

GATT failure hides trade war intent

by Anthony K. Wikrent

Contrary to all media reports, the United States government—actually, the nexus of Anglo-American financiers, energy resource companies, and food cartels that control the U.S. government—has achieved its objective in the Uruguay Round of talks on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT): the collapse of negotiations, creating a pretext for launching trade wars against continental Europe and Japan. The talks broke down in Brussels on Dec. 6, over U.S. demands that European Community (EC) countries cut farm supports.

On cue, Sen. Max Baucus (D-Mont.), chairman of the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Trade, said that the United States “now has no choice but to use Super 301 and agriculture subsidies to promote the interests of U.S. farmers. . . . I don’t see much merit in continuing the round. Some countries, notably the European Community, simply lack the political will to liberalize trade.” House Majority Leader Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.) added, “We may need a new version of the Gephardt Amendment for the 1990s,” referring to his 1988 proposal for trade retaliation against countries that have too large a trade surplus with the United States.

Brandishing a sheaf of protests against “unfair trading” filed by U.S. businesses under the Super 301 provisions, the United States threatened to impose 200% duties on EC agricultural and beverage exports worth almost \$420 million, and published a list of retaliatory targets for import levies, including: cordials and liqueurs; mineral water; vermouth and other spirits; artichokes; and cheese. These punitive duties may be imposed as early as Dec. 31.

The collapse of the GATT talks serves three useful purposes for the Anglo-American oligarchy. First, in line with their policy of “food as a weapon,” no significant food production capability is to be allowed that is not controlled by them.

Second, it provides a convenient “whipping boy” to blame for the onset of economic depression. Even that bastion of monetarist free trade, the London *Financial Times*, which has been in the forefront of attacks on the EC’s refusal to dismantle its system of food production, noted on Dec. 10 that, “given the fraying of the [U.S.] social welfare net during the Reagan years, federal and state governments will either have to raise extra revenue to finance improved benefits and services, or accept responsibility for urban deprivation on a

truly horrifying scale. . . . If the safety net is not repaired, poverty could become a defining issue in the 1992 election campaign.”

Third, the collapse of GATT clears the stage for full-scale trade war against continental Europe and Japan. On Dec. 10, the London *Times* carried a warning from City of London insider Anatole Kaletsky: “The world is now faced with the choice between two kinds of economic warfare. Either there will be an international trade war with America, resulting in the worst economic depression since the Thirties. Or European politicians will have to begin an all-out attack on their own farmers. . . . For the first time in decades, the threat of a genuine trade war from America is credible. . . . At the same time Europe is more vulnerable than ever to American protectionism. The fall of the dollar has made key European industries so uncompetitive that small additional measures may be enough to destroy such shaky projects as the Airbus, and to cripple other ‘national champions’ like Siemens in telecommunications, Philips in consumer electronics, Olivetti in computers, and even Mercedes and BMW in luxury cars.”

In the same vein is the recent call for “technological apartheid” against the developing sector, by a high-level French government official writing under the pseudonym “Jean Villars” in the Sept. 7 issue of Sir Jimmy Goldsmith’s *L’Express*. Villars argued that a ban be placed not only on military-related technology exports to the developing sector, but on all high-tech exports. The Third World should receive “appropriate technology” only, he wrote, gloating that “technological apartheid is a brutal formula.”

LaRouche: Food control is mass murder

Commenting on Dec. 8 on the GATT breakdown, Lyndon LaRouche emphasized that the U.S. negotiating posture is, on the one hand, “another sign of insanity on the side of the Bush administration”—the insane ideology of free trade which maintains that farmers who do not receive a price comparable to their costs of production, can still somehow produce food. But on the other hand, such ideological insanity is “simply a battering ram, a resource, used by those who are proceeding with a much more calculated view of the matter, and less naive.”

Their objective, he explained, is malthusian food control. “If they can successfully impose the conditions they demanded in the GATT negotiation, as non-negotiable demands, which is what they were by the United States, that would collapse worldwide food production, and would put food control into operation in a way which would ensure not only political control by the Anglo-Americans, but the success of their genocide through mass starvation and disease program against the darker-skinned peoples of the world. We have to say that. Let’s not kid ourselves with this stuff. Let’s not be mealy-mouthed. Let’s say it openly: that food control is mass murder, on a greater scale than Adolf Hitler.”