



A14422 034507

"SECOND-CLASS CITIZENSHIP"

An Address by Tom L. Popejoy
At State Convention of the American Legion
Carlsbad, New Mexico
July 15, 1962

Z14
CSWR
LC
72.3
N6
P67
1962

There have been times in the last eighteen months when I thought that I was in the "doghouse" with your organization. For this reason I am very pleased to accept your invitation to speak here today. Maybe you are not so mad as I thought. In any event, your officers were good enough to give me the privilege of talking straight to you about any subject I chose to select.

Before I move into the main area of my talk, I want to indicate to all of you that the University has had many fine relations with Albuquerque units of the American Legion, as well as your state organization.

We joined recently with the Legion and other agencies in sponsoring the appearance of Admiral Arleigh A. Burke for the Memorial Day address in Albuquerque. He spoke at our new University Stadium, and our staff cooperated fully with the Legion in preparing the grounds and the stadium for the event. It was my pleasure to introduce Admiral Burke.

A few months before the Memorial Day exercises, the University sponsored the appearance of Mr. William C. Sullivan for an address on communism. Mr. Sullivan serves as Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's Assistant Director in Washington, D. C., and he is believed to be one of the most knowledgeable persons in the United States about the dangers of communism.

Through the efforts of the American Legion, churches, public and private schools, other agencies, and the University community, we were able to attract more than 6,000 persons to Johnson Gymnasium on our campus to hear Mr. Sullivan. Incidentally, Mr. Sullivan made a fine speech. I wish every one of you had an opportunity to read what he had to say. A little later I will quote from one of his recent talks.

Adding to our continued interest in some of the programs of the Legion, we joined with the Carlisle-Bennet Post No. 13 in presenting to the citizens of Albuquerque its annual fireworks display on the third of July. The event took place in the University Stadium, and our staff, I am told, cooperated fully with Legion officers.

I mention these events to you to indicate that the University has wide interests. These actions on our part also indicate that we are anxious to preserve the tradition of freedom and the symbols of democracy which the Legion undertakes as a part of its total program.

I would like now to move to the central purposes of my address to you today. I want to talk to you about some other phases of the University of New Mexico in particular and also about other universities in general. In discussing this matter with you, I hope to throw some light on the position which the university system holds in America and in the democratic society which we cherish.

First may I give you a brief run-down on a few major statistics of the University of New Mexico. It was founded in 1889. From that date to the present it has grown into a major university. Last fall we had 8,030 students enrolled for credit courses. In 1960-61 the students

came from every county in the state, from every state in the nation, and from 37 foreign countries. There are eight undergraduate colleges -- University College, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Education, Fine Arts, Business Administration, Pharmacy, and Nursing; also the Graduate School, the School of Law, and the new School of Medicine. We have 41 instructional departments; work leading to the master's degree is offered in 38 fields, and toward the doctor's degree in 14.

The 8,030 students enrolled last fall were taught by 300 faculty members, and the annual budget for the year 1961-62 was more than \$10,000,000. The University is responsible for the undergraduate and graduate programs at Los Alamos. We also have two major programs going for the staff members at Sandia Corporation in Albuquerque. As you know, both Los Alamos and Sandia are heavily involved in national defense projects.

The University also sponsors annually more than a million dollars worth of research projects financed by the Federal Government. For the most part, the projects are related to defense matters, and some of them are classified in nature. At the present time we have Navy and Air Force ROTC units on our campus. Additionally the Navy, Army, and Air Force are now sending a select group of officers to our campus for undergraduate and graduate training.

During World War II the University served as a training center for a complement of 400 Navy officer candidates and 200 Army meteorologists. Many of our faculty, not young or healthy enough for the draft call, served as instructors in these programs.

I am sure you must know that University alumni served bravely in World Wars I and II, as well as in the Korean conflict. Our records show that at least 192 gave their lives in these conflicts. Several died on Bataan.

Many of our ROTC graduates are now serving as officers in the Navy and Air Force.

