"black versus Muslim" feud throughout western Africa.

Like the Ayatollah Khomeini, Qaddafi's goal is the dissolution of the nation-state as the institution for the mobilization of a people for progress. "Republics," said Qaddafi in a speech earlier this year, "are a creation of the Western bourgeois system, are merely a transition stage to *Jamahiriyah* [Arabic for "peopledom"]. The dawn of the age of the masses has begun. Libya, in cohesion with Iran, represents a new world Islamic movement."

In September 1978, all of Libya was put under the governance of a network of "people's committees," composed of students and illiterate peasants. The committees were the working experimental model for the "komitehs" that were later to sprout up in Iran. In Libya, national institutions and agencies were taken out of the hands of the country's thin layer of trained personnel and put under the direction of the mob. It is this policy for programmed chaos that Qaddafi now seeks to export to all of Black Africa through his "Islamic legion" mercenaries.

The historical roots of Qaddafi's Africa policy lie in his membership in the secretive Senussi Brotherhood mystical cult, a special operations branch of the international Muslim Brotherhood organization.

The Senussi Brotherhood was founded in the early 19th century by Mohammed bin Ali al-Senussi, an ascetic who believed in a mystical idea of "Islamic unity." Al-Senussi spread a network of monasteries across north and east Africa and into Arabia.

By the late 19th century, the Senussi Order, which claimed 3 million adherents across all of North Africa, was organized as a bitterly anti-French movement. By World War I links had been established between British intelligence and Senussi leaders. One Senussi leader was a scion of the Azzam family, one of the top families in British intelligence's Muslim Brotherhood today.

In ensuing years, the Senussi Brotherhood operated as a tool alternately of the British and of Mussolini's fascist assets in Africa.

With Qaddafi's rise to power, Libya's Senussi network and enormous financial power was placed in the hands of the Italian-centered "black nobility." This nobility also controls and helps fund the Club of Rome.

One example of this relationship involved Libya's top private banker, the mysterious Abdullah Saudi. Through his directorship of the Libyan Arab Foreign Bank, Saudi has set up banks in many African countries.

Saudi is also the vice-president of the "scientific committee" of the recently formed Piu Manzu International Research Center in Rimini, Switzerland. Other directors of this committee include Aurelio Peccei, the head of the Club of Rome, and Jan Tinbergen, the Dutch author of the 1976 Club of Rome "Reshaping the International Order" (RIO) report.

Will U.S. farmers be able to help?

by Susan B. Cohen

Today the United States has a multimillion-ton farm surplus that could halt mass starvation in Africa. Yet, as things presently stand, under Carter administration policy the surpluses will not be used to rescue Africa from genocide. And if the administration has its way, the world's mightiest food industry may shortly be incapable of feeding America's own populaton.

American agriculture is up against the most serious crisis since the 1930s Depression. As many as 50 percent of American farm producers may go out of business during the 1980 harvest unless emergency action is taken. Producers have been forced to operate at below cost of production, papering over this impossible proposition with growing layers of debt. Now, as the result of inflated production and credit costs, combined with extensive drought damage under Carter, the turning point has arrived.

Parity—the policy of government and intergovernmental commitments to enforcing orderly marketing at price levels that reflect cost of production plus a gross profit for producer income and investment—is the key to the solution for both U.S. and Third World agriculture.

Contrary to prevailing mythology, parity is not a subsidy or a handout to agriculture: it is the only sure way to guarantee stable supplies of food at stable prices. The "cheap food" policy of the Carter administration and its predecessors has had the opposite effect, leading to potentially disastrous instability in both production and prices.

In the Carter administration's hands food is used as a weapon against both American farmers and the developing sector. The PL-480 Food for Peace program is the clearest case in point.

Providing an outlet for dumping food surpluses abroad, the program is essential to holding down farm prices. At the same time, by flooding target countries with cheap commodities at far below cost of production, agricultural development at that end has been stifled. Farm producers in the Third World must be guaranteed income levels appropriate to investment at the highest level of technology.

