
Interview: Nicholas E. Hollis

'ADM: Supermark-up to the World'

Nicholas Hollis is president of the Agribusiness Council. He was interviewed on Dec. 10 by Marcia Merry Baker.



EIR: You've documented extensively the history and practices of the famous company Archer Daniels Midland, and you've termed it, "ADM: Supermark-up to the World."

Very accurate! Why do you use that expression?

Hollis: Well, I think the important thing is to remember that the company has pled guilty to criminal price-fixing in just one food ingredient—lysine—and a number of other food ingredients have grand juries considering practices that ADM has been, at least, implicated in. The amount of money that has been estimated, just as a cost-transfer to the farmers—and this is just U.S. farmers—of the lysine price-fixing scheme while it was in operation, which is about two and a half to three years, is upwards of \$200 million. So farmers, certainly hog farmers, were paying quite a premium of this mark-up. That's why this term was used.

EIR: What other commodities are under investigation for price-fixing?

Hollis: Federal authorities are investigating high-fructose corn syrup, citric acid, methionine, which is another health ingredient for animal feed. Grand juries have also been convened on sorbates and certain vitamins. ADM is a primary producer of these products.

EIR: What is the degree of ADM's domination in different kinds of markets here and abroad?

Hollis: It depends on which commodity you are talking about. In corn processing, ADM is dominant. They have the largest capacity for corn milling as well as soybean processing in the country. There's a question of why this company stands out, of what makes it so menacing, and why these cartels are important. There are several aspects of why the "supermark-up" stands out.

One of the key aspects is the management of the company

itself—the family management of the Andreas family. And the corrupting of Dwayne Andreas, which involves a systematic effort over a lifetime to poison, corrupt, and take control of the non-profit association sector in so many of these agricultural associations, farmer cooperatives, university research programs, and foundations. Andreas has achieved this for the purpose of generating obscene profits. He used these groups to project a false image of broad farmer support for what these associations—that are really controlled by the ADM company—purport to represent, and hoodwinks the nation.

The real tragedy is that the farmers are the ones who are being subjugated, even further under the heel of the company.

EIR: Specifically, we hear that Federal subsidies for ethanol, or promotion of gasohol, are to benefit the farmer. But you're saying, this is how ADM benefits?

Hollis: Unquestionably. I think that the benefit, the amount of subsidy that ADM has received by its dominant position in the ethanol business, which it set up, was all part of Andreas's gameplan. He was able to create, through pulling political strings in the late 1970s—when the nation faced long gas lines and great concerns about dependence on foreign oil—the use of the renewable resource corn, as the preferred feedstock. Andreas had the corn and the excess molasses. He had to figure out what to do with surpluses, and he was clever in the way in which he was able to convince the White House and the Congress to essentially set up this market.

But, it remains somewhat of a question as to whether or not, had similar creative energy been explored, and pointed in the direction of developing other markets and other products, that corn farmers would be better off. The question is really, are they better off with ethanol?

Certainly, if you listen to the ADM-controlled association executives purportedly representing corn farmers, as opposed to talking to corn farmers themselves, you get a very skewed point of view about how important this is for farm income and for the corn farmers.

Corn is the biggest cash crop in our country. But when you track the amounts of money that the subsidies have generated, sloshing through the ADM coffers [some \$7 billion], and you link the use of those monies to the continuing corruption of the political process, and the funding of an unprecedented advertising campaign to manipulate the media, it becomes almost Orwellian. Kafkaesque.

EIR: So the public hears the name, "farmer," or, for example, the "National Corn Growers Association," but in fact, they are seeing or hearing part of a whole number of front groups, that are really serving ADM's interests?

Hollis: This is problematic depending upon which group you investigate—if you look at the Corn Growers, you discover that the National Association has a quite different philosophy than the American Corn Growers Association. You discover, too, that the way in which numbers, in terms of members—

which is always a way associations try to generate their own credibility—is an inflated number that really represents the totality of not only farmers in the state corn growers' groups, but their wives. They are basically doubling the number of members, even though the actual number of farmers continues to decline.

But, the other important point is that the state groups are quite autonomous in many ways from the national office, and therefore, to count all the members of state groups as part of one overall umbrella, is a bit of an exaggeration.

In other words, the appearance of a broad front of representative farmers' groups that the Corn Growers supposedly represent, reflects quite a bit of rigging. When you look past the curtains, you find out that there is really only one string-puller behind the scenes: ADM.

