

KNOW YOUR
GOVERNMENT SERIES
PRODUCER CAROL MADDOX
122 Woodside Pl.
Ft. Thomas, KY 41075
859-441-6030

THE

Dan Smoot Report



DAN SMOOT

Vol. 4, No. 18

Monday, May 5, 1958

Dallas, Texas

World Health Organization

April 7, 1958, the tenth anniversary of the World Health Organization, was World Health Day.

In a speech on the floor of the Senate, April 15, 1958, Senator Alexander Wiley (Republican, Wisconsin) referred to this occasion as "an important and inspiring anniversary."

The Congress of the United States let this "important and inspiring anniversary" pass unnoticed; and Senator Wiley, in his belated eulogy, gently chided his fellow legislators, but promised that they would make amends:

Senator Wiley said:

Last Monday, of course, (that is, April 7, the great birthday) the Congress was observing the Easter recess. So, but for the fact that most Members of the Senate and House were absent from Washington, I know that there would have been many heartfelt expressions from Members of the Congress in tribute to this outstanding organization — one of the most constructive on the international scene.

Later this month, Members of Congress will, however, gather in Washington in an afternoon and evening assembly to pay tribute to WHO. Leaders in American public health, physicians and laymen, diplomats and foreign policy spokesmen, officials, and private citizens will join at that time to celebrate this decade of WHO achievement.

Commencing on May 26 and 27, the General Assembly of WHO will open its anniversary celebration in Minneapolis.

On May 28, there will be the formal opening of the 11th World Health Assembly there. It will continue for 3 weeks thereafter. It will receive the Director General's report of the past year and adopt a program and budget for the coming year.

World Health Organization is a specialized agency of the United Nations. The United States and eighty-four other nations are members. Its 1958 budget is \$13.5 million. The United States pays one-third of the total budget. The other 84 nations pay the rest.

The United Nations was formally organized at San Francisco in 1945. The first international gathering called by the UN was the International Health Conference — held in New York, June-July, 1946.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT, a magazine edited and published weekly by Dan Smoot, mailing address P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station, Dallas 14, Texas, Telephone TAYlor 4-8683 (Office Address 6441 Gaston Avenue). Subscription rates: \$10.00 a year, \$6.00 for 6 months, \$3.00 for 3 months, \$18.00 for two years. For first class mail \$12.00 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14.00 a year. Reprints of specific issues: 1 copy for 25¢; 6 for \$1.00; 50 for \$5.50; 100 for \$10.00—each price for bulk mailing to one person.

This conference drafted a constitution for a World Health Organization.

The new WHO could not legally come into existence until 26 members of the United Nations ratified, or accepted, its constitution. Nonetheless, the International Health Conference set up an Interim Commission, with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, to start functioning immediately, awaiting the formal ratification of the WHO constitution. The Interim Commission operated until February, 1948, when enough nations had ratified the WHO constitution to justify the proclamation that WHO was now officially in existence.

It is obvious, of course, that this Interim Commission was operating illegally from July, 1946, until February, 1948; but no one seemed to care.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the United States Senate had not yet ratified the WHO constitution in February, 1948, when the constitution was proclaimed as officially adopted by the nations of the world.

Nonetheless, it was American taxpayers who had paid the bills for the Interim Commission during that 19-month period when it was operating without the legal sanction of international law, or even of its own charter. From July, 1946, to February, 1948, the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization was financed by "loans" from the United Nations and by grants from UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration): The United States was putting up practically all the money for these two agencies.

Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, a Canadian psychiatrist, served as the executive secretary of the Interim Commission until February, 1948. He then became the first Director General of the

World Health Organization. Chisholm kept that job until 1953 when he was succeeded by a Brazilian, Dr. M. G. Candau, present Director General.

When the World Health Organization was formally established in February, 1948, Dr. C. A. Winslow, editor of the *American Journal of Public Health*, wrote a report on the accomplishments of the Interim Commission during its 19 months of existence — and on the future plans and programs of the WHO.

Alger Hiss (later convicted of perjury for denying that he was a Soviet spy) published Dr. Winslow's report on WHO. Hiss published the report in the March, 1948, issue of *International Conciliation*, a publication of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Hiss, at that time, was president.

