



Reports of
an
Informal
Missionary Study Seminar
on
An Apologetic for Christian
Witness in Japan



January 2-4, 1962
Lacy-Kan, Hayama, Japan

Published
by
The Ad Hoc Committee

OCR & Word 2000 Format: Lonnie J. Dufty, 2008
PDF Version 1.1a, November 2008

Notice Regarding PDF Release of Hayama Archives

Accurate reproduction of the original books is an ongoing process. Errors can be reported to the Hayama Archivist, Lonnie J. Dufty. Before doing so, please check for an updated version at the site you downloaded from or www.jema.org (Japan Evangelical Missionary Association). For the foreseeable future my contact information is available in the JEMA directory. Should the above information be obsolete, request for updated information should be available via www.jema.org .

In making a report, include the following information:

Year of book.

PDF Date and file version (generally located on title page)

Page number(s)

Example: Hayama Missionary Seminar Report 1988, PDF Version 1.1, November 2008

FOREWARD

The Hayama Missionary Seminar meets annually in January and three sessions have already been held. The participants include men of various groups and persuasions who are free to share their own insights and experiences. However, the Seminar does not aim at joint action or pronouncements. In fact the missionaries are not in attendance as representatives of societies or churches, but as individuals. Abundant opportunity for open dialogue concerning important matters of mutual interest has been provided at each session. The leadership of the Holy Spirit and the love of Christ have been most manifest in these Seminars. Thus there has been generous and candid sharing of points of view which have transcended any mere intellectual exercise. The identification with and exchange of basic convictions has been a most helpful experience for all participants.

Each year a particular theme is selected for joint consideration, with the various facets being presented through carefully prepared papers, followed by discussion in which all participants are free to take part. The theme of the first Seminar in January 1960 was: "Our Ministry of Reconciliation in a World of Conflict," (2 Corinthians x:18). The second Seminar in January 1961 gave its attention to the problem of: "The Church and the Missionary in Japan," (Philippians 2:5). The next Seminar in January 1963 will consider: D. V., the theme of: "Christian Discipleship in Japan," (John 13:34, 35; Luke 9:23).

The theme of the third Seminar, which met at the Lacy-kan, Hayama, Kanagawa Ken, January 2-4, 1962, was: "An Apologetic, for Christian Witness Japan," (2 Cor. 5:18). This topic was found to be very timely and the participants felt that the excellent papers presented should be shared with the other interested persons in the missionary community. Thus these have been printed and are available in limited supply. It is to be regretted that it has not been found possible to include at least some of the further insights which were shared in the discussion periods. It is the earnest hope and prayer that these papers will be the means of extending some of the blessings of the Seminar to the larger community of Christ in Japan.

The urgency of the development of an appropriate Apologetic for Christian Witness in Japan has been well stated by Dr. Hendrik Kraemer, the well known theologian and missionary statesman, who paid a visit to Japan in 1961. He calls attention to the fact

that the early Christian apologists took the initiative for the conversation, they articulated communication and dialogue with their world, gradually learning in this way not only to formulate the Christian faith in relation to the religious and philosophical reality of their day, but to get hold more and more of what is implied in the intricate question: 'how to relate Christianity and culture? ... A Church (in this case the younger churches) which neglects the challenge to seek, on the highest intellectual and spiritual level, genuine communication in word and writing with the intellectual and spiritual spokesmen of the age-old, deep-rooted religious civilisations of Japan and India, for instance, condemns itself in the long run to become---in the entire social body--a ghetto, a blind alley."

Gordon K. Chapman
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. The Biblical Concept of the Christian Witness by Raymond Hammer	3
2. The Gospel Confronts Paganism, by John M. L. Young	10
3. The Gospel Confronts Human Government by Paul Johnson	29
4. The Gospel Confronts Pseudo-Christianity by Ian Macleod	40
5. The Gospel Confronts the Enigmatic Japanese by Ian MacLeod	53
5. Japanese Characteristics Which Condition Religious Response by William A. McIlwaine	62
6. Apologetic Preaching and Writing in Japan by James Phillips	75
7. The Christian Concept of Authority vs Japanese Patterns by Frank Cole	
8. Christianity Confronts Totalitarian Systems to Right and Left, by Hideo Aoki	113
9. The Christian Witness to the World, by Robert W. Wood	121
10. The Finality of the Gospel of Jesus Christ by Hugh Harris	129
10. The Finality of the Gospel of Jesus Christ by Hugh Harris	129
11. Closing Worship, by Kenneth McVety	142

THE BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF WITNESS

by Raymond J. Hammer

The theme that has been assigned to me is the Biblical background to the subject of our Conference. In the time at our disposal it is obvious that we cannot follow the Worterbush pattern in examining the full usage of the concept of Witness, and although I am confining myself to the New Testament, even there our study must be severely limited. What I propose to do is to examine the concept of Witness as such, and then particularly to study the witness of the Apostles in Acts, and, finally, concentrating on the Fourth Gospel to consider St. John the Baptist as the type of Witness for the church today. You will, I trust, pardon me for frequent asides, in which we shall see some of the wider implications of our study and its relationship to the totality of our faith and our commitment as ministers of the Gospel.

The Basic Meaning of Martus and its Cognate Terms

The "witness" was particularly a "witness" at a trial, and the New Testament gives us examples of this usage. For example, we are told of the witnesses at the trial of Jesus (Mark 14:59) - even though in this particular instance the witness is declared to be false and is accepted as unreliable even by those opposed to Jesus. The trial of Stephen (c.f. Acts 6:13; 7:58) gives us further examples, whilst the Jewish Sanhedrin is called upon to bear testimony to Paul's former zeal as a persecutor of the Church (Acts 22:5).

