The American Freedom Association BULLETIN

PUBLISHED AS THE OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN FREEDOM ASSOCIATION, INC.

Vol. II, No. 6 — 141 East Corriher Avenue, Salisbury, N. C. — October-November, 1954

World Law And Freedom

AFA is devoted to education and information on effective world law and its relation to religion, peace and freedom. The booklet, "Three Kinds of Peace" and "The Religious Basis of World Law" is devoted to a discussion of world law and religion and peace. What about the relation of world law to freedom?

Dr. Henry P. Brandis, Dean of the School of Law, at the University of North Carolina, stated once: "we are not striving merely for peace—merely the absence of war, which could be gained by yielding to Communist aggression. The real desire and hope of all Americans is peace with freedom and justice, possible only under some form of effective world law to prevent aggression and preserve the internal sovereignty and freedoms of the Nations."

World Law Dangerous?

How would world law "preserve the internal sovereignty and freedoms of nations?

Some people say that it will not. There are some people who fear that world law would mean the end of our Constitutional form of government and place Americans under the rule of alien law enforced by aliens.

World law of the totalitarian variety would indeed abolish our freedoms, but isn't it possible to establish world law to preserve rather than abolish freedom? It was John Locke who said, "The end of law is not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom . . . where there is no law there is no freedom."

There is no law on the world level of human behavior and there is little freedom—except for the world criminal.

Our military budget is largely determined by the actions of the men in the Kremlin; our young men are forced to give up several years of freedom of action and choice in order to help provide defense against aggression; we are all forced to give up large portions of our income in order that our nation can stockpile munitions and weapons of war or help provide our allies with defense materials which their war-torn economies are not able to produce; no longer does Congress decide whether or not we go to war—we are at war the moment we are attacked, as we were at Pearl Harbor.

It seems that much of our freedom is already gone forever, with much more to go soon, unless we establish some form of world law to restrain the world criminal and to preserve and enlarge the freedom of the people of the world.

World Law and Internal Matters

It is believed by many people that this world law need not and should not apply to purely domestic affairs of nations. What goes on inside a nation is the business of the people of that nation. Only to the individual actions previously agreed upon by the nations as constituting aggression or preparation for aggression would world law apply.

By removing the threat of war from the world community, the nations could devote their energies and resources to improving the lot of their citizens—free from the interference, horrors and burdens of war.

The "internal sovereignty" and domestic freedoms of each nation would be protected and preserved, just as our homes are protected and preserved by law. But, if we in Greensboro or Memphis began to stock machine guns and mortars and begin to conspire with some friends to bring violence upon a neighboring family, the police will arrest us, in order to protect the freedom and peace of that neighboring family and the whole community.

Thus, the right kind of world law will not only bring peace, but also "preserve and enlarge" domestic freedom

Continued on Page 2, Column 1

'ORDEAL BY FIRE'

Burck in The Chicago Sun-Times

Russian Proposal: Hoax or Hope?

On September 30, Russia's Andrei Y. Vishinsky proposed to the UN the elimination of all atomic and hydrogen weapons by stages and the eventual use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

He apparently also called for an international inspection program to insure compliance with disarmament agreements —a point on which East-West negotiations on disarmament have always broken down.

Vishinsky's resolution was complicated and detailed and its real import is not clear even now.

British Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd insisted that Russia must accept, on a "Yes or No" basis, two conditions if the disarmament negotiations are to succeed:

1. Does the Soviet government accept that there must be agreement as to the nature, function and powers of the arms control organ **before** countries begin to carry out **any** disarmament program?

2. Does the Soviet government agree that the officials of the Arms Control organ should be in position, ready and able to function in **all** countries concerned before these countries begin to carry out **any** disarmament program?

Still Unclear

In reply, Vishinsky declared that he would not answer in "Yes" or "No" form, and then proceeded to reiterate his past statements on arms control. These past statements, he said, must suffice as his answer.

Lloyd and Lodge contend that Vishinsky has as yet failed to clarify his position and has failed to reveal whether this Russian proposal has meaning or is meaningless.

While Lloyd saw in the new USSR proposal "a distinct possibility of progress," he didn't discount the possibility that it was more propaganda designed "solely to confuse the domestic political situation" in various countries.

If the USSR means business, its proposal must be broadened to include **all** weapons of war. If only atomic and hydrogen weapons are outlawed, this nation would be at the mercy of the Communist world in the event a war broke out—during which "more conventional weapons"—tanks, infantry, etc.—were used.

The Communist world of approximately 820,003,626 people can muster a mite more infantry than can the "reliable" allies in the free world.

Also, a ban on nuclear weapons would not prevent future "Koreas", (where we didn't see fit to use such

Continued on Page 2, Column 2