Mondale's food shock: shortages begin to hit the U.S.

by Christopher White

The United States is now on the verge of food shortages. Already in southeastern states and elsewhere in the country, milk shortages have begun to appear. Shortages in the meat supply will emerge as a next phase over the coming weeks and months. And then, unless the present slide is reversed, a third phase will begin: shortfalls in grain production, affecting in turn both livestock producers and the consumer at the supermarket.

The effects of the shortages will be different inside and outside the United States. Domestically, skyrocketing prices, particularly for dairy products and meat, will bring about a drastic shift in the nation's dietary standards and consumption patterns. For families at or below median income levels, those items will be priced out of the range of the weekly budget, except perhaps as rare luxury items. But for those outside the United States, particularly among the so-called developing-sector nations, the effects will be catastrophic. There, whole continents are scheduled to be reduced to the plight of starving sub-Saharan Africa.

The accompanying articles document the case that such a food shortage is even now emerging within the United States for each of the identified elements of consumption. The summary case was presented on national television by Independent Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche on Sept. 3, even as first reports of the milk shortage began to emerge.

Yet the U.S. Department of Agriculture continues to maintain the fiction, as Henry Wallace and his friends did during the last depression in the 1930s, that the real problem lies in "over-production" by the U.S. farmer. This fable, shown to be outright falsehood in comparison with world requirements for food, has been used over recent years to reduce the capabilities of the U.S. farmer to the point where he will soon no longer be able to produce, and to cover up the genocidal implications of pending disaster.

LaRouche called on American patriots to join with him to prevent the emerging danger. He showed that the crisis is politically caused, and must thus be reversed politically using the powers of the executive branch.

This farmstead in Oklahoma was abandoned in 1937, during the Great Depression. But the policies of Mondale's backers from the international grain cartels, and their friends at the Federal Reserve and the Department of Agriculture, are creating the same situation today. While entire nations in the developing sector are dying of starvation, these genocidalists claim that the problem we face is "over-production of food."

The world food supply is presently in the hands of a small group of companies, namely: Cargill of Minnetonka, Minnesota; Continental Grain of New York City; André and Company of Lausanne, Switzerland; Louis-Dreyfus of Paris; and Bunge, once of Argentina, now of Switzerland.

These companies handle over 90% of all U.S. trade in grains, and over 80% of the world trade in such commodities. They control seed supply, storage, and transportation. With oil and metals companies, they help rig commodity markets. Not one of these companies is cited on any stock market in the world. They are the private preserve of a small group of families. Of these families, the Andrés, in business since the early 17th century, take precedence, perhaps, as the oldest. The Fribourgs of Continental, founded in 1813, in the concluding phases of the Napoleonic wars, come next. Bunge and Dreyfus, developed under the patronage of the ruling house of Belgium in the 19th century, follow, with relative latecomer Cargill bringing up the rear.

The U.S. producer of soybeans or wheat is told that he must compete against Brazilians or Australians in producing and marketing his product. He is not told that Brazilian and Australian production is controlled by the same people who control him. World food production, and thus world food consumption, are kept in a stranglehold.

But behind these families stand, as patrons, representatives of the most evil institutions in the world, who are creating the emerging food shortage purposely, in order to reduce the world's population. One example is the Swiss self-professed Gnostic Denis de Rougemont, who heads the Venice-based Society for European Culture and the European environmentalist movement Ecoropa. De Rougemont has worked with the Swiss-based financial interests and insurance companies which control the cartel companies, to prepare for the famine that is now being brought about. In studies produced with a certain Giarini, economist for the association of Swiss insurance companies, and with the notorious Club of Rome genocide lobby, De Rougemont has prepared for the elimination of American agriculture.

De Rougemont and his friends work through the banking and insurance companies associated with families such as the Iselins, Staehlins, and Odiers, to control the world's food production capabilities. Their insurance companies and banks create the financial conditions in which the grain cartels deploy, from operating centers in Switzerland. U.S. farmers' production capabilities have borne the brunt of their attack.

A 'no food' policy

The refrain that this crowd has employed to further its policies is that U.S. agriculture "must become more market-oriented." In support of this lie, another is spread—that "market-oriented" policies mean cheaper prices for the consumer. In the name of this lie, the policies that were at the heart of the productivity increases made by the U.S. farmer, have been dismantled.