In each case the emphasis is upon witnessing to something that has happened or to something that has been said. We have here an important indication *of* what the witness is doing. In the case of Christ's trial, we have an instance of prevarication, but nonetheless there is the claim that the witnesses are pointing to something objective. The witness bears witness- to what has happened or been said. As we apply this to our Christian Witness, we are immediately reminded of the givenness of the Christian message. We are pointing to something (or rather someone) objectively confronting us in our individual or corporate experience. (In this connection we may note that, whilst the verb marturein is sometimes used absolutely, it normally requires an object.) And so we come on to:

(Continues on next page)

The Christian as Witness.

The first mention that we have of Christian martures is in Luke 24:40-49, "You are witnesses of these things". There are objective, concrete events to which the disciples must witness. We recall at this point the forceful introduction to I John, where the actuality of the experience, to which the witness is being, made, is expressed with an overwhelming conviction. The Christian is witnessing to that with which he has personally encountered. St. John goes on to say (I John 5:9) that God Himself is the ultimate witness, and that this witness is apprehended in the personal experience of the Church or the Apostle. This reminds us that, over against the objectivity (what God has done in Christ), there is the subjective relationship to the objective event or the objective revelation. There must be a union of faith and witness. St. John speaks first of the witness of the Father to Christ but he goes on to speak of the witness of the Spirit - a witness that is made within the Christian community and that brings faith to birth. There is the wedding of the objective presentation and the subjective commitment. Let me go further and say that the witness has no validity and no ultimate value, unless that wedding has taken place. That is the first sine qua non, to which we must come. But now to return to Luke (24:46-49), "You are witnesses of these things". Some of the manuscripts do have the present tense of the verb (este), but the future tense seems to be demanded - "You will be witnesses of these things". St. Luke is looking forward to Pentecost. The witness becomes possible, as the Apostles are empowered. We are reminded here of the marriage to which I have referred. Only the Holy Spirit can set the tongues loose and make possible the witnessing to the mighty acts of God, for then we are ourselves caught up into Christ. The Holy Spirit grants, too the gift of tongues. However we may interpret the gift of glossolalia in the Early Church, surely the important thing is that through the Holy Spirit the Gospel becomes intelligible and familiar to every creature. It could become the motive power for the new man, baptized into Christ.

Now this obligation to witness is laid upon the early Church, and we find the bounds getting ever wider. Mark (13:9) refers to the witness as extending to the "end of the world" and continuing, to the "coming of the Kingdom", We have here a very important indication of the function of Christian witness. It must be a witness to finality and ultimacy - to the total demands of divine sovereignty. The whole of that chapter in Mark is concerned with this note of ultimacy and finality, but let us beware of turning "eschatology" into mere theological jargon. It is for this reason that the New Testament

is not so much concerned with the "end" (to eskhaton) as with "the Coming One (ho erkhomenos). The divine sovereignty is no mere concept; is linked up with the Person of Christ Himself. That this personal relationship might not be lost, the witness of the post-resurrection period is almost exclusively tied up with the Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus. One can witness to divine sovereignty, because there is the conviction that in Christ there is finality. But we do not only have ultimacy there is also universality. Luke 24:47) speaks of repentance as being offered to all nations. And Acts speaks of the offer of a new life, possible through Christ, because Christ has risen from the dead. In the Apostolic Witness the historical resurrection has pride of place - but we must not limit the concept of "Resurrection" simply to the historical event. The "resurrection" must also speak of the power of a new life - the resurrection life which the Christian can live, as he is identified with the Risen Christ. Witness to the resurrection thus involves witness to life in Christ - live within the Church, which is the Body of Christ - and, of course, life through the Holy Spirit. In the Christian's witness to the Resurrection we must embrace all that we know elsewhere to be involved. There is the link here with the eskhaton, too. The reason is that in the "resurrection" you have witness both to the creation and the recreation of God. You have witness to life out of death, victory out of defeat. But the historical must never be forgotten. The witness is to what has historically taken place - and is accordingly no figment of the mind - no mere philosophical concept. Our Christian witness must stand by the scandal of particularity. (We may contrast the approach of Japanese Religions - and especially Buddhism, where you simply have the historical accommodation of the metaphysical concept, and where strict historicity is considered to be unimportant.) Christianity must stand fast to the historical event (c.f. Acts 1:21-22; 10:4-43; 22:14f; 26:16 etc.), and hence the eyewitness is important. St. Paul meets with the Risen Christ and life cannot be the same again. The past must be cancelled, and the new man in Christ must begin. It is of interest here that Stephen is thought of as a martus (Acts 22:42) because he sees the exalted Christ. He bears immediate witness to that which he has seen, and it is because of his immediate witness to the risen and exalted Christ that the violence of the crowd reaches fever-pitch. (In the case of Stephen's witness we may notice not only the immediacy, which is the result of his own immediate contact and insight, but also the lack of consideration for con-

sequences. I am not here advocating a lack of moderation, for St. Paul demands moderation of us, because "the Lord is at hand". St. Stephen's example does, however, remind us that we must not play for safety. Loose your life, and you find it. Try to preserve it, and you loose it.)

But let us move forward a step. Because the Risen Christ is at the same time the Word of God incarnate, we cannot limit the witness to the Resurrection alone. The Holy Spirit enables the Church to witness to the totality of the Christ event (cf. Romans 5:21; 1st Cor. 1:16; 15:15; Thess. 1:10). St. Paul uses marturein in the sense of "preaching under inspiration" (c.f. 1 Thess. 2:11-12; Ephesians 4:17). The fact that the operation of the Holy Spirit is central to such witness is also a safeguard against a mere academicizing. The Spirit is as the wind, and hence there is the intangibility in what God works outside of us, and in and through us. In a Sense , the Apostles, as witnesses, are speaking of what they have heard and seen. For the disciples in the ongoing life of the church there is a sense in which it is "no faith of our own" - It is a "traditum" (a "paradosis" - c.f. 1 Cor. 15:7) - and yet "a faith of our own", because there has been a new entering into it. The Apostles, too, whilst witnessing to a part experience, are conscious of the continuing presence of the Risen Christ in their midst.

