

## The Reemergence of the Academic Freedom Debate

*Matthew J. Streb*

---

THE TERRORIST ATTACKS of September 11, 2001, changed the world in many ways, including rekindling the debate over academic freedom on college campuses. In the wake of September 11, many of us in academia and elsewhere worried that we were in danger of losing much of the freedom we have enjoyed since the demise of McCarthyism. Would universities suffer through a second McCarthy era? Would there be other more subtle yet powerful threats to free inquiry and expression? What would the impact be on universities outside the United States? How would the tragedy influence the ability of American professors to collaborate with scholars in other countries?

The federal government quickly responded to the attacks by enhancing its own powers of surveillance. Under the USA PATRIOT Act, government has access to a plethora of private information about U.S. citizens. The ability of law enforcement to obtain phone taps has expanded greatly, and Americans can also be subjected to secret government surveillance of medical, financial, and library records. Even banks require personal information, such as social security and driver's license numbers, "to help the government fight the funding of terrorism."<sup>1</sup> Further, as a number of the contributors to this book note, government officials and watchdog groups have become more aggressive about denouncing and calling for the punishment of professors who challenge the war against terrorism and the invasion of Iraq. Will the government's new powers and aggressive attitude threaten freedom of speech at American universities?

The debates surrounding academic freedom after the terrorist attacks also brought back to the forefront debates over “culture wars” on college campuses that had dominated discussion during the late 1980s and early 1990s. With the rise of what some perceived as a “political correctness” movement and with the widespread enactment of speech codes, many conservatives (and even some liberals) argued that academic freedom was threatened by “thought police” who were limiting what could be said in the classroom in order to create what supporters of speech codes thought was a more conducive environment to learning. Although the codes were designed to eliminate hostile, harassing learning environments, opponents of the codes argued that they often drastically overreached—for example, codes that punished students for laughing at sexist or racist jokes. Political conservatives also maintained that a double standard existed. Students were prohibited from making statements that offended women, African Americans, or gays and lesbians, but speech that offended religious fundamentalists, for example, was fair game.

Since September 11, the culture war has emerged again and new battles are being fought on campuses. This time it is conservatives who want to stifle speech, as they protest a few outrageous (and many not so outrageous) statements made by professors criticizing President Bush, U.S. foreign policy, and the war in Iraq; several of these cases are discussed in this book. Those on the right condemned several colleges and universities for course content that they found offensive, including criticizing the University of North Carolina for assigning a book on the Koran to all incoming first-year students. In almost every instance, the professors’ comments or the content of the courses was defended by administrators as being protected under academic freedom (see Robert O’Neil’s discussion of several of these cases in Chapter 3). Again, though, those on the right maintain that a double standard exists. In Chapter 4, Donald Downs discusses the case of Zewdalem Kebede. Kebede, a San Diego State University student, was admonished by a university judicial officer for confronting several Arabic students who were expressing delight about the September 11 terrorist attacks. The Arabic students received no admonishment or punishment from the university. Those on the left charge that free speech must be protected and that professors and students must have the ability to criticize government; those on the right assert that only speech criticizing government is protected and that many who support government policy after September 11 feel the need to censor their speech.

Academic freedom has long been seen as an essential aspect of learning in a free society; however, the previous discussion indicates that there is a great deal of debate over what academic freedom means and how much should exist. Still, although the United States has occasionally lost sight of the immense importance of academic freedom (e.g., the wide support of the McCarthyites' successful purging of academics because of their political beliefs—or alleged political beliefs—more than fifty years ago), the value of the ability to openly discuss controversial topics—both in the classroom and in research—seems firmly embedded in today's American culture. Or is it? The essays in this book set out to examine the state of academic freedom both in the United States and abroad. With new threats and fears, have Americans remembered the importance of academic freedom or have we entered a new era of censorship and self-censorship?

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the book. First, however, I discuss the recent controversy that has emerged once again over the indoctrination of students by professors. I then turn to the importance of protecting academic freedom and provide some recent examples that leave cause for concern.

### The Debate over Education vs. Indoctrination

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, appeared to unify Americans, but that unification did not necessarily hold true on college campuses. Almost immediately after September 11, conservative groups accused liberal professors of indoctrinating students by criticizing U.S. foreign policy and pushing their beliefs on people who were still developing opinions about the world. Others argued that professors' comments made students who backed the government feel intimidated to express their support. Conservatives claimed that the academic freedom of professors allowed these environments to exist. As William P. Murphy wrote more than forty years ago, "Too often . . . the claim of academic freedom is put forth in a guise which makes it appear to be a bid for special privilege."<sup>2</sup> To those who charge indoctrination, academic freedom certainly looks like a "special privilege."

