Why Worry — Use More Tranquilizers!

The new tranquilizer drugs, now widely used for relief of chronic tension, neurosis, anxiety and even hangovers, are coming under an increasing amount of criticism. Indiscriminate and even regular use of the "pacifyers" is producing dangerous side effects such as glandular and liver disturbances, craving for stronger sedation, disturbed appetite and digestion.

Another interesting criticism popped up recently. Some psychiatrists, sociologists and political scientists believe that widespread use of the drugs, now almost as commonly used as aspirin by some strata of society, will produce such indifference and lethargy among the people that they will not be concerned about national and international problems.

These emotionally emasculated throngs will blithely skip through their lives without "worrying" about anything. Add these increasing millions to the normal number of inert and indigent people, and we might be a perfect "pushover" in the field of foreign affairs.

When one thinks of the difficult task world law advocates have had in the past in their attempt to arouse people to think and act, the future with tranquilizers looks very dismal.

It is a wonder that the anti-flouridation and anti-innoculation forces have not jumped on the development and use of tranquilizers as a vicious communist plot to lull the U.S. to sleep.

The only bright spot on the horizon is that at least many more people may go into slavery or oblivion with an idiotic smile on their lips, blithely ignorant of what is happening to them.

★ ★ ★

ONE BRIGHT SPOT

A recent article in the N. C. Jaycee FUTURE newspaper pointed out that some years ago the N. C. Jaycees went on record in favor of strengthening the U.N. and establishing a U.N. Police Force, and that said Police Force was now a reality.

The Jaycee item did not mention the few Jaycees who worked long hours, often against criticism and ridicule, to interest the Jaycees in that idea and then get them to endorse it. The same story could be applied to many organizations.

Over the years, when the going has been hard and usually fruitless, many of the "interested few" have dropped out of the fight for world law and education on that topic.

Now, when the need is greater and success is actually possible (and when the world law idea is an approved topic in "high places"), **we need supporters more than ever.** We are nearing the crest of the long hill and we need the dedicated, active support of many more people.

It is strange that now, when the future of the world law **idea** is bright, the world law **movement** is weaker than it has been in years. Can we re-vitalize it and go on to success, or will we stumble to a halt just short of success?

A Letter To The President

Greensboro, North Carolina
November 8, 1956

President Dwight D. Eisenhower
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear President Eisenhower:

We wish to congratulate you on your excellent speech of October 31, and particularly on that section dealing with the United Nations and world law, which we quote:

"My fellow citizens, as I review the march of world events in recent years, I am ever more deeply convinced that the United Nations represents the soundest hope for peace in the world. For this very reason I believe that the processes of the United Nations need further to be developed and strengthened. I speak particularly of increasing its ability to secure justice under international law.

"There can be no peace—without law. And there can be no law—if we were to invoke one code of international conduct for those who oppose us—and another for our friends.

"The society of nations has been slow in developing means to apply this truth.

"But the passionate longing for peace—on the part of all people on the earth—compels us to speed our search for new and more effective instruments of justice.

"The peace we seek and need means much more than mere absence of war. It means the acceptance of law, and the fostering of justice, in all the world."

We are pleased to see the attempt to use a United Nations armed force for policing acute danger areas in the Middle East.

We hope that our government will proceed rapidly to even more fundamental steps to establish effective world law through a strengthened United Nations.

Sincerely,

For the American Freedom Association

OSCAR K. MERRITT, Chairman

This letter was sent to President Eisenhower, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, and Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr. on November 8, 1956. It represents the thinking of those Board members who were able to be present at the special Board meeting, which was called on such short notice. The letter was also sent to all North Carolina newspapers as a "Letter to the Editor". We understand that the letter was printed in all of the large newspapers, and we hope that the smaller "weeklies" have already carried it or will do so in the future.

★ ★ ★

A Review And Preview

by Peter P. Cooper

As we enter the new year of 1957, we might well pause to reflect on the immediate past and wonder about the future.

Since World War II, the free world has seemingly failed to recognize that the Communist threat is unique in history—that it is more diabolical, methodical, well-planned and smoothly executed than any form of aggression the civilized world has ever seen.

Free world leaders have consistently backed-off from Communist pressures, appeased their demands and resigned themselves to Communist advances in certain areas.