The Witness of Christ

St. John reminds us that the witness is not simply verbal, but also active. Christ is the Logos, but the works of the Incarnate Logos bear witness and are themselves signs of His Persona and His mission. (c.f. John 18:37; 3:11) Christ's work bears witness to the truth, but Jesus is Himself the truth (14:6). All comes round to a circle. Jesus' witness is self-authenticated, but yet the self-authentication is itself part of God's activity. The fact that God swears by Himself is evidence of the self-authentication of God's work. So Jesus says that only the sign of Jonah is to be granted - but from the Book of Johah we find that Nineveh repented at the mere preaching of Jonah. The sign was the direct word of God. In the case of jesus, the self-authentication of His message lies in His very Person. It is not outside of Him; but comes of His intrinsic nature. Similarly, the Christian's witness is part of Christ's own witness, because the Christian is en Khristo and Christ is "en umin". The Christian's witness is caught up in Christ's own witness to

Himself, and the Father's witness to Christ is part of the mutuality of self-witness within the Godhead itself. Through the Holy Spirit we are caught up into this self-authenticating witness within God Himself. (c.f. Our activity in prayer, where we speak to God (the Father) through God (the Son) in God (the Holy Spirit). We are thus brought into the *very* fellowship which exists within our Triune God. Jesus speaks of the Father's witness, and yet Jesus witnesses to Himself. In the person of God, God witnesses to God. The Word made flesh is the expression of God Himself in His fullness. What we have here is not mere semantics, but ultimate reality.

The universality of the Witness

"Jerusalem ...Samaria...the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts 1:6). The universal appeal and application hardly needs elaboration on my part. St. Luke, whose story was to lead up to Rome was no doubt very conscious of the thinking, which is reflected in the Psalms of Solomon (8:16), where Pompey is described as "he that is from the uttermost part of the earth" - i.e. Rome. But we today must not only think in terms of geographical boundaries. We must apply the injunction of the Risen Christ to every department of human life. The "uttermost part" may quite easily be upon our very door-step.

John the Baptist as the Type of Christian Witness

We cannot identify ourselves completely with John the Baptist, for he is presented to us as the last of the prophets and so less than the least in the Kingdom. In him we have witness to the anticipation, but that witness must be coupled with witness to the fulfillment. God is complete and so all His activity must be complete, but from the historical standpoint there are both the anticipation and the grasping of God's Lordship. Archbishop Temple - in what must be one of the greatest devotional classics of this century - writes as follows; "Here is one of those who act as beacons for pilgrims by reflecting the divine light ... His whole function was witness or testimony. He was a voice. He would direct attention away from his personality to his message. He pointed to one whose message directed attention to Himself; for He to whom John pointed, was the light itself" (Readings in St. John's Gospel, p.9). The light, he proclaims, is coming, and that light is Christ - and in the gloom of the Japanese situation only Christ can be our life.

The Christian witness is to learn from John. There must be no personality-cult; there must simply be the voice and the life that speaks of Christ. But, more, that Church, as the Body of Christ, is to call Lazarus out of the tomb, showing forth the witness of Christ within a world of death and corruption and speaking His word of life and resurrection. John the Baptist's very "raison d'etre" was to witness. It is for that reason that he says "Never mind who I am; listen to what I say" (c.f. Temple, o. cit. p. 21-22). Our words should be the same. It does not matter who I am. It is the One to Whom I bear witness that matters! For it is only Christ Who can say "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Only with Christ is the teaching- an introduction to the Person. We are one with Christ and so our work: is Christ's work - but there is identification with a difference. We are united, and yet still confess ourselves as the unprofitable servants of Him Who alone can claim to be the Master. St. Paul has learnt from John, when he says "We preach not ourselves" (II Cor. 4:5). We would claim attention not for self, but for Christ. And yet the very story of John's witness reminds us of the mystery of the limited response. John's witness to Jesus as the Lamb of God is accepted not by the crowd but by two of his own disciples. "To them," says Hoskyns, "his words are almost a command, and they pass from the prophet to the Christ, from the negations of prophecy to the affirmations of its fulfillment." They had passed from the spokesman to the one to whom the spokesman had borne witness - and that surely is the last word that must come to us all. "Not I, but Christ."

THE GOSPEL CONFRONTS PAGANISM

John M. L. Young

The subject before us is "The Gospel Confronts Paganism" which theme has been set in the larger contest of "An Apologetic in the Light of New Testament Principles for Christian Witness in Japan." Since the gospel confrontation with which we are concerned here is that with paganism, our preoccupation with New Testament Scripture will largely be with those portions where the gospel faces Gentile rather than Jewish thought.

WHAT WAS THE APOSTOLIC GOSPEL?

A necessary preliminary consideration to get our subject clearly before us is to ask, what was the gospel the apostles took to the pagan world? From whence did they claim to receive it and what did they conceive it to be? Basically, I think we shall see, their apologetical method sprang out of their theological convictions. To come to grips with their concept of the source and nature of the gospel they preached, then, let us put the case forthrightly, first of all, in a negative way.