The question of agricultural modernization is the crux of current food aid programs. Everything else is sheer hypocrisy, as was highlighted in the report produced recently by President Carter's so-called Commission on World Hunger after two years of deliberation. Embedded in a mass of verbiage is the contention that relief efforts are obstructed by recipient governments who are "using hunger and famine as a weapon of armed conflict or political repression." This from a government that is openly using food supplies to Somalia, for instance, to recruit, arm and train guerillas to run invasions into Ethiopia!

The way the "food weapon" works in the United States is straightforward. Since the World War II parity pricing policy was struck down after bitter fighting in the early 1950s, overall farm prices have been held below the cost of production. A steady bleeding of farm equity has been the result. Producers patched over the difference between pinched income flows and escalating operating costs and capital costs by piling up mortgages and loans. Since 1950, average indebtedness per farm has jumped from $2,200 to $52,100, not on the basis of increased income and creation of new equity values, but primarily on the basis of speculative inflation of land values.

Over the years, the growing debt burden has combined with constricted cash flow to restrict capital investment and investment in land improvement. The post-1973 crunch has helped force producers to farm as extensively as possible under every circumstance in an effort to compensate in volume what they are systematically losing in per bushel price. Soil erosion problems have consequently begun to multiply. And in the critical Plains States, producers are being forced to give up irrigation as the lifetime of existing wells runs out. Unable to afford the investment, they revert to so-called dryland farming. In this way the basic "plant and equipment" of the agriculture industry is being exhausted, and American food production capability seriously weakened.

President Carter's anti-inflation program, under which Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker jacked up the cost of credit to 20 percent, intersected this situation like a cleaver. This spring producers hocked their last scrap of equity to get operating loans at anywhere from 15 to 20 percent just to get crops into the ground. Then the drought hit.

By mid-July farm prices, which jumped 5.2 percent on drought-related concerns from mid-June, had finally recouped to the average level of a year ago, before the Carter export embargo against the U.S.S.R. pulled the bottom out of the grains market. But production costs were still 12 percent above last year's level. Net farm income could fall to little more than $18 billion from the $33 billion earned in 1979—a 40 percent drop. That would be the steepest single-year plunge in farm earnings since the 55 percent collapse in net farm income in the devastating year of 1921.

A 15 percent reduction in the corn crop this year has been projected by the USDA, based on conditions as of Aug. 1. As a one-time proposition, this will not result in a supply shortage. But the drought's impact reaches much further. The crop reductions, which are probably conservative as presently estimated, will push up prices at a fast clip.

The point is that there are many, many producers who have nothing to sell at any price—therefore, offering these producers another credit line is less than worthless. And with interest rates showing every sign of heading back up again, those who are not bankrupted outright by the harvest will be on the line.

The Carter record

The Carter administration has proved itself, as a quick review of the record shows, an enemy of progress and development in general and of a vital and profitable agricultural industry in particular.

• One of the first things Carter did upon entering the White House was to issue a hit list of 18 water development projects in various stages of design and even construction which he intended to shut down. Fully 12 of these projects, many of them absolutely critical to further economic development in the West, have been killed.

• More recently, Carter's Agriculture Secretary Bergland has appointed a self-proclaimed opponent of irrigation as his emergency drought aid coordinator! Upon assuming his post, at the height of the drought, Roger Sandman told the press: "We've become awfully irrigation-crazy in recent years. Water is not an unlimited resource."

• Interior Department chief Andrus is busy currently trying to lock up federal lands to prevent their development—for anything but President Carter's synfuels boondoggle.

• The foreign side of Carter's "cheap food" policy is exemplified in the January grain embargo maneuver that shut the door on 25 million tons of grain exports to the Soviet Union, a good business proposition that would have boosted farm prices respectably. In fact, there is every reason to believe that the administration was acutely mindful of the embargo's effect in pushing down grain prices when the decision to go with it was made. If the Afghanistan situation had not been invoked as a "national security" pretext for the operation, Carter would have been legally bound to enforce 90 percent of parity in the affected markets. ■