It is worth mentioning also that literally thousands of GI's who served during World War II and the Korean conflict have attended the University of New Mexico since serving in the Armed Forces. In the period of 1946-1952 this institution had far more than its share of GI's. We made tremendous efforts to house them and to offer them a high-quality educational program. If you were on the campus during those years, you will remember that we had 33 temporary buildings in use for the benefit of these returning veterans.

Recently I stated publicly that all of the faculty members who have been involved in controversy, who were healthy and within the appropriate age limits, served with distinction during World War II.

Additionally, I would like to call your attention to the fact that our present faculty is literally saturated and infiltrated with war veterans. Many of them belong to reserve units, and several belong to veterans' groups such as the Legion.

These statistics should give you some background material for the remainder of my statements.

For the past fifteen months or so there has been a considerable amount of turmoil and ferment which has been related to the University of New Mexico. These variables have occurred on and off the campus. They have been apparent in legislative sessions, in newspaper columns and editorials, in resolutions passed by organizations. What some people have said privately, and, on occasion, in large groups, is not suitable language for me to repeat here or elsewhere.

I am not a stranger to this type of language. As you heard a few minutes ago, I grew up on a ranch, and I am a chronic golfer. Both of these endeavors expose one to rugged forms of communication.

Most of the reactions, both on and off the record, were due to statements made by some faculty members in the form of a petition which they signed, by opposition which they expressed for a certain disclaimer oath, by a certain book written by one member of the faculty, and by a letter another faculty member wrote to the newspaper.

Our 1960-61 student year book, which stressed some of the things which come naturally, and the 1961-62 student newspaper, which criticized other newspapers, and which viewed most conservative principles with extreme skepticism, added fuel to the whole spectrum of controversy which enveloped the University community and which spilled over into other areas of the state.

What a year and a half this has been! It would take me all day to rehearse in detail all of the events. In the main they involved questions surrounding the rights of faculty members and student editors to express themselves within the rights given to them by the Constitution of the United States.

During these turbulent times it has been my purpose to defend members of the faculty and the student body, even though I may not necessarily have agreed with their statements. These statements have produced a whole bevy of letters addressed to me in a spirit of anger in some instances, and in a spirit of praise in others. Most of the letters of anger were unsigned. A few American Legion posts have worn out mimeograph machines sending out bulletins to local members and to me.

These bulletins have great value to me. Whenever my ego is running at a feverish pitch as a result of some notable attainment which has come to the University, and in which I may have played a small part, I can withdraw one of these deprecatory scoldings from my files, and it will reduce me to size in a hurry.

Many people have reacted to the University as a whole. The institution has been praised by many for the freedom given to its faculty and students in matters pertaining to public issues, and it has been severely scolded for permitting such activities. In some instances these scoldings have suggested legislative investigations, the application of insect powder, the abolition of the Law School, and the firing of faculty members.

During all the time the heat was being vented, we were able with the aid of our friends to forestall a legislative investigation while the 1961 Legislature was in session. We were able to ignore newspaper editorials, criticisms, and suggestions. We did not purchase or use any insect powder, and we did not fire a single faculty member involved in any of the acrimony. We plan to continue these policies.

On the other side of the ledger, the fact that the faculty is doing an excellent job of teaching and research has come in for little if any comment from our critics. The University continues to grow, and students by the thousands are clamoring for admission to our classrooms.

Just a month ago on June 15 the University graduated 939 students. There were 622 receiving their first college degree; there were 278 receiving a master's or LL.B. degree, which is normally the second

degree; and finally there were 28 Ph.D. and other doctor's degrees. These latter degrees are the highest degrees that one can earn. A large number of these graduates will stay in New Mexico to follow their professions. Many of our science and engineering graduates will go into research installations right here in the state.

The number of students who would like to be admitted to and graduated from the University is increasing every year. In fact, the pressures are so intense in this respect that we have found it necessary to refuse admission to hundreds of students from both in and out of the state who have made less than average grades in high school.