Negatively

The gospel for Paul, the foremost apostle to the pagan world, was the Word of God which came to him by the revelation of Jesus Christ, not in any Barthian sense of a flash, coming through church proclamation, without propositional content other than the conviction that Jesus Christ is the Lord. Indeed, Paul is at pains to point out that Christ's revelation came to him without the proclamation of any man. In Galatians 1:11 and 12 he declares, "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached to me is not after man. For I neither received it of man neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Then he continues, "But when it pleased God to reveal His Son through me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither went I up to Jerusalem to them who were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia." (15-17)

Paul clearly understood that his knowledge of the gospel had been acquired by direct revelation from God, and that this and his knowledge of the eschatological program of

Christ, had been given to him as full-fledged, conceptual propositions. Neither Kant nor Kierkegaard had yet appeared on the stage of history to tell him that the God, who created the vast universe and intelligent man, had produced a man so limited that He could not communicate transcendent truths to Him; and I do not think Paul would have believed them if they had. In writing to the Corinthians of the things which up to then were unknown "which God hath prepared for them that love Him," Paul adds, 'But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.' (I Cor. 2:9, 10) And then he states, "'Which things also we speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.'" (v. 13). Later, as he introduces the 15th chapter in which he describes his gospel and presents more prophetic material which he could only have received as revelations of content, he asks the Corinthians, "What? came the Word of God out from you? or came it unto you only? If any man thinks himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (I Cor, 14:36, 37). Not even in the apostolic age did God give His revelations to the rank and file of believers in the church, but He did to Paul whose teachings were thus the commandments of the Lord.

"All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," the apostle declared, and Peter in closing his second epistle includes the epistles of Paul in those scriptures of which they had such a lofty concept. He wrote, 'our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you' and also in all his epistles speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." (II Pet. 3:15-16).

From these quotations it is also very apparent that Paul did not take the gospel in any Bultmannian sense either. To Paul, Jesus Christ was the Son of God sent from heaven in fulfillment of Old Testament apocalyptic prophecies which were not myths, but revelations from God of His future plan, even as Paul, himself, received such revelations. Although Paul does not mention the virgin birth, no description of the manner of the incarnation of Christ could more properly depict his concept of the nature of Christ than that given by his traveling companion, Luke, in the opening chapter of his gospel. Whatever Paul's personal cosmology was, or that of the times in which he lived, his understanding of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit upon him and other Biblical writers

clearly indicated that he and they could transmit the revelations they received, and teach the message of God in such a way that their presentation was devoid of human error and was in truth the very Word of God. Paul had unlimited confidence in the sovereign God's ability to do, end to make men do and say, exactly what He pleased. He had unlimited confidence in the fact that the Gospel he taught was precisely the gospel Christ wanted him to teach. He had seen Christ personally and had been taught by Him, and he knew the gospel narrative was no myth. Peter specifically denies that it was myth. "For we have not followed sophisticated myths but were eyewitnesses of His majesty." (II Pet. 1:16). A god who could not do what men could not do who could not act with power in the historical realm with power unknown to men, performing what we today call miracles, was no god to Paul. The God who was the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Creator and Sustainer of the Universe and man, the One who had planned man's salvation and had sent His Son and Spirit to accomplish it, this is the God who is the Author of what Paul variously calls "God's gospel", "Christ's gospel" and "my gospel."

Paul's eschatological hope was "Palestinian" only in the sense that this was the land in which Christ and the prophets had first proclaimed it, To Paul it was the eschatological hope of all the world, to the Greek as much as to the Jew, a message of hope from heaven, not from man, and it was a vital part of his kerygma in all his preaching to the Gentiles.

Positively

What then was Paul's gospel? He summed it up briefly to the Corinthians in these words, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you... which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he arose again the third day according to the scriptures." (I Cor. 15:1-4). Earlier in the epistle he had written, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom. Put we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness, but unto those who are called, both Jew and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God for I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." (I Cor. 1:21-24; 2:2)

Paul's preaching of the gospel constantly affirmed that his presentation was not a repudiation of Old Testament scripture but a confirmation of it. His gospel was scripture oriented. This he emphasized in spite of the fact that by so doing he made the crucifixion of Christ, which was foremost in his preaching, seem to be even more of a scandal to his Jewish hearers, and ridiculous to the Gentiles under whose legal system He had been executed. The Jews well knew the Old Testament curse pronounced upon anyone hanging on a tree. (Deu. 21:23) This, which to the Jew was the evidence that the crucified Jesus of Nazareth could not be the promised Christ, was to Paul the very proof that He was! For the Old Testament had also pronounced another curse on all who did not perfectly keep the words of the law. (Deu. 27:26) Paul's gospel, then, was to show that men could be saved from this second curse only by accepting the fact that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, who "redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us ... that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Gal. 3:13, 14) The crucifixion of Christ was thus to Paul the authentication of His Messiahship and the central fact of his gospel kerygma.

Although to the Greeks there was nothing of philosophical wisdom in such proclamation yet Paul knew that the "power of God" was in it. He followed it by immediately declaring what he knew was equally unacceptable to Greek intellectuals, the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. One of their poets had declared, "Once a man dies and the earth drinks up his blood, there is no resurrection," anastasis is the word used, the very word Paul used for the resurrection. The idea of resurrection was rejected by the Greeks as foolishness, although most of them accepted the immortality of the soul. Yet Paul in the interests of gaining a sympathetic hearing neither omitted the resurrection nor substituted an emphasis on immortality for it. The resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth was evidence of His deity, and also a vital part of the message Paul knew to be the power of God unto those who were called. For neither Jews nor Greeks would Paul dilute his gospel one iota in the interest of making it more palatable to pagan minds.

The gospel with which Paul confronted the pagan world, then, was one he held to be revealed from heaven, the story of God's way of salvation for fallen men, the message which, when faithfully proclaimed, he knew would be used by the Holy Spirit to be the power of God unto salvation to all who believed. It was his deep concern to present this gospel forthrightly to the pagan world without fear of the consequences with unwaver-

ing faith that God would use it to the eternal salvation of men. Facing death he wrote to the young Timothy concerning his imprisonment, "I endure all things for the elect's sake that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. (II Tim. 2:10)

HOW DID PAUL CONFRONT PAGANISM WITH HIS GOSPEL?

