

# Dutch Farmers and Fishermen: The People Who Feed Us

*By Elze van Hamelen*

*“Not long after we met for the first time, [Medavoy] said to me, ‘I can tell you how to run a world, you know.’ I laughed. ‘Really.’ ‘Sure,’ he said. ‘You make up something complicated. Then you insert it into the bloodstream of the society, and you watch it bloom. You make it complex enough that it will take armies of people to sort it out and argue about it, and then you have them. The other thing is, what you make up has to cost money. A lot of money.’”*

- Jon Rappoport, interview with propaganda expert Ellis Medavoy

*“They keep changing the rules of the game.”*

- Jeroen van Maanen, Dutch farmer

# I. Introduction

In 2022, Dutch farmers made worldwide news when they began protesting government plans to move them off their lands. Less known to the outside world is the fact that Dutch fishermen, too, are being driven out of their centuries-old fishing grounds, as wind farms and “protected natural areas” take their place. For the current political class at the local, national, and global levels, and for the uninformed public at large, farmers and fishermen stand accused of damaging nature—with officials claiming that policies to “restore” nature and keep it free from human activity are necessary.

How did this false dichotomy of “man versus nature” arise and come to the forefront of policymaking? To answer that question, one has to dive into the history of industrial agriculture and the rise of global agribusiness (see **Some Post-WWII Historical Background**). That history shows that United Nations (UN) treaties to “protect” nature—such as Habitat I (1976),<sup>1</sup> Agenda 21 (1992),<sup>2</sup> and the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992)<sup>3</sup>—have encouraged rapid urbanization while emptying out the countryside. Even more significantly, these treaties are a direct (albeit stealthy) attack on private property and the sovereignty of nation-states.

Currently, the land grab is speeding up. The UN agenda to expand the amount of land set aside for “protection” is accelerating, and simultaneously, BlackRock and other asset managers and private equity investors are buying up large tracts of land worldwide. Meanwhile, the cities created through engineered urbanization are rapidly turning into open-air prisons—heavily surveilled “smart cities” divided into 15-minute zones.

To understand the challenges that Dutch farmers and fishermen are facing—and learn from their experiences—the Solari Report wanted to speak to them directly. In the spring of 2023, I conducted in-depth interviews with eight Dutch farmers and fishermen. (In this report, we provide bios for the two farmers and two fishermen interviewed on camera.) The interviews furnish a “from the horse’s mouth” picture of the tsunami of policies that are making it increasingly impossible for farmers and fishermen to keep producing food. Their sobering words form a centerpiece of this *2nd Quarter 2023 Wrap Up*. They warn that the means of food production are being undermined, moved abroad, or in other ways concentrated in the hands of multinational corporations.

As people around the world grapple with the importance of building and strengthening local food systems, the observations of Dutch farmers and fishermen, and their assessment of how current developments may impact their—and our—future, provide vital intelligence. Historically, the move from privately owned land and food production to centralized systems has led to famines, including the greatest famines of the 20th century. However, centralization is neither a necessity nor, if we take action, a foregone conclusion. In my conversations with farmers and fishermen, I encountered courage, resilience, creativity, entrepreneurship, and a real passion for the work that

they and their families and communities have performed for generations. The interviews also reminded me that farming and fishing communities do more than just provide our food—they maintain a cultural thread that keeps us rooted in history and to the land. As consumers, investors, and citizens, it is high time that we support the people who feed us.

This report:

- Describes the policy tsunami that has hit Dutch farmers and fishermen (Parts II and III)
- Outlines the coercive “solutions” proposed by the government and their consequences (Parts IV and V)
- Discusses the Netherlands as an industrial agriculture case study and cautionary tale
- Considers globalists’ long-standing plans for controlling land, people, and the seas (Parts VII, VIII, and IX)
- Examines the control grid and the economic and energy warfare and control of food supplies that it facilitates (Part X)
- Considers the larger endgame (Part XI)
- Proposes solutions (Part XII)