I believe it can be truthfully stated that the University is known far and wide as a high-quality institution. In a sense, I believe that a large segment of the people of New Mexico are aware of the high quality of the institution. On the other hand, there are many of these same people who would like to learn more about the reasons and justification for the recent controversies.

It will be my purpose for the rest of the time today to make two points in regard to this latter matter. First, we might ask ourselves whether the University of New Mexico with its current plethora of controversies is similar to other state universities. Second, we might address ourselves to the general question of, "What is it that makes and keeps a university excellent in its academic aims and purposes?"

Since misery loves company, I have made it a point to find out what has been happening at other state universities around the country. Frankly, most of the healthy universities have had it. Perhaps an excerpt from a recent Denver Post editorial, in which the University of Colorado

is discussed, makes the point better than I can.

"For the last 40 years, nearly every large healthy university campus in the United States has had within its student body a small scattering of Socialists, radical rightists, anarchists, Trotskyites, atheists, nudists, vegetarians and others dedicated to minority points of view.

"In the course of a normal academic year, students in any of these groups - or in no group at all - are likely to picket the campus, hang the dean or the football coach in effigy, boo a visiting speaker, criticize local newspapers and campaign for free love or the recognition of Red China.

"A few students, on any campus, will show up in shorts that are too short, beards that are too long, manners that are too crude or morals that are too loose to suit the tastes of the university town or the tempers of the taxpayers and alumni.

"A few professors can be counted on to make foolish or intemperate statements in the course of the year. A few will become storm centers of campus controversies, and a few - sometimes the same ones - will win international renown for their work.

"This is the pattern of campus life in America, and the people of this state are frequently reminded that it is also the pattern at the University of Colorado.

"Among the 11,000 students and 550 faculty members in Boulder, the potentialities for controversy, excitement and blowing off steam are almost unlimited.

"If those potentialities are fully realized in Boulder, it is only a sign of the growing intellectual vitality of the campus, a sign that CU is a live university and not a dead one.

"This newspaper is convinced that the turmoil and the color on the CU campus are indications of health and not of disease.

"It is distressed not by the university, but by reckless and unthinking critics who look upon controversy as a sign of subversion and intellectual ferment as un-American."

Practically all of the state universities in the southern states have been torn and twisted as a result of the segregation issue. The Universities of California, Washington, Oregon, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, Colorado, and Ohio have had serious troubles because of opinions expressed by outside speakers. The question of the disclaimer oath has

worried several other universities. Perhaps the most amusing incident which created a furor was the University of Illinois professor who advocated free love for the students. He got fired.

Almost uniformly student newspapers have stirred the adrenaline of many citizens these past few months. On the basis of the results which I have briefed for you, it would seem that a state university without controversy or ferment ought to be investigated to see if there is any life or vitality in the brains of the faculty and students.

On the other hand, if controversy is the badge of excellence, the University of New Mexico ranks high.

This observation leads me into the second point I mentioned - that is, what constitutes a high-quality university.

In this connection we ought to understand what we mean by university. There are many definitions, but one of the best and latest I have heard was formulated by President Litchfield of the University of Pittsburgh.

"You will be among the first to understand that an American university is by definition a place of free inquiry. It is not a government bureau, nor an industrial corporation, nor a church. Its role in society postulates question, criticism, controversy, debate, and doubt in all matters, social as well as scientific. The university embraces and supports the society in which it operates, but it knows no established doctrines, accepts no ordained patterns of behavior, acknowledges no truth as given. Were it otherwise, the university would be unworthy of the role which our society has assigned it.

"In the last analysis, the university must be free to think as its

members will, to the same extent and for the same reason that the press must be free to comment as it will, as one branch of government must function independent of another, as the churches must be free to offer doctrinal sanctuary, as the corporations must have opportunity to pursue product and market with an absolute minimum of outside direction." Phi Beta Kappa Key Reporter, Winter 1961-62.

It goes without saying almost that the university is a place of learning, where students and faculty members in an uninhibited way are searching for the truth.