Notable exceptions to this steady retreat have been the Truman Doctrine and Marshal Plan, which saved Western Europe and Greece and Turkey from Communist domination; the Berlin Blockade Airlift; and the Korean War, which finally resulted in a restoration of the status quo and a compromise on U.N. and moral principles.

Low Point of U. S. Foreign Policy

The low point of our foreign policy came during 1956, when we found ourselves involved in a tragic bit of drama, highlighted by the U. S. supporting the forces of aggression and abandoning our Allies.

Egyptian Dictator Nasser, who has long defied the UN over the Palestine situation, began to openly embrace Communist support for his "pan-Arabic" policies; began to prepare for armed aggression against Israel with Communist weapons; and finally, he took over the Suez Canal in violation of international agreement.

France, taxed beyond endurance by Egyptian support of Algerian terriorists, depends on the Suez for much of her trade. So does Italy and many other European nations.

Israel, plagued for years by Egyptian Commando and terrorist raids on farms and villages, has long been denied use of the Suez Canal by the Natzi-imitator Nasser. Israel had pled for U. S. and U.N. assistance in gaining use of the Canal and preventing the forthcoming Egyptian assault on Israel. The U.N. maintained its characteristic inactive role and the U.S. State Department replied by denying Israel further weapons.

Britain, who's economic life depends on the Canal perhaps more than any other nation, had followed Secretary Dulles' orders in turning Suez over to Nasser, after obtaining the latter's promise of continued international operation. When Nasser broke his word and seized the Canal, Britain tried to reason and solicited U.S. and U.N. assistance.

When Prime Minister Eden saw that Nasser was not to be trusted or reasoned with, and that no action was forthcoming from the U.N. or the U.S. State Department, he chose not to wait until Britain was strangled before acting. He reverted to the age-old law of survival of the fittest and enlisted the aid of the French in a limited armed assault on the Suez area. Israel took advantage of the situation and launched an attack to "take the edge off" the Egyptian invasion threat by occupying the Egyptian invasion buildup and commando staging areas.

A Still Lower Point of U.S. Foreign Policy

While this situation was rapidly developing, the Hungarian people were striving valiantly for freedom against Russian invasion.

The world looked to the U.S. for leadership and initiative.

At first, the U.S. State Department simmered in anger over the Allies having acted without consulting Dulles, but as threats of Russian "volunteers" to aid Nasser seemed near to fulfillment, U.N. Delegate Lodge took the lead in having the U.N. condemn the Allies, comfort Nasser, call for invaders to get out, and call for a U.N. Police force to police the Suez area. The U.S. threatened the Allies with dire consequences if they didn't comply.

The U.S. also led the U.N. in condemning the Russian orgy in Hungary, calling for the Russians to get out and calling for U.N. observers to go to Hungary. The U.S. didn't threaten the Reds with any dire consequences because the Reds had called their bluff in Korea and Indo-China before.

The U.N. Police Force was formed and transported to Egypt; the Allies obeyed the U.N. and got out of the Suez (Nasser then showed some more of his true colors by demanding more concessions.) The Israelis pled for the U.N. to send the Police Force to prevent another invasion build-up. They have been ignored to date.

But, the Russians in Hungary ignored the U.N. condemnation, condemned the U.N. in turn, and refused the admittance of U.N. observers. The U.S. and the U.N. did nothing.

Slow Progress Towards World Law

Before World War II, and especially since then, advocates of enforceable world law to prevent war have labored, with varying degrees of enthusiasm and dedication, for a dynamic foreign policy designed not only to effectively stop aggression, but to prevent it as well. Progress has seemed meagre and success out of reach most of the time.

And now, as we begin the new year, we can see that our efforts have not been wasted nor in vain.

Thanks to many years of work, education and information by world law advocates, plus the urgency of the Middle East situation, establishment of the U.N. Police Force was readily accepted by most people as a minimum necessity. This was a big step, but only a step.

During 1957 the world will decide whether the U.N. Police Force is to prevent aggression as well as stop it. If it is to prevent war, it must be a permanent force. The fate of Israel and the question of war or peace in the Middle East will depend on this decision.

1957 may also show us whether aggressive dictators will continue to enjoy a "preferred status", as have the Reds in Hungary and Nasser in the Middle East, while free nations cannot expect support and protection from the U.N. Effective law against aggression must

(Continued on Page 5)