Paul was God's foremost messenger of the Gospel to the pagan world of the earliest Christian era. Almost all that we know of the Gospel's first confrontation with paganism comes from either that which has been written about him in the New Testament or that which he wrote. What then was his method of presenting the gospel to pagans? Beyond contradiction, I think it can be said, that his apologetical method stemmed from his conviction as to the source and nature of the gospel. In the Acts narrative, we have brief synopses of two of his presentations of the Christian message to the heathen, one to the uncultured pagans of Lystra and the other to the intellectuals of Athens. Let us now look at these, in the light of what we have thus far said about Paul's gospel and also in the light of the exposition of his theology given in his letter to the Romans.

Paul's Proclamation at Lystra and Athens

Lystra was high on the plateau of the Taurus Mountain Range, ascending abruptly from the coastal plain and Perga below. To get there they had to pass through some of the worst bandit country in the Roman Empire, frequently "in perils of robbers", as Paul later was to write. Whether for this reason or some other, John Mark had refused to go with them on the journey. The people of Lystra were unsophisticated pagans, a mixture of primitive pagan stock and Greek immigrants, who worshipped the Greek gods and had temple built to Zeus. They believed that Zeus and Hermes, the Roman Jupiter and Mercury, had once visited their city, and these were their patron gods. The Cretans had a mausoleum built as the tomb of Zeus, but to the people of Lystra he was a living deity. They would have given enthusiastic endorsement to the words of the poet who had written of Zeus:

They fashioned a tomb for thee, O holy and high one-
The Cretans, always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies'.
But thou are not dead; thou livest and abidest forever,
For in thee we live and move and have our being.

There evidently was no Jewish synagogue at Lystra for Paul mentions none, yet apparently it was the home of Timothy whose mother was a Jewess and his father a Greek. (Acts 16:1) The conversion of this family seems to be the fruit of Paul's first visit to Lystra. As the young Saul of Tarsus once watched the stoning of the martyr Stephen, so also possibly the young Timothy may well have witnessed the stoning of Paul.

Paul's miracle of healing at Lystra brought to him and Barnabas the astonishing reaction of their being declared to be a visitation of the city's patron gods, the fictitious deities from whom the apostles came to plead with the people to turn away to the true and living God since the others were nothing but idols, inventions of man's imagination. How did the apostles deal with this situation? What was Paul's gospel proclamation and apologetic to these pagans? We see it revealed in the brief summary of his message at Lystra as well as in the more detailed account of his sermon to the sophisticated Athenians, and also in the introduction of his epistle to the Romans. His message is grounded in the presuppositions of the nature of God as the one, living, sovereign Creator, with whom he starts his message; in the nature of man whom he introduces as God's finite creature, now lost in ignorance of God and following corrupt ways; and in the nature of Christ as man's only present Saviour and future Judge.

Paul believed that God was the sovereign Creator of the universe and man, and with this assumption he began his message. He did not begin with an argument for the existence of God, but with a statement as to His nature which clearly distinguished him from the gods of the heathen, the: only One who is supreme over all. He did not introduce him as one who was a foreigner to their land, but rather as one who had always been their God, revealing His gracious kindness to them by sending them rain and fruitful seasons, although they had not recognized Him and had thereby made Him a foreigner to their midst. He could say to them that they had knowledge of the existence of God yet at the same time they must acknowledge He was unknown to them. Literally, what he said to the Athenians, was "that which ye worship acknowledging openly your ignorance, I proclaim unto you.." (Stonehouse, p. 19) The significance of their knowledge and of

their ignorance we shall consider shortly. From God Paul proceeded to man, His creature, who had repudiated Him and who was walking according to his own sinful, idolatrous ways. Paul believed that God had created man in His own image, but that man had fallen into deep sin, so that the image was seriously marred, and in some aspects lost. Man lost moral excellence, that is true righteousness and holiness, and true knowledge as well, in all of which he must be recreated if he is to be restored to fellowship with God. (Eph. 4:24 and Col. 3:10) But having lost these he is at enmity with God (Rom. 5:9) spiritually dead (Eph. 2:1) so that he has no inclination to worship the true God, and morally depraved so that he lives for the creaturely self and not for God's standards (Rom. 1:28).

Man as God's Continuing Image-bearer

Not all aspects of the image of God, however, were lost in the fall. Man is the creature who is the image-bearer of God. If he had completely lost that image in the fall he would no longer be man. The fall did not make him "not-a-man." The natural man is still God's image-bearer in three aspects. First, he is a rational being with self-consciousness, having a reasonable soul which attests to him that he is more than his body; that there is an ego, an inner self within him which can control his mind and is really he. His age-old and universal hope of immortality is not that his body will escape death but that his soul will.

Second, he is also a religious being with God-consciousness, having within himself ineradicably a sense of God, a sensus deitatus. It is to this Paul is referring in Rom. 1:19-20. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:" In verse 19 we read of that which may be "known" of God. In what sense is it known? It is not a content of knowledge about God natural to all men, but an awareness that God exists. It is this basic sense, rooted into his being at his creation, that enables him to see the general revelation of God in the works of nature, including himself, for he does see it, Paul says in verse 20.

He sees both that there exists deity and His eternal power above this created world; and then, as we shall observe shortly, he sinfully suppresses this truth. This is the basis for his inexcusableness before God.

