

Scientists expect that these beams of particles will flow along the magnetic field lines surrounding the Earth. hope to learn more about the ionosphere which stores this charged particle energy, releasing it periodically in auroral bursts. These results will bear on research needed on electron beam propagation through the ionosphere required for the study of directed energy beam weapon defense programs, though the results from these civilian experiments will be not be classified.

Materials processing experiments are in progress in Spacelab, as scientists and engineers research ways to grow large, perfect crystals on space and to create new alloys and materials.

Short-term materials processing tests on previous Shuttle flights have already demonstrated that new pharmaceuticals and products to treat disease will be new space industries in the next few years.

Many experiments will be performed to gain a better "look" at Earth. Studies will be done to determine more precisely the chemical composition and chemical reactions of the upper atmosphere. New all-weather remote sensing techniques will be tested using a microwave radar instrument which could revolutionize the Landsat-like remote-sensing satellites currently in use.

Because half the experiments aboard Spacelab during this mission are from Western Europe, the orbital inclination of the Shuttle is different than previous flights. Generally, when the Shuttle is launched from Cape Canaveral, it flies directly east across the Atlantic Ocean. When it is on this orbit, which is inclined 28 degrees to the equator, it does not pass over any region of the Earth that is further north than southern Florida, or any region that is further south than the same 28 degrees.

In order to be able to photograph Europe, the Shuttle flew northeast after launch, and is inclined 57 degrees to the equator. For the first time, the Shuttle crew will be able to photograph all of South America and virtually all of Europe, not just the mainly equatorial regions seen in past Shuttle pictures. Many nations expect that these high-resolution photographs will aid map-making efforts and will open up new regions of Earth for space investigation.

For years, space scientists have complained that the cost of Space Shuttle development has taken away money from space science experiments. With this first Spacelab flight, it is clear that the Shuttle has given space scientists the opportunity to do *in situ* research, in a laboratory that will open up whole new fields of study.

The next step, while Spacelab is providing exciting new science on its short trips into space, is to start building the permanently orbiting space science facilities that will be tended by scientists and astronauts who work in a space station for months at a time. Spacelab has proven that career scientists can foray into space and working together with their colleagues on the ground, can open up new frontiers in space science.

How Europe's food being destroyed by

by Rainer Apel

European agriculture is being threatened by the failure of the European Community's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to adopt an American System program of utilizing the highest level of industrial technology to expand production. A full-scale financial and political attack, on the scale of the assault on American agriculture by the world's Malthusian forces who want to cut population by cutting the food supply, is being launched against the far more vulnerable European food production system. Despite statistics that claim that Europe is self-sufficient in grain and beef production, and produces a 30 percent milk surplus, average animal protein consumption in Europe is only 50 percent that in the United States.

In addition, CAP policy maintains the remnants of a peasant agriculture system, forcing modern productive farming to subsidize tiny farms that barely survive. If U.S. agriculture, the most productive in the world, can be destroyed by Malthusian policymakers using the hoax of overproduction, the future of Europe looks grim.

The recent statement of one West German agricultural politician to *EIR* shows how widespread the monetarist policy of cutting production in the face of financial crisis is among Western European agricultural policy makers—with the exception of the farmers themselves. When told of the extent of the world food crisis and the collapse of U.S. food-producing capacity, he stated: "I don't know whether things are as dramatic as you say. But what I see is that the Americans always wanted to feed the world, at least that is what they always told everyone, and now they can't even feed their own people. . . . All of this proves that the American system does not work, while ours in Europe does. We can feed our people, and more than that. We are, as a matter of fact, producing more than we need, and that's why we must cut back."

But another political figure described a very different, and dangerous, situation. "You speak of a food crisis in the

supply is the CAP's policies

U.S.?" he told *EIR*. "I can tell you that food supply isn't that secured in Europe either. Just imagine a major international economic collapse, which would bring down world trade. We here in Europe are highly dependent on imports of many basic food products. If we can't get them, we would have to ration food and issue food stamps within two weeks—our surplus reserves are that thin!"