A university becomes great then when the quality of the faculty and student body is high - when the faculty and students work in an atmosphere of freedom - freedom to learn and freedom to teach without any interference.

It is this principle of freedom to learn and freedom to teach which has brought about the need for a written statement of principles in this respect. Freedom to learn and freedom to teach is often referred to as academic freedom. In 1940 the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors agreed on a final version of these principles. They follow.

PRINCIPLES OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM
approved by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
and the
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES
in 1940
and by the UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO in 1948

(a) The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

(b) The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.

(c) The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.

It is worth repeating that these principles are mainly for the good of the students. If faculty members are muzzled or in any way restricted when they are in the classroom, other than being restricted in accordance with the principles which I have just read, then the students will not feel that they are receiving all the basic facts. If a teacher is inhibited in his research by censure or danger of being fired, he will not be able to present the truth as he has found it, and

the students and the world of knowledge will be seriously damaged.

I do not know of a single major university that does not follow these basic concepts of academic freedom. If we were to list the twenty-five best universities in the United States today, we probably would come up with Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Chicago, Stanford, Cornell, University of Pennsylvania, Duke, Northwestern, Rice, and the California Institute of Technology, all privately-controlled independent universities; and California, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Carolina, Penn State, Oregon, Washington, Indiana, Ohio State, and Michigan State, all state universities. At least, these are the ones which come to my mind first. There are, of course, many other fine universities, both private and public, in this country.

I am reasonably well acquainted with the quality of the institutions which I have listed, and I am certain that people in the know as far as higher education is concerned would have these names in the top thirty universities of the country. (It is more than modesty that keeps me from including the University of New Mexico in this list. All I can say now in this respect is that we have high aspirations to reach the levels of the universities which I have listed.)

What are some of the common characteristics to be found in these twenty-five universities? Practically all are large and complex. They have excellent faculties. They pay the best university salaries. They are well established and traditionally known. Their faculties are known throughout the collegiate world, not only for their quality, but for the wonderful intellectual climate in which they follow their professions.

Members of these faculties have also felt free to discuss public issues. They have felt free to enjoy the privileges of citizenship in a free society. It is this element of freedom which added to their other qualities has made it possible for these institutions to recruit and to hold the extremely high-quality faculties which they have. First-class faculty members will simply not take assignments at institutions of higher learning if they are aware that conditions of second-class citizenship prevail. Naturally they will not take new assignments for other reasons. The salary scale is important. The voice which faculty members have in academic matters, and the authority which they possess in the educational planning, are also decisive.

In more recent years business, government, and industry have learned the values which come with close association with first-class universities. A fabulous amount of government research money goes to these institutions, far more than the number of students they enroll would justify. The government, however, is interested in the quality of the faculty as the most important criterion in making research awards.

Perhaps the most exciting development in and around these universities has been the avid interest that business and industrial firms have manifested in them.

I have just returned from a Presidents' Institute at Harvard University. While there I had a splendid opportunity to see, first hand, the great increase in industrial development which has taken place in the area close to Harvard, M. I. T., and Boston University. Electronic enterprises, computer centers, large industrial research units, and many other auxiliary concerns have been started and developed there in the

past ten years. Why did they locate there? The main reason can be attributed to the existence in that vicinity of several fine universities.

There are two or three other centers in the United States where industries have started and which need highly-trained engineers and scientists. The one in the Los Angeles area has a strong affinity for Cal Tech, UCLA, USC, and other colleges.

Another one is forming in the San Francisco complex, where the University of California and Stanford are located. The third one which comes to mind is in the Chicago area, where the University of Chicago, Northwestern, and the University of Illinois are situated.

Perhaps the fourth one is forming in the Houston, Texas, area, where NASA has recently decided to locate a large research center. I am told that the large space agency (NASA) wants to locate its research units near competent universities. You are aware that Rice University is in Houston.

