

variations were detected in restriction enzyme patterns from each individual, the differences were limited when taken from the same individual over time, *but markedly different from different subjects.*

The Levy group summarizes their work as follows:

"These studies indicate that disease progression correlates with the appearance of variant viruses that are more cytopathic and have a wider host range than the original isolate. The variants we isolated could have coexisted in each host from the time of infection and had different levels of expression during the course of infection. Alternatively, the virus originally transmitted to the host could have undergone genomic changes during the course of infection. We do not believe these biologic changes reflect the conditions *in vitro* because, except for isolates from subject #1, all isolates were characterized within 3 to 4 weeks of isolation. If selection of one isolate occurred, then this preferential recovery gave the same results consistently: The three individuals who advanced in disease yielded the more cytopathic viruses than the individual who remained healthy. Finally, most of the isolates were retested after three months in culture and showed the same biologic properties. The lack of molecular change in HIV-1 after long-term passage has been reported.

"These results suggest that the development of disease symptoms in HIV-1-infected individuals is associated with the emergence of more pathogenic virus variants. Future studies with these isolates should provide information on the genes that determine the virulence of HIV-1, and identify potential targets for antiviral therapy."

### The implications?

The virus is not a pure entity, but a self-evolving phenomenon of a disease process. Under certain conditions of gross devolution in the physical economy of the biosphere, a viral singularity is "thrown up" by the process itself. Without a continuous improvement of the most advanced species in the biosphere—namely, the human species as a whole—the process begins to cannibalize itself and transforms to a lower-level manifold of activity. The transformations thereby catalyzed take on a "life of their own," so to speak. In which, absent the intervention to reverse the biogeochemical crisis in the physical economy of the biosphere as a whole, the devolving process "favors" the replication of improved strains of the virus, its mutants, and its recombinants. These transformations are "mapped" or "projected" into the biology of individual infected human beings, who themselves serve as the "petri dishes" for growing ever more virulent strains of virus.

These transformations focus upon the very questions which initiated the famous 1974 Biological Holocaust study prepared by Lyndon LaRouche and his associates, which forecast the development and progression of an AIDS-like viral pandemic in the precise areas and time sequence that AIDS has followed.

## The nonexistent food surplus of Europe

by William Engdahl

According to reliable sources from COPA, the Brussels central organization of European farmers' organizations, the European Community (EC) Agriculture Commission is privately admitting that the "surplus crisis" no longer exists, but publicly continues to act as though it does still exist at the "alarming" rates of the past three years.

One of the EC's main arguments to motivate the drastic farm austerity prices of the past several years has been the "soaring" cost of EC farm subsidies—fully 67% of total EC spending, \$27 billion last year. Officials neglect to mention that that was how EC member governments initially wanted to have it.

The other factor willfully ignored by Brussels officials zealous to cut farm spending is that fully 33% of the increased cost for Brussels in the past two years comes from the dollar effect. Grain is priced in world trade, as are most agriculture exports, in dollars. As the dollar drops, the price the EC must compensate in intervention for exports increases. Nobody in Brussels will talk about this "non-agriculture" factor, despite the fact it is, according to one EC official, by far the largest cost increase factor in the last two years.

And now, with the Feb. 13 Brussels "Stabilizers" agreement of EC heads of state, the EC will automatically impose a complex set of punitive taxes and price cuts if even one ounce more than 160 million tons of grain is harvested in the EC. The "trigger" number was deliberately set at a level just above the extremely low 153 million ton harvest of the last year. EC farm sources expect this year's harvest to be above 160 million tons. Reliable EC grain trading estimates of the actual cost to the farmer of this new "stabilizer" are that prices paid to EC grain farmers of average size will be further reduced by at least 20% per annum for the period until the Single Europe Act goes into effect in 1992, establishing a single internal market.

Pointing to the above, EC Agriculture Commissioner Frans Andriessen told a Brussels audience at an April 7 food conference that the EC was moving toward a "market oriented" agriculture policy. That term, "market oriented," was coined by a multinational study made for the Trilateral Commission in 1985. It has become official policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the EC. That is only further

confirmation that farm policy of the world's most important producing countries is in a vise grip of these cartel multinationals.

The following is a review of the actual "intervention stocks" in EC storage for the three principal food products making up the stores—butter, meat, and grains.

