

Appeasement Policy a Failure, Says Geologist, Foreseeing War

'Have' Nations Must Join to Halt Penetration of the 'Have Nots,' He Adds—Calls Hull Trade Treaties Ineffective as Defense

An analysis of the current world crisis as a struggle to wrest control of the world's natural resources by the "have not" nations—Germany, Italy and Japan—from the "have" nations—England, France, Russia and the United States—was presented yesterday to the closing day meeting of the Geological Society of America by Dr. Charles K. Leith, past president of that organization.

Dr. Leith, who is vice president of President Roosevelt's Planning Committee for Mineral Policy, predicted failure for the appeasement policy of Prime Minister Chamberlain of Great Britain.

Substitution by democracies of armed force for an appeasement policy "before redistribution of the world's natural wealth goes much further" is "a safe assumption," he said. Pointing out that military preparations for the defense of their mineral wealth were being pushed by the "have" powers, he added that application of mineral embargoes against Germany, Italy and Japan may result from the present critical situation. He predicted victory for the "have" nations in the struggle against the "have nots" and added that "ultimate control of the world's resources will remain where it is."

"The Hull trade treaties are not an effective defense to penetration by the barter method," Dr. Leith said. "If the 'have not' powers really decide to resist such measures, other political counters in the way of sanctions or embargoes will have to be used.

Inferior Nations Unchanged

"Appeasement through the elimination of trade barriers and restoration of free circulation of raw materials between countries as planned by the Hull pacts is merely an effort to preserve the status quo in which the balance of power is retained by the 'have' nations by virtue of their possession of the larger share of the world's mineral resources and it leaves the other countries in their old inferior position. In the meantime Germany is acquiring essentially needed supplies through barter.

"The United States cannot avoid the issue. It is part of our domain that is ultimately at stake. The United States is the world's largest producer, the largest consumer and the largest distributor of minerals and their products. The frontiers of our mineral industries, including sources and markets, extend to nearly all parts of the world. Even the hazard involved in any attempt to maintain neutral shipping rights in this field may be enough to involve us in the struggle.

"The United States and England together control in about equal proportions nearly three-fourths of the world production of minerals and, not less important, they control the seas over which the products must pass. Any approach to equalization by gaining new territory means a shift of sovereignty on an unthinkable scale. Nearly 90 per cent of the world's industrial power is concentrated along an axis extending from the Great Lakes in the United States eastward through Central England and West Central Europe, and most of the mineral resources

of the world are tributary to this power axis."

Forcing Others to Act

Dr. Leith, a member of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, said that defense measures against the economic penetration of the "have not" nations is still "sadly in arrears." He explained that the course of events is forcing the "have" nations to take more vigorous steps for their own protection, and added that the application of sanctions and mineral embargoes was "a not unlikely outcome" of this trend.

Cession of colonies to Germany, Italy and Japan would accomplish little toward appeasing the appetites of those countries, because the total resources of such lands is not very great and fall far short of meeting the requirements of the aggressor nations, he continued. He maintained that "simple arithmetic" showed that there would have to be a wholesale transfer of territories, including large areas of self-governing regions, before the "have not" nations could surmount their present inferior position in point of mineral resources.

"The acquirement of Abyssinia, Austria, Manchuria and large parts of China and Czecho-Slovakia have done little to meet the mineral requirements of the 'have-not' nations," he went on. "Real appeasement by this method would require the passing over of considerable parts of the English-speaking, French and Russian domains as well as parts of the supplies controlled commercially by the English-speaking people outside their borders.

"Still further, it would mean division of control of the sea to assure continuity of movement from distant territories. In short, the scale of the transfer is unthinkable from a political standpoint, and it seems to be a safe assumption that before it goes much further it will be resisted by the armed force of the 'have' nations, as illustrated by our recent announcement of policy to protect the Western Hemisphere.

"If the German domestic effort toward self-sufficiency in minerals promised real success, there would be less pressure for the return of colonies or for the acquisition of political control of other territory. It is precisely because it is not succeeding and is at the same time narrowing access to the world raw material markets, that Germany is now demanding political control of raw material sources outside of its boundaries."

The convention closed last night with a dinner dance at which the Penrose Medal of the Geological Society was presented to Dr. Andrew Cowper Lawson of the University of California. Dr. Lawson, tenth recipient of the medal, was praised for "eminent research" which has marked a "decided advance" in the science of geology.

Dr. Arthur L. Day, retiring president of the Geological Society, presented the medal to Dr. Lawson. Dr. T. Wayland Vaughan introduced the recipient of the medal and Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin acted as toastmaster.