'That empire in Southeast Asia is the last major resource area outside the control of any one of the major powers on the globe. . . . I believe that the condition of the Vietnamese people, and the direction in which their future may be going, are at this stage secondary, not primary.'

-- Senator McGee (Wyoming) U S Senate
February 17, 1965

SCARCE RESOURCES: THE DYNAMIC OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

BY HEATHER DEAN

At the time she wrote this paper, Heather Dean was a member of the Research, Information and Publications Project of the Student Union for Peace Action in Toronto.

Published by:
The Radical Education Project
Box 625 Ann Arbor MI 48108

An independent education, research and publication program initiated by Students for a Democratic Society, dedicated to the cause of a democratic radicalism, and aspiring to the creation of a new left in America.

INTRODUCTION

FOUR THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM

1. LENIN'S

Lenin wrote at a time when domestic markets in Europe were saturated, leading him to predict that the industrialized countries would war among themselves for overseas outlets for investment capital and for overseas markets. The Social Democrats argued that alternate solutions would be found - the crises of 'overproduction' would be ended by increasing domestic demand by wage increases, welfare payments, etc. Lenin dismissed with two words ('under capitalism!') this notion that the greedy capitalists would give the workers money.

However, the development of capitalist economies has shown an almost limitless capacity for internal expansion. Legalized unions, welfare, public works, defense spending, planned obsolescence, space programs, consumer credit, ad-created markets and fad spending . . . techniques beyond the wildest dreams of the Social Democrats . . . lead one to suspect that the last cataclysmic convulsion of capitalism just isn't coming.

Not only have capitalist economies succeeded in expanding internally, but they have observably not exploited market and investment opportunities in the underdeveloped countries. The feudal economic and political structures of the Third World provide neither purchasing power nor opportunities for investment in industry and, liberal disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, American policies are directed at maintaining such structures.[1] There has been no effort to duplicate the European expansion sparked by investment in the industrialization of North America.

Yearly American investment overseas is approximately 5% of domestic investment, and the major part of that is in Europe and Canada. Only 2% of American overseas investments is in underdeveloped countries; only a negligible amount on the Asian mainland.

American investors do make a tidy sum each year on their overseas investments, and it would be naive to suppose that the corporations involved would be too altruistic to fight to maintain them. But the degree of expansion has been so limited, the profits so peripheral to the American economy, that it takes a peculiar sort of demonology to believe that they are in themselves adequate justification of the three wars and countless lesser military actions by which the United States has gained and maintained control of the Third World.

2. NEO-MARXIST

Some modern Marxists argue that America's overseas investments are indeed negligible to the survival of the American economy, but that the domestic economic effects of imperial wars are crucial. The figures lend more weight to this argument. American investments in her domestic war industries each year are more than 60 times

---

1 For example, the Alliance for Progress specifically forbids use of its funds for any sort of land reform program.

her investments in underdeveloped countries.

However, there is nothing magical about the kind of economic waste implied in needless war spending. Other forms of waste such as space programs are equally effective sources of investment, and many other forms would be easier to sell politically than wars against fictitious invaders.

3. LIBERAL

In response to this sort of argument, the majority of the American liberal-left denies that the Marxist theories of imperialism explain American foreign policy today, although they credit it (when they know it at all) with some degree of accuracy in interpreting the earlier part of the century. Their most common explanation of America's military domination of Asia, Africa and Latin America suggests that there is no rational motive for it. Imperialism belongs to America's economic past; however the ideology and bureaucracy that supported these outdated interests have a blind momentum of their own that has made them endure beyond their moment in history.

This understanding leads to a politics of petition - the Quaker 'Speak Truth to Power' approach. Its analysis of American power is filled with words like 'irrational fear,' 'blunder,' 'paranoia,' or 'fixation.' So the solution is seen in affecting a change in the personal qualities of the men at the helm, running peace candidates or helping those in power see the illogic of 'the system in which they are trapped.'

