criticism and be criticized. Only through such unparalleled freedom of thought and investigation can an academic institution, especially one dealing with science, perform its function of seeking the truth." The insertion of this paragraph into the committee is the most flagrantly misleading smoke-screen there is. It is calculated to make the unwary think that "academic freedom" is at stake. This is simply not so. Professor Struik is free to examine controversial matters, to criticize and to come to any conclusions whatever! If this were all he is alleged to have done, he would not be facing trial at the present time. He is not charged with examining controversial matters, with criticizing or even with being a Communist. He is specifically charged with advocating the violent overthrow of the government of the United States.

Finally, the fifth paragraph may be taken up sentence by sentence. The statement says 1) "We believe that Professor Struik should have the right to express his views without inhibition." If there is any merit to the government charges—and this will not be known until the conclusion of the trial—then the committee is in effect stating that Struik should be allowed to break the law. Under the Smith Act when a person's views are such that they advocate the overthrow of the government, then these views are unlawful! 2) "Without taking a stand on his political opinions, we feel his indictment is a potential threat to the freedom of expression of all of us." Here is a repetition of the smoke-screen thrown up in the preceding paragraph. His indictment is not a potential threat to anyone's freedom of expression. He was not indicted for expressing any literary views. He was indicted for advocating the overthrow of the government of the United States. 3) "Agreement or disagreement with Prof. Struik's views is not an issue here, and this statement is directed to Americans of all political beliefs." It would appear that the committee statement has been all too strong in its appeal with misleadings and insolent prefaces and this will not be known until the conclusion of the trial. And yet the grand jury was either hoodwinked or was stupid. 4) "It is important to all of us that his case be defended vigorously and to the full by all freedom-loving people." This is an American tradition in all cases; it is a privilege enjoyed by all Americans. And yet in our history has any group so abused that privilege as have the Communists, as witnessed by the trial of the Communists before Judge Medina in New York?

It was with frank amusement that I read the statements of several M.I.T. professors who were taken in by this ploy—a gobbledygook and allowed their names to be used in conjunction with this committee. It is one thing to solicit funds for the defense of a man charged with a crime, but it is quite another to pretend the appeal with misleading statements and insinuate pre-judgment of the guilt or innocence of the man. Since the professors, not as individuals, but as faculty members of M.I.T., have seen fit to inject themselves gratuitously into the case, I hope they will explain their reasons for signing this statement. By appealing to a little simple reasoning, the committee's statement becomes a transparent tissue of misrepresentation. Freedom of speech and academic freedom are not at stake, and in fact have nothing to do with the case. The one fact that remains is that Professor Struik is charged with advocating the violent overthrow of the government of the United States. His guilt or innocence will be decided by a jury and not, fortunately, by the committee nor by those who have signed its statement.

John Fitch '52

The Perfect Christmas Gift
FIBERGLAS FISHING RODS
MANUFACTURED UNDER TRADEMARK, Technical Publications, Inc. 125 Riverside Avenue, Rockland, Mass. 02066

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARTFORD</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAVEN</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCHESTER</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETROIT</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANY</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For your information:

- **It's the week before Christmas**
- **Just a little pat-lock, you'll see**
- **And away you go!**

---

**Home for Christmas by GREYHOUND**

- **CITY** | **Fare**
- **HARFORD** | 2.60
- **NEW HAVEN** | 3.05
- **ROCHESTER** | 3.25
- **NEW YORK** | 4.15
- **WASHINGTON** | 3.45
- **PITTSBURGH** | 3.40
- **DETROIT** | 4.15
- **ALBANY** | 4.15
- **SYRACUSE** | 7.00

**For U. S. Routes**

- **LI 2-7700**
- **10 ST. JAMES AVENUE**

---

**Campus Interviews on Cigarette Tests**

**No. 30...THE SQUIRREL**

**They Had me out on a limb!**

This nimble-minded nutracker almost flummoxed those tricky cigarette mildness tests. But he worked himself out of a tight spot when he suddenly realized that cigarette mildness is not a question of single sniff. Smokers everywhere have reached this conclusion—there's just one real way to prove the flavor and mildness of a cigarette.

It's the sensible test...the 30-day Camel Mildness Test, which will show you to try Camel as your steady smoke—on a pack-after-pack, day-after-day basis. No snap judgments. Once you're in the "smoker's T-zone" (T for Throat, T for Taste), you'll see why...

---

**After all the Mildness Tests...**

Camel leads all other brands by billions.