

Kissinger food weapon aimed at Soviets, Europe

by Chris White

The Bush National Security Council, headed by former Kissinger Associates, Inc. official Brent Scowcroft, has reportedly blocked U.S. shipments of food to the Soviet Union in retaliation for their less than enthusiastic support for George Bush's personal vendetta against Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

According to German syndicated columnist Peter Schroeder, a usually well-informed Washington correspondent, Gorbachov was told bluntly during his meeting with Bush in Paris on Nov. 19, that there will be no food aid for the Soviet Union from the United States as long as Moscow continues to block U.S. efforts seeking a resolution approving use of military force against Iraq at the United Nations. Schroeder's Nov. 20 column, as printed in the *Wiesbadener Kurier*, reported: "Before Gorbachov conferred with Bush, the National Security Council of the U.S.A. had already given him the *pay-back* for the *brakeman's* role of the Soviets who can veto any United Nations resolution: Planned American food aid to the citizens of the Soviet Union has been called off for the time being."

As of Nov. 23, the United States stood alone among advanced sector nations in not signing on to the Western package of winter emergency relief which is now being negotiated for the Soviet Union. This package could be worth up to \$10 billion; Margaret Thatcher's government had committed \$10 million, underlining who stands where.

German-Soviet cooperation the real target

The substance of the report involves more than the question of winter food help for the wreckage of the Soviet economy. It is also a devastating rebuttal of Bush administration propaganda about what is at stake in the Gulf crisis, and why U.S. forces have been deployed.

It is documented, from shipping reports out of Great

Lakes and Gulf Coast grain facilities that U.S. shipments during the months of August, September, and November collapsed dramatically. Shipments valued at only \$11 million were exported from U.S. ports to the Soviet Union during the month of August, compared to more than \$330 million in June.

If the shipments of food began to dry up in August, the reason cannot simply be the lack of Soviet co-operation in the Gulf crisis. The official in charge of the U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union in this matter is Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, the number-two official under Secretary of State James Baker, who was given the responsibility about four months ago, at the end of July.

This points to the likelihood that the policy Schroeder reports, of withholding food from the Soviet Union, was actually going into place before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. However, it is well-documented—for example, in *EIR's* special report entitled "Bush's Gulf Crisis: The Beginning of World War III?"—that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was brought about by manipulation of Iraq and Kuwait. U.S. Ambassador in Baghdad April Glaspie was informing Saddam Hussein, days before the invasion, that the U.S. viewed Iraq's disputes with Kuwait, including territorial disputes, as an inter-Arab matter. During the same period, CIA officials were advising the Kuwaitis to stand firm. So, the policy of drying up food shipments to the Soviet Union was being cooked up at the same time as the war in the Gulf.

What changed between June, when the U.S. food shipments were comparable to those of the year before, and August, when they began to collapse, was the Anglo-American view of the emerging relation between Germany and Gorbachov. In mid-July, Gorbachov and West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl met in Gorbachov's hometown near the city of Stavropol, to work out their agreements on the process of

German re-unification and on the complementary aid package which re-unified Germany would extend to the Soviet Union. That meeting, portending the emergence of the unified economic power of the Eurasian land-mass feared by Anglo-American geo-politicians over the course of the century to date, set off alarm bells in London and Washington. The shut-off of U.S. food aid, beginning in the aftermath of the Gorbachov-Kohl discussions, shows that, far from the food shut-off being an expression of personal pique over non-cooperation over the war threat brought into existence in the Gulf, changing the international agenda by threatening 60% of the world's known oil reserves was the Anglo-Americans' response to the Kohl-Gorbachov agreements.

U.S. food exports drop before Iraqi invasion

Where U.S. food exports are concerned, this pattern is clear. In August, the value of U.S. farm shipments to the U.S.S.R. tumbled to \$11 million from \$391 million in June, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Since early September, U.S. exports of corn have fallen 40% from a year earlier. Last autumn's exports were especially high due to heavy Soviet buying. About 25% of the corn exported from the U.S. last year went to the Soviet Union. The U.S. has reduced the export volume by not offering government export-credit guarantees to the Soviets. This is contrary to what other major food exporters have done; Canada, France, Argentina, Spain, Germany, and Italy have maintained such guarantees. U.S. exporters claim this has cost them 6.35 million metric tons of grain sales since Oct. 1. Wheat prices in the U.S. are slumping, from over \$4 a bushel in early 1989 to about \$2.75 today.

Ships out of the Great Lakes port of Duluth, Minnesota have loaded only half as much spring wheat this year as they did in 1989. At export terminals in New Orleans, Louisiana, grain shipments are down by one-third since October 1989. This has forced some of the big grain facilities to cut shifts in half and close down for several days.

"The pace the U.S. is on for September, October, and November is very similar to the dismal pace of 1986," said the top economist at one of the nation's biggest grain exporters. "It's very, very slow."

"This year the fall rush simply didn't materialize," said Davis Helberg, executive director of the Seaway Port Authority in Duluth. "It's the slowest since the depression in world agricultural trade."

A President prepared to risk war in the Middle East and the lives of the hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops sent there, in order to defend his own image and to oppose the economic alliance emerging between re-unified Germany and the Soviet Union, which represents the best available means of pulling the U.S. itself out of the depression spiral down which it is heading, is insane.

Opposite to the Anglo-Saxon part of the world—Britain, Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand—

continental Europe, together with Japan, has protected itself from the lunacies of the doctrine of the post-industrial society, under which policy especially U.S. in-depth capabilities have been taken down over the last 25 years. Co-operation between continental Europe and the East, in the "Productive Triangle" design developed by economist Lyndon LaRouche, provides the most rapid means to generate the economic growth which would turn around the world economy as a whole. Under Bush and his former spine-stiffener Margaret Thatcher, the United States and Britain are rushing toward war to protect the presumed rights of their elites to plunge the world economy into the depths of depression.

Food war against Europe

If the shut-off in food to the Soviet Union is part of the policy package which created the war crisis in the Gulf area, then so, too, is what the United States and Britain are demanding of their allies at the current General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) talks.

U.S. food cartel operative Clayton Yeutter, speaking in Sweden as U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, attempted to brow-beat the Europeans into submitting to Anglo-American demands that they abandon policies which foster food production. Yeutter's masters grabbed 60% of the world's oil reserves with the deployment into the Gulf, and they intend to be the world's sole suppliers of farm products also. "My fortnight of talks around Europe have left me very pessimistic about the outcome," Yeutter blustered. "We need a substantial movement by the EC [European Community] on their proposals if any farm deal is going to be acceptable to the U.S. Congress. At present their proposals are unacceptable to almost every other country in the world." Yeutter threatened that "The level of confrontation would rise in the absence of success."

Desperate to bend the Europeans to their will, U.S. officials are invoking the specter of "a more active role by Congress"—massive protectionism and punitive trade retaliation—if the current round of GATT talks fails. The grain cartels are leading this effort. Executives at the American Soybean Conference in mid-November said that a wheat subsidy war between Europe and the U.S. was inevitable if the talks fail. A blatant example of Anglo-American thuggery was a remark by Robert Lim, a trade policy official of the Australian High Commission, that the last major U.S.-EC wheat subsidy war in 1986 cost the Argentines most of their wheat export income, equivalent to their entire debt service obligations.

A spokesman for Cargill U.K.'s European operations, David Nelson-Smith, bluntly declared, "We're in for a period of trade wars and unilateral action which will take place on both sides."

This is the kind of insanity out of which world wars are made, for essentially the same reasons which produced the two earlier world wars of the century.