4. SCARCE RESOURCES

The research for this paper was based on the premise that American policy is rational and successful. It may not be directed at our goals, but it is goal-directed, and the goals are not anachronisms of the American system but are essential to the maintenance of existing power relations. I have looked for this motive in that aspect of imperialism that is usually foot-noted in considerations of the American economic influence in the Third World - the massive extraction of raw materials.

While not denying the existence of other economic motivations which are stressed by the Marxist left, I would argue that they are secondary to the total dependency of American production on foreign resources, that this dependency is sufficient in itself to explain U S policy, and that it leads to a fundamental conflict between the survival of the American economy in its present form and the drive for development in the Third World.

US MATERIALS POLICY STUDIES - 1950-1960

'Has the United States of America the material means to sustain its civilization?'

In 1952, the U S President's Materials Policy Commission opened its report with this question. Its answer shattered forever the myth of Cornucopian natural resources on the North American continent, and introduced a new alarm into the consciousness of policy-makers: the U S depended on foreign sources for every significant industrial resource except molybdenum and magnesium.

The Commission, headed by William S. Paley,[2] hired a phalanx of experts to predict U S demand for natural resources for the next 25 years, and to advise the President on legislation necessary to ensure that these resources would be available.

Its report is far from a dry compilation of statistics; its principal author seems to see himself as something of a philosopher-poet. In the introduction he reflects on the wry workings of fate which make materials a key factor in the struggle between the Spirit of Man and the Forces of Materialism. The report concluded that the materials would not be lacking. However it found domestic reserves adequate to meet only a small and shrinking fraction of American needs.

The Third World is expected to supply the bulk of the raw materials used by U S industry. In another burst of lyricism the Report details the mutual benefits to arise from this Free World division of labor. Each nation has its appointed role: that of the underdeveloped countries is to produce, that of the U S is to consume. (It's highly reminiscent of the speeches on peaceful coexistence that the Russians keep delivering to the Chinese.) By selling to U S markets, Third World nations will accumulate the capital necessary to finance their own industrialization. But this eventuality appears only in the rhetoric of the report. Their statistical projections do not allow for a significant increase in consumption of industrial raw materials in the underdeveloped countries.

In response to the Paley Report, defense stockpiling was undertaken on a massive scale to safeguard against such supply shortages as had occurred during the Korean War. Government subsidies (since largely discontinued) encouraged exploitation of inferior domestic ores in hopes of making technological breakthroughs. Government commissions were set up to give early warning of financial or political threats to foreign sources of defense materials.

Most important, and probably most successful, an organization was established with Ford Foundation money to refine and expand the work of the Paley Commission. 'Resources for the Future' was incorporated to do research, publish, and make policy recommendations. Paley was joined in its administration by such pillars of the American Establishment as George P. Brown,[3] Frank Pace,[4] and Laurance Rockefeller.[5]

The major publication of Resources for the Future (RFF) is 'Resources in America's Future.' It is a massive collection of statistics and extrapolations that attempts to predict patterns of American consumption to the year 2000, allowing for substitutions, probable technological innovations, etc. In tone its publications seem to be one half of a debate with Rachel Carson. One feels the presence of an unseen Conservationist Lobby proposing crimps in the style of the barons of the extractive industries, many of them on the board of RFF. This report, too concludes that the raw materials America needs will be available. But for those of us to whom 'America's interests' are not the whole spectrum of concern, the means by which this conclusion was reached are ominous. The introduction warns:

> It should be pointed out clearly, however, that our conclusion that there is no general resource shortage problem for the balance of the century applies specifically to the United States; it cannot be extended automatically to other countries. In many less developed countries, es-

---

2 Chairman of CBS and life trustee of Columbia University.
3 United Shoe Machinery, Boston Herald-Traveller Corp., First National Bank of Boston, New England Tel & Tel, Old Colony Trust Co.
4 Time Inc. Colgate-Palmolive, Continental Oil, Banker's Trust, Eurofund, etc.
5 Pres. Rockefeller Bros. Fund, Rockefeller Bros. Inc., etc.