### Cereals (million tons)

EC intervention or carry-over stocks in storage by the EC, put the so-called "grain mountain" into perspective. Here are the official EC intervention stocks:

|                | 1979 | '80 | '81 | '82 | '83 | '84 | '85 | '86 | '88* |
|----------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| (million tons) |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Intervention   | —    | +5  | +3  | +8  | +4  | +13 | +14 | +18 | +8   |
| Stocks         |      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |

(\*EC official figure as of Jan 31, 1988)

At the peak in 1986, the intervention stocks reached 13% of that year's harvest. The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) recommends about 25% to be the minimum emergency reserve. The 8 million ton intervention stock, with last year's harvest of 153 million tons, is a dangerously low 5.2%!

### The cereal substitutes trick

Now, what is never discussed in the entire Brussels EC surplus debate, is the import of cereals and cereal substitutes. One well-placed EC grain industry representative said that anyone daring to question this grain substitute issue is immediately branded "anti-free trade," "extreme rightist" and such epithets. It apparently has been effective in Brussels.

According to the EC definition of "cereal substitute," the following figures show import of cereal substitutes (soyabean meal, manioc, corn gluten feed, etc.):

#### Cereal equivalent imports (million tons):

|                | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 85  | 86  | 87  |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Cereal equiv.: | 39   | 39   | 43   | 41   | 38   | 42  | 50  | 58  |
| Import         |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |
| Total import:  | +55  | +55  | +56  | +51  | +47  | +49 | +57 | +65 |
| Grain + equiv. |      |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |

Source: FEDIOL, COPA, EEC, Brussels

In other words, including cereals (some 6-7 million tons in 1987) and cereal substitutes, the EC imported an all-time record 65 million tons last year, some 58 million tons of which were substitutes, most—25 million tons—being soya, meal, and beans.

### The special case of soya

According to the EC Seed Crushers and Oil Processors Federation (FEDIOL), total EC imports of soyabeans and

processed soyacakes for the years 1986 and 1987 are as follows for the European Community's 12 nations:

|                           | 1986 | 1987                      |
|---------------------------|------|---------------------------|
| <b>1) Soyabeans:</b>      |      |                           |
| 13,056,000 tons of which: |      | 14,650,000 tons of which: |
| 9,632,000 from USA        |      | 10,354,000 from USA       |
| 1,100,000 from Brazil     |      | 2,618,000 from Brazil     |
| 1,888,000 from Argentina  |      | 676,000 from Argentina    |
| <b>2) Soyacakes:</b>      |      |                           |
| 11,256,000 tons of which: |      | 10,650,000 tons of which: |
| 2,854,000 from USA        |      | 3,190,000 from USA        |
| 5,780,000 from Brazil     |      | 5,265,000 from Brazil     |
| 2,099,000 from Argentina  |      | 1,875,000 from Argentina  |

The impact of this import in destabilizing the entire price structure of EC agriculture cannot be overstated. The trade in world soya is fully dominated by some five grain cartel companies, of which Toepfer of Hamburg is 45% owned by Dwayne Andreas's Archer Daniels Midland. The others are Cargill, Continental, Bunge, and Ferruzzi-Central Soya. They control the soya markets of the United States, Argentina, and Brazil.

In the past several years, these multinational food cartel companies have taken advantage of the massively devalued currencies of Argentina and Brazil, a by-product of International Monetary Fund demands on their debt renegotiations, to cheapen their raw material costs, when calculated against their dollar profits. The debtor countries are forced to export valuable food products to pay foreign bank debt, not to increase protein levels of their seriously undernourished populations. This situation has allowed processed soya to be imported into the EC at cheaper costs than non-processed soya could be shipped into Europe, where it enters the EC tax-free according to a specific formal agreement between the EC and the United States as part of the GATT (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs). Because of this GATT exemption for soya imports into the EC, no EC farmer is able to produce on an efficient scale soya and other protein-dense grain substitutes at competitive prices with the cartels'. As a result, the EC is the world's largest soya and grain substitute trade market.

The EC "meat" stock is the only figure rising in the past 18 months *strictly because of the slaughter of dairy herds* under the EC dairy quota regime.

The "butter mountain," originally cited as the reason for a drastic March 1984 "dairy quota" in the EC, has dropped to its lowest levels since 1983 when arbitrary Brussels price changes caused the increase in dairy output which lasted into 1986. Large parts of the "surplus" were then given away by the EC, mostly in subsidized prices to Russia.

Such is the actual current situation of the much-argued EC food "surpluses." Before governments destroy more of the planet's most capital-intensive food-producing capacities in the name of "budget reform," it would be well to know what and who is manipulating the arguments of the surplus debate.