Alger Hiss also wrote the preface to Dr. Winslow's report on the World Health Organization, saying:

The Constitution of the World Health Organization . . . embodies in its provisions the broadest principles in public health service today. Defining health as 'a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity,' it includes not only the more conventional fields of activity but also mental health, housing, nutrition, economic or working conditions, and administrative and social techniques affecting public health.

It is easy to see why Alger Hiss gave maximum support to the World Health Organization.

WHO was set up, presumably, to promote the health of people all over the world. Everyone is interested in health. Could anyone oppose an organization dedicated to promoting it?

The World Health Organization constitution defines health, as Hiss points out, as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being."

This removes all limits from WHO's jurisdiction. To promote "health," this UN agency must intervene in every kind of human activity.

If you had a private hospital room, equipped with bath, telephone, radio, and television available for every person in the world every time he suspected the slightest symptom of some disease, you still wouldn't be giving him the feeling of mental and social well-being that is indispensable to his health.

To do this, you would also have to feed him, clothe him, house him, and entertain him properly — properly, in the sense that he has what he wants.

Thus, WHO has a charter to use tax money (most of it taken away from Americans) for promoting the establishment of a one-world socialist state — the same objective that Alger Hiss was promoting when serving as a Soviet spy.

Dr. G. Brock Chisholm wrote an introduction for Dr. Winslow's 1948 report on the World Health Organization.

Dr. Chisholm dwelt lovingly on the same theme that interested Alger Hiss: the unlimited scope of WHO's constitution.

Dr. Chisholm said:

This document may well go down in history as one of the most far-reaching of all international agreements. . . . The specific inclusion of mental hygiene, nutrition, housing, accident prevention, medical care, and social and economic conditions represents a broader concept of public health in the field of international action than has ever been promulgated heretofore.

Dr. Chisholm points out that the World Health Organization,

In addition to its more traditional duties . . . is specifically enjoined to . . . foster activities in the field of

mental health, especially those affecting the harmony of human relations.

Like Alger Hiss and Dr. Chisholm, Dr. Winslow gloats over the vast powers assigned to the World Health Organization. He says "it would be difficult to imagine a broader charter" than the constitution of WHO.

Dr. Winslow explains that the first problem of the new World Health Organization was the absorption of the duties of pre-existing international organizations in the health field — such as the International Office of Public Health which had been operating since 1909.

He said that the main concern of this old International Office of Public Health was the supervision of international agreements which required member nations to report the appearance, within their territories, of specified diseases—plague, cholera, smallpox, typhus fever, and yellow fever.

Dr. Winslow said:

The practical field of the (International Office of Public Health) was a somewhat narrow one. Its Charter limited its action to the exchange of information among nations regarding pestilential diseases, the publication of a digest of health legislation, and the drafting of common rules of quarantine practice recommended for national approval. For fear of infringement of national sovereignty, the Office was debarred from carrying on any actual health work in any country.

Winslow pointed out that the old International Health Organizations were unable to enforce their decisions upon member nations, whereas the new World Health Organization has overcome this weakness:

The old mechanism of awaiting separate ratification by individual nations often led to a lag of five or ten years before international sanitary conventions became operative . . . the new WHO provision that such conventions (i.e. international 'agreements') when adopted by the Health Assembly, become binding on all nations which have not recorded objection within a specified period, for the first

... makes really sound international quarantine programme possible.

Winslow sums up the first official report the activities and aims of the World Health Organization in these words:

The Interim Commission (of WHO) has — wisely and properly — begun its work with major attention to the traditional functions involved in the control of epidemic disease. It must, as the time is ripe, grapple with the more difficult — but even more fundamental — problems of mental hygiene, nutrition, housing and medical care, and with the health implications of the greatest factor in promoting disease in the world today — the problem of poverty.

The formal launching of the World Health Organization in February, 1948, stimulated more activity by international planners for the Great Tomorrow.

In August, 1948, an International Congress on Mental Health was held in London. Two thousand people from fifty nations attended. The Congress approved a formal report on "Mental Health and World Citizenship" which it submitted for the nations of the world to consider.

Here are some passages from that report:

Men and women everywhere, profoundly disturbed by world-wide confusion and conflict, are asking: 'Can the catastrophe of a third world war be averted? Can the peoples of the world learn to co-operate for the good of all?'