> pecially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, population presses hard on available natural resources; for them a sustained increase in living levels can by no means by guaranteed with the assurance it can be for the United States and other more advanced industrial countries.

In plainer words, the surpluses of industrial raw materials which America expects to import from Asia, Africa and Latin America are illusory. They would vanish from world markets if the intolerable stagnation of Third World economies was ended. To ensure their continued availability will require complete political and economic control of Third World countries - a control exercised against the most elemental interests of their populations.

THE EXTENT OF SCARCITY

In 1963[6], the Minerals Year Book supplied the following figures for U S imports for consumption:

MINERAL	% of consumption imported	% of world production
Iron	22%	
Manganese	94%	
Chromite	100%	14%
Cobalt	98%	
Nickel	86%	35%
Tungsten	43%	
Copper	25%	23%
Lead	35%	
Zinc	44%	
Uranium	38%	
Tin	78%	24%
Aluminum		45%
Bauxite	85%	31%

This gives some idea of the magnitude of U S reliance on other than domestic sources, but the figures are distorted in two directions. In some cases they minimize the shortage because current needs are being met by uneconomic government-subsidized exploitation of small deposits of inferior ore. In other cases, notably iron, the U S imports are of sufficiently high quality to compensate for shipping costs, but apart from the price differential, has quite adequate supplies of ore.

Taken to the end of the century, the relative significance of the shortages shifts, but the overall picture is sufficiently alarming that it is certain that scarce resources are a significant determinant of government policy. For those who quail at statistics, it is possible to skip the following array of figures. The gist of them is that the U S has between 1% and 10% of the reserves necessary to meet demand from now to the year 2000, and will require between 50% to 100% or more of known reserves in the 'non-Communist world' (the RFF amendment of Paley's 'Free World').

---

6 The budget -- $0 -- allows for only the latest data the Business Library sees fit to order.

All terms and statistics are drawn from the RFF report, 'Resources in America's Future.'

U.S.C.D. -- U S Cumulative Demand (total demand from 1960 to 2000)
NCW -- non-Communist World
reserves -- minerals contained in ore that can be mined with present technology (this includes ores which are not commercially feasible at current prices but which are technically easy to mine and c50% less rich than ores currently marketable).
resources -- minerals that could be mined if cost were no object, or given a technological breakthrough (such as oil in tar sands).

Electricity and steel will continue to be the irreducible basis of any advanced civilization for at least a century. The imponderables of shifts in consumption patterns, technological innovations and substitutions are held to a minimum in considering the following minerals: the ferro-alloys, and the two conductors of electricity, cooper and aluminum.

MANGANESE

Manganese is absolutely essential to the manufacture of steel; it strips it of the major impurity, sulphur. There is no possible substitute. Most of the world's reserves of manganese are in the U.S.S.R. and China. There will probably be discoveries in Africa, however, that could double the figure of 185 million tons in NCW reserves.

U.S.C.D. low projection - 48 million tons
med projection 73 " "
high 107 " "

U S reserves: 0.9 million tons

Total NCW demand - med - 300 million tons
Total NCW reserves - 185 million tons

TUNGSTEN

Tungsten has the highest melting point of any metal. It is used for high speed steels, and steels that must withstand constant friction like bits and drills. It imparts the necessary hardness to cutting tools, and is a major electrical and electronic component.

U.S.C.D. 250,000 tons 460,000 tons 800,000 tons
U S reserves 71,000 tons of low-grade ore
NCW demand 1,000,000 tons
NCW reserves 320,000 tons

Molybdenum is a possible substitute for tungsten in steel.

