

Agriculture by Marcia Merry

Save the soil from farmers!

The "oligarchy lobby" is using the issue of soil erosion to justify the destruction of food-producing capabilities.

Imagine if the famous, old "landed aristocracy" of Britain took over the British government agriculture ministry and used it to shut down everyone else. The exact equivalent is now taking place on the shores of the Potomac.

On May 6 and 7, the old feudal oligarchy's U.S. front group, the Conservation Foundation, co-sponsored a symposium, jointly with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in Washington, D.C. The policies put forward call for vastly reducing farming, understanding that this will drastically collapse world population—in order to prevent soil erosion.

The Conservation Foundation is heavily lobbying Congress to pass a National Resources Conservation Act of 1985, to lock up farmland and create wilderness zones. They are also at work at the regional level to permanently set aside farms, shut down irrigation systems, and make way for duck preserves and private, landed estates, owned by "their kind," and aided by government tax gifts. The Conservation Foundation of New Jersey, technically a separate, "co-thinker group," has published a study on the "British Model of Land Management."

At the symposium, the Conservation Foundation released a study, "Eroding Soils—The Off-Farm Impacts," intended to justify their campaign to reduce farming. The study is published as a 252-page book, based on the contrived results of so-called research sponsored by the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation, the Atlantic Richfield

Foundation, and Exxon Company, U.S.A.

The Conservation Foundation maintains that \$6 billion a year in damage occurs in waterways and fish and wildlife breeding grounds, and in wastewater treatment costs as a result of soil erosion—especially from cropland. Their report estimates that \$2 billion a year in damage results from cropland erosion, which they say causes run-off containing pesticides and other contaminants.

The Conservation Foundation points to the corn-belt states as the worst problem. The study's author, Edwin H. Clark, recommends that farmers reduce their use of fertilizer and pesticides, and remove land from row-crop production.

This is an immediate threat to the national and international food supply. The United States grows about 50% of the world's corn, and fully 60% of the world's soybeans—both key feed inputs into the meat-supply chain. All figures show that the U.S. spring planting this year will be significantly reduced in acreage, and underfertilized. As much as 10 million acres will be idled out of a national base of approximately 82 million. Total world corn output this year could be reduced by at least 5% due to the current U.S. crop reduction, provided there is perfect weather to compensate for the dry winter.

In 1983, the PIK acreage set-aside, plus the record drought, reduced world corn output by 25%—all of it due to the fall in the U.S. harvest. To advocate retiring, instead of improving,

U.S. farm acreage is to deliberately call for genocide from nutrition collapse or outright starvation.

Yet, in the name of preventing erosion, efforts are under way to push these ideas in Congress. On April 23, a measure passed the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development, calling for a long-term Conservation Reserve Program, under which debt-strapped farmers would be enticed to sign over their land for non-crop government-regulated use.

The issue of soil erosion is real, but as the Conservation Foundation is forced to admit, there is no evidence that soil erosion has increased in the last decade. If farmers had adequate income levels and were enabled to apply the technology and management methods required, the problem would be minimized. Similarly, if water management infrastructure on the continent were upgraded—canals, waterways, treatments plants—there would be no water shortages or pollution problems.

This approach is suppressed in the Conservation Foundation reports and activities. Their pedigree tells you why.

They were formed in the 1940s as a cleaned up version of the pre-war Nature Conservancy Society of Europe, whose members espoused outright feudalistic goals, and included such luminaries as Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. The first director was Fairfield Osborne, the nephew of the host of the infamous 1931 third international conference on eugenics—the master race project of the oligarchy. Osborne was an outspoken Malthusian advocate of depopulation. Over the four decades since its formation, the Conservation Foundation promoted these policies under the guise of concern for the environment, wild animals, and now, the soil.