The most recent figures published by the EC claim that the members of the 10-nation community are more than self-sufficient in food production. Western Europe produces 100 percent of its grain requirements, 105 percent of beef requirements, 130 percent of milk requirements, and close to 100 percent of requirements for fresh vegetables. But these very figures are being used to promote the policy of cutting both immediate production levels and future productive capacity—while the average level of nutrition in the EC nations is already considerably lower than the United States.

Most immediately threatening to the European food supply is the bankruptcy of the European Community. By the end of 1983, the CAP, which has only ensured current food production levels by heavy price subsidies to European farmers, is expected to have a deficit of about \$2 billion, and for 1984, a deficit of at least \$5 billion is estimated. The EC has already begun to cut back on subsidies by blocking \$360 million in pre-payments to food exporters in early November, in order to bridge a growing hole in the EC common budget. Continued cuts will bankrupt European farmers just as U.S. farmers are being bankrupted by the slashing of the U.S. government farm program. And, with European agriculture already significantly less productive than American, the collapse of European food production will be even more precipitous.

The overproduction hoax

The attempt by EC bureaucrats and their fellow thinkers in numerous think tanks to lay the blame for the economic

crisis on overproduction is based on fraud. The fact that Europeans consume 50 percent less animal protein than Americans belies any claims to sufficient food production for Europe—to say nothing of the food needs of the developing sector. The entire CAP program is structured to force limits on production.

The CAP subsidizes a large number of unproductive, often tiny farms in most of the EC nations—with the costs sustained by the more productive, technologically better-equipped farming sectors. On an average, the productivity of a European farmer is one-third less than of the average U.S. farmer. The employment of manpower differs by a factor of two or more among the various European agricultural regions, and even within a country that has reached the highest productivity in dairy farming like Great Britain, there are regions of absolute poverty among farmers, with production methods that are closer to the late 14th rather than the 20th century.

The problems of European agricultural underdevelopment have been exacerbated by the CAP under the regime of EC official Sicco Mansholt, who once claimed that "non-growth is possible—you just have to believe in it." The CAP has discouraged the technological development of farming and instead enforced the maintenance of the barely self-sufficient, "small family-based farm system."

Mansholt, who lived with West German Green Party leader Petra Kelly for a considerable period, was fully aware of the consequences of his policies. "The real crisis [of the future] will be a food crisis," he stated in 1974. "Here, the situation will come to a peak within the next four to eight years. We will experience another crisis then. The automatism of prices will no longer function. No capital will flow into agricultural production any longer; this would be completely useless anyway and wouldn't pay off." Mansholt is also one of the founders of the radical-environmentalist Ecoropa organization, an even more important proponent of Malthusianism than the pro-genocide Club of Rome. Ecoropa bred many of the leading Greenies of today. The hatred of modern technology which crept into the CAP under the influence of the Mansholt Plan can probably best be shown by the following quote from a recent EC document:

"The development of new technology has led, particularly in the case of animal production, to the setting up of agricultural enterprises for which land is no longer a limiting factor. There is a risk that this development may aggravate the problems of overproduction which have been experienced in the milk sector. . . . The Commission will pursue the examination of measures to allow certain farmers to give up milk production."

Slaughter the dairy herd

Two proposals for cutting this "overproduction of milk" are under discussion now: One says that out of the 25 million cows of the EC, 10 percent should be slaughtered, and, eventually, a premium should be paid to farmers to encourage

them to sacrifice their cows. The other proposal calls for a quota system which would pose limits to the total amount of milk bought and sold within the EC, which would be enforced by penalties on milk processors. Farmers have responded that the dairies would thus "be turned into the EC's police, and it would be a crime to produce more than the quota."