NICKEL

Nickel is the single most important alloy mineral, currently used in over 3000 alloys.[7] It gives steel strength, hardness, and resistance to corrosion or deformation at high temperatures. It is found in quantity only in Indonesia, New Caledonia, Canada and Cuba. Le Nickel of Europe (French Rothschilds) controls the New Caledonia mines, so the North American market is supplied almost entirely from Canada.

U.S.C.D. 7 million tons 11.7 million 19.3 million
U S reserves .5 million tons
NCW demand 37 million tons
NCW reserves Canada - 6 million New Caledonia - 4.6 million
Indonesia - 5-8 million; total proved - 11.3 million + inferred

CHROMIUM

Chrome steels are extremely hard for their weight, and of course are resistant to corrosion.

U.S.C.D. 40 million tons
U S reserves - 4 million tons of very inferior ores
NCW demand - 200 million tons NCW reserves - 450 million tons

Estimates of reserves are tentative while exploration continues in Africa. Reserves in South Africa may run from 80 to 800 million; in Southern Rhodesia from 175 to 250 million.

COBALT

Cobalt is used in steels that must resist corrosion at extremely high temperatures. It is used in jets, missiles, gas turbines and generators. Actual use has been less than the projections so far due to the political instability of the Congo.

U.S.C.D. med: 450,000 tons; high: 700,000 tons
U S reserves - 45,000 tons
NCW reserves - 900,000 tons plus inferred reserves in Africa

COPPER

The only mineral that conducts electricity as well as copper is silver. However, a more plausible substitute is aluminum, with 60% of the conductivity of copper. Copper shortages are world wide. Neither the U.S.S.R. nor China have a potential surplus.

U.S.C.D. 60 million tons 112 million 181 million
U S reserves - 30 million; resources 20 million Canada 9 million
NCW demand - 500 million tons
NCW reserves - 200 million proved; 200 million inferred

ALUMINUM

Although it is rare in North America, aluminum is a fairly common mineral throughout the world. One major strike was made when a farmer sent a sample of poor soil for analysis. As it is produced by electrolysis, the ore has moved to power; this is why Canada has been a leading aluminum producer. Control of major hydro-electric power projects in the third world is more critical to securing aluminum supplies than is control of the source of the ore.

U.S.C.D. 140 million 255 million 480 million
U S reserves - 13 million reserves; 98 million resources
NCW demand - 900 million tons (med)
NCW reserves - 800 million tons

---

7 Anyone missing footnotes and references for this sort of statistic can write me for them, c/o New Left Committee 658 Spadina Ave, Toronto, Ontario Canada.

IS THERE ENOUGH TO GO AROUND?

With approximately 8% of the NCW population, the United States is presently planning to reserve for her own industries and her own consumption between 50% and 100% of the world's mineral resources. Her assurance that these resources will be available to her use is hard to explain. Even using the figures given for NCW demand, there would appear to be a bitter competition for resources imminent. And those figures are predicated upon continuing desperate poverty for one-half of the world.

NCW demand was calculated by assuming a growth rate of consumption of industrial raw materials of between 3% and 6%, most of it to come from Europe. To see these figures in proper perspective, consider the past history of developing nations.

a) UNITED STATES

Between 1867 and 1905, steel production increased an average of 25% per annum. This average reflects even higher rates of increase in boom times, followed by severe depressions. After a period of stagnation, World War I sparked another surge in production of 15%-20% per annum.

b) JAPAN

In arming for World War II, Japan increased her steel production from 2.5 million tons in 1932 to 8 million tons in 1943. Due to deliberate occupation policy, her steel-making capacity was reduced to 3 million tons until 1949. In 1964 she produced 40 million tons -- an average rate of growth over 15 years of more than 10%.

c) CHINA[8]

COMMODITY	Production in Metric Tons			
	1952	1957	1958	1959
Coal	66,000	128,000	270,000	335,000
Oil	440	1,444	2,260	3,500
Copper	10	50	70	80
Iron	4,290	15,000	30,000	45,000
Manganese	191	700	850	1,000
Aluminum	0	20	27	60
Lead	7	45	60	75
Steel	1,350	5,350	8,000	12,000

