manipulate the United States.

black elected officials and former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, among others, the real crime in all of that was not only what they did to us—and naturally that was not so pleasant—but that they prevented especially the American people from having access to ideas which would have prevented all this trouble: the 20 years of interventionist wars, the millions of people who died as a result of it in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya—all of these things. And the present situation in the world, which is still a very tortured place, all of that would not have happened, if people would have had an unhindered access to the ideas of my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and the organization which he created. So, I can only hope that you are right.

Nixon: Yes. Well, to be frank, we were told—I didn't know anything about the LaRouche organization. All I was told, from what I heard was, "They're just a bunch of crazy people. They're crazy people." But, I was never told *why*, or what they were saying that was so outlandish. And now, when I started learning about Chatham House and the Club of Rome, and some of these different organizations, I thought, "Well, these things are all real! And the things they're talking about, no wonder they're being ostracized."

But, the bottom line, I think what we're getting at now is, there is a new paradigm. Now, one can argue that it's a different kind of imperial paradigm, maybe a more corporate imperial paradigm out of the U.S., but a different paradigm nonetheless. And I think the

traditional colonial powers in Europe, the Frances and the Germanys, are being pushed into the background. And I think there will, in fact, be— You know, we can celebrate; I think there are things to celebrate right now. There is still the chance of a nuclear war. But while that danger is not gone, for the moment war between the major nuclear powers seems to have been lessened, at least. So there are things that we can— Survival is important. There will be challenges, but it's possible that there may be opportunities, maybe to enlighten people to have international discussions that weren't available before.

But it's going to be a difficult time in Europe, because I think Europe is going to be facing severe economic challenges. The only thing I think may be an opportunity for Europe is this: Europe did not have independence or sovereignty; you could argue there was a vassalage to the U.S. empire, or the British Empire, or whoever, but clearly the individual countries in Europe, in my opinion, did not have the sovereignty they needed to make decisions on their own. And if some of that starts to happen, I believe there will be opportunities.

One of the things that President Putin said, and President Trump said, both had said “Well, we'll be willing to make individual deals, with individual countries in Europe, as opposed to the EU or these supranational organizations.” I think there are opportunities there. If some of the individual countries can begin to come to their senses and say, “OK, we'll make some economic deals that work,” and the Russians have nuclear power, maybe they can come in and build us a plant, or whatever, different things that can happen. I think there are opportunities there if new leadership comes to the forefront, and maybe the poverty and terrible things that are predicted in Europe can be mitigated, if the people are allowed to take control. And, as you say, if the people are allowed to be exposed to various ideas, I think there's some opportunity here.

So, there's always room to be positive and hope, and push for a better future, and a better present!



kremlin.ru

Russian President Vladimir Putin. He and President Trump agree: Let's deal with European governments, not the European Union.

Policy for Europe and the Middle East

Zepp-LaRouche: When U.S. Vice President J.D. Vance made [his speech](#) in Munich, I really thought it was a breath of fresh air, because he said—and the audience was gasping; you could actually see how they were trying to get air—but he was saying, not Russia and China are the biggest threat to Europe, but it comes from within the European Union itself,

namely, that there is a suppression of ideas and freedom of expression. And that is so true! Because you have almost a dictatorship, in terms of what is allowed to be said, what is not allowed to be said, and this really hit a chord. And by chance, the next day I was at a demonstration in Munich by Zoom, together with Scott Ritter and Ray McGovern; the demonstration was against the Munich Security Conference. That conference used to be a very good forum



White House

U.S. Vice President J.D. Vance at this year's Munich Security Conference: The biggest threat to Europe is EU suppression of freedom of expression.

of experts who would discuss security measures, when Ewald von Kleist and Horst Teltschik were still the heads of it. But ever since Wolfgang Ischinger became its head [2008-2022], it went downhill to the present leadership of Christoph Heusgen—who started to cry,



BüSo/Ilse Dietl

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Scott Ritter, and Ray McGovern address a Feb. 15 peace rally in Munich, Germany.

by the way, when he left! He was a real crybaby— But it turned into a public relations outfit for the military-industrial complex.

