

Agriculture by Wayne Johnston

Washington's 'free trade' line

It's a warmed-over version of the policy the British East India Company tried to use to destroy America.

On March 18, state agricultural commissioners from most major farm states humbly sat in obedience at the mid-year conference of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, and were subjected again, as they have been in the past, to a barrage of "free trade" propaganda from "guest speakers" that included former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman; Rep. Kika De La Garza (D-Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee; U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter; Environmental Protection Administration head Lee Thomas; Assistant Agriculture Secretary Peter Myers; Ray Lett of the USDA Intergovernmental Affairs Office, and Agriculture Trade and Export Policy director Jimmy Minyard.

The bloodthirsty line they retailed—with one exception, a guest speaker, Mexico's agriculture commissioner—was a warmed-over version of the old British East India Company trade war policy of the early 1800s, under which cheap goods were dumped on countries, including the young United States, to destroy their economies.

Today, "free trade" is the euphemism for food cartel and International Monetary Fund domination. Most of the agriculture policies of the last 20 years have been designed by the banking circles associated with these cartel interests, and the speakers at the state agriculture commissioners' conference are prominently associated with them.

Most prominent is Orville Freeman, Democratic agriculture secretary in the 1960s, who has consistently pursued food output reduction, in part

because he thinks the world has too many black, brown, and yellow people, and it would be best if many of them starved.

Freeman is associated with the "New Yalta" food trade policy, in which food flows from the West are guaranteed to the Soviet Union, while at the same time, trade war is conducted within the Western Alliance—between Argentina, France, and the United States in wheat exports, for example—in the name of "free trade." Computer scenarios of trade war options under this perspective have been done in Freeman's home base, Minneapolis, at the Hubert Humphrey Institute, with which Freeman is associated.

The 1985 farm bill is perhaps the most rabid "free trade" format ever enacted into law by the U.S. Congress. In a special section called "Export Enhancement," which Freeman called the "only way to move exports," the mechanisms are specified by which U.S. government-owned grain stocks are to be given *for free* to the cartel trade companies (Cargill, Continental, Pillsbury, Bunge, André, Archer Daniels, and the rest), in order to guarantee profits to these privileged New Yalta companies while they offer discount exports, to the Soviet Union primarily. Under this program, the cartel pays prices to the U.S. farmer that are way below his costs of production, and at the same time, breaks the world market.

One of the main topics of discussion at the conference was prospective trade wars with the European Community.

That same week, new Agriculture

Secretary Richard Lyng initiated tough trade war talk.

to turning the U.S. farm sector crisis around is to expand exports: "It may take two years before we get it turned around—last year's farm bill that reduced prices of U.S. commodities was the first step." We will "make deals" and work very aggressively in the export enhancement program, he said.

Lyng has been avoiding the obvious question: How will U.S. farmers be able to pay their debts and costs, and survive to continue producing food, with the low prices paid in the "export enhancement" swindle.

As department statistics prove, the U.S. exported a higher volume of goods when world prices were high than when they were low. Developing countries, under low world price levels, are forced to export more commodities (that they desperately need for their own consumption) to try to meet the IMF's demands for debt payments. This, in turn, reduces their ability to buy needed imports because of lack of income. The U.S. farm sector is experiencing the same IMF policies under the guise of "export enhancement." However, despite state appeals for financial help for farmers, Lyng said: "We're not considering any kind of gradual loans to farmers, nor would he exercise the option for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make special loans for the 1986 crop.

Mexican Agricultural Minister Eduardo Pesqueira disagreed with the other speakers at the session, and voiced opposition to free trade, rightly terming it the "law of the jungle." Mexico had been treated unfairly in its trade relations with the United States, he stated. He called for a "fair trade" or "equity of trade" policy. "Policies should make us partners in progress." Under "free trade," said Pesqueira, summing it up, "the beast devours the human."