If true, the indoctrination of students by professors should be cause for concern for anyone committed to education; after all, indoctrination is not education. Because of these charges of indoctrination, conservative activist David Horowitz created the organization Students for Aca-

democratic Freedom to challenge professors who the organization believes are promoting their personal beliefs in the classroom. The organization has chartered chapters on more than 135 college campuses and continues to grow. Students for Academic Freedom is pushing an "Academic Bill of Rights" that encourages universities "to recognize and promote intellectual diversity on campus[es]" in state legislatures and in the U.S. Congress.<sup>3</sup> The group has had some success. The Georgia senate passed a resolution "encouraging public colleges and universities to refrain from discriminating against students because of their political or religious beliefs."<sup>4</sup> Another group, NoIndoctrination.org, provides students with the opportunity to post complaints about biased professors on a website.

The controversy over education versus indoctrination is at the center of the debate over academic freedom, and, as the previous examples illustrate, it is more contentious than ever. Certainly we should be concerned about indoctrination simply because it may create a classroom atmosphere in which open, honest discussion of issues is not encouraged. Professors' ability to speak their minds is protected; yet students may be censoring themselves. In the end, academic freedom is threatened. But organizations such as Students for Academic Freedom and NoIndoctrination.org also have been criticized because they pose a threat to academic freedom in their own right. Many university faculty members and administrators assert that these two groups are engaging in a witch hunt to stifle thought and limit speech. They maintain that professors should have the freedom to decide the content of classes. They also argue that sometimes these "academic freedom" movements themselves promote indoctrination and limit the free exchange of ideas. For instance, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) closely monitored what occurred in the classroom immediately after September 11. In November 2001, ACTA, an innocuous sounding group founded by Lynne Cheney, issued a report titled "Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It." The report listed several "controversial" comments made by students and faculty after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Some of the comments that made the list were simple claims of fact. For example, Todd Gitlin, professor of communications at New York University, was taken to task for saying, "There is a lot of skepticism about the [Bush] administration's policy of going to war."<sup>5</sup> Learning cannot be fostered in an environment where simple claims of fact, much less controversial comments that may be made for the sake of debate, are condemned by those

outside the classroom. It is not difficult to understand why a professor might shy away from discussing extremely important—yet divisive—issues. Again, education suffers.

The recent controversy over education and indoctrination highlights the renewed importance of the academic freedom debate, especially since September 11. The growth of organizations such as Students for Academic Freedom, ACTA, and Campus Watch will continue to affect academic freedom, perhaps in some ways for the better, but in most ways for the worst. We should be concerned with the potential indoctrination of students—although actually defining indoctrination or knowing when it is occurring is difficult—but we also must be uneasy about groups that try to limit speech in the classroom and on college campuses. Murphy is correct: Academic freedom may appear to be a special privilege. In reality, however, it is an essential component of an open, engaged learning environment.

### The Importance of Academic Freedom

To many academics, the importance of academic freedom is obvious. After all, it is the cornerstone of the university's mission to educate students and expand the boundaries of knowledge. For education to be most effective, professors and students must be in environments where they are free to learn about and debate complex and controversial issues. Also, as specialists in certain fields, professors should have the freedom to decide the content of their classes. Although concerns over indoctrination may be justified, academic freedom is a principle that must be protected for education to flourish.

Perhaps the best-known advocate of academic freedom is John Stuart Mill, who argued that the free exchange of ideas is needed in a society that values truth. Mill's views have long influenced the way Americans think about academic freedom.

Although speech codes were not in existence during Mill's time, he surely would have been opposed to them. Mill believed that only by allowing the expression of *all* ideas could we falsify what we thought to be previous truths or learn to defend more vigorously what we know to be true but is challenged. While supporting the concept of academic freedom, Mill no doubt would have been concerned about charges of indoctrination as well. Mill would have encouraged open debate in the classroom of all ideas, something that cannot happen if academic freedom does not exist.