What surpluses of raw materials would be available to the U S if the U.N. undertook a development program designed to bring the Third World to the consumption level of

8 Based on the U S Bureau of Mines Special Supplement #29, March, 1960.

a poor European country by the year 2000? (By which time the U S G.N.P.will have quadrupled.) The obvious pattern consumption-would follow, from the examples above, would be far from a stately 3% of nothing increase per annum. For the first few years, reflecting the smallness of the base, production and consumption would increase by 50% to 300% per annum, and then settle to a steady 10% growth rate.

What will the year 2000 find in fact? Surely not the world predicted in the U S studies, where half the world is swept with plagues and famines as they trudge out to the mines to dig up raw materials for an American affluence of science fiction proportions! The rate of development I have hypothesized is possible. The Third World knows it. They know that the much-vaunted roads, railways and telegraphs that American money has gifted them with lead from the mines to the ports. If they refuse to accept the division of labor on American terms, there will be far too little to go around.

The U S represents approximately 8% of the 'non-Communist world' population. Europe and Canada are approximately twice that. But they need the greater part of all known reserves to maintain their current level of consumption; in some cases they need more than all known reserves, as with copper and tungsten. Is the enemy the U S confronts really Communism - or is it in fact industrialization?

IMPLICATIONS FOR US POLICY

It must be a conscious and primary aim of American foreign policy to ensure that the flow of raw materials from the Third World is never interrupted.

Imagine a situation in which pro-Peking Communist Parties controlled all overseas sources of raw materials for America's steel industry. They could cripple the U S as an economic and military power.

But America runs the risk of political opposition from many strains of political opinion besides the Maoist. And the important conclusion to be drawn from the first part of this paper is that there are economic reasons for any honest and independent government -- communist, socialist, liberal democratic or even revolutionary-right -- to stop selling raw materials to the United States. An examination of all the possible contingencies that could motivate a government to cut off American supplies makes it quite clear that American dependency on foreign suppliers makes it necessary for her to maintain regimes in power that are under her total control.

First, and most vital, a country may wish to conserve its resource base for its own industrial development. It will not be impressed by arguments that the necessity of containing communism requires economic sacrifices from the underdeveloped countries.

Second, there will be competition for what surpluses they may wish to sell, and they will have no reason to hand America a monopoly of their exports. America will have to compete with capitalist and socialist Europe, and with other Third World countries. Since her competitive position will not be strong, she will probably lose open competitions. Primary producers will sell raw materials in those markets from which they can purchase back finished goods at the lowest prices. This is much more likely to be Japan, for instance, than it is the United States.

Third, there will inevitably be anti-American sentiments associated with any independence movement, and that may provide a political motive for giving preference to

non-American buyers, as a symbol of independence or an expression of a legacy of bitterness.

Fourth, there might be sanctions in protest against American foreign policy in other Third World nations. For example, an independent Asian government such as Sihanouk's would be unlikely to sell war material to the United States while it was engaged in a counter-insurgency war such as in Vietnam.

A military consideration makes it equally imperative, from the American viewpoint, to maintain American puppets in Asia. Any number of Asian countries are located along the shipping routes by which the U S obtains strategic materials. If any one of them were to collaborate with a country (guess who) with whom America was engaged in a protracted land war, it could seriously interfere with American war industry.

HOW US SECURITY IS GUARANTEED

There are three dangers against which American policy-makers will guard which arise from reliance on foreign sources of raw materials:

1) Political control of strategic locations by potentially hostile regimes.
2) Trade sanctions for political reasons.
3) Loss of supplies for economic reasons.

Tactics to forestall these eventualities are varied. The ultimate weapon of government, and perhaps the best understood one, is the military coup, instigated by the C.I.A. and backed by the Marines or the Seventh Fleet.

