zation of the total land-area of the United States. We’re going
to have to distribute the population more over the entire area
of the United States, and less in a few areas like this thing
that’s going to crash around Northern Virginia, around Wash-
ington, which is due for a collapse.

So therefore, we’ve going to reorganize the United States,
so that we are going back to agriculture, and developing the
land for that base, we’re going to go back to a lot more empha-
sis on local industry, particularly private industry which is
locally controlled, or closely held corporations. And we’re
going to plan to distribute our production and our develop-
ment over a larger land-area and raise the standard of living
of the population per capita, and the income of communities,
by going from a post-industrial society, which is a low tax-
revenue base for communities, to a productive economy
which provides a higher tax-revenue base for local commu-
nities.

So we’re now going to make better utilization of our land-
area, so that we’re using all of the land-area, developing all
of the land-area, instead of concentrating population more
and more in a few, what are going to become vast, concen-
trated slums, unless we do something about it.

So that’s in general what this is about. So, now back to
you. . . .

Dialogue: The Battle in
The United States

Q: Hello, this is Daniel from Leipzig. I have essentially
two questions. First of all, in the briefing this morning, Wil-
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The view is that, on this matter, we have to internationally use the action which is now occurring in the United States under our initiative, and use specifically that action, in the United States, as information to the processes in the other places, in Europe and so forth.

So therefore, the battle now is in the United States. It is not a battle which could be fought in parallel in various countries at this point. Because the problem is, you get a breakthrough and you’ve got to get a recognition of authority for the breakthrough occurring. We can do that in the United States.

For example, this thing that appeared in the FAZ today as an ad . . . is an example of that. Leuschel, a person who’s known to us from our studies of such matters over a period of years, has this ad citing me as an authority on this issue, in the financial section of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung today. That is going to have repercussions. But that exists around the world.

So therefore, what we have, the kind of thing I was saying, what I put out as the proposal, the kind of information that Paul [Gallagher] just summarized on the situation, this information going out into these areas and other parts of the world will have the proper effect. And therefore, you don’t have to think about parallel organizing, of doing something the same as we’re doing in the United States and other countries. What you have to think about is, we’re doing something in the United States, that’s where the war-front is, and if the United States doesn’t change the war-front, there’s no credibility for its being conducted in any other part of the world.

So therefore, we must win the battle in the United States. Otherwise we will lose the war! Our major objective should be, to win the world war. And we have to win the battle in the United States to win that.

Now, what we have to do to win the war, beyond the launching of the attack from the United States, under U.S. leadership in that sense, is we have to take the same program, programmatic outlook, creating the details on the battlefront in the United States, and get that out to all these other areas: that this is what is happening.

You’re in a very interesting period on this, typified by the case of the Stephen Colbert “roast,” which is actually—and I’ve emphasized, this “roast”—if you know the United States inside, as I now know it, you realize that there’s a big phase-change occurring in the United States. You have the Cheney and Bush factor, and in terms of one poll, Bush is the 20% factor, on support for his continuing what he’s doing now. Which means that, already, Bush has lost a lot of the support of the lunatics, because his lunatic factor in the United States among voters is about 30% or so of the voters. And if he gets down to the 20% area, that means that even a large number of the lunatics are quitting the Bush campaign. And there are also things going on that can change as quickly.

So the fight in the United States, is a credible fight. You see signs all over the world that the Bush thing is crumbling. The danger now, is the fact that the Bush-Cheney phenomenon (to call it a phenomenon), is crumbling, which means that the Bush-Cheney phenomenon is the dying tiger, which is prepared to strike, because if it doesn’t strike now, it never will be able to. So it’s a very dangerous situation in that sense.

But in terms of the long-term process, history is against the present policies of the United States and of Europe. History is against it. History is against the current world policies. And if people defy history by clinging to present lines, then we’ll go through a Dark Age.

So, this is the issue. We have to look at it this way, not as a sense of separate fights around the world. We have to see this as one war, in which the United States is the crucial center, the decisive point, on which the fate of the world depends. But then, we can not win the fight in the United States, unless the fight in the United States can be extended, as a U.S. fight, into other parts of the world. Because the Europeans have no courage. You’re telling the Europeans, when you talk about what we’re doing, you can’t copy it in Europe: Because European systems are based on private, privately controlled central banking systems, which control governments. We don’t have a European government in West or Central Europe, which is capable of doing that under its present constitution. But if the United States does it, then these government have to do it.

So, we’re trying to correlate this international situation to win that kind of war.