The importance of academic freedom may have best been summarized by Justice Douglas in *Adler v. Board of Education of the City of New York* (1952).<sup>6</sup> In *Adler*, the Supreme Court upheld a New York civil service law that “provided for the disqualification and removal from the public school system of teachers and other employees who advocated the overthrow of the government by unlawful means or who belonged to organizations which had such a purpose.”<sup>7</sup> In his dissenting opinion, Douglas forcefully argued that:

The Constitution guarantees freedom of thought and expression to everyone in our society. All are entitled to it; and none needs it more than the teacher.

The public school is in most respects the cradle of our democracy. . . . The impact of this kind of censorship in the public school system illustrates the high purpose of the First Amendment in freeing speech and thought from censorship. . . .

The very threat of such a procedure is certain to raise havoc with academic freedom. . . . Fearing condemnation, [the teacher] will tend to shrink from any association that stirs controversy. In that manner freedom of expression will be stifled. . . .

There can also be no real academic freedom in that environment. Where suspicion fills the air and holds scholars in line for fear of their jobs, there can be no exercise of the free intellect. . . .

This system of spying and surveillance with its accompanying reports and trails cannot go hand in hand with academic freedom. It produces standardized thought, not the pursuit of truth. Yet it was the pursuit of truth which the First Amendment was designed to protect. . . . We need be bold and adventuresome in our thinking to survive. . . . The Framers knew the danger of dogmatism; they also knew the strength that comes when the mind is free, when ideas may be pursued wherever they lead. We forget these teachings of the First Amendment when we sustain this law.<sup>8</sup>

Although the Court disagreed with Douglas in *Adler*, five years later a majority first recognized academic freedom as a constitutional right in *Sweezy v. New Hampshire* (1957).<sup>9</sup>

Mill and Douglas were right: Academic freedom is an essential component to education. Without the ability to openly discuss controversial topics, students—and for that matter professors—cannot develop intellectually. As David Moshman wrote, “To encourage intellectual progress, we must promote reflection, coordination, and social interaction, the basic processes of development.” Moshman continued, “There are many ways to do this, but the fundamental context for all of them . . . is one that encourages students to consider, propose, and discuss a variety of ideas—that is, an environment of academic freedom.”<sup>10</sup>

However, there is great concern today over protecting that “environment of academic freedom.” Just a quick glance at some recent events makes it easy to understand why. Largely in response to September 11, both the federal and state governments have taken steps—or tried to take steps—to limit academic freedom. At the federal level, the largest assault on academic freedom—as well as many other cherished civil liberties—is, of course, the USA PATRIOT Act that Congress hastily passed almost immediately after September 11 and reauthorized in 2006. As mentioned, the Patriot Act is not usually associated with the restriction of academic freedom but rather with the restriction of due process rights. Although the due process rights of individuals are certainly of immense importance, the Patriot Act’s effects on academic freedom are also of great concern. The Act has led several academic groups, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Library Association Council, and the National Council of American Studies Association, to name a few, to raise questions about academic freedom post-9/11.

Although there are several aspects of the Patriot Act that threaten academic freedom, one provision in particular stands out. The Act expands the federal government’s authority to demand “business records,” including lists of library records and recent book orders. In addition, librarians and bookstore employees are barred from disclosing any request from law enforcement for book records. As O’Neil writes elsewhere, “It will be difficult, if not impossible, to report with any accuracy the extent to which the ‘business records’ provisions of the Patriot Act have affected academic freedom—save for the unlikely prospect that the responsible agencies either volunteer such information, or a court compels its disclosure.”<sup>11</sup> Initial evidence is troubling, however. “Surveys conducted in late 2001 and in October 2002 by researchers at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign found that since the USA PATRIOT Act became law, some 550 libraries had received requests from federal and state law-enforcement agencies for the records of patrons.”<sup>12</sup> The “business records” provision could possibly lead professors or students to think twice about checking certain materials out of the library or buying certain books, which, in turn, could keep important research from being conducted.