Short of this, American aid to the armed forces of tottering regimes gives the U S de facto political control. When Americans train and select the armed forces' officers, and service and repair military equipment, the effective control of such an army lies outside its own territory. This amounts to occupation by proxy.

American aid also means that the capital equipment of a country -- its transportation system and industries -- rely on American parts, and thus the country is extremely vulnerable in the short-run to sanctions.

Stock-piling of scarce resources is used to maintain political and economic orthodoxy in the poor nations, as they are too close to the verge of complete economic collapse to withstand the dislocation of suddenly losing American markets. Since their margin of survival is so slight, they have no bargaining power, even when facing what appears to be a seller's market.

A final barrier to independent development is the lack of any source of development capital that is ear-marked for the priorities of mankind, and not controlled by the handful of great, interlocking financial empires that are most rewarded by the status quo.

HOT SPOTS OR GOD SAVE AFRICA

If you make a list of troubled areas around the world -- South Korea, Indonesia, Brazil, Congo, Rhodesia, Chile, Ghana, British Guiana, Philippines -- you have also made a list of sources of critical raw materials.

At the moment we seem to be trading Africa for Asia, which is cruel for the Africans, but may move us one step from the brink. Africa is particularly valuable, not only for the vast reserves of copper, chromium, manganese, and cobalt, but also for power. The Volta project, whose future has just been taken from Kwame Nkrumah's hands, will generate enough power to take aluminum production out of the hands of the northern hemisphere.

We may expect to see Africa and Asia firmly in the hands of 'responsible' leadership, who will stress traditional agriculture and fiscal stability over industrialization. Or else.

THE CORNUCOPIANS

Some economists, known to the Conservationists as 'the Cornucopians,' see in each exploited raw material not the use of an irreplaceable resource, but the forging of a key to even greater resources. They point to past history and current trends to show that technological innovations have made possible substitutions or mining of inferior ores at lower costs than earlier exploitation of high-grade ores.

In considering the impact of scarce resources on American foreign policy, two questions arise. How far can technology deliver us from the Law of Diminishing Returns and how many of U S policy-makers are Cornucopians abroad as well as at home?

Theoretically, the whole earth is exploitable as a source of industrial minerals; the barriers are cost in dollars, and cost in time, training and machines. If the U S were presented with a fait accompli; if all her colonies were denied her and she was thrown back on her own and Canada's reserves, she could probably find ways of surviving as an advanced civilization. She has the knowledge, the training centers, the tax base, the power, the tools.

But short of that, will she do it, or will she continue to loot the poor countries of the earth?

At least three times in man's history, great civilizations have grown stagnant and been destroyed because they lacked the social forms that would realize the potential of their sciences. Steam powered the doors of temples while ships were rowed by slaves.

The capacity of American technology to solve the resource problem is not in question. It is in the selection of priorities, not the capacity for research, that our civilization is failing.

The space race is everybody's prime example of misallocation of our human and technical resources. Throughout the fifties reformers cried 'In some countries in the Far East and Africa, 50% of the population is blind! Forget the moon, and find a cure for trachoma.' Immunization against the trachoma virus was finally developed through a break-through in virological research comparable to the development of the Salk vaccine -- by the Chinese.

The system as it is presently structured will not lead to creative alternatives to imperialism as solutions to the resource problem. So long as ownership and control lie in the hands of the great international cartels, and so long as research priorities are determined by market mechanisms, looting will remain the logical solution to a problem with such initial components.

RESEARCH IN A COMPETITIVE MARKET

Although the human race as a whole is going to have to find means of using the less accessible and less-easily reduced ores, at any given point, a strong competitive advantage will accrue to whomever has the cheapest raw materials. It is technically feasible for the United States to find ways of mining manganese from the ocean bottom, but as long as Indian coolies are scratching 50% ore out of the ground with wooden spades, it is economically ridiculous to produce it at 20 times the cost. The Russians and the Chinese both possess substantial deposits of most of the minerals America and Europe lack. As long as their low-cost ores are on the market, Americans will purchase on world markets, and keep secondary sources in Asia, Africa, and Latin America 'on ice.' But since the status quo in these countries is a standard of living below subsistence and declining, the status quo can only be maintained by force.