Third, man is also a responsible being with moral consciousness. Paul is referring to this in Romans 2:14, 15. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." What is man's conscience? Is it not his consciousness that he ought to do right and ought not to do wrong? This is implanted in all men making them moral creatures and distinguishing them from the animals. It is not that the heathen inately know correctly what is right and what is wrong. The heathen have all kinds of erroneous moral standards. But they do have standards, and a conscience which tells them they ought to do what they believe to be right and ought to abstain from what they hold to be wrong. They even acknowledge that gross evil is deserving of punishment Paul says in Romans 1:32, but they suppress this voice and go on in sin.

In this we see also the nature of unbelief. It is of the nature of man's unbelieving condition to suppress all truth that would point him to God. In Romans 1:18 the Greek verb translated "hold" is katecho, the prefix giving the significance to "hold down", or to restrain. Men suppress the knowledge of God within them; they do not want to respond to His revelation of Himself in nature. General revelation will never lead the heathen to God because this sinful reaction of unbelief causes them to suppress the truth pointing to God.

Yet the revelation is there and the God-consciousness is universally in man. Paul took advantage of this in . Athens when he began his sermon with a reference to their altar to the "Unknown God." He does not say that they have conceptual knowledge of the Creator God of whom he is going to speak, but that they are aware that One must exist who is supreme over all the universe. This awareness is not epistemological knowledge but part of man's metaphysical nature, which sin makes him seek to suppress. Perhaps we can use the illustration of a Geiger counter signaling its response to the presence of uranium as somewhat comparable to man's God-consciousness responding to God's general revelation by signaling to him "God is". It was Paul's task then, and the missionaries' task today, to bring to fallen man conceptual knowledge of God from His

special revelation, the Scriptures, that they might have their ignorance dispelled and receive propositional knowledge about Him.

After his proclamation of God and of idolatrous man, His creature, Paul turns to a presentation of man's need of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, the world's only Saviour and Judge. The Athenian's prided themselves on being racially superior to other Greeks, not being immigrants but having sprung from the native soil of Attica. Paul forthrightly but courteously rejected this concept by declaring the unity of the human race with the statement, "He hath made of one (blood) all nations of man," and also by quoting from one of their own poets, "For we are also his offspring." The unity of the human race, all springing from the same point of origin and the same, one, first parent, is a fundamental concept preliminary to the understanding of the salvation of sinful men through the one Saviour, the God-man, Jesus Christ. (Rom. 5:12-19)

By quoting their own poets at points where their observation of general revelation had led them into statements whose phraseology was true, things which they therefore themselves acknowledged they knew about God, Paul could show them how they had suppressed and distorted even the truth they professed to know. They had made images of metal with which to worship god and thus had worshipped the creature more than the Creator! This showed great ignorance but God, he pointed out, was willing to overlook it if they would repent of it as a great sin against Him, and turn from idols to serve the living and true God. There is no other way to escape the judgment of the Almighty God, who is going to judge the whole world by One whom He has appointed. This One has proved to be entirely adequate for this solemn task for He has risen from the dead.

This was a forthright appeal to these intellectual pagans, as it had been to the unsophisticated ones earlier, to turn from their sinful idolatry and serve the living and true God. It was not just teaching Christian theory or doctrine, but the giving of a message from a man to men, to be heard, understood, and followed, as coming from one who was deeply concerned about their condition and had come, as an ambassador of God, with a message from heaven to alleviate it. It was a concrete message to concrete men in their situation of sin and ignorance. It was a message spoken courteously but forthrightly, whose basic tenets were repugnant to the pagan mind. Yet these were clearly presented and their significance understood. The result, as it will usually be' under such circumstances, was that the great majority were incredulous and went away

with pride and smug satisfaction in the superiority of their own beliefs; but some others became inquirers, and a few believed. For these few Paul was willing to make every sacrifice, even to the laying down of his life. The example of his passionate zeal and love strikingly underscored the terrible urgency and seriousness of the gospel he proclaimed.

TWENTIETH CENTURY GOSPEL PRESUPPOSITIONS AND APOLOGETICS

Paul's presuppositions and apologetic methodology as he confronted paganism with the gospel in the first century of the Christian era must be ours also as we confront the paganism of Japan in the twentieth century. We, too, confront men created in the image of God, yet fallen in sin and suppressing the knowledge of Him who is revealed in nature, man and history. We cannot accept the Barthian concept that there is no general revelation of God at all and that there does not exist any divine image in the men whom we confront. Nor, on the other hand, can we believe that general revelation is redemptive revelation. Man in paradise had general revelation all about him, but it was not redemptive revelation because he needed no redemption. Following his fall, however, and his loss of the aspects of the image of God of righteousness, holiness and true knowledge, he needed special revelation of God's manner of redemption if he was ever to be restored to fellowship with God. Therefore, in Genesis 3:15, God appears before man with special, direct revelation of His message of deliverance. Neither general revelation nor common grace are sufficient to lead totally depraved men, sin-ruled men, to know and to fellowship with God. Due to man's sinful nature, he instinctively and invariably seeks to suppress God's witness to him through general revelation and common grace.

Because of God's common grace, however, man's work of suppressing the truth is in turn counteracted by God. Common grace is an attitude of favor of God upon men as men, not upon them specifically as saved or unsaved. It has a two-fold work. In part, it is God's grace in restraining the heathen from realizing their full potential for evil. It is thus a restraining influence of God holding sinful men back from being as wicked as they are capable of being. But it also has another function. It is God's common grace that "maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." (Matt. 5:45) God thus gives men the opportunity to realize that He is good and long-suffering in spite of their callous indifference to Him. He sends His good gifts to them all that they might turn to Him. But they reject Him. Common grace also enables

them to do acts of civil righteousness, such as to love their families and nations. Their reaction, however, due to the nature of unbelief, is always to suppress the truth of this witness of God to them. Therefore they are without excuse! The heathen are not yearning for God and for His Christ because of general revelation or common grace.