Studies of human development indicate the modifiability of human behaviour throughout life, especially during infancy, childhood, and adolescence. . . . Examination of social institutions in many countries shows that these also can be modified. These newly recognized possibilities provide the basis for improving human relations, for releasing constructive human potentialities and for modifying social institutions for the common good.

The social sciences and psychiatry also offer a better understanding of the great obstacles to rapid progress in human affairs. Man and his society are closely interdependent. Social institutions such as family and school impose their imprint early in the personality development of their members, who in turn tend to perpetuate the traditional pattern to which they have been moulded. It is the men and women in whom these patterns of attitude and behaviour

have been incorporated who present the immediate resistance to social, economic, and political changes.

Thus prejudice, hostility, or excessive nationalism may become deeply embedded in the developing personality without awareness on the part of the individual concerned, and often at great human cost. . . .

In order to be effective, efforts at changing individuals must be appropriate to the unfolding personality, while in the case of a group or society, change will be strongly resisted unless an attitude of acceptance has first been engendered.

Principles of mental health cannot be successfully furthered in any society unless there is progressive acceptance of the concept of world citizenship. World citizenship can be widely extended among all peoples, through the applications of the principles of mental health. . . .

Programs for social change to be effective require the joint efforts of psychiatrists and social scientists working in co-operation with statesmen, administrators and others in positions of responsibility. . . .

Few societies of which we have knowledge are wholly free from distortion of human impulse, sometimes on a large scale, such as racial oppression, or industrial conflict. Furthermore. . . . in some of the countries most advanced industrially, mental disability is more extensive than any other form of disease.

Thus, it is obvious, the 2000 representatives from 50 nations who attended the International Congress on Mental Health at London in 1948, regarded Americans as the people most in need of mental health treatment.

The Mental Health Congress made a set of proposals for revising laws which govern the handling of people who are mentally ill. This set of proposals was sent to all member nations of the World Health Organization.

There is no evidence that other nations paid any attention to the proposals; but America's zealous liberal bureaucrats did.

In 1950, the United States Public Health Service published a "Draft Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill" and recommended it to all 48 state governments. The

H.

Draft Act was patterned on the proposals made by the International Congress on Mental Health. Since 1950, about half of our states have rewritten their mental health laws — using the Draft Act as a model.

The officially stated purpose of the Draft Act — and of all the state laws based on it — was to “facilitate access to hospital care” for mentally ill people.

Thousands of well-meaning people, thinking they are doing something to help the tragic victims of mental illness, have supported the massive movement to rewrite the nation’s mental health laws; but these innocents obviously never find out what they are supporting.

Practically none of the new state laws on mental health do anything to relieve the suffering of sick people — or prescribe better facilities for treating them.

Using scare statistics which tend to show that most people in the United States are, or have been, or will be “mentally ill” — and which show that our hospital facilities are already overcrowded — advocates for the new mental health legislation recommend nothing to correct the horrible condition which they claim to exist. They recommend laws to make it worse.

The new mental health laws being written by state legislatures all over the country merely “facilitate access to hospital care.” That is, they make it easier for bureaucrats, political enemies, and selfish relatives to get someone committed as a “mentally ill person” — and thus get him out of the way.

All the constitutional guarantees against loss of property or liberty without due process

of law are weakened or set aside — so that bothersome people can more easily be disposed of as “mentally ill.”

Brock Chisholm, the first Director-General of World Health Organization, says that World Government is necessary to the preservation of civilization.

Chisholm, together with all the socialists, communist sympathizers, one-worlders, and outright Soviet spies (like Alger Hiss) who set up the World Health Organization, wrote its constitution, and set its course, borrowed and refined the brainwashing techniques of the Soviets.

Their objective is to prepare the people of the world for one-world government. They recognize that simple propaganda will not do this fast enough, because people tend to cling to their old “prejudices” about national patriotism, individualism, loyalty to family traditions, and devotion to “narrow” religious dogmas. All these prejudices and loyalties must be removed from the minds of men — quickly — so that all people will accept the idea of a one-world socialist state.

Brock Chisholm summed the whole thing up when he said:

There is something to be said for... *gently* putting aside the mistaken old ways of our elders... If it cannot be done gently, it may have to be done roughly or even violently.

Psychiatrists are to take the lead in this World Health Organization’s crash program of brainwashing the world.