EIR: What is the status of the latest charges against ADM?

Hollis: The jury found Michael Andreas and Terrence Wilson, president of the corn-processing division of ADM, guilty of criminal price-fixing in September 1998. They await sentencing, which has been tentatively set for Feb. 26. There are some motions that the defense has put forward to try to have the case thrown out—the arguments are very flimsy, you know how lawyers can operate, but the end result of this is likely to be jail time, starting in 1999, for the convicted.

EIR: You have politely called “coincidences,” some of the ways ADM has received special treatment, after the initial, June 1995 FBI raid on their offices. Can you characterize the last few years?

Hollis: Justice delayed is justice denied. This is a slow minuet that has been choreographed and orchestrated to the tune of a \$100 million fine that ADM paid to the Justice Department in 1996, about 15 or 16 months after the raid, and *only* after the U.S. government case became much stronger with the active support of some of the other conspirators, other companies that were involved in the cartel.

Only then did ADM agree to plead guilty. But the \$100 million fine ADM paid was less than some experts expected, and enabled ADM to leave the settlement table with quite a good series of compensating positions, including blanket immunity for Dwayne Andreas: the appearance of the whole thing, from the standpoint of what happened after the raid leading up to the settlement in October 1996, and the machinations inside the Justice Department, the resignations of key officials, and the de facto replacement of authority in handling the case, which was originally being coordinated at the Deputy Attorney General level by Jamie Gorelick. The strong implication is that there was a tremendous damage-control effort, and there were people—Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division Joanne Harris, Assistant Attorney General for the Anti-Trust Division Anne Bingaman—who were effectively pushed out of the way.

The net result was that ADM was dealt with in a very special way. There was a selective prosecution, directed at

the whistle-blower, Mark Whitacre, with whom the FBI was working to gather all of the intelligence. This was done on grounds that he had embezzled money, unbeknownst to the government handlers, while he was tape-recording ADM activities. When Whitacre's defense responded that offshore money transfers via dummy corporations reflected management-approved special bonuses that were off the books, and fairly standard at high levels at ADM, it was ignored.

Indeed, the Justice Department seemed to be willing to listen to and take all of its information from ADM, with regard to Mark Whitacre. So, you have this rather unique situation, where the government has a case in which it has netted more than \$200 million in fines from the company and others, from the work of the whistle-blower, and *yet*, the Justice Department has seen fit to, with the appearance of working closely with ADM, effectively send this young man to prison for nine and a half hard years without chance of parole. Whitacre is currently serving prison time, while his bosses, who appeared to mastermind the price-fixing, are still walking free.

The Justice Department knows that there are a lot of people looking at this particular bizarre set of circumstances and coincidences, that involve the *appearance* and smell, of some kind of a cover-up.

EIR: In contrast to ADM's track record, and cartel agribusiness, what was the perspective you had in the 1960s, when the Agribusiness Council was formed?

Hollis: The Agribusiness Council is a non-profit association. It was started to project the best of American agribusiness into the international arena. At the time, President Johnson, wanted U.S. firms to participate more aggressively in the Green Revolution. He was anxious to get American companies more involved in overseas joint ventures, and more agribusiness-type trade.

The term “agribusiness” really refers to virtually any company or individual having anything to do with the production, distribution, including the transportation, the financing of activities, marketing and the research and development of food products. So, you have a much wider array of entities, from a field-to-fork perspective. From the farmer, who is part of agribusiness, as a thinking businessman now, with his own computerization, all the way out to the grocery stores and the fast-food chains. Anybody involved in the food system becomes a part of the agribusiness family. If you eat you have a stake in the agribusiness food system.

EIR: Were you involved in any special aspect of the Green Revolution? The “miracle rice,” or the new wheat?

Hollis: The council was primarily involved in taking overseas missions and welcoming incoming official trade delegations. This was before the days when the government decided to jump into the trade mission business in a big way.

I might add, that there have been allegations that the government has sold various slots on trade missions to the highest political contributors. But back in the 1960s and '70s, trade

missions were often mounted by the ag organizations and the other non-profits, chambers of commerce, the manufacturing associations. The Agribusiness Council was a leader in these early activities, and also in the identification of investment opportunities in developing countries.

EIR: In recent months, we've seen some dramatic and hopeful policy shifts by Russia, and other governments, taking actions in the interests of their national economies. In November and December, the Primakov government announced that they want to rebuild their agriculture sector, which was taken down drastically in the 1990s during the so-called shock-therapy reform, and import-dependence period, that began at the insistence of Margaret Thatcher and George Bush.