Like other producers, farmers incur costs in producing food. Those costs include maintaining the equipotential of land, as well as the costs directly associated with producing a crop and raising livestock. To the extent that such costs of production are not covered, the farmer will not be able to continue to produce. When the cost of debt-service is added to declining income, and the fall in land values, the basis for credit, is added to that, the extent of disaster becomes clear. An increased "market orientation" has resulted in the bankruptcy of perhaps the most efficiently managed and productive sector in the world economy. Yet the enormous productivity increases achieved by farmers since the 1960s show that it is not our farmers who are responsible for the current crisis.

The fraud that such "market orientation" results in cheaper food prices is easily exploded by comparing the evolution of prices paid to farmers for products such as livestock and grains, with the prices for the same products paid by the consumer. Such a comparison will show, over the last years, an inverse relationship: As the price paid the farmer has collapsed, prices paid by consumers at the supermarket checkout counters have been zooming upward. Our so-called cheap-food policy is actually a no-food policy.

The policy that has been under attack by the U.S. allies of the identified Swiss interests, who are effectively led by Orville Freeman and his circle of grain company-connected, ex-Department of Agriculture officials, is known as **parity**, or price supports.

The free-market ideologues associated with President Reagan's disastrous economic policies, and the shapers of Walter Mondale's policies for agriculture, agree with the Swiss-based controllers of the grain-cartel families. Anyone who campaigns against the vestiges of the parity system, is in fact proposing an accelerating rate of increase in the price of food, food shortages, and starvation worldwide.

The "market-oriented" policy has dictated that exports of U.S. foodstuffs be increased, while production of food within the United States be reduced. The exports have either gone into storage in the Soviet Union, or have been dumped on world markets at so low a price that so-called competitors cannot maintain the capital investment required to develop their own food production capabilities. In this way, the world has been made increasingly dependent on U.S. production, while the basis for that production, the independent, technologically cultured farmer-producer, has been destroyed.

And now the nation's capacity to produce its food supply has been brought to a turning point. If we return to a policy of parity pricing for agricultural production, as Franklin Roosevelt did in mobilizing the U.S. economy for war, we can begin to safeguard our own supplies, and, if credit policy is revised accordingly, we can permit other nations to develop production capabilities which do not presently exist.

Such measures would have to be implemented as part of an overall emergency overhaul of the nation's economic policy. It could be done, and LaRouche, in his nationally televised broadcasts this year, has shown the way. To do it means to launch a war against the worst evil the world has yet seen, an evil which has turned food into a weapon for the destruction of human life on a scale unprecedented in human history.

Debt bomb set to

by Sylvia Brewda

The debt bomb is set to go off, and it's not ticking away only in Ibero-America, but also in the cornfields and cattle feedlots of the United States. American farms are being crushed under a $215 billion debt burden, and, adding to that the non-farm debt of rural banks and the state debt of farm states, the total far outpaces the $300 billion owed by the top four Ibero-American debtor nations.

The precipitous decline of farm credit and real-estate values is in turn jeopardizing the solvency of regional banks and state budgets in the worst-affected states, threatening a chain-reaction collapse of depression dimensions. The debt is forcing farm foreclosures on a scale not seen since the last Depression. And banks are unable to lend, since falling land values mean that their loans are not secure.

Dr. Neal Harl of Iowa State University reports that 10% of the farmers in the Midwest agricultural heartland have a debt-to-asset ratio of 70:100 or worse. These farmers carry 25% of the farm debt for those states, roughly $22.6 billion. They are not expected to receive loans for another planting, and are vulnerable if any sudden shock occurs in the banking system. An additional 18% of the farmers have debt-to-asset ratios between 40:100 and 70:100. These farmers are not facing an immediate credit cutoff, but they are all losing net worth. If any disturbance of the credit market occurred now, these farmers would have trouble getting loans for spring planting.

Fred Young, vice

estimates that "40% of the farmers here could fail in the next five years." Tom Olson, head of the Agriculture Committee of the Independent Bankers Association of America and president of Lisco State Bank in Nebraska, reports that 5% of the farmers face serious problems and possible liquidation this year, while an additional 10-15% are under stress to meet their payments this year. In Minnesota, the agriculture commissioner says that 14% of farmers do not expect to survive for two years.

Yet spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture insist, with Agriculture Secretary John Block, that "this is the best year ever"! USDA Deputy Undersecretary Kathleen Lawrence received considerable criticism in Iowa when she stated, "There will be some loss this year, but not significantly different from a normal year on a year-to-year basis." Don