VESTED INTERESTS

(no I am not now, nor have I ever been...)

What this phrase means is simply demonstrated. The East India Co. made enormous profits out of the maintenance of India as a British colony. It did not make as much in profits, however, as it cost to hold India by means of a vast administrative system, an overseas army and a Pacific fleet. So for Britain as a whole, it was not profitable to hold India, at least by force. But, the people who made the profits were not the same people who paid the price. And the people who made the profits, and had a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, controlled the foreign policy of Britain against the interests of its people.

The situation may now exist where enclaves of power depend for their power on a productive system that has become obsolete for the nation as a whole. More concretely, it will be possible to substitute agricultural fuels (alcohol) for mineral fuels. So it is no longer in the interests of the American people to support a war for oil, but it may well be in the interests of the Rockefellers.

A parallel and more perplexing problem is the phenomenon of vested psychological interests. If we know enough to make competition for the earth's resources a closed chapter in the evolution of human culture, will the legislators of the great powers undergo the shift in consciousness that will make fear of shortages obsolete in fact as a determinant of policy?

If some of these flying saucers would stop to offer some other-wordly benevolent guidance, they would probably suggest a world-wide program of search, research and development. The needs are obvious; how to get there from here is not.

We need an exhaustive geophysical survey, under U.N. auspices, of Canada, Africa, Latin America, and all areas where reserves are suspected but not proved. With an expanded and scattered reserve base the risks of losing political control over any one country would be minimal.

'Do I understand, Senator, that you are prepared to take those risks with the security of the United States and the Free World?'

The U.N. should also provide development capital, so that owner countries will not

run into a credit squeeze in the international capital market, and be forced to sell to the controllers of international credit, who just happen to include the same people who currently own most of the earth's resources (Morgan, Rockefeller, Rothschild).

International aid should be reallocated from currency stabilization to industrial development

With Russia and China both self-sufficient, and probably able to produce for export, there is probably enough to go around, at least potentially. But we are considering the motivations and probable decisions of groups of men committed to the security, and the competitive advantage, of a particular political and economic system that they wish to preserve unchanged. However great an abundance of raw materials are discovered in this century, the political considerations remain critical as long as one government has political control over the resources necessary to another government. It means that the resource-poor country must control the producing country, or be in some degree dependent on its good will.

A supranational body in control of prices and allocation of scarce resources might lessen the political tensions involved, but there would still be risk, still insecurity, for the developed countries. And a fair allocation would involve surrender of economic advantages that the United States is currently securing by military and paramilitary means.

'Do I understand, Senator, that you are suggesting placing the security of the United States and the Free World in the hands of the one-worlders, Black Africans, communists, and assorted riff-raff who inhabit the United Nations?'

Unfortunately, the economic motives for enforced poverty and economic stagnation in the Third World are easily elided into the 'Great Black Blot' theory of communist expansion which U S congressmen seem to find so compelling. They overthrow governments to defend freedom, not our inflated levels of consumption. Political unrest in an area of strategic importance is easily rationalized into a military tactic by which the international communist conspiracy is attempting to cut our supply lines. (There's a marshall's baton in every attache case.) 'Our interests' and 'our commitments' are logically identical, but psychologically polar opposites.

It is past time that we made the leap in moral imagination that would let us understand that we are rich because they are poor. Guerrilla movements are swelling throughout the Third World, and the lines are becoming clearly drawn. We must commit ourselves to the creation of a system of international distribution that will permit the industrialization of the Third World, or visit more Vietnams on the poor of the earth.