Many in Congress have tried to repeal the “business records” provision, but without any success. In July 2004, the Republican leadership extended the time available to vote on the Freedom to Read Protection Act by an additional twenty-three minutes in order to ensure enough

votes to make certain that the act did not pass. A year later, the Senate voted to significantly change the library provision, but the House—through controversial rules limiting debate on proposed amendments—stifled any attempt to change the law.<sup>13</sup> Finally, in 2006, small changes were made to the so-called library provision (e.g., libraries can now challenge whether the government acted in bad faith in demanding the records), but critics were not appeased. “This deal does not prevent the government from obtaining the library, medical and other sensitive business records of people with no link to suspected terrorists,” argued Wisconsin senator Russ Feingold, the only senator to vote against the original USA PATRIOT Act. “The records just have to be ‘relevant’ to a terrorist investigation, which is not adequate protection against a fishing expedition.”<sup>14</sup>

Library records and book orders are not the only aspect of academic freedom threatened by laws such as the Patriot Act. The Patriot Act amended the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA), making it easier for law enforcement agencies to obtain wiretaps or to use search warrants to seize any voice-mail or e-mail messages. It also amended the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), allowing law enforcement officials to circumvent students’ rights to confidentiality of their academic records if the records are deemed relevant to an investigation of terrorism. University officials do not have to notify students that their educational information has been disclosed. All these aspects of the law seriously threaten academic freedom.

The Patriot Act is not the only instance in which the federal government has shown a lack of commitment to academic freedom. After one Columbia University professor, Nicholas De Genova, said at a campus event that he wished for “a million Mogadishus,” more than 100 members of the House of Representatives called for his resignation.<sup>15</sup> De Genova’s comments were certainly offensive to most Americans, but if academic freedom is to mean anything, we cannot simply censor speech that we do not like; a slippery slope would no doubt ensue.

The federal government has been relatively restrained regarding academic freedom compared to some state governments. State legislatures have castigated university officials for defending academic freedom. When a “teach-in” on U.S. foreign policy was held at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, by four faculty members, several members of the North Carolina legislature chastised university officials for allowing the event to occur. As previously mentioned, UNC officials took more heat from the state legislature after the school assigned a book



about the Koran to all its incoming students. The lower house of the state legislature “attached to the university’s appropriations bill a requirement—clearly intended as a form of punishment—that if any religion were to be studied at Chapel Hill, equal time must be given to the study of ‘all other religions.’” The state senate, however, rejected the amendment.<sup>16</sup>

After Ward Churchill’s controversial essay, in which he compared the victims of the September 11 World Trade Center terrorist attacks to Nazi Adolf Eichmann, the governor of Colorado, Bill Owens, and many state legislators demanded that Churchill be fired. The university president at the time of Churchill’s statements, Betsy Hoffman, refused to fire him because of the statements; however, the University of Colorado is—at the time of this writing—conducting an investigation of Churchill regarding a variety of other charges, including plagiarism, which should not be protected under academic freedom.

The Churchill case is likely the most documented case of a threat to academic freedom after September 11. Ironically, the controversy did not emerge until well after September 11 (and after several of the contributors to this book finished writing their chapters). Although Churchill’s essay was written within hours of the terrorist attacks, it flew under the radar until Churchill was invited to speak at Hamilton College. A student, Ian Mandell, the editor-in-chief of the student newspaper, was doing some background research on Churchill and came across his essay. The essay quickly became media fodder after Mandell wrote an article about the essay, and after Hamilton’s president, Joan Hinde Stewart, cancelled Churchill’s appearance because of, according to Hinde Stewart, threats of violence.<sup>17</sup> Churchill’s remarks were certainly incendiary, but if academic freedom is to mean anything, scholars must have the ability to criticize the United States government and its policies. The Churchill case also illustrates the power that the media has had in questioning the right of academic freedom after September 11.

State governments haven’t just called for the dismissal of certain controversial professors and questioned the curriculum. As discussed earlier, state legislatures, including Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, and Ohio, have deliberated over the “Academic Bill of Rights” put forth by Students for Academic Freedom. The Ohio bill, introduced in January 2005, would “prohibit instructors at public or private universities from ‘persistently’ discussing controversial issues in class or from using their classes to push political, ideological, religious, or anti-religious

views.”<sup>18</sup> However, in September 2005, the bill was shelved in favor of an agreement made by the state’s university presidents that “universities are committed to respecting diverse viewpoints and that neither students nor faculty will be evaluated based on political opinions.” The bill was largely seen as an acceptable compromise.<sup>19</sup>

Although the governments’ actions were primarily in response either directly or indirectly to September 11, one event that has severe implications for academic freedom was not related to the terrorist attacks. At a conference on gender imbalances in science, the president of Harvard at the time, Lawrence Summers, raised the possibility that the imbalances came from innate sex differences. Summers, who was not advocating the position but simply raising a point that has been made by many, was harshly criticized. The National Organization for Women called for his resignation, many prominent alumni threatened to withhold donations, and more than 100 Harvard faculty members signed a letter condemning Summers.<sup>20</sup> Those on the right argued that the response to Summers’s statement was political correctness run amuck. Certainly the rebuke of Summers, ironically even from many who are committed to academic freedom, will make others think twice before discussing contentious issues. This issue of self-censorship is Paul Sniderman’s focus in Chapter 9.