Why do these industries want to be near these fine university centers? John Fischer, editor, recently wrote in Harpers Magazine that the scientists and engineers employed by these firms wanted to be close for several main reasons. Their children would have access to high-quality educational units. They would have many opportunities to attend lectures and meetings involving their own professions. And, finally, they would be able to recruit new staff members from the nearby universities.

I am sure that the Los Alamos Laboratory in Los Alamos and the Sandia Corporation in Albuquerque did not in the first place come to New Mexico because of the University of New Mexico. It was wartime when they were established, and surely the geography and other indigenous factors were

the prevailing reasons.

The close cooperation which the University now has with these agencies in educational and research matters has great mutual value. I am told by the officials of both agencies that their recruiting program is much more efficient as a result of the fact that the University of New Mexico is in Albuquerque. They have told me also that the quality of our faculty and the diversity of our programs have added much to the general advancement of their respective installations. The University also feels that there is much for the institution to gain by having these large government research and engineering agencies near our campus.

You may wonder why I have spent so much time on this matter of industry and education. I am sure, however, that all of you are interested in the economic advancement of the state. The arid climate and our large shortages of water limit us to a certain extent in the development of industry. It would appear for the present that our future to a degree depends on the continuation of our research facilities and the establishment and enlargement of other industries closely related to engineering and science.

If these concepts are valid, the institutions of higher learning in New Mexico hold the key to the future of our economic development. These types of installations and research centers and related industries will simply not come in numbers unless the higher educational institutions are first-class.

As I said before, you cannot have a first-class institution without a first-class faculty. There are some people in New Mexico who are

ambivalent in this respect. Frequently in the same breath they say, "It is perfectly all right for these faculty members to blow off about the disclaimer oath or the H. U. A. C., but they should not do this while they are on a state payroll."

Additionally, there are some writers in this state who are ambidextrous. With one hand they write that faculty members have the right to take sides on public issues, but with the other hand they write that the faculty members are a bad influence on the students in their classes.

Continued strife due to this type of thinking will drive competent and imaginative faculty members from the state. They do not believe in second-class citizenship. Brilliant and exciting students will seek their education outside the state. In many instances they will not return.

Can we afford to lose the talent which we so urgently need for the advancement of New Mexico?

I think it would be a fine idea for all of us to ponder the wisdom of the words uttered recently by Mr. William C. Sullivan, the Assistant Director in Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's office in Washington, when he spoke at the University of Oregon.

1. The individual has the necessary volition and capacity to be self-governing. Hence, there must be freedom under law for every individual - freedom of thought, expression, action, inquiry, dissent, investigation, education, and worship.
2. Every individual possesses inherent dignity and worth as a sovereign personality.
3. All individuals are equal before the law and are entitled to equal opportunity.

4. Every individual is endowed with certain unalienable rights, among them being the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And for each right, there are corresponding responsibilities.
5. The individual is superior to society; therefore, society exists for his good and for his complete development.
6. Only through a rule of law - civil and moral - can society fulfill its obligation to the individual.

These concepts do not mean that we must agree with everything that the faculty members say. Surely all of us have the right to disagree. But they do seem to indicate that it is not right for us to disagree with them in one breath, and figuratively to hit them over the head with a baseball bat in the next breath, by asking that they be investigated and fired.

I have stated publicly that the University of New Mexico does not have a single communist on its staff. I have also stated publicly that we do not have a single disloyal person on our staff. I have also stated that if anyone could name a single communist or disloyal person on our staff, he or she should name him posthaste. Not a single name has been presented to me.

A poem came my way the other day which reads:

"Song of a Modern Vigilante"

I sometimes fancy as I spy
That I excel the F. B. I.
Right now I'm making little lists
Of folks I think are Communists.
I have no proof on anyone,
And yet the lists are loads of fun.
All friends of foreign aid, I think,
Must be set down as rather pink.
A little pinker, not far off.
I list, perforce, the college prof,
And pinker yet the college crowd
That lauds the Bill of Rights out loud.