The Chinese government has been moving on agriculture development going back to 1978—livestock, infrastructure, input ratios, etc. In December 1998, President Jiang Zemin of China visited Russia, stressing mutual development. And elsewhere, there are other national-interest protective measures being taken, in line with what you have been promoting. What do you think about the prospects for this?

Hollis: Let a thousand flowers bloom! We were involved in outreach to China in the 1980s. We took a mission to the Soviet Union in 1990, and the follow-up series of activities led to the creation of a Polish Agribusiness Council in 1994.

Our meetings in Moscow in 1990 were aimed at trying to get some of the different republics to show interest in setting up these types of self-help, people-to-people initiatives, to begin to get their agriculture better understood and organized, and even to encourage in some areas the private enterprise themes. These initiatives—that took so well in Poland as many Polish farmers own their own land, it didn't take in Russia where land ownership is problematic.

The alternate approach that was pushed at that time—with Dwayne Andreas again in the vanguard, and his sidekick Bob Strauss, who was confirmed as U.S. Ambassador to Moscow in the last months of the Gorbachov era—created a framework for selling more grain into Russia, and at the same time, sending legions of consultants to, basically, recycle the money that had been pledged to the Russians to help them get their economy in a free-market model. Just recycling consultants, and at the same time, pumping large amounts of com-

Jennings Randolph: in the FDR tradition

Jennings Randolph (1902-98), from West Virginia, served in the U.S. Congress for a period spanning more than five decades: in the House of Representatives from 1933 to 1947, and the U.S. Senate from 1958 to 1985, when he retired. Sworn into office with the New Deal landslide and Franklin Delano Roosevelt



in 1933, Randolph championed the disabled and “the man and woman at the wayside in the road,” as he put it, as well as many of the “FDR Democrat” policy priorities, including infrastructure development (Tennessee Valley Authority, aviation, highways) and social programs (such as medical care for the aged on Social Security).

During his Senate career, he turned his attention to international affairs. Rejecting the “bushel for a barrel” rhetoric popular in the 1970s, one initiative he launched was the founding of the Agri-Energy Roundtable (AER); another was the U.S. Institute of Peace. The AER model reflected his own complex interests from high technology

to alleviating hunger and malnutrition. AER's efforts intersected the debate on food and energy security issues, and Randolph's leadership underscored his fervent desire to build bridges between energy-surplus and agricultural-exporting nations. The diplomatic “dialogue” approach with member-nations of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries embodied in AER activities, enabled him to advance cooperative agricultural and energy projects with key Third World leaders.

AER's work spawned affiliated agribusiness associations around the world, for example, in Africa, India, the Philippines, Poland, and throughout the United States. In 1985, after retiring from the Senate, he assumed leadership of the Agribusiness Council (ABC). Randolph's views on how to expand a nation's economic base are relevant to our strategic situation today. Agribusiness Council president Nicholas Hollis, who worked with Randolph for more than a decade, described him in the following way, in the Dec. 10 interview with *EIR*:

A ‘balance’ for national self-sufficiency

“Jennings Randolph was a great humanitarian, and during his last term in the Senate, he took a great interest in these [Agribusiness Council] programs. When he became the chairman of ABC, he helped develop a dialogue between food and energy countries. It was a unique program of exchanges on the *balanced* nature of developing self-sufficiency in energy and food. He used those themes to build an international roundtable, of which the Agribusiness Council is the U.S. component, but which has

modities into them, has resulted, I think, in a situation which is truly tragic, where the Russians really don't have much of a clue at this point, how to get their agricultural act together.

We've pumped a lot of materials in—commodities sold on various programs that have been sponsored by USDA [U.S. Department of Agriculture], and financed by U.S. taxpayers, and the money has benefitted companies like ADM. This is one reason ADM's continuing ability to do business with the government (i.e., USDA), after price-fixing convictions is so questionable. The result is that the Russians are more dependent than ever on outside food which contributed to great humiliation and serious political unrest. While at the same time the solutions and the ideas have never really been given a chance—some of the most effective programs are people-to-people, on-the-ground teaching exercises, that are designed to help the Russians understand the use of appropriate technologies and ways in which they can actually build up yields—few of those programs are being given any attention or support.

