

that there would be at best zero growth, but more likely, it was negative. In manufacturing, a fall of 1.2% was expected. Professor Adedeji asserted that the drop in output was a consequence of lack of local raw materials due to drought and lack of imported materials due to non-availability of foreign exchange resources. This had resulted in very low rates of capacity utilization; in many cases, industrial plants were closed outright.

The decline in per capita income in Africa would continue, he said: By the end of 1985, output per person would be nearly 12% lower than it was in 1980.

IMF ravages

IMF pressure has led to many African governments cutting down expenditures on vital activities, including transport and infrastructure projects needed to get food to the starving. Devaluation of African currencies as demanded by the IMF has led to cuts in imports, including of necessities such as food and oil.

- Ghana devalued its currency, the cedi, by 30% in December, the fourth time in little over a year, on the orders of the IMF. The IMF has also demanded cuts in subsidies, an increase in interest rates, and increased prices for petroleum.

- Ivory Coast has reduced its public investment programs on the orders of the IMF, and encouraged "redeployment of resources to profitable export industries." In November 1984, Ivory Coast's foreign debt was rescheduled since, according to the minister of states M. Maurice Seri Gnoleba, if Ivory Coast had had to service the debt each year, it would have had to freeze all other economic activity.

- Niger had signed an agreement with the IMF in 1983, and the government took "emergency measures," including cutting the number of sales outlets for cereal by the Food Products Company, dismantling state monopolies on marketing certain basic goods, increasing the rates for electricity and coal, and reducing staff. Now the government is being ordered to "privatize" a large part of the state sector, which employs more than 13,000. More than 20 firms could be partially or totally privatized, and one business is simply to be closed down.

- Somalia devalued its currency by almost 30% in January, following a 48% devaluation in September 1984. The devaluation was an attempt to win IMF approval for a new standby arrangement. The IMF is also demanding a significant reduction in the number of employees in the public sector.

- Chad is being forced to cut government spending on the IMF's insistence that the budget deficit should not exceed 5% of the gross domestic product. The Chad authorities are intending to increase some taxes and create new ones.

- Sierra Leone has devalued its currency by 58%, to pave the way for a new IMF standby agreement.

The story goes on. Africans will die, and keep on dying, until the International Monetary Fund itself is destroyed.

Moscow's hand in

by William Engdahl

Is U.S. agriculture policy being dictated by the Kremlin? This news service has come into possession of direct evidence which links one of the top Soviet intelligence think-tanks in the West to the planning and design of the United States Department of Agriculture's radical new 1985 Farm Bill. That Farm Bill, under the auspices of "free market" economics, will destroy the U.S. farm sector.

The facts and background to this dramatic revelation are outlined below.

In June 1983 at the estate in Laxenburg, Austria of the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Mr. Ed Rossmiller of the international relations section of the Department of Agriculture met with a top-level group of IIASA's Food and Agriculture Program under the direction of one Dr. K. S. Parikh. At this meeting, they developed a computer simulation which became one of the essential arguments in selling the catastrophic and controversial new farm bill.

IIASA is the headquarters for an eight-year project to develop the most extensive computer-based model of total global food production, demand, and prospects.

This IIASA study, though it has not before now been made public for reasons which will become clear below, provided a nice set of computer simulations and numbers used by Secretary Block and Cargill Grain Corporation's man in Department of Agriculture, Undersecretary Daniel Amstutz, to persuade an unwitting President Reagan to go with the drastic new bill. The studies, according to Parikh, "prove" that elimination of farm price supports in the United States and Western Europe will not greatly reduce production, but will reduce consumer food prices. This, of course, is an outright lie.

The Block-Amstutz bill proposes to crush the world's most productive food production capability with mass bankruptcies by removing billions of dollars in government price and other financial support to farmers. U.S. farm debt is estimated to be more than \$212 billion, more than the combined debt of Mexico and Brazil, the two biggest Ibero-American debtor nations. Even without the drastic cuts in Block's proposed "free market" farm bill, conservative estimates are that between 30% and 40% of America's farmers

the U.S. farm bill

are headed into some form of bankruptcy this year. Block, whose own farm is going through bankruptcy proceedings, says a “shakeout” of American farm capacity is necessary.

