

Hunt, John F., and R. Connelly. *The Responsibility of Dissent: The Church and Academic Freedom*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969. xvi + 224 pp. \$ 3.95 (paperbound).

Some years ago George Bernard Shaw could propose seriously that to speak of a Catholic university was a contradiction in terms. Thanks to the courage of some good Catholics, that can no longer be said of many Catholic institutions of higher learning. This has become especially true since 1968 when leading Catholic educators of the Western hemisphere promulgated a "Statement on the Nature of the Contemporary Catholic University," a document sometimes referred to as "The Land O'Lakes Statement." In it academic excellence is established as the basic priority of a university. In part it reads: "To perform its teaching and research functions effectively the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself" (p. 117).

This is not to say that in every Catholic university full academic freedom is enjoyed. There are those who feel that in order for an institution to maintain its Catholic identity the ecclesiastical hierarchy that supports the institution has the responsibility also to control it. This is justified under what is called a "modified" academic freedom. There is no question, however, that inevitably some tensions develop when two concepts of freedom face each other.

The book under review presents an account of the proceedings that took place at The Catholic University of America when 21 Catholic professors on July 30, 1968, signed a statement of dissent from the Papal Encyclical *Humanae Vitae* that had appeared the day before. On September 5 the Trustees of the university threatened with suspension any professor who refused to abstain from public comment inconsistent with pronouncements of the Church hierarchy, and set up a Board of Inquiry to establish the nature of the conduct of the professors who had dissented from the encyclical.

The authors of this book were the lawyers who represented the professors before the Board of Inquiry. In it the history of the proceedings and the prepared testimony presented at the time are carefully documented. In a companion volume (*Dissent in and for the Church: Theologians and "Humanae Vitae"*) Hunt and Connelly document that part of the case which dealt with the theological justification for the dissenting position by the professors and the manner in which they chose to promulgate it.

Since the professors involved in the dissent were members of the theological faculty, not only statements defining academic freedom adopted by the American Association of University Professors, but also those adopted by the American Association of Theological Schools were appealed to as normative for the conduct of the investigation. The basic issue throughout the proceedings was to establish the principle that any evaluation to be done of a professor's theology,

or of his professional conduct, was to be done in terms of peer-established criteria, and not of standards of insitutional loyalty having their source outside of the academic community. When the need not to offend sources of financial support becomes a standard by which to judge faculty performance, then no amount of lip service to academic freedom is convincing. As Clarence W. Friedmann, Associate Secretary of the College and University Department of the National Catholic Education Association, said at the time of his testimony before the Board of Inquiry: "A university can afford to be poor but not unfree."

At a time when many institutions, ecclesiastical, educational, and civic, are having difficulty in knowing how to deal with dissenters, the publication of this case study on The Catholic University of America is most timely. Here lawyers tried to find out what declarations of principle on the part of educators actually mean. They have shown that misunderstandings are many times the result of false equations. To equate "faith" and "loyalty to inherited institutional forms" and then to condemn those who distinguish faith from such loyalty is a common ecclesiastical sin not very different from that committed by those who in a civil context equate "law" and "order" and then apply indiscriminate force in order to maintain their vision of order, taking for granted that the law guarantees their actions.

A special word of thanks is due those who decided to publish this case study. Would that every time a theological faculty, Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, is submitted to the strain of a Board of Inquiry tempted to demand that theologians must prove their orthodoxy, the proceedings and the testimony were published in as well documented a fashion as they appear in the book here reviewed.

Saint Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

HEROLD WEISS

Jocz, Jakob. *The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968. 320 pp. \$ 6.95.

In recent years several writings by Jakob Jocz, Professor of Systematic Theology at Wycliffe Seminary, Toronto, have been devoted to the theology of the election, the encounter of Jew and Christian, and the spiritual destiny of Israel. Some of the findings evident in these writings appear in the present volume, e.g., "Israel," being not a biological term but a spiritual concept which embraces all who respond to the grace of God. The author writes as a devoted adherent to dogmatic Christianity, and in modern scholarship his sympathies lie with Martin Noth, W. Eichrodt, A. Richardson, and Karl Barth. The book will appeal to the Christian divine who faithfully maintains that the Bible's understanding of the human predicament is correctly seen through the lens of classical Protestant scholasticism. To the reader who seriously questions a major assumption of the author that Biblical