U. N. supporters, as I've said,
Are also ipso facto red;
And redder still, on my red lists,
Are all the integrationists.
Just for good measure in my labors,
I add a few of my good neighbors.
Thus I rejoice that loyalty
Resides alone in you and me -
Although, before my work is through,
You may, good friend, be listed too.

This poem first appeared in THE CATHOLIC NEWS,
publication of the Archdiocese of New York,
and was later reproduced in AMERICA.

I feel certain that basically the American Legion in New Mexico and in the country at large is vitally interested in preserving our form of government as well as the rights and responsibilities which go with it.

Recently your National Commander of the American Legion, Mr. Charles L. Bacon, enunciated in the Albuquerque Journal seven lessons of freedom. Freedom of the home, freedom from injustice, freedom of worship, freedom of elections, freedom of the press, freedom of opportunity, and freedom to disagree.

Mr. Bacon described the terms of these freedoms through statements made by seven new American citizens who have earned their citizenship the hard way. They were born and lived in countries where these freedoms for the most part were lacking. The statement made by Mr. M. Neuschaefer, a lecturer at the University of Kansas City, who emigrated from his native Germany after the war, is worth quoting in regard to freedom to disagree.

"For all of us who have lived under a thought-controlling dictatorship, the right to disagree is precious. The freedom to uphold a

minority opinion is the true essence of democracy. Freedom to disagree is the Promethean spark which keeps America's creed alive."

In 1955 Mrs. Popejoy and I and our son, Tom, went to visit our daughter and her family in Munich, Germany. The city was well on the way to complete recovery from World War II damage. Some of the scars of Hitler's foolishness were still discernible, however. One of the most graphic soul-stirring episodes of the war was brought to our attention when we visited the University of Munich. This institution was hurt deeply by the war. Like other German universities, it tried to maintain its freedom to the last before Mr. Hitler took over.

When it was decided that the university should knuckle under to Hitler's dictatorship and all of its features of censure, the University of Munich still had some elements of resistance. A Professor Hans Berger and six of his colleagues, before a packed assembly in the court of the main building, spoke and distributed some pamphlets deploring Hitler's proclamation of stultified and controlled education.

Before the sun went down the next day, Professor Hans Berger and his six colleagues were shot and buried. The great University of Munich was reduced to a propaganda vehicle and a slave to the dictates of a madman.

The Munich University incident is a harsh lesson of what controlled thinking can mean in a university community.

Hitler's defeat brought the University of Munich back to pre-war status, and it is now one of the most distinguished in the world. Someone said that there is nothing worse than a free press - nothing except a controlled press.

There are probably some people in New Mexico and more in the nation

who feel that there is nothing worse than a free university. I hope they will be willing to add in good conscience that there is nothing worse than a free university except a controlled university.

A controlled university faculty is the immediate and continuing by-product of a dictatorship form of government. It doesn't matter whether it is communist or fascist controlled; the results will be almost complete darkness as far as enlightenment and free progress of ideas are concerned.

Fortunately the University of New Mexico and other universities in the United States are not subservient to a police state. We are not in business to make ideas safe for students. We are interested in a vigorous program of higher education which will make it possible for students to accomplish critical and objective thinking when confronted with suggestions and ideas. A free university can afford heresy, but it cannot tolerate the dictates of a conspiratorial government.

The free play of ideas in the classroom, free and easy access to books, journals, and pamphlets in the library, freedom to search out the truth in the laboratory, are the best guarantees of a free society. Students, when given these freedoms, will surely be on the side of our way of life. The battle will be lost, though, if we use subterfuge, half-truths, and practiced and planned hysteria. These are the tools of destruction used by the communists and fascists.

The library at the University of New Mexico is, of course, the best in the state. The collections include 306,775 volumes, 216,832 government publications, 4,843 racks of microfilm, several thousand pamphlets, and 49,189 maps.