EIR: In the early period, were you involved in the farm ex-

spawned a whole series of international conferences, trade missions, and ongoing non-profit associations in a number of countries. "Jennings Randolph was one of the legislative fathers of the TVA. In 1987, he was able to convince the TVA to join the Agribusiness association. The TVA did, in fact, participate in some of our international and national meetings, and was instrumental in setting up, with us, a renewable energy subcommittee, chaired by a top TVA official. This was about ten years ago. That particular activity has generated a number of subcommittee meetings, and there is more interest at the state-level agribusiness councils now as a result of that.

"So that, even against the backdrop of falling energy prices, and falling commodity prices, which makes many of the renewable energy feedstocks difficult to justify economically, the continued interest in renewables is part of this. TVA has been a big leader in biomass energy technologies.

"Randolph was a living legend. He had a charisma, and a humanitarian spirit that transcended all the passing issues. And when he would get up at the head table at meetings overseas, and tell his West Virginia homespun jokes, and, of course, weave more serious thoughts in. He was just an inspiration to those that were in these meetings, who subsequently went out into the world and to set up their own independent associations, and tried to treat people a little bit more humanely and honestly."

For more information on The Jennings Randolph Recognition Project, contact: e-mail: agenergy@aol.com, or fax (202) 887-9178.

change programs that went back and forth?

Hollis: Certainly, we have encouraged all those farmer exchange programs that we're aware of. One in particular, we worked with in Iowa. But that is a little afield from what we try to do. Our approach, and our basic idea all along, was to get the Russians, and the Ukrainians to form their own self-help organizations based on private enterprise principles. I was in Ukraine in 1997, and went into the countryside, and made some speeches and had some meetings with local Ukrainian farmers and agricultural processing leaders and other leaders, who were interested in trying to use the "Polish model," which is progressing.

A basic problem is that ag organizations that are based on the *commodity* model. They are set up and connected in the way that our system is here, directly to the USDA, with its "subsidy engine" feeding into the associations. They quickly lose independence and become, by proxy, nothing more than government toadies. Thus, if government policy is wrong, the entities are misguided, and the individuals in them have no way to correct the mistakes that are made at the highest levels. These are not true associations at all, and they also don't really have the flexibility that a true association has, to begin to implement creative ideas and programming that really give spirit and heart to people on the ground. And the spirit and the lack of enthusiasm and hope that one sees now across the former Iron Curtain countries—with some exceptions—is really disheartening and very sad, because *it needn't be this way*.

EIR: The toll had been great. But specifics for agriculture development have been announced in Russia, including: the priority of expanding poultry development; rescheduling, just putting off, debt in the farm and food-processing sectors, in order to keep operations going; increasing inputs of fertilizer; and generally, revving things up. The bad situation today is seen as an opportunity to make way for something better.

Hollis: I'm not saying we oughtn't to sell into Russia. We should help U.S. farm income by marketing. But what I am saying is, that there is a predatory nature in force-feeding the goose, or jamming huge amounts of dumped commodities into countries which can be counterproductive.

EIR: You know that U.S. chicken parts imported into Russia have become legendary: They are called "Bush legs," after George Bush!

Hollis: Right. The Russians have developed a taste for these foods but I'm not sure there is not a direct link between the chicken-leg issue, and the desire the Russians have to get self-sufficient in chicken production. They'll be reaching not for U.S. chicken company expertise, but they will be looking to Hungarian and Polish companies, that they have more compatibility with.

The Russians are resentful of the kind of marketing approach that withholds the money that was promised on the aid side, and instead jams them with this hard-trade lever,

where you're going to take these huge amounts of chickens. It ends up, over a couple years, generating a few people in this country a lot of money. But the country itself loses long term: over the possibility of feeling a more cooperative, partnership approach with the Russians; and it hurts the Russians immediately. It infuriates them, and they're not generating any real ability to make income. If they don't generate an ability to make income, they can't buy from us long-term.

EIR: So we have either an opportunity to collaborate in things being built up, or trouble.

Hollis: Yes. There needs to be what Jennings Randolph called a *balanced* approach—with a capital “B” [see box]. Not to say that there aren't some valuable lessons to be learned in export development. But a trade, not aid, theme is what we have advocated. At the same time, unless you help build up a country's ability to self-generate, and have faith in the value-added, long-term product sales line you could develop with a partnership. Unless you do that, if you try instead to take the short-term rip-'em-off approach, everybody loses. And that's the fear I have now, with what we see unfolding.

