

AGRICULTURAL REPORT

GRAIN EMBARGO TO AID SLAVE LABOR SCHEMES

NEW YORK, Oct. 10 (IPS)--The recently maneuvered U.S. embargo of Soviet grain was intended to create a "Red-scare" and publicly terminate the policy of detente; but its broader effect is to establish control over the world food supply as the means for implementing global slave-labor redevelopment projects. As a bonus, it also will refine the machinery for destroying agriculture in the U.S.

With the announcement of export controls last Sunday, the Rockefeller forces positioned themselves politically to determine which countries receive grain and which do not. Any sale exceeding 50,000 tons of corn, wheat, sorghum, soybeans, or soymeal or any sale more than 100,000 tons within a week to any one country now requires prior approval from the Rockefeller Administration. Decisions will be based on the same criteria as those of the World Bank's annual report: Is this country a credit-worthy investment risk for labor-intensive projects, or does it fit the "Fourth World" category--"better left to starve"--like famine-wracked India or Bangladesh?

Export Controls Intensify Looting

While export controls formally were announced only this week, they have been in de facto effect for a number of years--most notably this past year. Yet their formalization increases their strength as a controlling weapon. With many of the developed nations--especially Japan, but also West Germany, the Netherlands, Canada, Italy, and the U.K.--dependent upon the U.S. for foodstuffs, the export controls push them to the edge. Either they go along with Rockefeller's fascist "redevelopment" or they are cut off from U.S. exports. In the same way, third world nations who resist or who do not have lootable natural or human resources quickly will be labeled fourth world and left to starve.

Rockefeller already is well on his way to significantly reshaping the grain trading empire. Working through the multinational grain exporting companies under his controls, Continental Grain, Cargill, Cook and Bugge, he has begun the looting campaign. Grain exports have increased to just about every area where redevelopment schemes are scheduled or have begun. "Special trading preference" has been given to countries like Mexico which he has already begun to loot and to countries like the People's Republic of China which he intends to loot. Just this past year, both China and Mexico have moved into the top ten position of nations receiving U.S. agricultural exports,

10/14/74

IPS 3

replacing both the Soviet Union and France. China's imports of U.S. wheat, for example, rose five times over the previous year's imports, from about 0.6 million metric tons in 1972-73 to 3.2 million in 1973-74. Her purchases accounted for 10.6 percent of the total U.S. exports.

In the Middle East, slated for redevelopment, agricultural purchases have increased from slightly more than \$.5 billion in 1973 to over \$1 billion in 1974.

"Red Scare" and Shortages Sham

While the press led a hysterical smear-job on the Soviet Union as the "cause of the food crisis", they printed nothing about the vast increase in exports to the Chinese. It was never mentioned that Soviet wheat purchases dropped in 1973-74 from their previous high level to about 2.7 million metric tons, 0.3 million more than this year's cancelled purchases. Moreover, the cry of shortages is a sham. While corn and soybean crops have been reduced by drought and frost, the bumper wheat crop harvested earlier in the year nearly compensates for the losses. There is still enough food to feed both the U.S. and the world.

Threat to Domestic Agriculture

The same machinery that has established Rockefeller's control over the world food supply doubles as his control over the domestic market. When he chooses, Rockefeller can wipe out U.S. grain farmers at one stroke simply by holding back exports, glutting the market with grain, and thus driving prices through the floor. International trade is crucial to the stability of the U.S. grain market since two-thirds of the wheat, half of the soybeans, and one-fifth of the corn crops are exported. With farmers possessing large quantities of grain which they had withheld from the market in anticipation of price increases, the American farming community is in a totally vulnerable position.

Such a drastic collapse of feedgrain prices is unlikely to occur right now because the destruction of domestic livestock, poultry, and dairy farmers is incomplete, therefore necessitating the continuation of high feedstuff prices. But the boom can be lowered at will. At that point the speculative grain exporting companies, like Continental and Cargill, will carry out a near total withdrawal from the market. Prices will nosedive, setting off panic selling by farmers and most farmers will be left holding the bag. Agricultural production will then be shifted to the third world.

Butz' Ouster

Using the grain scandal as an excuse, Rockefeller forces are trying to force the ouster of Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz. Senator Henry Jackson charged Butz with being "soft" in dealing with the Soviets and has demanded his resignation.

The Wall Street Journal pointed to the inevitability of Butz' ouster in a front page article Oct. 8. Other Rockefeller lackeys have joined in this campaign. But Butz, as his previously militant anti-control stance demonstrates, agreed to export controls only under Rockefeller-induced duress. The real reason for Butz' removal, however, is that as Secretary of Agriculture, he heads up the U.S. delegation to the World Food Conference. Refusing to go along fully with a fascist starvation program, Butz is not "safe" enough for such a sensitive job. Butz is an obstacle to the implementation of a "world food bank" and the rest of Rockefeller's world food program. Butz' well known position is that "International dialogue. . . centers too much on aid and reserve programs and not enough on opportunities to enhance production."

The Wall Street Journal complained that, as a result of Butz' attitudes, the "world food bank" is not even being considered seriously except in watered-down versions. The Journal also expressed concern that the Administration will not allocate sufficient funds for the proposed "agricultural development fund" which is to build the minimum infrastructure necessary for labor-intensive third world agriculture.

PRESS WATERGATES FARM CO-OPS

Oct. 10 (IPS)--Farmer-owned cooperatives recently have been besieged by a barrage of adverse press publicity led by the New York Times and Washington Post. These exposes of "powerful" coops date back at least to the Watergate investigator's "discovery" that three major milk cooperatives had contributed to Nixon's campaign, allegedly as a bribe to raise milk support prices.

Recently the New York Times revived the month-old milk adulteration case involving the Dairylea coop. The Times' "watergating" of Dairylea is aimed at a thorough housecleaning of the New York Agriculture Department and removal of remaining farmer influence. Although Dairylea already had paid a \$150,000 fine, a Times editorial indignantly demanded a criminal investigation and used the issue to put State Attorney General Lefkowitz on the hot seat as well. The upshot of this concerted press campaign is that Lefkowitz has launched a grand jury investigation, which will include an inquiry into the way the case was originally handled by state agriculture officials. Meanwhile, Lefkowitz' Democratic opponent, Robert Abrams, has jumped into the fray screaming "coverup" and demanding exposure of an "apparent conflict of interest" in the Department of Agriculture and Marketing. State Commissioner of Agriculture Frank Walkley is a former dairy farmer who once belonged to the Dairylea coop.

10/14/74