## Some Post-WWII Historical Background

The narrative that underpins many of the policies that are driving people off the land and sea is that man is “bad for nature” and that nature needs to be saved from man. To understand how this narrative came to the forefront of regulations, we have to go back to the period after WWII. During this post-war period, agriculture in many parts of the world underwent a fundamental transformation from the traditional farming practices used for thousands of years to an industrialized model of agriculture. This shift, which was top-down, could not have been achieved without state intervention.<sup>4</sup>

When Britain’s position as a global hegemon started declining in the period after WWI, power brokers at the U.S. State Department started planning to take over its role. That group recognized, however, that it would not be sustainable to occupy colonies through direct rule, as Britain had done. Instead, they gradually constructed a system of economic colonization, whereby countries had ostensible political independence but were controlled by debt bondage and forced liberalization and globalization policies. The new global governance architecture was run by, among others, the UN, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO).<sup>5-7</sup>

As geopolitical analyst F. William Engdahl explains in his 2007 book *Seeds of Destruction*, “Under the banner of ‘free trade’ and the opening of closed markets

## Man-made Hunger

*“A country that does not take care of its food supply is doomed.”*

~ Patrick Schilder, fisherman

*“Mass starvation is a process of deprivation that occurs when actors impede the capacity of targeted persons to access the means of sustaining life.”*

~ Alex de Waal, research professor

*“In a highly centralized and industrialized food-supply system there can be no small disaster. Whether it be a production ‘error’ or a corn blight, the disaster is not foreseen until it exists; it is not recognized until it is widespread.”*

~ Wendell Berry

The major famines of the 20th century were not caused by the whims of nature, although nature certainly can exacerbate famines. The famines were caused by politics and policies. In a 1999 article about China’s great famine,<sup>209</sup> Vaclav Smil quotes historian Richard Rhodes, who considered “public man-made death” possibly the most overlooked cause of 20th-century mortality. Although Rhodes defined man-made deaths as those resulting “from war, political violence, and their attendant privations,” Smil’s details about China’s famine show that cold, calculating socioeconomic policies can be every bit as fatal.

This is a point often emphasized by Tufts University research professor Alex de Waal, one of the world’s foremost experts on humanitarian crises. In a Tufts interview about his 2017 book *Mass Starvation: The History and Future of Famine*, de Waal quickly dispensed with the notion that mass starvation is caused by “natural” circumstances such as food shortages, overpopulation, or natural disasters. He stated:

*“That is nonsense. Famine is a very specific political product of the way in which societies are run, wars are fought, governments are managed. The single overwhelming element in causation—in three-quarters of the famines and three-quarters of the famine deaths—is political agency. Yet we still tend to be gripped by this idea that famine is a natural calamity.”<sup>210</sup>*

As de Waal and scholar Bridget Conley explain in an article titled “The Purposes of Starvation: Historical and Contemporary Uses,” the most egregious instances of mass starvation have been the result of communist regimes’ “titanic social engineering” attempts. They state, “Soviet agrarian reform, the ‘Great Leap Forward’ in China, and Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, are the leading contemporary examples of forcible socio-economic transformation.”<sup>211</sup>

The precise numbers are still unknown, but according to estimates cited by Smil, during the “Great Leap Forward” (1959–1961) in which China and Mao sought to reform the country’s agricultural system, starvation killed 30 million Chinese.<sup>209</sup> In southern Russia, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, Stalin’s agricultural reforms caused the “Holodomor” (Great Famine); Ukrainians suffered the most, with the Holodomor causing an estimated 3.3 million excess deaths in 1932 and 1933, according to de Waal and Conley.<sup>211</sup> They estimate that another 1.2 million died from starvation or related causes under the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia.

During these top-down agricultural reforms, farmers were driven off the land. In the Soviet Union, the government confiscated farms (*kulaks*) and turned them into collective farms; those peasants who did not want to join the collectives—about five million of them—were deported to central Asia or Siberia.<sup>212</sup> In China, similarly, the regime forbade private food production and forced peasants to join agricultural communes.<sup>209</sup>

There are many other smaller-scale examples. What they have in common, according to Conley and de Waal, is the use of mass starvation as “a process of deprivation” intended to “impede the capacity of targeted persons to access the means of sustaining life.” This can be achieved through multiple policies that reduce a population’s access to food and water. In short, Conley and de Waal argue, mass starvation “is produced by leaders’ decisions and serves political, military or economic goals.”