This slashing of dairy production will do more than cut low European animal protein consumption even further. Both of the proposals would collapse overall farming in Western Europe. The guaranteed price system for milk products is the best source of farm income in the EC, on which many farmers, as in the United States, are dependent as other income sources have been cut by world depression. Billions of dollars have been invested in dairy farming, but the small size of many farms has kept productivity too low to sustain their operation. Most of the farms keep less than the average 40 to 50 cows estimated as necessary to produce enough milk to yield stable net profits for the farmers. If the 10 percent cut of the herds is forced through, thousands will be forced to stop producing altogether. These proposals make clear that the Mansholt policy is to eliminate food production, not preserve the way of life of the European peasant. Most of the farmers who would be forced to stop milk production would be the same "small farmers" whom the Commission claims to support.

Debts cut investment

Europe's farmers have been rendered all the more vulnerable to income cuts by their growing indebtedness after the imposition of high interest rates in October 1979. The combined effect on mortgages, interest rates on credits, and refinancing obligations for old credits has been such that investment in West German farming dropped by more than 16 percent in 1980 alone, and has not resumed pre-1979 levels since. Exact figures for debt and investment levels in France, whose farmers have been hard hit by the sharp rise of interest rates, are not available, but it is estimated that the situation there is even worse than in West Germany. When French President François Mitterrand attempted to make a goodwill tour of the provinces, he was almost lynched by enraged farmers, and escaped only under heavy security protection.

While agricultural politicians in Europe have failed to address the debt crisis, one recent phenomenon underlines the impoverishment of European agriculture. A slowly growing, but visibly increasing number of European farmers can no longer afford to buy agricultural machinery and tractors on the European markets, and have been forced to resort to machines and tractors produced in Eastern Europe or even the U.S.S.R. These tractors, far worse equipped than Western models and built for usage in the less-efficient Eastern European and Soviet farming areas, are considerably cheaper than the cheapest comparable available from Western producers.

The most important producer of agricultural machines and tractors in West Germany, the Fendt company, reports that low French far income has caused a drop in sales of tractors to this crucial traditional market in Europe. French farmers used to buy 20 percent of all the tractors exported by Fendt. Saudi Arabia, which used to take another 20 percent of Fendt's tractor exports, has bought less in 1983 due to losses in oil revenues, and the situation is similar on many other customer markets. The company's export rate has dropped from about 50 percent in 1982 to 45 percent in 1983.

Sources in West Germany are stating that one-fourth of the country's 400,000 full-time farmers could be wiped out by the measures the EC wants to impose, which will create a shock-wave of bankruptcies throughout the entire economy. Many West German producers of agricultural machinery made large investments in expectation of a guaranteed rise in the EC's food production, and West German farmers went heavily into debt to modernize their farms between November 1982 and April 1983, in expectation of the "upswing" the Bonn government claimed would occur—an "upswing" that disappeared into the accelerating world depression.

The world food crisis

The European Commission, particularly since the adoption of the Mansholt Plan in 1969, is committed to food autarchy and self-sufficiency for Europe, policies whose effect is to undercut food production in the developing sector. The CAP is to a large extent a system of protective import fees imposed on all products entering European markets. Almost 50 percent of all revenues the European Commission has are based on such import taxes; the other 50 percent is based almost exclusively on a portion drawn from the value-added (surcharge) tax on all goods traded within the EC.

Europe has a policy of selected preferential agreements with one-third of the developing nations. Sixty-three nations are bound to the EC by the ACP (African-Caribbean-Pacific) treaty—also known as Stabex (Stabilized Export Income)—which guarantees them agricultural exports to Europe at prices slightly above the average- and low-world market prices.

Ostensibly, the ACP nations are allowed to negotiate quotas of what they can sell to Europe, and in return can buy machinery at similarly guaranteed prices from Europe. But the overall effect of the ACP agreement has been to enable selected Third World nations to produce cash crops for export, not develop a high-technology based, productive farming system which could feed their own population and yield surpluses for exports. The ACP functions as an integral part of IMF-World Bank financial policy for the developing sector, by ensuring a certain calculable income for participating nations—and a base for the IMF credit policy.