Those who can be persuaded by the gentle methods of propaganda to go along with the idea of a one-world socialist government will be persuaded. Those who cling to their old no-

tions and refuse to be persuaded can be declared insane or mentally ill.

* * * * *

It Does Happen Here

Lavrentia Beria, the late head of the dread Soviet secret police under Stalin, has been quoted as saying, to a class of American communist students, studying the techniques of communist revolution at the Lenin Institute in Moscow:

By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression and scientific turmoil. . . . At last, only communism can resolve the problems of the masses.

A psychopolitician must work hard to produce the maximum chaos in the fields of mental healing. . . .

With the institutions for the insane, you have in your country prisons which can hold a million persons and can hold them without civil rights or any hope of freedom.

The tenets of rugged individualism, personal determinism, self-will, imagination, and personal creativeness are alike in the masses antipathetic to the good of the Greater State. These willful and unaligned forces are no more than illnesses which will bring about disaffection, disunity, and at length the collapse of the group to which the individual is attached. . . .

It is the mission of Psychopolitics first to align the obedience and goals of the group and then maintain their alignment by the eradication of the effectiveness of the persons and personalities which might swerve the group toward disaffection. . . . Where the Russian State does not yet have power, it is not as feasible (as in the Soviet Union) to remove the entire self-willed individual. Psychopolitics makes it possible to remove that part of his personality which, in itself, is making havoc with the person's own constitution as well as the group with which the person is connected.

It is hard — if not impossible — for an American to believe that such diabolical ideas about the destruction of the human mind for the purposes of political thought control could ever actually be practiced anywhere on earth. Certainly, such ideas could not even be considered in the United States — could they?

What an outcry of public rage there would be if the American people could be convinced of the truth of what is happening in their own country!

Let's examine some more of the expressed ideas of popular and influential liberals who, for many years, have been promoting the World Health Organization ideal of revamping the thinking of Americans to make them accept one-world socialism.

Among these is Harry A. Overstreet, a best-selling author.

In *The Great Enterprise*, published in 1952, Overstreet said:

In each of these (cases of people with strong opinions) we can predict that the individual will respond with triggerquickness and in exactly the same way. Sometimes, it appears, such persons have constellations of prejudice areas. A man, for example, may be angrily against race equality, public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, organized labor, and the preaching of special rather than salvational religion. . . . Such people may appear normal in the sense that they are able to hold a job and otherwise maintain their status as members of society: but they are, we now recognize, well along the road toward mental illness.

Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, Director General of the World Health Organization from 1948 to 1953, now President of the World Federation for Mental Health and Vice President of the World Association of World Federalists, wrote a 92-page book entitled *Prescription For Survival*, which was published by Columbia University Press in 1957.

Dr. Chisholm's book reveals an intense concern about the mental health of Americans who have become emotionally crippled with convictions about religious faith, national pride, and "other prejudices."

Chisholm calls these convictions "absolute certainties," which make the average American unsuited for World Citizenship.

And World Citizenship (apparently for Americans only) is Dr. Chisholm's prescription for survival:

"We are now under the necessity, the absolute necessity, of functioning as world citizens, as part of the human race."

"There is... a new situation in the world, for which we have no preparation. Our organizations, our national constitutions, our methods of doing business, our monetary systems, all our institutions, were never designed to solve these problems at all."

"By advocating that we should free our children of the 'certainties' of their ancestors, I do not mean that we should abolish religion or religious teachings. One cannot deny that, throughout human history, religion has been a tremendously important part of people's lives. It has represented, episodically at least, an attempt to understand, a striving to find this harmonious living about which we now try to talk scientifically...."

"What I am suggesting is that they (the people who need religion) should not be tied to the system of beliefs to which their parents happen to adhere, beliefs often acquired through the accident of birth...."

"Children need to make their peace with religion — everybody does in some way, but it is hard to justify the parents who will prescribe one particular religion for their children in a way that can make them feel guilty, ashamed, and subject to a variety of neurotic difficulties if they dare to change their minds about it."

"I believe that every child should be taught in his early years the facts of religion... that he should be helped to understand what religion has done, what it has done for people and what it has done to them; how it has been used ef-

fectively and satisfactorily under some circumstances and disastrously under others."

"Most of our children are exposed to lies regularly. Parents generally have two entirely separate standards of truth — one for children and one for every body else...."

"I remember being tremendously impressed with this phenomenon years ago, when I was doing observation work in a child development clinic...."

