

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene
School of Public Health
Stadium Gate 27

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

November 14, 1975

The Honorable Frank Church U. S. Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Church:

I totally agree with you that Mr. Bush is a political creature and has no business heading a major, purportedly objective Civil Service Agency of this government. The appointments of Mr. Ford are running in the same pattern of political expediency and power moves as those of his predecessor.

I like the analogy that "Gerald Ford has the ideals that Richard Nixon would have if he had any."

Henry Blackburn, M.D.

HB:jp

pc: Minnesota Congressmen and Senators

STRICT LIB CSOTA committees. AGPICULTURE PUBLIC WORKS AND

TRANSPORTATION

Congress of the I nited States House of Representatives Washington, D.G. 20515

November 20 1975

GEORGE L. BERG, JR. ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

U. French

325 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE THREE HIS Washington, D.C., 20515

(202) 225 2472

210 Post Orrige Bisching

MANKATO, MINNESUTA 56001

(507) 383-4563

Mr. C. Peter Magrath President University of Minnesota Office of the President 202 Morrill Hall Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dear Mr. Magrath:

Since the first of the year, we have had more representatives and more correspondence from the University of Minnesota than we have from any other special interest group.

While I will always be glad to do what I can, within our financial limitations, to assist and support legislation and programs of interest to the University, I very much resent the nature of the enclosed letter which I received today from Dr. Henry Blackburn.

If the University of Minnesota has nothing better to do with its money than to furnish its professors with the stationery and. postage for the purpose of writing disparaging letters attacking the President of the United States, then perhaps the time has come to cut back on some of the assistance we have been appropriating for higher educational programs.

In an effort to be helpful, I am asking the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise me of how much financial assistance the University of Minnesota has received from the Ford Administration during the current fiscal year.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Tom Hagedorn

Member of Congress

TH: jb

Endo-ure

CC:SBIC LAF



Office of the President 202 Morrill Hall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

December 5, 1975

The Honorable Tom Hagedorn Member of Congress 325 Cannon House Office Building Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Representative Hagedorn:

I appreciate your having called my attention to the copy of the letter you received from Dr. Henry Blackburn, writing to Senator Church on University of Minnesota stationery. To set the record straight, Dr. Blackburn's letter is an expression of his own political views, not the views of the University of Minnesota or any of its departments, and it clearly should not have been written on University letterhead.

The use of University stationery and/or postage for personal, political, or commercial purposes is contrary to long-standing University policies. All of the policy statements, from a 1914 Regents' policy to the 1971 "Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility" and the proposed policy on professional consulting, service activities, and other outside work, which will be acted upon by the Regents sometime in the near future, include language protecting the rights of University personnel to express their views, but clearly differentiating personal views from any form of University endorsement. I am sure you appreciate the fact that this distinction can be difficult to make when a faculty member or administrator is writing about his or her particular field or the Federal legislation or programs dealing with that field, but in this case, Dr. Blackburn was obviously writing on matters outside his University activities. I have asked Vice President French and Dean Stauffer to discuss the matter with him and to make it clear that any future expressions of his personal views comply with University policies.

On the more general subject of the correspondence you receive from University of Minnesota people, you should know that we do try to encourage University personnel to check first with my office and Stan Kegler's office

The Honorable Tom Hagedorn December 5, 1975 Page 2

before writing to members of the Minnesota Delegation on matters of University business. While I have no illusions about the comprehensiveness of our success in this regard, I do feel that it is important to me to know what our people are writing about, and when there is a question about an official position of the University, we are careful about clarity and appropriateness. As I have mentioned before, I am concerned that we do not provide members of the Delegation with enough information about the impact of Federal legislation and programs, but we are working on that, and I hope we can provide more helpful material.

I have found the Minnesota Delegation to be most helpful and cordial to the University, and I have been especially impressed by the bipartisan nature and openness of communication. If you feel that you have been improperly contacted by someone from the University, I would appreciate knowing about specific instances so I can take the appropriate steps to clarify the situation and prevent a recurrence.

On the question of the extent of Federal support to the University, you may find it difficult to get a firm figure for the current fiscal year, but the total Federal appropriations, contracts, and grants for the year ending July 1, 1975 were \$75,726,272, constituting about 19.5% of total University revenue.

On a more personal note, I was sorry to hear of your accident. My empathy stems from a broken arm I received a few years ago, trying to jump over a barricade to impress my daughter and nephew with my dexterity. I hope your recovery is swift and complete.