The ACP system does not address the Third World debt crisis, nor of the low prices for farming in the developing nations. The man credited with authoring the Stabex system,



"Alternative" agriculture—a Greenie turned peasant—in West Germany. The EC's promotion of such primitive agriculture is undermining Europe's ability to maintain its food supply.

West German SPD politician Klaus von Dohnanyi, negotiated the treaty in 1975. Dohnanyi has a reputation as a fanatic adherent to the ideology of "blocism," the idea that the world economy is doomed to disintegrate into separate blocs all fighting each other for survival. This is the world outlook the New York Council on Foreign Relations cultivated in its "Project 1980s" at the same time the Stabex treaty was negotiated.

Dohnanyi, who in 1975 was assistant secretary in the Foreign Ministry in Bonn under Hans-Dietrich Genscher, a close confidant of Henry Kissinger and Helmut Sonnenfeldt, had the full backing from his superior for both the first and second five-year Stabex treaties. Genscher himself is known in Europe as supporting a continental European bloc secured by political, military, and economic-agricultural autarky. It has been rumored among officials of the European Community's bureaucracy that Genscher's energetic campaign for getting Spain and Portugal as fully integrated members into the EC is largely motivated by his plan to make these Iberian nations Europe's future producers of soybeans, making Europe independent from soybean imports from the United States.

The ACP treaty also grants member nations some protection from the EC's brutal aggression against production in the rest of the Third World. Many of the Europe's surplus products are subsidized for export to a price level below

already low world market prices, and millions of tons of sugar, grain, and milk products are dumped onto world markets, undercutting even further any income for all those nations not part of the ACP protection system. Ironically, most of the 1 million tons of sugar thrown onto the markets has usually been previously imported from the ACP nations.

Even threshold nations such as New Zealand have complained bitterly, though with little success, about the EC's dumping practices which have ruined most of New Zealand's own share in the world milk and butter market. This brutal dumping policy—the overall effect of which has been to contribute to the ruin of many developing sector nations as markets for European industrial products, with devastating effect, is directly financed by European taxpayers. Spokesmen for such Third World nations have drawn the parallel to Britain's ruining India's well-developed, independent textile production by the end of the 18th century, which paved the way for British textiles and cotton to be forced on India—at much higher prices.

The EC bureaucrats usually point to the quarter-billion dollar food aid the Europeans are providing to the famine regions via the United Nations' aid programs, in order to emphasize the European concern about the world food crisis. This is combined with complaints that "most of these countries have never succeeded in developing their own food production . . . and food aid creates illusions that they don't have to." This is more than cynical, because the European Commission is undercutting Third World nations' attempts to build their own food supply and a viable income based on fair agricultural prices. In addition, the EC is reducing the few food reserves available for such aid programs from Europe as part of "cutting overproduction in the EC."

The limits of protectionism

The EC's agriculture policy, while undercutting Third World development, cannot sustain Europe's own farmers and producers of agricultural machinery. The system of guaranteed prices for agricultural products within the EC is counterproductive within the context of "EC blocism."

The "small family-based farming" at relatively low technology-input which is the aim of the European Commission will prevent Europe from becoming a world food supplier. The present CAP system of the EC is ruining small farmers, and reducing the profits of most of the high-technology farming sectors throughout Europe, while dumping on world food markets means certain ruin for the EC itself. While Europeans are complaining that if the gaping deficits in the EC are not closed, the Community will fall to pieces, the remedy lies in restructuring the EC.

Whatever is being decided by the EC's agricultural politicians and experts within the coming few weeks and months, it means certain doom for Europe's farming, unless a reorientation of the Community's agricultural policy is put on the agenda.