They list “nine objectives that can be furthered through mass starvation”:

- Extermination or genocide
- Control through weakening a population
- Gaining territorial control
- Flushing out a population
- Punishment
- Material extraction or theft
- Extreme exploitation
- War provisioning
- Comprehensive societal transformation

Conley and de Waal make several other important points about what they summarize as “starvation crimes.” First, though “culpability” may initially be “relatively easy to deny,” the “long duration of maintaining the policies that create these conditions undermines claims of innocence. In most of the ‘uses’ of mass starvation...deprivation was imposed on thousands of people over multiple years.”

Second, the two authors explain that the policies of starvation can be exacerbated by external factors, such as “environmental stress, natural calamity, global economic shocks” as well as internal factors such as “economic inequalities and policy that cause economic distress.”

Third, the processes of globalization of food markets and urbanization create dependencies for populations that no longer rely on local food production.

If we compare the nine objectives of Conley and de Waal to the policies implemented over the past 70 years, there are some striking parallels. In particular, we can note the following:

- Agenda 21, or what more recently has been dubbed “the Great Reset,” is a megalomaniacal plan for “comprehensive societal transformation” (#9) that is very reminiscent of the earlier communist visions of a perfect society.
- As we have seen, the urbanization and globalization of food markets seen in recent decades were not natural processes; they were implemented through social engineering on an enormous scale.
- Habitat I laid the legal foundation for these phenomena by redefining private property for the objectives of “material extraction or theft” (#6) and “gaining territorial control” (#3).

In addition, the countless policies that are weakening people’s ability to provide for themselves and sustain their lives—or prevent self-reliance altogether—can certainly be interpreted as “control through weakening a population” (#2). To recapitulate, these weakening policies include:

- Policies that drive farmers off the land
- Policies that drive fishermen off the sea
- Professional bans on starting a farm or fishery
- Policies that restrict access to the land
- Policies that restrict access to freshwater, such as the right to strike a well or use ground- or rainwater
- Destruction of dams and freshwater reservoirs
- Policies that facilitate corporate control over seeds and attack peasants’ and indigenous peoples’ right to control their own seeds<sup>213</sup>
- Policies to cull cow herds, such as the Irish government’s proposed 10% reduction between 2023 and 2026,<sup>214</sup> or the Dutch government’s intention to reduce the nation’s cows by at least 40%<sup>215</sup>
- Policies to cull poultry, with 272 million birds culled worldwide between October 2021 and March 2023 to combat “bird flu”
- Bans on fishing and hunting<sup>216</sup>
- Bans on access to community gardens, such as happened in Ireland during lockdowns<sup>217</sup>

Finally, we could add to this list the policies that have facilitated “economic inequalities and polic[ies] that cause economic distress”:

- Lockdown policies that prohibit people from working
- Policies that bankrupt the middle class and redistribute assets to corporations and institutional investors (such as the “Going Direct” policies implemented during Covid)<sup>218</sup>
- Policies that cause energy prices to skyrocket
- Policies that increase inflation

As Henry Kissinger famously stated, “control over food is control over people.” We are not at the point of mass famines yet—at least not in the West—but if we take a lesson from history and look at these policies in their larger context, we should take heed. As Ian Fleming’s *Goldfinger* tells us, “Once is happenstance. Twice is coincidence. Three times is enemy action.” Author and activist Naomi Wolf has stated:

*“As a political consultant you learn to reason backwards. You look at the effect—you draw conclusions from the effect [of a policy]. The story is made up, always. You learn that as a political consultant. The principals will set a goal, they will say ‘Get us to this goal,’ and then the Chief of Staff goes to the message shop, meaning the storytellers, and says, ‘Tell a story that will get people to accept this goal.’ And that is how politics works.”*  
219

Perhaps the goal is “just” to control the food supply, and coming events will not take the form of a famine. If Mr. Global’s plans for lab-grown meat, milk, and fish, vertical farms, aquaculture, and insect farms pan out, there may be sufficient food for the population, albeit not foods that are fresh, local, or healthy—but even access to these “pharma foods” could well be on the condition of signing up for a digital identity, central bank digital currencies (CBDCs), and regular medical “treatment.”