SOVIETS BLAMED FOR SUGAR HOAX AS SHAH HOARDS

Nov. 6 (IPS)--The Rockefeller-engineered sugar shortage took a new twist this week as scare headlines in U.S. newspapers accused the Soviets of buying up scarce supplies. Like the recently contrived scandal over Soviet grain purchases, these stories are part of an ongoing effort to drum up an international "red scare" aimed at decapitating working class struggles. Meanwhile, the real hoarder-the CIA's Shah of Iran-goes undetected and gains a convenient cover story.

Iran, Kuwait, and other Rockefeller oil company Arab fronts are squatting on a three-year sugar supply they recently bought at record prices—at least two million tons of sugar. The Soviets' alleged purchase amounted only to 400,000 tons—or about one-quarter of what they usually import in a year! The Philippines, which supposedly sold the sugar to the USSR, denies that the sale was ever made!

Although no real shortage exists, world sugar prices more than quadrupled on the commodity exchanges this year. This transparent hoax represents a severe blow to working class families worldwide who traditionally turn to sugar as a substitute for more expensive protein-rich foods during depression periods. British workers, who sustain themselves through a day of back-breaking speedup by pausing for an afternoon cup of liquid sugar (tea), were the first to feel the pinch this year.

The panic now is spreading to Western Europe and the United States. On Nov. 5, San Francisco workers were greeted by headlines in the local yellow press, the <u>San Francisco Examiner</u>: "Soviets Drop Sugar Bomb." Later that day, sugar was reported to have disappeared from area stores.

Phony Shortage

The phoniness of the "shortage" is obvious given that world sugar production will increase this year. Despite recent flood damage lowering Eastern Europe sugar beet production and the crop shortfalls in Western Europe attributed to weather and "virus yellows," these losses are more than offset by the rise in world sugar cane production. According to the West German analyst F.O. Licht's October figures, every major sugar cane producing country expects bumper crops. Licht estimates that world sugar cane production will increase 5.4 per cent over last year's crop. Given the destruction of working class incomes in the last year, consumption is bound to collapse: Only substantial hoarding and speculation could have produced the fourfold price rise!

Despite the high prices, U.S. and Western European sugar growers have not benefitted significantly. Most U.S. sugar cane producers contracted their crop at \$14 a ton last winter, so they will not receive any payment at the current world price--now \$51 a ton on the New York exchange. Domestic sugar beet farmers have suffered large

11/6/74

losses each year since 1971, and many are trying their luck at other crops. The U.S. Sugar Act, which previously set quotas and protected domestic farm prices, has been allowed to expire by Congress as of the end of this year. Sugar growers have protested that when the Sugar Act expires they will be edged out of the market by foreign sugar cane producers controlled by multinational cartels.

and promotion of the analysis in a contract of the contract of

Cuba Covers for Rocky

In still another development, Castro's Cuba is prostituting itself by lending support to the formation of an OPEC-style Latin American sugar producers' bloc proposed by the governments of Mexico and Argentina. In so doing, Cuba has offered an "anti-imperialist" cover to the Rockefeller multinationals' direct attack on workers' consumption.

Meanwhile, traditional U.S. suppliers Philippines and Brazil are playing coy and withholding supplies from the U.S. The press is speculating about a Cuban-U.S. "rapprochaent," which would lead to Cuba's partial replacement of the Philippines in the U.S. market. Philippines President and mass murderer Marcos took advantage of the dropping of U.S. quotas to adopt a "progressive, independent" stance Marcos sent his wife to negotiate a trade deal with the Peoples' Republic of China to buy crude oil in exchange for Philippines' sugar and other raw materials. Thus Marcos will attempt to sucker the Chinese into a Rockefeller-controlled South Asian "self-sufficiency" zone based on slave labor.

THERE IS NO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Nov. 6 (IPS)--Two U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) spokesmen told IPS yesterday that there are no policy differences between Rockefeller, the State Department, and USDA over food banks and stockpiling. USDA Assistant Secretary for International Affairs Clayton Yautter expressed great dismay over UPI and AP press reports of a split between the State and Agriculture Departments. "Let me make it clear that there is no difference between our policies," Yautter stated, "none whatever. I say this without equivocation. For some reason, people are trying to make out a difference."

Yautter's colleague in the USDA, Assistant Administrator for International Trade Gordon Fraser, echoed Yautter's claim that the State Department already has swallowed the USDA. Referencing Secretary of State Kissinger's statement to the Rome Food Conference yesterday, Fraser said: "We are for an internationally coordinated system of nationally held food reserves. There are no differences; there are no differences."

The hysterical reaction of these two officials follows the hast retreat made by Secretary of Agriculture Butz since he has come under intense pressure from the State Department. Butz was forced to