The argument of Paul in Romans 10, following verse 17, is in striking support of the fact that God has always been speaking to the pagan Gentile world. "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." (Romans 10:17, 18) Paul here wants to show that God's present offering of His gospel to the Gentiles, through Paul's preaching, is not an absolutely new interest of God's in the Gentiles but just a fulfilling of a continued one. To do this he quotes from Psalm 19:4, in verse 18, and says the "sound" and "words" of God went out to all the world: When did this take place? When did or when do, the heathen hear the word of God, the speech of God?

Calvin in commenting on this verse in his commentary on Romans says that the heavens and the earth "have a sort of tongue of their own to declare the perfections of God..God has already from the beginning manifested his divinity" to the Gentiles, though not by the preaching of men, yet by the testimony of His creatures; for though the gospel was then silent among them, yet the whole workmanship of heaven and earth did speak and make known its author its preaching. It hence appears, that the Lord ...did not yet (heretofore) so withdraw from the Gentiles the knowledge of himself, but that he even kept alive some sparks of it among them ... he showed by this prelude that he designed to make himself known at length to them also."

Our God has thus not only never withdrawn His witness to the heathen but by this very fact He has shown His intention some day of revealing Himself to them with far more clarity, said Calvin. When we as missionaries go to them with the gospel we can rejoice to know that that day has arrived for them, that God has sent us to them, and that He has His elect among them. Because He has maintained His testimony both within them and without them in nature, we are able to communicate His message to them.

Point of Contact

Because of these things we do have a point of contact in our witness to the heathen mind. They are still men, in the image of God, in these important, unchanging aspects. No matter how low they may fall into bestiality they are still men; still conscious, at least to some small extent, of their need, and with some yearning to rise above their plight. If they were not men in the image of God we could not communicate to them. The very presupposition of missions is that they have a God-consciousness and so we can speak to them of God. We do not begin our witness to them in a void, but with the knowledge God has already spoken to them and is speaking to them.

It is not that we can simply build on their sense of God and bring them to God merely by giving them more information! No. It will only be rejected unless our witness is accompanied by the sovereign act of God's Holy Spirit in regenerating them. Not common grace but special, supernatural grace is needed to bring men into His Kingdom.

Since we have this point of contact, however, or perhaps we should think of it as a point of attack, we can talk to them. We can witness and we can reason. We can tell them of the God of creation and providence and know that these are not meaningless concepts to them. We can go on to demonstrate to them the traditional arguments for the existence of God, the cosmological, teleological and ontological arguments, seeking to show that the God we postulated from the Bible exists and know that this will strike a responsive chord in their hearts even if they proceed to suppress it.

This method of witness is useful to teach them more of God, man and the universe, and their true relationship, and to drive the one opposing the truth further into the corner of illogic and contradiction. But we must remember that the door to the Kingdom of God is not opened by the power and persuasion of human reasoning alone, nor by any other human effort alone. Admissions forced against the will leave the mind of the same opinion still. Nominal head assent is still heart rejection. The kicking against the pricks of the reasoning which is goading them into a corner soon begins again in some other direction. Why? Because men are not argued into the Kingdom of God. They have to be born into it.

Paganism in Japan and Our Apologetic

In our confrontation with the pagan mind in Japan, then, we too face men made in God's image, but fallen and constantly suppressing their God-consciousness and moral consciousness. The implanted seed of religion is a subconscious impulsion to worship although the sinful mind of unbelief brings a suppression and distortion of it so that they seek satisfaction in substitutes and false worship. The substitutes of Shintoism and Buddhism to which they turn are not too unlike those Paul faced when he confronted the Epicureans and Stoics.

Epicurus had summed up his philosophy once in these words: "The gods are not to be feared; death cannot be felt; the good can be won; all that we dread can be conquered." His most famous pupil, however, reduced his statement "pleasure is the chief good" to one which became more typical of first century Epicureans when he declared, "all good things have reference to the belly." (Durant, p649) The kind of culture thriving under this type of thought is described by an historian and sounds not unfamiliar to those who recall the thinking of Japanese Shintoist men of even a decade ago. Professor Angus wrote, "Vice found congenial soil in the Graeco-Roman world ... The characteristic Greek virtue was moderation in all things - including vice. Greek culture and refinement was for Greek gentlemen, not for their wives. The low estate of Greek wives and the blandishments of the hetairai (courtesans who could talk intelligently on art and politics, could sing and make pretty jokes) could not conduce to sexual purity. The easy philosophy of the Cyrenaics and Epicurus were used as an excuse to gloss over sensuality.., Infidelity in married life became frightfully common and received but slight condemnation. It was hardly any disgrace to pay court to or support a mistress. The loose amours of the gods were put forward as justification of immoralities. Society was indulgent - 'to step aside is human' was its motto." (Angus p. 49-50) He also speaks of the widespread use of abortion and infanticide, and that poor parents would sell their children for prostitution.

The Shinto concepts of sin, truth, the natural goodness of man and the multitude of deities are also characteristic of that age. A Shinto professor has written concerning these as follows: "Moral judgements as to what was considered to be good or bad were not a fixed system of standards ..The Shinto manner of grasping truth takes in consideration the fact that values were constantly changing ...The soul of man is good.

Shinto does not have the concept of original sin. Man by nature is inherently good ... In modern Shinto there is no fixed and unalterable moral code." (Ono, pp. 105-106) In the opinion of this writer we must take into more serious consideration the Shinto ideology and the threat of a national return to a Shinto-oriented military despotism. I think the possibility of such a return, barring a Communist invasion from the outside, may well be more real than an internal communist take-over. Shrine influence has already been restored to a very strong position in Japanese society today, especially in the country where I have been told it dominates rural life.