So, there was a demonstration against it, insisting that all conflicts be resolved through dialogue and negotiations—and I was addressing this by Zoom, very briefly. But I was told by our own organizers, who participated in the demonstration, that the people absolutely loved the speech of Vance. They thought his remarks were so important to be said at this point.

So far, so good. I think this was very, very good. I am very happy about what is happening with Ukraine, with Putin, with Trump. They made an historic game-change which is extremely valuable. The only thing which is left, is what will be the Trump policy in the Middle East? Because, there, we have the ultimatum of last Saturday, which Trump had made, that all the Palestinians should accept leaving the Gaza Strip, and naturally, that is completely unacceptable. It was rejected by all the neighbors. And the demand that Hamas should deliver all hostages at once: that ultimatum passed and there was some progress.

So, it seems a little bit back and forth: this is moving forward, but, the atrocities in the West Bank are continuing; the attacks even in Gaza are continuing. And I'm concerned that since Trump's Middle East policy was very much influenced by Zionist elements who are backing either Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu— Netanyahu comes increasingly

under attack from Israel itself, from the military there and others. But, nevertheless, there is still legislation, I think, in Congress, which forbids students to even show empathy for the plight of the Palestinians—and there, I see a double standard. Because if Trump really wants to come in and tell Europeans what they should hear, there is a weak spot if he is then pursuing the same suppression of discussing what is going on in the Middle East, in the United States. So what is your take on that?

Nixon: A couple of things, and something that I've been saying for a while now. I've been trying to navigate the new Trump. This version of Trump is a very different version of Trump than we experienced the first four years, and I think partially because there are—I call them the “board of directors”—the very, very powerful “tech bros,” I call them, that are backing Trump and clearly have decided to take the country in a different direction.

But one of the things that— I have really come to the conclusion that we have to ignore what Trump says; that Trump says things for effect, right? That he makes bombastic, outlandish comments—“Well, if the Russians don't do that, we'll double down on them, and we'll send extra...”—and everybody got really upset when Trump said, “If the Russians don't make a deal, we'll double down on them, we'll send more, we'll triple down on the sanctions” and all that. And at the time, I thought to myself, “Yeah, we'll see about that. Trump's just saying that. We'll see what he says.” And when we see in actuality what the policies are, they're 180 degrees—or as some people would say, “360 degrees”—they're 180 degrees from that.

I've come to the conclusion that Trump is a person who says things for powerful effect: “If you don't do this, I will do something really, really big,” and then we all dance around like a cat on a hot tin roof, and we all talk about it. And while we're talking about it, they're formulating a policy.

So, I'm no longer going to connect Trump's bombastic tweets on Truth Social or whatever, with his actual policy. I think we're at a point, now, where



President Donald Trump

White House/Daniel Torok

we have to see what the Trump administration does, and use the actions that happen day to day, to try to project the next action, as opposed to using the latest Truth Social bombastic tweet or whatever it is. That being said, here's my point: I don't think it's incidental that the meetings with the Russians were in Saudi Arabia, in the Middle East; that the Saudi leader was considered a mediator was an integral part of it. The Saudis have said— One thing we know for sure about Trump, and that is, that he definitely wants normalization with Saudi Arabia. I think the Saudis want it with Israel. The Saudis have made it clear, there has to be a Palestinian state in order for that to happen. There are very strong rumors in a number of different areas, that have come out, basically saying that part of the discussion with the Russian team was, how the U.S. can work with the Russians, and use the Russians' diplomatic strength to mitigate some of the issues that the U.S. has with Iran and with North Korea, etc.

I believe that what we're seeing here will be a push to resolve the Ukraine issue, and at the same time or shortly after, try to resolve the issue in the Middle East. I believe that Trump really wants to resolve that, and I'm not saying it because he's a good guy or a bad guy, not from a moral perspective, but from a perspective of what the vision is that he sees for the United States' future. I think the discussion that Trump has had recently of reducing the military budget implies, you're going

to have to clean up your mess in the Middle East, if you're going to have less of a military and you're going to recede. So, I think that there will be a push— Oh, the other thing is, it's clear from the rhetoric of the Trump diplomatic team that they want to return to the world community of diplomacy, as opposed to trying to dominate the world community of diplomacy. And the only way they can do that, that they can have the moral footing to do that, is to clean up, for lack of a better term, the issue in Gaza, occupied Palestine, however you want to call it.

