union, be free of subversive taint, have his social security card in good order, be in line with various "fair employment" rules . . . And, if I am looking for a job for myself, my freedom of choice is similarly narrowed. Besides, in most cases I cannot accept a job (or offer one) if it pays less than a dollar an hour. Now I may not be worth a dollar an hour to anyone, and I may be perfectly willing to work for less; but I am not allowed to. I'll just have to sit around in demoralizing idleness and subsist off government handouts. As an employer I may be so fixed that I could make a profit if I took on a dozen extra workers at eighty cents an hour but no higher, and I will therefore be glad to do so; but I cannot, not even if my town has hundreds of unemployed workers who would much prefer genuine jobs to relief checks.

Controls and Restrictions

If I am a farmer, I cannot freely decide, on the basis of my judgment concerning the best and most profitable use of my own land, what seeds to sow and where. If I violate the controls and restrictions and allotments handed down to me by the agricultural bureaucracy, I'll end up bankrupt if not in jail.

It goes without saying that I can't hang out my shingle as doctor, lawyer, barber, pharmacist, dentist or saloon keeper unless I have applied (in quadruplicate) and paid for piles of permits, licenses and authorizations covering everything from pulling teeth to selling hair oil. Nor, of course, do I dare try to interest the public in financing a new business venture unless I have first paid my long and expensive obeisance to the SEC. My tenants may be perfectly willing to pay higher rent if I can assure them redecorating and better service. I as landlord may be happy to give them the redecorating and service if I can break even on my investment. But the fact that both tenants and landlord are willing is in many towns not sufficient: the rent control board remains; it orders and we must obey.

Perhaps I am old-fashioned, and would like to make my own corn whisky in a homemade still in the basement. If the revenue agents find it, they will not wait to prove even that it has ever been in operation. Trembling at the thought that a bottle of untaxed liquor might find its way down a citizen's gullet, they will swing their axes to smash my poor still on sight.

Maybe I have decided that, rather than trouble myself constantly over something that I can't help anyway, I will take my chances with H-bombs and forget about them. What I may have decided doesn't matter. I *must* protect myself, whether it affects anyone else or not, and whether I want to or not, as a hundred or so New Yorkers found out a few months ago when they ended up in jail after remaining in the open air during a trial alert.

Compared to a concentration camp, most of these examples are trivial, granted. By a long shot, America is not a "slave State." All of the restrictions on our liberties are alleged to be for our own or society's good; and many of them doubtless are, or, if not, are unavoidable under conditions of mass industry, swollen population and international tension. But they are restrictions none the less, justified or not. Each of them narrows the field of our freedom of choice. I comment again that what is chiefly disturbing is not so much that the restrictions exist as that they are so generally taken for granted. A free citizen who proposes to remain free ought to be irritated that he *must* get an official document before he can travel where and when he wants, or that he *cannot* choose freely what kind of insurance he wishes to buy. Over and above the time and money they cost him, a businessman ought to resent his mounds of governmental paper work as an invasion of his God-given freedom to make his own choices—for good or ill. Most workers may think themselves well advised to join a union, but as free men they ought to be acutely and consciously annoyed when they are *compelled* to join.

I have been wondering about next Fourth of July. Maybe there was too much silence this year. Maybe my neighbors and I ought to find a bootleg fireworks maker, conceal a cracker or two behind an old copy of *The Federalist*, and at an agreed hour set off a big bang all over town, just to remind ourselves what made the Fourth of July noteworthy in the first place.

Looking Multi-Ways at Once

The multi-valued orientation shows itself, of course, in almost all intelligent or even moderately intelligent public discussion. The editors of responsible papers, such as *The New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Chicago Sun-Times, Milwaukee Journal, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, San Francisco Chronicle, Louisville Courier Journal*—to name only a few—and the writers for reputable magazines such as *Fortune, New Republic, Harper's, Atlantic Monthly, Commonweal* or *The Nation*, almost invariably avoid the unqualified two-valued orientation. They may condemn communism, but they try to see what makes Communists act as they do. They may denounce the actions of a foreign power, but they do not forget the extent to which American actions may have provoked the foreign power into behaving as it did.

S. I. HAYAKAWA, *Language in Thought and Action* (Harcourt, Brace)

A Note on Academic Freedom

By PARK CHAMBERLAIN

A free press is a press uncontrolled by government. Free enterprise is enterprise uncontrolled by government. Free speech and free religion are speech and religion uncontrolled by government. These propositions are self-evident; only by deliberate change of definition can doubt be cast upon their validity. One can say, as in fact General Franco did say in a recent interview, that the press cannot be free as long as it is left uncontrolled by government—meaning that any press is controlled by its owner, from whom it may be freed by government action. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding General Franco's views, the words "free" and "freedom" when used in the above context have and always have had in this country but the one meaning—freedom from government.

To these well established American concepts of freedom has been added in recent years a new one—"academic freedom." What is it? Surely, the freedom from government of an "Academy"—an educational institution—and of course including only those privately owned, for those owned and operated by government must by definition be excluded. Such a private institution, in the name of "academic freedom," must enjoy rights analogous to those enjoyed by a newspaper in the name of "freedom of the press," or a church in the name of "freedom of religion." Specifically, this must mean that individuals who so desire may found or support an "academy" where their ideas may be promulgated and their ideals perpetuated, free of government interference. Indeed, upon analysis, academic freedom plainly consists of a kind of bundle of the familiar rights of speech, press, religion and assembly, all of which are necessary to the free operation of the Academy.

A Natural Right

Academic freedom, then, like its constituent parts, is a natural inalienable right, stemming from God and fully guaranteed by the Constitution against government interference. And like other natural inalienable rights, it must not only not be interfered with by government, it must be made secure by government, for the purpose and only purpose of the establishment of government is to secure the inalienable rights of the individual. The activities of government necessary to the security of such rights are simple: they consist of the maintenance of order and the enforcement of contracts. The former is probably all that is necessary to protect my right to freedom of speech; the latter—enforcement of contract—will also be necessary to the preservation of my right to freedom of the press. By this I mean that I may limit by contract the rights of all who deal with me and my press, and that government must enforce such contracts; government in particular must uncompromisingly secure my right to break with a printer, to refuse space to an advertiser, or to dismiss an employee, if any such should attempt to dictate my editorial policy.

The same is true of freedom of religion. That great doctrine means simply this: that the individual may join what church he pleases, or no

church if he pleases, and practice any ritual. In no case may government interfere; to do so would be a violation of freedom of religion. Government's only obligation is to make this right secure against hostile persons who may be either *within* or *without* such church. As in the case of the other freedoms, the maintenance of order will protect the church and its personnel against physical violence, and the enforcement of contract will protect it from enemies within itself. In the latter case, if a minister of a certain religion should become hostile to it, government must protect the right of the church to oust him—by force if necessary.

And so with academic freedom. The God-given right of individuals to found an academic institution and to dedicate it to desirable ends must not be interfered with by government; it must, however, be maintained by government, not only as against physical violence, but also in the enforcement of the right of the institution to dismiss employees who desire to teach doctrines inconsistent with the ideals of the Academy, and without the terms of their contracts of employment. Only thus can academic freedom be secured.

Self-evident as the above truths may be, there are those who would destroy academic freedom by wresting it from the Academy and vesting it in