
Schiller Institute

Agriculture Group: No Limits to Growth!

This memorandum of the Agricultural Commission of the Schiller Institute was formally submitted to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) meeting in Rome on June 3-5, 2008.

When the book *Limits to Growth* was published in 1972, it was the beginning of a planned development that can correctly be characterized today as global genocide. The oil crisis was the first step in bringing the population of the world into economic dependency. With the debt trap and the high-interest-rate policy at the end of the 1970s, the nations of the Third World were condemned to sell their food at dumping prices, on the markets of the industrial nations, in order to meet their obligations to pay interest. At the same time, these imports were used as substitute for animal fodder, dairy, and poultry farming. This was when the well-known “lakes of milk” and “mountains of meat and butter” were created, sold again on the world markets with subsidies and export grants, while ruining traditional national markets. With this grandiose redistribution, gigantic streams of goods emerged, which were controlled by just a few agricultural companies (Cargill, Bunge, ADM, Toepfer, etc.). That this development did not occur by accident, but rather was consciously manipulated, can be gleaned from the U.S. position paper NSSM-200, issued while Henry Kissinger was National Security Advisor.

The world again needs independent, self-employed farmers, who are appreciated as a part of the *Mittelstand* [small and medium-sized productive businesses] in the economy as a whole. This can only be achieved by bringing back the following points as rights and as law:

1. Continuous agricultural production is to be guaranteed in all areas of production through parity prices, and to be stabilized in periods of inflation through a timely equalization of value.

2. Supply-regulating measures like milk quantity regulation, sugar market regulations, and starch quotas, etc. are to continue, which has to be ensured by func-

tioning external protection.

3. Agricultural production has, first of all, to serve the national population, according to respective local situations and nourishment traditions, and not the benefit of big agricultural cartels.

4. Market demand is to be regulated and guaranteed by the state, by providing for the buildup of respective reserves; it cannot be handed over to private firms.

5. The rules and regulations of the WTO, as practiced in recent years, are not appropriate to ensure feeding the world's population. Quite the contrary, its incomprehensible measures are aimed at global population reduction.

The right to adequate food is a basic right of man, and applies to the entire world. Therefore, food production worldwide must be increased. For this purpose, dry areas which have been unusable up to now, must also be turned into arable land, through irrigation.

Food is not a substitute for scarce raw materials to produce energy; and in no case can it be an object for financial speculation, which at present is primarily to blame for the increase in food prices.

In order to grant the hungry population of this world the necessary aid now, it is necessary to locate the stocks of the large agricultural business groups, and to make them available at low prices to needy nations.

Signed: Josef Kremmeter, Helmut Eichinger, Josef Lebmaier, Alois Krumbachner, Josef Perschl, Walter vom Stein.

For further information: Schiller Institute Agricultural Commission, 49-0611-2052065, www.schiller-institut.de.



www.schleswig-holstein.de

Germany's high-technology agriculture is being squeezed into bankruptcy by globalization.

Continued from Page 42

ing that “all countries should abide by global trading rules agreed to through the WTO.” He insisted that all nations must also “lift trade-restrictive policy measures, such as export restrictions.” On biofuels, Schafer said: “Let there be no mistake, the U.S. is firmly committed to the sustainable production and use of biofuels, both domestically and globally.”

Brazil: President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva continued his defense of biofuels, denouncing protectionism as the primary cause of hunger. He blamed climate change, speculation, and people eating more, as secondary causes, but “above all, the maintenance of absurdly protectionist farm policies in rich countries” is to blame.

World Bank: President Robert Zoellick targeted protectionism, and called for completing the Doha Round, suggesting that derivatives on weather forecasts for poor countries would help. He had the chutzpah to call this, “a New Deal for agriculture.”

International Monetary Fund (IMF): Managing Director Dominique Strauss-Kahn began his speech by denying reality: “There is one important fact about the global food crisis that stands out: it is not a global food shortage. In fact, there is enough food to feed the world.”

Japan: Despite Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda’s plan for doubling rice production in Africa, announced at the historic Japan/Africa conference May 28, and repeated in his FAO speech, he opened his speech with praise for the genocidal Club of Rome: “In 1968, a think-tank was formed here in Rome gathering the wisdom of wise men from all over the world who accepted the call of Dr. Aurelio Peccei, an Italian. This think-tank was to be known as the Club of Rome. Four years later, in 1972, the Club of Rome released a report titled “The Limits to Growth,” which gave a warning on exhaustion of resources and destruction of environment... [But] we continued our dependence on fossil fuels without reflecting upon our lifestyle of mass production, mass consumption, and mass waste, thereby steadily increasing the emission of greenhouse gases. Thirty years have passed since the Club of Rome issued the report. We are finally hearing the scream of the Earth.”

HOTLINE

LaRouche and EIR Staff
Recorded Briefings
—24 Hours Daily
918-222-7201, Box 595

The Lisbon Treaty

A ‘Yes’ Vote Means Death to Democracy

The Lisbon Treaty will see sovereignty taken from the people without their consent, write five Members of the European Parliament—Harry van Bommel, Jeremy Corbyn, Jean-Paul Lecoq, Lars Ohly, and Paul Schäfer. This article was published in the May 22 edition of the Irish Examiner, and several other newspapers.

Three years ago, an overwhelming majority of the electorates of two of the European Community’s founding member-states voted to reject the European Constitutional Treaty. In France and the Netherlands, despite solid backing from mainstream political parties and organisations representing both sides of industry, this latest step in the top-down integration of Europe failed to win support. The only democratic course would have been to consign it to history and, after widespread consultation, present the peoples of Europe with a real alternative vision of the Union of our nations.

Instead, a virtually identical treaty is to be imposed on us, with only the Irish being allowed to vote to accept or reject it. In France and most likely the Netherlands there will be no new referendum. Nor will there be a vote in the United Kingdom, despite the governing Labour Party’s manifesto pledge. In these three countries, ruling elites insist that the Treaty of Lisbon is very different from the Constitutional Treaty, and that lacking the rejected measure’s constitutional implications it need not be put to a vote.

Elsewhere, those who support the new treaty are more honest. In Germany, where a referendum has never been in the cards, Chancellor Merkel has said that “the substance of the Constitution is preserved.” José Zapatero, Prime Minister of Spain, whose voters—though on a very low turn out—backed the Constitutional Treaty in a referendum, assured the Spanish people that “We have not let a single substantial point of the Constitutional Treaty go,” adding that the new treaty was “a project of foundational character, a treaty for a new Europe.” Even [former Irish prime minister] Bertie Ahern noted that there had been no “dramatic change to the substance of what was agreed back in 2004.”

The similarity between the two texts is disguised by a structural sleight-of-hand. Instead of a single document to replace the existing treaties, Lisbon is a series of amendments to those treaties. A study by the British think-tank Open Europe has shown that only ten of 250 proposals in the “new” treaty differ from those in the text rejected three years ago,