So, I believe that they are looking to take the opportunity to speak with the Russians, to try to work with the Russians and Saudis, and to try to (for lack of a better way to put it) bring the elements in Israel that are out of control to heel and to get a deal. I hope so. It's sad, and again, we must push back against the violence that's going on right now.

But, I'm trying to guess, and I see that as a possible, potential direction that we'll see coming out of the negotiations in Saudi Arabia, and I'm saying I think there's a lot that will be coming out of the Saudi Arabia negotiations, other than just Ukraine. There's a lot more going on there, other than just Ukraine, and I think it's absolutely, it was in Saudi Arabia so they can try to get this Israeli issue dealt with as soon as possible.

Water Management for All

Zepp-LaRouche: As you know, we are pushing the [Oasis Plan](#). This is the idea to develop lots of new fresh water, both from a canal system from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, but also nuclear power for desalination and so forth. My late husband and I, in 2002 we were in Abu Dhabi. And if you go there along the beach, it is unbelievable: With the help of water, they turned the desert into wonderful gardens, into lush plantations—and there is an island which used to be completely barren, and now there's already old vegetation; 40 years old. And there are birds, birds that migrate over the wintertime, they land on this island, and you think it's a paradise.

So, that approach could be taken for the entire

Middle East! Because the entire Middle East is desert. I don't know if you ever flew over that region. I once did, and I looked out of the airplane window, and I tried to see an oasis, and there was none! Nothing; nothing green. If we could convince, maybe, the Gulf States, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates—they are all very wealthy—rather than building a ski resort in the desert, which I think is what Saudi Arabia is doing, they could spend some of this money to make the entire region livable for everybody as a basis for peace. Because I believe that “the new name for peace is development.” And you have to give an incentive to young people so that they basically say: “OK, let's stop the cycle of violence; let's become an engineer, a scientist, a parent, because we want to build a future.”

And I think what is *most* required right now is visionary leaders, be it Trump, be it people from the region, who step forward and say: Let's go for a completely different policy.

My hope is that we from the Schiller Institute, we succeed in making a huge international campaign about that. And last week, we had the International Peace Coalition meeting where we had the honor to have Dr. Naledi Pandor from South Africa, the former Minister of International Relations and Cooperation. She endorsed the Oasis Plan. And we have other diplomats from Palestine, from other countries, endorsing it. So, I hope this gets to the attention of President Trump, because he's an investor; he would inspire people to invest in such projects, and then it would fly. So, what do you think? Is there a chance that he may do that?

Nixon: I think yes, that should be brought to his attention. It should be pushed. I think it's a great opportunity. *And*, one of the angles that could be used with



Karel Vereycken (May 2024)

The Oasis Plan for Southwest Asian development.

President Trump is this: I'm sure you're familiar with California. A significant portion of California is just desert, built on desert, and they have to pump water in, and they're having trouble with not getting enough rain. It rains in California for five or six years, and then it doesn't rain for five or six years! Desalination plants could be something that could be utilized there. So, I think from the angle of President Trump, you could push desalination and those types of technologies there, and push the angle that, “Look, it's something that you

could use in the United States.” Because he is very much into the “Make America Great Again,” America First, and what’s good for America, as you develop the technologies—also, American companies, of course, can be involved—and they can be involved in making money. And it could be used in different parts of the United States.

So, it’s something that could be pushed; supported by President Trump. I think there has to be an angle in there for President Trump to see a way that this type of technology and this kind of thing can be done in the United States to help Americans. And if he sees that, it may help him to see that, “Look, I want peace and prosperity in that region, but hey! This can help us, too, and oh, maybe we can get some—” You know what I’m getting at.