"I saw two little boys, one of whom was in trouble. He would be about four, I suppose, and an older boy, perhaps six or a little more, was persecuting him, making him unhappy. The smaller boy, tears in his eyes, but not quite crying, was saying, 'It does so! It does so!' The bigger boy, being very superior, was saying, 'It does not! Don't be silly. It does not!' This exchange continued for a few minutes and then the little boy put his hands over his ears and said, 'I won't listen to you! It does so!'"

"The bigger boy pulled the smaller one's hands away from his ears and hooted, 'The sun does not go to bed at night. How could it go to bed? There's no bed in the sky, is there, dopey?'"

"The smaller child broke down, and with tears running down his face, he sobbed: 'It does so go to bed at night! My daddy told me.'"

"And at that moment he realized his father had lied to him; it was a deep tragedy, one from which he probably will never completely recover...."

"Does any of us suppose that that child has a good chance of ever being able to function as a world citizen with that amount of distortion at four years old?"

"We do know what teachers need in children who come to school for the first time.... They want children... who are not nailed to the mast of an absolute belief, but who are capable of considering all peoples' attitudes and of finding what is useful in them and discarding what is not, on the

WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas, taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941, he joined the faculty at Harvard as a Teaching Fellow in English, doing graduate work for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the field of American Civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He served as an FBI Agent in all parts of the nation, handling all kinds of assignments. But for three and a half years, he worked exclusively on communist investigations in the industrial midwest. For two years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an Administrative Assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After nine and a half years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost four years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July, 1955, he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side — the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues. Smoot now has no support from, or connections with, any other person or organization. His program is financed entirely from sales of his weekly publication, *The Dan Smoot Report*.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to *The Dan Smoot Report*.

initiative of their own intelligence and not because some of their ancestors said or wrote this or that, even if it was written down in a Constitution. . . ."

Some so-called universities have not been teaching universal values at all but only teaching conformity to one way of life, one religious attitude, or one set of group certainties. Such institutions, of course, have no right to call themselves universities. Their teaching is not universal."

"We (Americans) had the most admirable, nicest, most aggressive ancestors that anybody ever had. They went out while the going was good, and grabbed off the best parts of the world before the rules were changed. This is regarded as highly admirable in many parts of the world where people regret that their ancestors didn't grab while the going was good, before the rules were changed, but instead sat back and left future generations to suffer the results of their lack of action."

In 1945, Brock Chisholm delivered three lectures for the William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation.

His main theme in these lectures was that psychiatrists must assume the lead in securing world peace by changing the thinking of mankind — again, particularly, Americans. Specifically, psychiatrists must rid mankind of all ancient or preconceived notions about good and evil:

"Prejudice, isolationism. . . . are well known and recognized neurotic symptoms. . . . Even self defense may involve a neurotic reaction when it means defending one's own excessive material wealth from others who are in great need."

"The only lowest common denominator of all civilizations and the only psychological force capable of produc-

ing these perversions is morality, the concept of right and wrong. . . .

"We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers. . . ."

Dr. Chisholm sees three requirements for preventing war:

(1) A World police force "prepared to suppress ruthlessly any appeal to force by any peoples in the World."

(2) A redistribution of wealth, so that all people in the world can live at approximately the same economic level.

(3) Psychiatric education for all people who show any 'neurotic tendencies' which cause war:

"If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility."

"We should begin to teach psychology in the first year in school, at about five or six years of age, before their ability to think has been entirely spoiled."

He anticipates that the "battle . . . will be a difficult one" but thinks that, with luck, psychiatrists may be able in twenty years to—

"Change the dearest certainties of enough of the human race. . . to root out and destroy the oldest and most flourishing parasitical growth in the world, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. . . ."

If you do not keep a permanent file of *The Dan Smoot Report*, please mail this copy to a friend who is interested in sound government.

DAN SMOOT,
P. O. Box 9611, Lakewood Station
Dallas 14, Texas.

Please enter my subscription for (_____ years) (_____ months) to THE DAN SMOOT REPORT. I enclose \$_____; please bill me for_____.

Rates: \$10 for 1 year
\$ 6 for six months
\$ 3 for three months
\$12 first class mail
\$14 for air mail
\$18 for 2 years

PRINT NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE

8.