

## AGRICULTURE

### White House, GAO revive Kissinger's food weapon

Amidst a flurry of press hype, the "food weapon" is getting top-level White House consideration for inclusion in the nation's foreign policy. Administration officials told the *New York Times* on July 3 that as part of the executive-level search for ways to break OPEC, a special office would be set up to examine the flood of "outside expert" suggestions. One of the first items taken up will reportedly be Zionist lobby Senator Daniel Moynihan's (D-NY) recent demand that the administration make a "sustained effort to break the OPEC cartel" by creating a "wheat export authority" including the U.S., Canada and Australia to blackmail the oil-producing nations.

In fact, the oil hoax is a pretext for sharpening up the "food weapon" for use not so much against OPEC—as even proponents admit—but against the East bloc and Japan, among other targets earlier identified by the scheme's original official sponsor, Henry Kissinger. The other target is the American population, who are being conditioned for war mobilization by the "get tough" propaganda advocating an exercise of the food weapon.

A mass organizing drive has been launched by the American Agriculture Movement (AAM), the farm gang nurtured by East Coast environmentalist-terrorist supporters, to set up a "National Barrel-for-a-Bushel Committee" to rally support for Moynihan's "expert authority" through offices to be set up in every major grain-producing state in the country. At the same time in the Senate, George McGovern has railroaded a mandate to President Carter to create an international wheat cartel through committee.

The full scope for the food weapon's targeting was emphasized by its advocates in interviews with EIR at the time. "Actually, the Bushel-for-a-Barrel isn't aimed directly at OPEC," one spokesman said. "They consume so little grain it wouldn't work. What we really want is to raise the prices for Japan and Eastern Europe. They can afford it..."

The fact that testimony on Democratic Rep. Jim Weaver's "National Grain Board" bill for government control of all U.S. grain exports ran overwhelmingly negative last month has not discouraged the press and organized proponents of the food weapon from continuing to barrage the population.

Food weaponeers hoped to parlay the vastly exaggerated news of Soviet crop shortfall to their advantage. In the *Journal of Commerce's* June 26 editorial, "Food Scarcity Again?", the Ford Foundation's Lowell Hardin and Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute are quoted as respectively railing against Soviet emphasis on livestock development and animal protein consumption, and proposing that there is now a trade-off between energy and food.

The Soviets have imported an average of 14 million tons of grain a year over the past seven years, the *Journal* points out. In the year ending Oct. 1, under the long-term purchasing agreement in effect between the U.S. and the USSR, the Soviets may purchase up to 15 million tons of American grain—they've bought 13 million tons so far—but after that anything above 8 million tons requires separate negotiations.

The *New York Times* on July 1 asked, "Is the Year's Grain Harvest A Possible Crop of Trouble?", and repeated thinly veiled censure of the Soviet Union for building up livestock production and thus generating added demand for grains. After citing accurate Agriculture Department statements as to the existence of more than ample U.S. grain sup-

plies, *Times* columnist Seth King concludes pro forma: "Even so, foreign demands could pull down the current surpluses and increase the temptations for Washington to use food as an economic and political lever, something no official since Henry Kissinger had admitted to publicly."

#### Threats against Mexico

The most specific and outrageous food weapon proposal has been formulated by the U.S. Government Accounting Office and exposed in the July 4 issue of the Mexican daily *Uno Mas Uno*. The study itemizes Mexico's rural poverty, castigates the Mexican government for allegedly denying aid to villages with populations under 5,000, and proposes that the U.S. government "restrict trade with Mexico" until the "unequal distribution of resources" is reduced. Secondly, the GAO charges that U.S. firms in the food sector, 65 of them "powerful multinationals," connive with their Mexican partners to export food from Mexico; these exports should be controlled.

This policy is intended to subvert Mexico's capabilities for maintaining its present exports of fruit and vegetable produce to the U.S. while mechanizing and expanding the grains output whose shortfall is currently made up through imports from the U.S. The GAO policy would (a) force Mexico to follow the World Bank policy of subsidizing the most backward, inefficient, village-economy sector; (b) simultaneously foment Iran-style "distribution of resources" jacqueries among the peasants; and (c) suspend key imports to deepen the chaos. The Mexico recommendations are only one chapter of the report, which is titled "World Hunger."

—Susan Cohen