You know, I used to do sales, and I once had a professor years ago who said, “Sales is about influencing people, to buy something that you’re selling, a product or a service.” And I had a professor years ago that said to me, “How do you influence people?” He said, “Everyone’s listening to the same radio station, WIIFM, ‘What’s in it for me?’ And if you want to convince anyone of anything, don’t tell them, it’d be good if you do this; it’d be nice, it’d help people. They’ll fall asleep. You have to say to people: This is what’s in it for you.” And I think by approaching President Trump from the angle of “what’s in it for” not just him, but what’s in it for the country that he represents, I think that it’s a great idea here; that it would be good for the world. From that angle, there is a great opportunity, possibly, to get President Trump behind it. And I think if he gets behind it, you can make it happen.

Add this: You’ve got China, which does a lot of building and construction in Africa and the Middle East, and has tremendous capabilities in that region. *And*, which also gets a lot of oil from that region. And so, it benefits China to have stability, to have growth of the region, to have economic growth—and expansion.

So, I think there’s a lot of angle to influence world powers—China, Russia, the United States—to get onboard, to invest and to be a part of that. I think it’s a

great idea.

Zepp-LaRouche: President Trump did mention some weeks ago, when the fires in Los Angeles were raging, “Why don’t you bring the water down from Canada?” and so forth. And there is the famous NAWAPA North American water management project, which we were already promoting some decades ago, that could be immediately put on the agenda. You could really eliminate the danger of such fires breaking out and having such a devastating impact. If the United States would just look at China and not say, “This is a threat”—Vance in Munich said, “China and Russia are



UNICEF

Desalination plant in Deir al Balah, Gaza, opened in 2017.

not a threat.” I was very interested to hear that. If President Trump and the Trump team would just look at what China has done.

Actually, they applied the American System of economy, because that is national banking; sovereign control over the credit, which is what Alexander Hamilton promoted. And if you go back to the American System of economy inside the United States, which has been very much under the British system in the recent period, you could do exactly what China did, and better! China built a 45,000 km (about 28,000 mile) network of fast trains, and these trains, they go— It’s just an absolute joy to go on them, because you’re flying through the landscape, you’re not shaking, they’re smooth at 350 kph— and they’re now building one for 400 kph, and they’re already testing a magnetic-levitation

North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA)



Sources: Parsons Company, *North American Water and Power Alliance Conceptual Study*, Dec. 7, 1964
Hal Cooper; Manuel Frias Alcaraz; EIR.

train at 600 kph, and even a vacuum-tube maglev train of 1,000 kph.

So, the United States could just go to the most advanced level, leapfrogging all of these technologies; build a totally modern system; build some science cities. The United States is populated on the coasts, but it's completely underpopulated in the central areas. One could say, "Let's connect all the major cities of the United States through high-speed trains, and then build some new cities along these hubs, these nodal points on this train system."

You could make a new science city which would be devoted to the most advanced science and technology; you could have students there, you could have a cultural center. I mean, if the Arabs can build the

biggest new museum and whatnot, why cannot the United States take the best of all cultures and make it like a museum kind of demonstration, so that all the children, and the students who are growing up, become versed in universal history and really join a completely different outlook.

As much as I think this idea of "Make America Great Again" may appeal to the people who are called by Hillary Clinton the "deplorables"—which was the most cynical expression you could have!—the United States is also famous as a melting pot. There are many Asians, many people from Latin America, many people from all places in the world. And the United States could become a place where a new renaissance is taking place, capitalizing on the best that all traditions of all cultures have produced so far! And that way President Trump could become a true visionary. I know I'm stretching it a little bit, but I know one has to put out ideas now which completely break through the old schemes of geopolitics. The very idea that some people think that you absolutely have to have an enemy, in order to do what you want to do, is in my view the worst idea! It led to two world wars, and in the time of thermonuclear weapons, we should absolutely regard geopolitics as a mental disease, because that's what it is.

The Emerging New Paradigm

Nixon: Even in the title for this particular show, "The Emergence of a New Paradigm," I think that implies that we do have to use forward thinking, that we do have to come up with new ideas, and we do have to have some hope and belief that we may be able to institute some of the, I say "new ideas." As you know, a lot of these ideas aren't new! But no one would listen to those who had these ideas. And a big part of the discussion now, about the military-industrial complex potentially being cut in half, whether that's realistic, I don't know. But, that being said, if we're up around \$850 billion, as you know, by the time you add the black ops, CIA budgets, by the time you add the USAID and the National Endowment for Democracy, we're over a



CC/DF4D-0070

The high-speed Beijing-Tianjin Intercity Railway. It takes about 30 minutes for the trip of 120 km (75 miles).

trillion dollars.