In an exclusive interview with this writer, Dr. Parikh revealed that the IIASA collaboration with Block’s “free market” lunacy is far-ranging and, in light of the revelations, should be regarded by relevant government officials as a question of the highest national security. Parikh outlined far-ranging penetration by the IIASA, including a direct in-house computer hook-up between the Department of Agriculture in the United States and the IIASA headquarters in Laxenburg. He further revealed a network of active IIASA “moles” inside the Reagan administration, in addition to Rossmiller, including one high official of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers, one Robert Thompson.

What is IIASA?

All of this becomes astonishing in light of the fact that President Reagan personally made the decision, early in his first term, to stop substantial U.S. government funding of the IIASA based on the fact that they were documented to be one of the highest-level Soviet intelligence capabilities in the West, including the vehicle for tapping into sensitive Western computer banks and so forth.

IIASA was created through negotiations between “Mr. Eastern Establishment,” McGeorge Bundy, and top Soviet KGB intelligence operative Dzhermen Gvishiani in the late 1960s. Gvishiani, who headed the IIASA and used it as a major base of operations into the West on strategic economic issues such as energy supplies and food, is the son of a Soviet general who was close to Stalin, the son-in-law of the late Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin, and head, at least until recently, of the Soviets’ State Committee on Science and Technology—meant principally to steal same from the West. He was also the real initiator of Aurelio Peccei and Alexander King’s genocidal Club of Rome, the backer of the “limits to growth” operations which have been used to destroy industry throughout the West since the late 1960s.

Inasmuch as President Reagan’s attitude toward the IIASA “East-West channel” is generally known, and the KGB’s use of it widely exposed several years ago, this means that

top officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture wittingly traveled to, met, and collaborated with a KGB intelligence agency to map strategy for destruction of the West’s most strategically important food-producing capability.

Moreover, the IIASA-Department of Agriculture collaboration was not a one-time thing, but continues to this day, according to Parikh!

The grain cartels’ role

That Soviet intelligence would have an interest in furthering the process of destruction of the West’s food-supply capabilities is not a surprise to anyone. What is difficult for some to grasp is the interest of certain circles in the Department of Agriculture in collaborating with the Soviets.

The answer partially lies in the nature of the “deal” of the primarily Swiss-based Big Six grain-cartel trading companies, which effectively control the world’s trade in foodstuffs. With the argument that “excess” production and harvests in the United States and the European Community—the world’s second-largest agriculture production capacity—must be controlled, they are orchestrating a global food crisis, much as the same networks and families orchestrated the fraudulent “oil crises” of the 1970s: Control world production and force prices sky-high.

To do this for agriculture means that the major farmers of both Europe and the United States must be used against one another. Out of the rubble, the grain cartel will develop an iron grip on global food supplies. No doubt, they probably imagine this will give them a powerful “bargaining chip” in a “New Yalta” world dominated by the Soviets.

In December of last year, Block and Amstutz went to London and held a press conference, where they bluntly issued a declaration of war against European agriculture. Using the cover of the Soviet-scripted “free market” farm bill, the U.S. agriculture officials told startled Europeans that the new Department of Agriculture farm bill will aim at breaking into traditional European export markets in a savage war of competition.

The cold-blooded cynicism of Soviet intelligence in this process was revealed in an article in the Soviet Communist Party’s economic weekly *Ekonomicheskaya Gazeta* in July 1984. There, in an 8-page analysis of Western agriculture titled “Monopoly Agribusiness,” writers from IMEMO, the economic intelligence think-tank which reports to the Soviet general staff, wrote that parity systems are to be condemned because they promote the industrialization of farming! They especially single out *fermerskii kapital*, the model for which is the traditional American family-held farm, the world’s most successful productive model to date.

Soviet publications thus openly agree with Block’s “free market” strategy in facilitating destruction of the world’s most productive food producers. This, however, should not be surprising in light of the above. The Soviet Union through IIASA is the major architect of that “free market” strategy.