With all best wishes.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath President

CPM:djf

cc: Minnesota Congressional Delegation

university of minnesota **Memo** to DR. Black BURN

from Bul

Phease vote HE AHACHED LEHES, ONE
Yours and HE OTHER FROM Commens man)
HAGEDORN. ALSO NOTE THAT V.P. FRENCH HAS
REQUESTED "Comment" From ME. FRANKLY, MY
Comments of the moment would not be APPROPRIATELY TEMPERATE. TO PARA PHRASE THE LAST
OF OF YOUR LETTER, "I would APPROCATE YOUR
EXPLANATION, IF YOU HAVE ONE." I'M ASKING

Lee D. Stauffer, Dean School of Public Health 1325 Mayo University of Minnesota

Dear Dean Stauffer:

I have indeed an explanation for my correspondence with Congressmen; perhaps I don't have a complete or satisfactory explanation for any bad taste or judgement in the letter to Senator Church.

First, I regret infinitely having caused the University embarrassment. The embarrassment of any poor taste on my part, it appears, may be matched against the huge embarrassment of threats from a Congressman against this University for simple expressions of political opinions by its faculty.

In explanation, I have a long history of congressional correspondence, some of it giving documentation, some opinion. Some of it is simply a short and direct, though perhaps usually not so feisty, expression of support or disagreement with a Congressman's public view.

This exchange is a right, if not a duty, of a citizen, even a faculty member, and has resulted in mutual molding and changing of opinions, including my own.

For example, in the letter at issue I received a very useful and thoughtful reply from Messieurs Fraser and Mondale, both of whom led me to realize that it is not the political experience which is of concern in this CIA appointment but the immediate political ambition and animus which make it a questionable appointment by Mr. Ford. I had already replied to them, in gratitude for the enlightenment, as in the enclosed.

With regard to the particularly opinionated tone of the second sentence of my letter to Frank Church concerning Ford political appointments, this is usually further than I go in expressing opinion, and was clearly unessential to my point. I regret having written it, but it is, nevertheless, simply an expression of political opinion, and in my opinion, is indeed analogous to some expedient appointments of Mr. Nixon, and many other previous presidents.

As for the even more gratuitous and unnecessary last paragraph in my note, about Mr. Ford's political ideals, I had just heard or read that quotation as a joke, on that day and found it appealing. I will try to find a written reference but it's probably in the verbal tradition. It is, in my opinion, "appropriate" in the sense that Ford's political actions appear to come from firm conservative ideals and convictions, whereas Nixon's appeared to come largely from expediency. I have often heard the opinion expressed by political people and other citizens and share it, that this idealism could result in more "damage" to certain areas of

social programs, for example, health, education, and welfare, than the more expedient policy of the Nixon administration, which nevertheless was purportedly very conservative but perhaps without the idealism to live by its conservative tenets.

Beyond this, I have no other "explanation" for my letter, as you request, except to add that my usual c.c. addressed to Congressmen are to Fraser, Mondale, and Humphrey who apparently are more tolerant than Mr. Hagedorn to my opinions — however expressed. This letters' circulation may therefore have been an "accident" in the sense that my secretary interpreted it as the full delegation addresses rather than those I usually communicate with.

Lastly, it has simply never occurred to me that I shouldn't on rare occasions such as three or four times a year use my University office facilities for the individual expression of scientific judgement or political opinion in letters to Congressment will be very happy to reimburse the University for any and all such expenses -- past and present if the Administration determines that all such correspondence should be at personal expense and not on University paper. I fear that I don't see very well how that would avoid such devastating Congressional reactions, as a faculty member is easily identifiable without his stationery!

Finally, I am profoundly disturbed by a Congressman's implied threats against higher education in general and this University in particular because of the perfect and precious and important right of a citizen to express a purely political opinion in a letter to his Congressman, no matter how poor in taste, how supercilious or even how disagreeable. The idea that my personal congressional letter, so resented by Mr. Hagedorn, should be considered to arise from any "special interest group" of the University, that it should direct fire to the whole of this University rather than to me individually, and that threats of "cutbacks" should arise out of this simple, if simpleminded expression — is one which I leave to others to evaluate. I will now reserve my opinion and evaluation on this matter, which should please everyone. Unless, of course, the good Congressman expresses this opinion publicly — or carries out his implied threats against the University because of my letter. In which case, presumably, I would have the support of the University to express my opinion of his actions.

Sincerely,

enry Blockburn

Honorable Walter F. Mondale Senator from Minnesota 443 Old Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

I am most impressed with your thoughtful and reasonable ten-point program on the CIA.

Cordially,

Henry Baackburn, M.D.

10:10

The Nonorable Donald M. Fraser Congressman from Mühhesota 332 House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Fraser:

Your good letter on the Bush appointment to the C.I.A. and Mr. Mondale's 10-point letter to the President on this issue helped to clarify my thinking about past political experience and immediate political ambition as considerations for public service in such an agency. Thank you very much.

Cordially,

Henry Blackburn, M.D.

3: 1p