Now, if you have half a trillion dollars to start with, you can now talk about high-speed rail, which can move people, which can move products and things that need to be moved, whether its minerals, things that are being mined, and moved and used. So, the reality is, if in fact there is a significant decrease in the military budget, the discussion about high-speed rail, the discussion about building new infrastructure, becomes a legitimate discussion. The main reason that these things haven't been a legitimate discussion is because this has been a militaristic empire and it's all used to build weapons and ship weapons—and all of the money has gone to the military-industrial complex.

And, might I add this, and this is critical: The issue of brain-drain, of when people come out of school with engineering degrees and physics degrees, etc., what do they do? Where do they go to make money? They're going to go to Lockheed Martin, they're going to go to Northrop Grumman, they're going to go somewhere, where they could use that knowledge to make the latest missile and build the latest targeting system, right? The technological sector, well, that's used for targeting, and that's used for "we've got to upgrade our nuclear weapons," etc.

When you change the paradigm to one where we're upgrading our infrastructure, where we're figuring

out how to put in high-speed rail, etc., now we don't have that brain-drain. And when the people come out of college with these STEM degrees, now, that intellectual capital—I hate to use those kinds of terms that the neoliberals use, but you understand what I'm saying—the intellectual power of our young people can now be used to target things for the betterment of our society, for the improvement of our society, and it changes again! It's the emergence of a new paradigm, a paradigm where we actually see what was termed, "the peace dividend"; the peace dividend that we never had.

And that peace dividend was redirected to, rather than being a peace dividend, to double down on the war paradigm.

So, I think the idea that you're talking about is a powerful—I think one of the reasons why these ideas were rejected—ideas from your organizations and other organizations—one of the reasons why they were belittled, and rejected, was because they would have taken some of the financial capital that the warmongers wanted to use for the military-industrial complex. And let me add this: For the "narrative" complex of think tanks and news operations around the world, well, once those things aren't draining all the capital that they use for the advancement and the betterment of our society, now, I don't think it will be as critical to shut the mouths of people, such as yourself, who are coming up with novel ideas. And as I said, some of these ideas aren't even new! They're good ideas, but they simply had to be rejected, because they were a threat to the money that was going into the pockets of the warmongers.

Zepp-LaRouche: Actually, there is one question which came in from Alberto Portuguese, who is the founder and president of a peace organization called [Humanity United for Universal Demilitarization](#). He says: "How can we end the scourge of war in a system where governments of industrial countries have the ob-

ligation to promote sales exports in what their war industry produces?” Now, you answered that in part, and I also answered it in part, but still, the question remains: A lot of these people contributed to President Trump’s election campaign, especially from Silicon Valley. And the whole area of artificial intelligence, and cyber, and things like that, will play an increasingly bigger role.

It will take a tremendous job to direct those— I’m not against artificial intelligence; I think digitalization, and all of these things, like every technology, depends on whether it is used for the common good, or used for evil purposes. And that depends entirely on the quality of the human being which is deploying these technologies.

So, how do we make the jump to turn a system which, up to January 20, was directed in one direction, and with the entry of President Trump, there is a new beginning, but it is a gigantic job. One problem is that the European leadership—not all of it, but parts of it—is tied to what you call the “Deep State” inside the United States. So, that dynamic— The British do not give up; NATO is still planning for the coming war against Russia. The Danish military intelligence put out a statement that they expect a big war to come with Russia in five years or so. German Defense Minister Boris Pistorius is talking about making the whole country “war-ready,” which is an abomination! Who in Germany would want to have another war? I find this so absolutely disgusting. First of all, the German history should have taught everybody in Germany a lesson that war is the last thing in the universe you would wish to have, and these warmongers are at it relentlessly!