But horrors, it includes the New York Times, recognized by practically all journalists as the best newspaper in the Western Hemisphere and possibly in the world. You may not know that this newspaper has several times advocated the dissolution of the House Unamerican Activities Committee, and it has viewed with misgivings the "Operation Abolition" film which was produced last year and circulated widely in this country.

The library also includes many other newspapers which took the opposite view. Also in the library of the University are books authored by Karl Marx, one of which is the famous "Das Kapital," and other books espousing communism.

Back issues of the New York Times include many speeches made by Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Stalin, and Mr. Zorin, Chief of the delegation from the U. S. S. R. to the United Nations. We subscribe to the Russian publication Izvestia and the Russian newspaper Pravda. We have a number of Russian publications of a scientific nature in our collections.

Thirteen members of our faculty are expert one way or another in some specialty which relates to Russia. Five of these speak the language fluently. We offer a major and a minor in Russian studies. Several people from our military and research installations in and near Albuquerque take courses in Russian and Russian studies to improve their knowledge of that country. We want to learn all we can about Russia.

Some patriot asked me the other day, "Do you teach about communism at the University?" I said, "Yes, we do. We will also teach courses in our medical school about cancer and insanity."

Naturally our students have abundant opportunities to learn all about our United States. They had many courses in grade and high school days on this same subject. But courses at the university level in history, economics, geography, political science, literature, anthropology, sociology, geology, biology, law, drama, art, music, and others, add to their store of knowledge.

As long as I am President of the University of New Mexico, I shall fight with all the acumen and energy that I have for the freedom of our faculty and our students. I shall do this because I think it is right and necessary. It is the one way that our democratic way of life will survive in the world, a large portion of which is trying to tear down and erode the dignity of man as an individual.

I want you and other citizens to be proud of your university; proud because it aspires to higher quality; proud because it wants to serve the state and nation in these desperate hours of survival; proud because it wants to find the truth wherever it may be. The light of truth in a free society is the torch for our survival.

I challenge all of you and all others to follow the seven lessons of freedom as stated this year by your National Commander, Mr. Charles Bacon, I will repeat them: freedom of home, worship, elections, press, and opportunity, freedom from injustice, and freedom to disagree. If we meet this challenge, the nation will survive in a peaceful world. If we fail, our children and future generations, if they live, will suffer forever the indignities of controlled thinking, controlled living, and controlled dying. The communists and other extremists live this way. Let us defeat them forever by constantly using and living the seven lessons of freedom.

Let us do away with second-class citizenship. Let us all fight with the feeling that all citizens have equal rights under the laws and constitution of our country. And, finally, let us proceed with these aims on the basis of dignity, fairness, accuracy, and discretion in our dealings with each other.

An excerpt from a recent statement made by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in this respect is pertinent.

"There exists today in our land a vital 'rift' which the communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label of 'communist' is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority. Those whose lives are not led according to what one segment of society might decree to be the 'norm' are too frequently challenged as 'Reds.'

"Attributing every adversity to communism is not only irrational, but contributes to hysteria and fosters groundless fears. Communism is, indeed, our paramount adversary, and it leans on its credo of invincibility and a concept of historical inevitability to accomplish its ends. The way to fight it is to study it, understand it, and discover what can be done about it. This cannot be achieved by dawdling at the spring of knowledge; it can only be accomplished by dipping deeply into thoughtful, reliable, and authoritative sources of information.

"The job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen. This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action. We must unite as a people, we must understand our basic American heritage under law, and we must face the communist menace with deliberation, quiet courage, and knowledge. These are the qualities which communism shrinks from -- these are the qualities against which communism can never succeed."

At the time I was inaugurated President of the University of New Mexico on June 4, 1949, I stated in my inaugural address that: "Among the faculty of a sizeable university one may expect to find all shades of political opinion. The constitutional right of every American to choose his own political philosophy cannot be denied to university professors as a class. There is, however, no place on a university faculty for a teacher who, under the cloak of academic freedom, works actively to promote a form of government which would destroy the very privileges which he enjoys."

I have not changed my mind in regard to this fundamental principle.