EIR: What about the farm situation in the United States right now. Here, supposedly, the ever-loving “market forces” were going to solve everything—the premise, for example, of the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act, which has amounted to “freedom to fail.” We have a situation of grain not being sold that's piled up on the ground around the country. Farm hog prices have gone down to less than 10¢ a pound. What reading do you have from your state associations?

Hollis: The same reports you just outlined. That things probably haven't been this bad in 30, 40 years. That it's a very gloomy season as the year has drawn to an end. Farmers are climbing the walls. Many of them are going to the wall, in droves.

The tragedy is that much of this could be averted, but we have the sense too that some of the predators in agribusiness, one of which is a company we were talking about at length earlier in this dialogue, ADM, have actually found ways to take advantage of the farmers. For example ADM will obtain information through the infiltration of farmer cooperatives, and approach financially strapped farmer groups to loan them money. Later ADM seizes the collateral, like farm elevators, which is the key to creating more processing capacity, and gaining more control. This is all part of a predatory pattern. There are fewer and fewer farmers. Take hog farmers who are being driven out of business by these low prices, and yet, in certain areas of agribusiness, the pork-processing companies seem to be doing quite well. You look at ADM's earning statement last year, it is quite revealing. They now own 12% of the nation's largest meat-packer—IBP.

EIR: IBP for its third quarter 1998, had a record profit rate.

Hollis: While huge numbers of ranchers and hog farmers are going out of business. Something's fundamentally wrong

there, which anybody in association with public policy work can recognize. So, we are getting alarming reports from certain sectors. And we wonder whether or not people can continue to believe that all is well. When you look at the ADM ads with David Brinkley on his old show, you think that a new dawn, and new glorification of the farmer is developing, and that all is well in the countryside.

It reminds me a little of a story of a fellow, who was an old guy, who went down, on a very hot summer day, into a cellar, to get some relief. He wanted to get the cool air. The moment he entered the cellar, he was blinded by the darkness of the cellar. When he got into the cellar, another man who was already in the cellar told him, “Don't worry. It's natural that when you come into the darkness from the light, that you are unable to see. But soon enough, your eyes will grow accustomed to it, and you will hardly notice it as dark.”

And the fellow who had gone into the basement said, “That, my dear friend, is exactly what I am worried about.” If darkness is darkness, the danger is convincing yourself that it is light.

And I think in our current situation in agriculture, there are those who are running around trying to convince the farmer that it really is not as dire as it is. And that lulling is only aimed to further disadvantage the few farmers that are left. The country lacks connectedness to the real sector, to the farmer. It is kind of a terrible situation when the people themselves, in their own ignorance, allow a company like ADM to present itself as the patron, and the defender, and the cheerleader of the farmer, when in fact the farmer has a very different opinion of the company, and sees himself as being subjugated under their heel, and essentially being pushed out of existence.

And the public, and even the intelligentsia, the elites, and the public policy dialogue, are fed a constant dialogue of these ADM infomercials, to believe that the countryside is quite well and quite vibrant and that ADM is really riding the white horse, and taking care of the farmer. It's an outrage.

EIR: It certainly points up that a change of *thinking* is drastically needed, and the consequences of not doing it will be dire, terminal. In November 1998, Lyndon LaRouche put out a strategic paper on this, “Food, Not Money, Is the Crisis” [*EIR*, Nov. 13, 1998]. He has called for responding to the situation in Russia as a strategic opportunity to take a traditional “food for peace,” nation-building approach—meaning the 1940s/1950s style approach, not the last 20 years of Henry Kissinger's “food as a weapon” policy.

Hollis: I think the position is correct. I think it is a food crisis, not a money crisis. Yes. In terms of the Russian situation.

The problem with the era now is that everybody has got this sort of beggar-thy-neighbor and let's-rip-'em-off-now-and-get-rich, and not worry about the consequences. Everything is bottom-line/next-quarter attitude. This is beginning to sow a terrible whirlwind.

I am just afraid that people don't want to spend much

attention understanding the dilemma of the rural sector, and want to believe that agribusiness and agriculture grows on their supermarket shelf. They're going to be subjected to the "Supermark-up to the World," in ways that we haven't even talked about here, which are really serious in relation to food safety, and the kind of food that you are ingesting. And the kind of corners that are cut by companies to add a few pennies to the bottom line, and where that leads you, is scary.

ADM's history of corruption

1918: Dwayne Andreas born in Illinois, one of five sons; involved in various family processing ventures.

1945-52: Dwayne Andreas works for Cargill, starting as general plant manager, ending as VP in charge of soybean and linseed oil. His assistant James R. Randall (hired at Cargill in 1948), later becomes president of ADM.