I just described some of the difficulties. What is necessary in terms of dealing with these problems for the Trump administration to make the hopeful ray of light which we saw with the Riyadh meeting, become a powerful, steady tendency?

Superseding ‘Anti’-ism

Nixon: A couple of things: I do believe that the paradigm of aggression and confrontation from members of the ruling elite in Europe right now, will be changed. I remember someone saying: “Some people are born great, some people become great, and some people have greatness forced upon them.” Well, I think the paradigm will be forced upon the people in Europe, who

are spoiling for a confrontation against Russia; it will be forced upon them both by the voters in Europe, and by the U.S., which will be retreating from Europe. And they will have neither the economic nor the political capital that they need to pursue their evil works; that would bring us all to a nuclear confrontation. I think that’s a good thing.

I think an important part of responding to the great question that the gentleman had was his first three words: “How do we...” That’s a good question, “How do *we* do that?” And here’s how we do that, in my opinion—Number one: you have to continue to build on and strengthen the anti-war community; you have to continue to build on those of us who oppose confrontation. But there’s a second part to that, that we really need to consider now, and that is: When U.S. President Joe Biden’s administration was there, or as I’ve called it oftentimes, “the Blinken-Sullivan administration,” we had to push back against people who were clearly moving in a wrong direction. With Donald Trump, we’re going to get a mixed bag. We’re going to get some things that we’re unhappy with; we’re going to get some things that we’re happy with. I think we have to build the anti-war community, but the anti-war community also has to take on a more assertive aspect. Just the word “anti”—I’m opposed to war and military conflict, but what are you for?

And now that I can look at the Trump administration, and say, I’m unhappy with some of the things that they’re doing, but I’m very happy with some things that they’re doing—the anti-war community has to have an element of it, that when we see our government or any particular official doing policies that we approve of, that we have an element where we, for lack of a better term, we reward them. So, when Donald Trump says, I’m going to make peace with Country X, then rather than we the people just running around with signs that say “We oppose war with Country Y,” and then when he says, “I’m going to make peace with Country Y,” we go home and look out the window—we now take on an element where, when we see a government, a country, a politician doing something that seems to be in the best interest of the people, that we come out in support of that!

That’s not saying we support Donald Trump when we don’t support Donald Trump. Instead the perspective is when there are policies that we oppose, that we actively oppose them in a unified manner. But, when

we see things that we do like, that we come out and pat him on the back and say, “President Trump, that’s a great job, getting peace with Russia.”

We had this huge rally in D.C. some years ago, where I was one of the speakers, called the Rage Against the War Machine. Well, if we were to get a deal with the Russians, and now it’s signed, and it goes through our Senate, and now we have a treaty with the Russians, what’s wrong with having a rally that’s not a “Rage Against the War Machine,” but a rally that says, “We are happy about this, and we support this thing.” And we say to the Trump administration, “Can you have someone from your administration come to speak at our rally? We want to support this particular thing.”

Now, if they do something else we don’t like, we push back against them. But because there are opportunities now, I think there needs to be an element of the anti-war community that is also there to push for the things we like and to reward the politicians and administrations that move in a direction that’s a more peaceful direction.

A Global Phase-Change

Zepp-LaRouche: I think that is good advice, because the world has also dramatically changed since four years ago. You have now the anti-colonial formation of the BRICS; you have the Global South, which is the Global Majority. I don’t think that that is a genie which can be pushed back into the bottle, because the Africans, the Latin Americans, many Asian countries, they are reviving the Spirit of Bandung. This year is the 70th anniversary of that historic conference in Indonesia. But the difference is that in 1955, when the Asian and African countries got together for the first time in earnest to create the Non-Aligned Movement, they lacked strength, and therefore, all the efforts to try to get a new world economic order were pushed back. We were involved in that: My husband wrote an [International Development Bank](#) proposal, already in 1975, which was adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement in 1976 in Colombo, Sri Lanka. But, then all the leaders who had signed that—Mrs. Bandaranaike of Sri Lanka, Indira Gandhi of India, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto of Pakistan—all of them were destabilized, and in the case of Bhutto, even killed. [Mrs. Gandhi was also assassinated.—ed.] So, the whole movement did not make big advances.