The preceding examples all illuminate the fact that debates over academic freedom are as heated as ever and are not likely to subside anytime soon. It is the goal of this book to examine some of those debates and to assess the state of academic freedom, both in the United States and abroad.

### The Plan of the Book

The book is divided into four sections. In Chapter 2, Tim Shiell continues the introduction by providing a strong defense regarding the importance of academic freedom. According to Shiell, there are three conceptions of academic freedom and he believes that the civil libertarian conception is the most virtuous. However, he is also concerned that, today, the civil libertarian conception of academic freedom faces grave threats.

In Part Two, the contributors examine academic freedom in American universities today. Two of the chapters focus on the most blatant threat to academic freedom: Would faculty and students be explicitly

punished by the government or by university administrators for unpopular or unpatriotic speech after September 11? Robert O'Neil (Chapter 3) and Donald Downs (Chapter 4) argue that, although in some cases it appeared that this was going to happen, calmer voices prevailed in the end. O'Neil and Downs both come to a cautious but positive conclusion regarding the effects of September 11 on academic freedom, although their reasons for why academic freedom survived are somewhat different. According to O'Neil, academic freedom was generally upheld because of the state of the law regarding academic freedom, which has much improved since the days of McCarthy. The Supreme Court, O'Neil argues, has consistently come to the defense of academic freedom over the last fifty or so years. In addition, the norm of free speech has become more institutionalized on college campuses. Downs also supports the norms of free speech argument that O'Neil puts forth, but he believes that, in cases where those norms have been challenged, First Amendment organizations, such as the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), or faculty organizations, such as the one at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, have been there to protect academic freedom. Still, according to both O'Neil and Downs, academic freedom in the classroom today might not be completely the same as academic freedom in the classroom on September 10, 2001, but it does not appear to be that different either.

However, Downs does express some concern that thought on the right could be open to attack. Yet, in the cases cited by Downs, academic freedom was upheld in the end. Again, Downs argues that this result was not necessarily because of a general commitment to academic freedom, as O'Neil argued, but more because of organizations such as FIRE. Even if the cases that Downs cites were resolved in ways consistent with upholding academic freedom, his argument about censorship from the left should be taken seriously by anyone who is committed to the concept. Academic freedom may have been upheld, but not without a strong fight.

O'Neil's and Downs's conclusions may be positive, but they are not blinded by optimism. Indeed, both O'Neil and Downs are well aware that not everyone is committed to protecting academic freedom. Every case that O'Neil or Downs mentions was met with some sort of response from the public, usually calling for the "offender's" dismissal.

Certainly academic freedom entails more than just speech in the classroom. Restrictions on academic freedom can exist in far less obvious ways, especially regarding research. In Chapter 5, Susan Lindee

documents the significant scrutiny of scientists by the government since September 11. In fact, no group of scholars may be affected more by that day than scientists.<sup>21</sup> Government has been critical of many scientific studies since September 11 and is often the major source of academic research funding. In some cases, as Lindee notes, government scrutiny led to self-censorship.

The third part of the book examines academic freedom from a global perspective. The chapters are not designed to build a broad theoretical framework for looking at academic freedom overseas; rather, they serve as snapshots to provide a basis for comparison of threats to American academic freedom. Although the restriction of academic freedom in the United States—both explicitly and implicitly—is a serious concern, the contributors of Chapters 6–8 remind us how grave the problem of academic freedom remains around the world compared to the United States.

In Chapter 6, John Akker looks at academic freedom in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, where, in many cases, academics have been imprisoned, beaten, and/or murdered because of their lectures or writings. In Chapter 7, Antonio Brown focuses on academic freedom in Western Europe, the birthplace of academic freedom, and finds that governments in these countries may not be as committed to the principle as one might expect. According to Brown, there has been a significant struggle between proponents of academic freedom and those who see the need for a degree of censorship to promote community and social cohesion. In Chapter 8, Enrique Desmond Arias examines the academic freedom landscape in Latin America. According to Arias, non-governmental groups, such as guerrilla organizations, can pose just as great a danger to academic freedom as do authoritarian governments.