1945: Andreas meets Hubert Humphrey, then mayor of Minneapolis, and elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948. Their collaboration involves some 85 world trips; Humphrey is Michael Andreas's godfather.

1952: Andreas makes his first trip to the Soviet Union, as 34-year-old VP sales representative for Cargill, Inc. One of few U.S. citizens to get visas to the Soviet Union.

1954: The Food for Peace law, PL-480, is enacted. Humphrey and Andreas travel to Poland and to the Vatican, as a showcase bi-partisan move with Eisenhower administration, to pave the way for paying Cargill and other cartel firms to ship food to the East bloc.

1965: Archer Daniels Midland formed, merging assets of the Archer, Daniels, and Andreas families.

1966: Dwayne Andreas becomes president of ADM.

1968: Andreas "loans" \$100,000 to Humphrey's Democratic Presidential campaign, and is charged with illegally transferring corporate funds for election purposes. A Minnesota Federal judge, a friend of Humphrey's, dismisses the case. Andreas, via a Minneapolis business partner, Kenneth Dahlberg—chairman of Minnesota branch of Nixon's Committee to Re-Elect the President, or CREEP—funnels \$25,000, which ends up in the account of Watergate burglar Bernard Barker. Rep. Wright Patman (D-Tex.), whose Banking and Currency Committee was investigating the case, expressed concern that Andreas was one of the investors granted a Federal bank charter in a Minneapolis suburb. Dahlberg was among the five applicants for the charter. After Nixon's resignation in 1974, \$100,000 in cash, provided by Andreas, was found in the White House safe. Andreas got his money back in full, and reportedly, was able to successfully dodge subpoenas from Sen. Sam Ervin's impeachment hearings.

1971: Michael Andreas joins ADM at age 23. Trained in

speculation by Cargill's Julius Hendel.

1973: Dwayne Andreas's nephew, Martin Andreas, becomes ADM's chief salesman for corn sweeteners.

1974: ADM enters into price-fixing scheme, overcharging U.S. government by \$19 million in sales of soy-fortified food to the Food for Peace program. ADM is convicted in both criminal and civil suits, but evades repaying the government its share of \$19 million.

1976: ADM pleads no contest to Federal charges of systematically short-weighting and misgrading Federally subsidized grain shipped abroad. ADM loses no contracts, and continues shipments.

ADM/Cargill start up ethanol production, for non-food use of crops, lobbying for Federal subsidy, because Andreas needs a way to dispose of huge corn syrup excess.

1977: The newly enacted Federal sugar price support nets ADM millions of dollars by preventing sweetener prices from dropping. The staff author of the law, David Gartner, is a top aide to Humphrey; ADM bribed Gartner with a contribution of \$72,000 worth of ADM stock to a trust fund established for Gartner and his family.

1978: Gartner is appointed to Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The story of ADM's bribe to him breaks, but Gartner refuses to resign or to pay ADM back.

1984: Andreas first meets Mikhail Gorbachov in Moscow, in December. President Reagan appoints Andreas to chair a task force on private initiative; Andreas recommends creating an Economic Security Council, which becomes the Economic Policy Council. The joke around Washington is: "Ask not what you can do for your country; ask what your government can do for ADM."

1990: The Clean Air Act is a boon for ethanol output, with Cargill and ADM owning over 70% of the capacity.

1990s: Under the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Accord, ADM and Cargill extend their control and reposition their operations in North America. Dwayne Andreas joins the board of British intelligence publishing empire, Hollinger Corp., run by Canadian Conrad Black.

1994: Federal grand juries take anti-trust evidence on Cargill, ADM, Tate & Lyle (U.K.), and CPC International on price and supply fixing of lysine, citric acid, corn sweeteners, and starch. These four companies control 74% of U.S. wet corn milling.

1995: On June 27, the FBI raids ADM executive offices and homes in Decatur, Illinois.

1996: In October, top ADM executives Michael Andreas and Terrence Wilson leave the company.

On Oct. 14, ADM pleads guilty and agrees to pay fines of \$100 million for criminal price-fixing of lysine and citric acid.

1998: Michael Andreas and Terrence Wilson are convicted of criminal price fixing. Sentencing is scheduled for Feb. 26, 1999. ADM commands world's largest processing capacity for corn, soybeans, and wheat, with 165 processing plants, 300 grain elevators, 10,000 rail cars, 15,000 trucks, and 2,000 river barges.