But now, with the rise of China, China has lifted

850 million of its own population out of poverty, which I think is a great civilizational contribution, because poverty is a human rights violation. If people have to be unsure where their next meal is coming from, how can you talk about human rights? So, China has contributed. And I’m not claiming I’m a China expert, but I have traveled to China since 1971, so that puts me in a very rare category of people who have observed the rise of China with my own eyes many, many times. And in my deepest conviction, I do not believe that China is an imperial, aggressive power. They’re not exporting their ideology, and asking other countries to take it as their own. They think the non-interference into other countries’ systems is the basis for a just, win-win cooperation, where everybody has advantages and everybody thinks the advantage of the other is to their own advantage.

Therefore, the biggest hurdle in my view is, given that the countries of Africa really think that China is their friend, dismissing Churchill’s crazy idea that countries don’t have friends, but only interests— I have talked to many Africans, who told me that they really think that the attitude of China toward Africa has proven that they act as a friend; and the same goes for Russia, because Russia supported the independence movement, and it’s now supplying them with energy and so forth. But, the biggest hurdle is, can the new Trump administration have a positive relationship to this desire of the Global South to overcome colonialism forever, and become middle-level-income countries themselves? I think that is probably the biggest hurdle to be overcome, and I would like to hear what you think.

Nixon: I agree with you. And in the context of that particular issue, which we have yet to see, you have to see what the Trump administration’s attitude will be to South America, and in particular, to Cuba, to Nicaragua, and to Venezuela—particularly Venezuela, because that’s where the oil is. And that’s going to be a major focus. And we don’t yet know what it’s going to be, because one of the discussions that’s been here, and I’m sure you’ve heard it, is a discussion of “spheres of influence.” Wherein maybe the new people in power, the new direction of the U.S. would be, we have spheres of influence; China has theirs, Russia has theirs, and we have ours. We take over Greenland or Canada, and now this hemisphere is our sphere of influence. Of

course, people who have presented that to me, and asked: “What do you think about that? Do you think that’s the plan?” I said, well, for one thing, Russia and China will never buy into it. Because, rather than “spheres of influence,” what you’re looking at is blocs. And instead of military blocs or ideological blocs with the Soviet bloc and the American bloc, you’re just looking at geographical blocs. And blocs ultimately end in contradictions, they end in confrontations, and blocs end in wars. So, I think the Russian or Chinese perspective would be: “Look if we want to do business with countries in South America, fine! If you want to do business with countries in the Caucasus or in Asia, that’s fine! Everybody does business with whoever they want to.”

I think we have yet to see the direction that the U.S. is choosing to go, regarding that, but I think it is critical. Now, we’re starting to see the direction toward Europe and toward Eurasia to some extent, unfold, regarding the U.S. foreign policy. I do think it’s important to keep an eye on the direction they choose, particularly in South America, Caribbean, in their local area—whether they pursue one of diplomacy, such as with the world powers, or the traditional one of domination. So, let’s face it, as everyone knows, there are some decades where nothing happens, and weeks where decades happen! While we’ve had the Trump administration in office for literally three or four weeks, it seems like it’s been three or four years, in changes!

So, I would admonish people not to jump the gun and make a lot of assumptions as to what they’re going to do, either good or bad, so that we can remain fluid; those of us in the anti-war, and the pro-growth, pro-humanity community can be fluid and keep an eye on the direction that things are going, because right now, things are fluid. But I think the mistake that a lot of people are making, is going overboard in trying to predict. Because all of the predictions that we’re hearing now are based on the old paradigm: “Well, you know, Trump did that in his first term, so he’s going to do that”; “Well, the Russians have always done that, so they’re going to do that”; “Well, the U.S. administration is an imperial power, they’ve already done that.” It’s a mistake now, and exactly as you’re saying, we’re in the *emergence* of a new paradigm. The new paradigm hasn’t even completely taken shape. *And*, from a positive perspective, because the new paradigm is forming now, it gives people like us an opportunity

to have input in the final resolution: What does that paradigm look like? I don’t think that we should just sit around and wait, and say, “Let’s see what this country decides to do. Let’s wait to see what the world powers decide to do.”

