

\*pd

~~sunday~~

sunday business - agri-biz col. - oct. 12, 1975 - take one<<

Agri-Business Column<<

\*BC By Ferdie jJ. Deering

The United States government is plugging for a food reserve plan that could lead us into a worldwide partnership with Communists, and Oklahoma wheat is a pawn in this political chess game.

If that is what the American people want, that may be the way we should go. However, citizens should know where we are headed, because nations ~~that~~ <sup>which</sup> have started down that primrose path seldom have found ~~their~~ their way back to freedom.

Representatives of the International Wheat Council recently spent two days discussing feasibility of the U.S. proposal to set up a \$4.5 billion international grain reserve system which supporters claim would smooth out peaks and valleys in supply, demand and prices.

This plan would involve stockpiling 917.5 million bushels of wheat and 245 million bushels of rice (1,162.5 million bushels) in granaries (Washington insists on calling them silos) around ~~the~~ the world.

Ironically, just seven weeks ago, on Aug. 22, 1975, the last government-owned commodity storage structure used to store farm surpluses in this country was sold by our government. In ~~49~~1959,

MORE<<

\*pd

sunday business - agri-biz col. - oct. 12, 1975 - take one<<

Agri-Business Column<<

\*BC By Ferdie J. Deering

The United States government is plugging for a food reserve plan that could lead us into a worldwide partnership with Communists, and Oklahoma wheat is a pawn in this political chess game.

If that is what the American people want, that may be the way we should go. However, citizens ought to know where we are headed, because nations that have started down that primrose trail seldom have found their way back to freedom.

Representatives of the International Wheat Council recently spent two days discussing feasibility of the U.S. proposal to set up a \$4.5 billion international grain reserve system which supporters claim would smooth out peaks and valleys in supply, demand and prices.

This plan would involve stockpiling 917.5 million bushels of wheat and 245 million bushels of rice (1,162.5 million bushels) at the start in newly built silos around the world.

Ironically, just seven weeks ago, on Aug. 22, 1975, the last government-owned commodity storage structure used to store farm surpluses in this country were was sold by our government. In 1959

MORE<<

\*pd

sunday business - agri-biz col. - oct. 12, 1975 - take two<<

the U.S. Department of Agriculture owned grain storage capaci-  
/ capacity /  
for 990 million bushels of grain. Compare with the new figure.

The proposal for storing our surpluses elsewhere is an out-  
growth of the World Food Conference held in Rome last Nov e  
/ November /  
under auspices of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organi-  
zation (FAO). At that time, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger  
promised we would be in there pitching in worldwide food distri-  
bution. The joker is there are far more catchers than pitchers.

Out of nearly 140 nations in the world, at least 130 are  
net food importers. Nobody expects two of the world's biggest  
food producers to share their production, but Russia and China  
are willing to receive whatever may come their way.

The United States has always has supplied more foreign food  
aid than all other countries combined, running as high as 90 per  
cent of the total in some years. This ratio is popular with big  
producing countries, hungry countries, wealthy oil nations, devel-  
oping nation nations, and countries which produce little besides  
more population for others to feed. They want us to continue.

This leads to a companion proposal for a unified worldwide  
government to receive and distribute food and other resources.  
By any method that would place American produce at the disposal  
of such an organization, under the UN or howee however, we will lose.

MORE<<

\*pd

sunday business - agri-biz col. - oct. 12, 1975 - take three<<

If dispensation were to be handled on a democratic basis, we would be outvoted. If it were handled on a dictatorial basis, others would outboss us. If militarily, others have larger forces. If food is were to be handed out according to need, those who produce too little would be able to claim more of what we grow.

Those who advocate one world government are making headway, using American food supplies as leverage. There is no reason to believe that a unified world government would be a free world. If that were what heads of other nations wanted, they could start by freeing their own peoples from existing dictatorships.

This Marxist philosophy is being sublt subtly advocated under the guise of humanitarian relief. Perhaps some promoters do not realize the full impact of their emotion-charged appeals for the U.S. to assume responsibility for feeding the world, but others do.

My files contain numerous published statements by leaders of various various organizations which advocate some form of worldwide government, coupled with an international food reserve.

Stuart Chase, author of "The Most Probable World," sums up what many are demanding in a book review he wrote for "Technology Review," publication from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Oct.-Nov. 1975). These paragraphs reflect his line of thinking.

/ paragraphs /

"If bombs, babies and bulldozers are to be controlled, I

MORE<<

\*pd

sunday business - agri-biz col. - oct. 12, 1975 - take four<<

see no escape from the pl political establishe of a worldwide  
/ political establishment /  
steady-state society," Chase wrote, adding:

"With high technology no longer n in the blundering hands of independent sovereign states or multinational corporations, but firmly controlled by competent generalists directing a steady-state world, we could decide what to keep---say solar eneg energy---and what to skip---perhaps open-pit mining. We can assume with some confidence that very few factory-farms would be on the agenda, but mini-technology for a million or two villages should be very much in order."

Extremists already have their plans laid for taking over the world, with steady-state governments and dictator generalists, who would decide what kind and sizes of farms they want and who would be allowed to eat what they produce.

If the United States is drawn into this scheme to store our food resources in in silos which our government would build in other countries, we should expect heads of those nations to decide how our food reserves would be used.

If not, what could we do about it? Would we send armies to protect our property, or would they just take over?

\*ET