One consistent theme that surfaces throughout Part Three is government's role in protecting academic freedom. Although a strong, powerful government can be a threat to academic freedom, a weak national government is not necessarily desirable either, as Arias shows in Chapter 8. And, as Akker's numerous examples make clear, many governments remain uncommitted to academic freedom entirely. Even in Western Europe, as Brown notes, commitment to academic freedom varies.

Understandably, September 11 affected issues of academic freedom in countries around the world less than in the United States, but the countries discussed in the chapters by Akker, Brown, and Arias were

not immune from threats to academic freedom after 9/11. All three contributors are in agreement that, since September 11, foreign-born researchers studying in Western Europe and the United States face greater scrutiny and visas are more difficult to obtain, limiting noncitizens' participation in academic conferences and attendance at colleges and universities. As the AAUP notes, "Given the pace at which university recruitment of foreign visitors must often proceed, such delay and confusion threaten international scholarly collaboration."<sup>22</sup> Potential graduate students must postpone their studies because of problems implementing SEVIS, the federal government's system for monitoring foreign students and visiting scholars while they are studying in the United States. In fall 2002, the backlog of applicants was estimated to be 25,000. One survey found that 30 percent of participating institutions saw a decline in the enrollment of foreign students during the 2002–03 school year. The decline in foreign students is troubling because "over the past twenty years, noncitizens have accounted for more than 50 percent of the growth in the number of Ph.D.'s earned [in the United States]."<sup>23</sup> Pressures to either cancel or restructure Middle Eastern studies have emerged.<sup>24</sup> Federal regulations have limited editing and publishing papers by researchers in embargoed countries.<sup>25</sup> None of these facts present a positive outlook for American scholars' abilities to learn from and collaborate with researchers and students from other countries in the future. As a result, the writers of these chapters argue, the pursuit of knowledge is threatened.

In the final section, Paul Sniderman and Evan Gerstmann offer some concluding remarks and comment on some of the less explicit restrictions on academic freedom. In Chapter 9, Sniderman maintains that the most serious threat to academic freedom actually comes from self-censorship rather than from overt punishment for unpopular views, and he argues that certain university policies make self-censorship, even by tenured faculty, more likely. In Chapter 10, Gerstmann provides a broad overview of several less obvious threats to academic freedom, including mandatory loyalty oaths for faculty members, the expansion of institutional review boards, and ever-increasing numbers of faculty without the protection of tenure. If O'Neil is correct that the commitment to academic freedom in the classroom has indeed become institutionalized, then it is these subtle restrictions on academic freedom noted by Lindee, Sniderman, and Gerstmann that should be the greatest concern for academics post-9/11.

## Balancing Safety and Academic Freedom

The terrorist attacks of September 11 were unlike anything the United States had encountered before. As a result of the attacks, Americans were scared—and rightly so. Preventing another terrorist attack should be the primary goal of government and law officials. Certainly new security measures are needed to prevent another 9/11; the question is, At what cost? September 11 presented the American people with a classic example of conflicting rights. How do we balance individual freedoms with the need to protect society from another terrorist attack?

The most obvious response, and perhaps most understandable given the tragedy of the event, is to err on the side of stopping terrorism. We give up some rights in order to be protected by government. This makes us feel safer, and it is important for citizens to feel safe (although it is difficult to determine how effective measures that force us to give up some of our rights have been at preventing terrorism). But reactions out of fear often lead to bad consequences, such as restricting academic freedom. As Benjamin Franklin wrote, “They who would give up an essential liberty for temporary security, deserve neither liberty or security.”

The general conclusion of the contributors to this book is that academic freedom in the most obvious sense was upheld after September 11. A few problems emerged, but almost all were handled in a satisfactory manner. For that, academics (and in a broader sense, all Americans) should be happy; although we should remain vigilant. However, two other more troubling conclusions emerge. Less obvious threats to academic freedom exist, and these threats are increasing the risk that the United States will become isolated from the rest of the academic world. For education to be most effective, academic freedom must be protected. Colleges and universities must be places where open dialogue on divisive issues can occur and where scholars can feel free to research controversial questions whose answers will add to the body of knowledge (even if people do not like the results). Events as tragic as September 11 cannot make us lose sight of this central premise of education. If they do, education in the United States and, indeed, around the world will suffer immensely, and that is something that no one can afford.