As you said, your discussion of the issue in the Middle East, in Africa, regarding the desalination plants, regarding how things can be changed there: Rather than wait to see what the world powers can do, various groups, organizations, and coalitions now, we can make recommendations to these world powers, we can present our worldview, we can get our ideas in, and hopefully help to shape a paradigm that’s forming, rather than wait for the world powers to.

Because, rest assured, look: Those who were involved in some very evil deeds over the course of time, have not gone anywhere, and they will be working to take an opportunity to shape the new paradigm. Right now, if you look at the UK and if you look at its Prime Minister Keir Starmer, those people, right now, they’re stiffening their spines and they’re saying, “No! I’m not going to let this happen! We’re going to keep it the old way.” At some point, I believe even they will say, “Well, wait a minute: If you can’t beat ’em, join ’em.” And they’re smart; we can’t underestimate these people. I think at some point they’ll wake up and say, “You know what? The world’s changing. How can we influence this new paradigm, to take it *back* toward the direction it was?” And so, as they’re doing that, I think we’re all going to have to understand that this new paradigm that is emerging is not definitive yet, and that we, from a positive perspective can have input and help to shape it—and it is our responsibility to do it.

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, the time is really flying and we’re almost on the hour. But let me mention one last idea. I’ve believed for a very long time that the world has moved to a point where, either we put the one humanity first, and define the national interest in affinity and coherence with that interest of humanity as one, or, it will not function. And that has to do with the fact that when the Roman Empire collapsed, people in India didn’t know about it for several years, and they had the beautiful Gupta period, and it was a rising renaissance. But this time, because of nuclear weapons, and because of pandemics, and because of the internet, we are so interconnected that I think we have reached a point in



The signing of the Peace of Westphalia in Münster, 1648: Take into account the interest of every other people, if you really want peace. Painting by Gerard Terborch.

history, where we need to have a new global security and development architecture, which takes into account the interest of every single country on the planet. And, frankly, I think that the meeting between the foreign ministers, Lavrov and Rubio—while you can say a lot about it as secondary and tertiary comments—has the germ of hope that such a new security order could emerge. Because if the Trump administration says they don't regard Russia as an enemy, well, that's already a very important step.

If they would extend that to China, I think we would be even a huge step further. Trump has already proven in his first administration that he can talk to the leader of North Korea. If they would take a more conciliatory attitude toward Iran, which now has a military alliance with Russia and is very close with China, I think that you could come up with an order which does, indeed, do what the Peace of Westphalia did, which was to come up with the principle that you have to take into account the interest of *every* other, if you want to have peace. And that, in my view, would be the real new paradigm, because you are moving beyond geopolitics. You are moving into an area where diplomacy and negotiation will really be the way conflicts will be settled

in the future.

So what's your view on such a perspective?

Nixon: I agree. And I think right now, that Russia can be an integral part of that, because Russia has the ability to mitigate the tension between India and China, and if they can also mitigate the tension between the U.S. and China, then Russia can change the world. Because if China and India can get past their historical problems, and the U.S. can get around the concept of trying to dominate China, or seeing them as an adversary, as opposed to a potential ally, if Russia can get in that middle, and mediate those—those 3.5 world powers, right? I think that really gives us an opportunity

to move forward—and to alleviate the proxy war issue. Because a lot of these issues that we're looking at, or these wars that we're looking at, are proxy wars between world powers. If you could get those four world powers really into alignment, all the proxy wars will dissipate. And they will all be invested, if there are wars in particular areas, they will all be invested in addressing them and bringing them to a halt.

Zepp-LaRouche: Well, I just answered a question by [TASS](#) on my comments on the Riyadh meeting, you know, the freakout about Europe not being invited. I said: Why would you invite proxy powers, given the fact that the Ukraine war was a war between NATO and Russia? So, I take your words with great joy, and I thank you very much. This is an extremely hopeful perspective, and I hope it will inspire a lot of people to come forward with new productive ideas.

And thank you very much, and I hope to see you again, soon!

Nixon: Thank you very much. I appreciate your good work, and it's been an honor and a pleasure to speak with you today.