Many of the Stoic concepts, on the other hand, were not unlike those of Buddhists. They preached an ascetic doctrine of simplicity and self-restraint and saw all things in God, who was usually conceived of in a pantheistic way as Nature, or the Law of the universe. The universe to them was a "gigantic organism of which God is the soul, the animating breath, the fertilizing reason, the activating fire," says Durant. (p. 653) They believed in Fate and the Stoic sought a complete "apatheia, or absence of feeling, that his peace of mind will be secure against all attacks and vicissitudes of fortune, pity or love." (Durant, p.655) In some of these ideas Zeno and Zen are not so far apart:

Buddha (Sakayamuni) who lived perhaps two centuries before Zeno, was an acute thinker who sought by cold analysis and then by mystic contemplation to solve the mystery of life and the world. The remarkable nature of his accomplishment can be seen in the multitudes who reverence him as the supreme being today as well as the great revival of his thought in the Western world in this mid twentieth century. Buddhist missionaries have headquarters in Germany today and 10,000 converts in seven cities while Zen Buddhism is creating great interest throughout America. The Dutch theologian A. Pos, in a remarkable paper on "Buddhist Propaganda In The Western World and The Christian Answer" makes these observations on the nature of Buddhism.

"Buddha fathomed the radical nothingness of self and the insubstantiality and illusoriness of all that exists, and realized the power binding man to it, viz. karma while beyond it he saw the dawn of deliverance: nirvana ... He sought an answer to the problem whether somewhere in this created and therefore transient world an unchangeable and imperishable being could be found. In this Heraclitean stream, however, he nowhere found a fixed point to keep foothold.. .things and relationships

exist and change and perish, without permanent being ... From matter down to gods, he nowhere found the eternal, unchangeable brahman,(and) *he* found in his analysis of the inner world nothing but anatman, non-self ... Thus Buddha triumphantly discovered and preached brahman (eternal unchangeable being) and atman (individually existing self) as the great deceptive illusion...As long as man believes in a permanent soul and eternal brahman to which he will return, he will not really be released 'from himself and the world... So long as the fire of desire burns in man, and in the craving for life he wishes to preserve his existence, he continues to be bound in karma and is again and again born anew ... Hence his (Buddha's) fundamental principle: life is suffering in this state of bondage." Salvation, the way to freedom, is thus deliverance from this great illusion of the existence of eternal being and individual self-existence by contemplation, complete "detachment from the ego and the world", which is the entrance upon the happy state of nirvana. (pp.30-31)

Buddhism, on its journey in Japan, has undergone considerable modification. It has tried to maintain its basic tenets but has found them frequently accommodated to the popular beliefs of a polytheistic nation. They have tried to maintain "that there is no real individuality, that all things are one in essence" and "that the cardinal sin from which all men need to be saved is the error of believing in the objective reality of individual things." (Callaway, p.12-13) What men call evil is desire and ignorance is its cause as it is the origin of all particularity. But as Callaway points out, since busshin, the Buddha Mind or Universal Mind "is ultimately the only reality, it must be the source of Ignorance as it is of everything else." (p.23) A Japanese Buddhist scholar in a recent writing declared, "I do not think there is either evil or sin. This is the non-duality of good and evil (zen'aku funi)" i.e. good and evil are not two. (Living Buddhism in Japan, p. 36)

This relativism is the underlying stratum of Buddhist thought, and in Japan it has some interesting manifestations as it deals with such subjects as the soul and sin. Another of their scholars has written, "Buddhism does not have the idea of the soul as substance; but it can be said that as an expedient (hoben) the concept of soul has been generally accepted by Buddhism" in Japan. Another stated, "the so-called world after death, the Pure Land or hell, is an expedient-view (hoben-setsu). I think that as a matter of fact, however, the expedient-view has prevailed so largely that Buddhism cannot turn around." (p. 89) On the subject of-sin, another declared, "sin in Buddhism seems to me

to mean the absence of harmony ... attachment to something .. If so, even when one commits adultery, if he is not attached to it, it does not constitute a sin." (p. 87) Another expression of this basic, underlying relativism is the saying, uso mo hoben.

What then must we do as we face this Japanese paganism? I shall conclude by making the following suggestions. First, we should know pagan thought, the teachings of Buddhism and Shintoism, especially their underlying philosophies. It would be advantageous to be able also to quote some of their writers both to be able to expose and refute the fallacies and failings of their systems; and to be able to illustrate, when we can find them, that even their own teachers recognize the truth of a point we are making, or admit they have no solution to it. Such was the use Paul made of the Greek writers.

Never can we take the position that the kernels of true phraseology they have gleaned, from their observation of general revelation and God's common grace to the, represent evidence of "the latent Church" within them, as per Tillich. (The Theology, p. 284) Nor can we relate "the Christian God-story to the religious beliefs of the Gentile world" on the assumption that if they have tried to interpret the universe "as the embodiment of a single supreme formula, moral and spiritual as well as physical." . "whether they accept Christ or not, they are certainly living kata logon" (according to the logos and can be thought of as "Christian Buddhists", or "Christian Taoists", as per A.C. Bouquet. (The Theology, pp. 184, 194) An erroneous theology of missions can only produce an erroneous missionary objective and apologetic.

Second, we need more forthrightness in our refutation and rejection of pagan ideas. The early Christians in the second century, in an age of Church History we call that of the Apologists, practiced this direct attack on pagan thought and within a century saw their beliefs accepted by the empire. The First Apology of Justin Martyr and The Exhortation To the Heathen of Clement of Alexandria ought to be reread today and their forthrightness emulated, it seems to me. We can recall the words of Professor Yanaihara who, when asked why the Church here had proven so weak before the Shinto nationalists, replied, "One reason was the missionaries... (they were not) outspoken in criticizing life around them. The result was that they produced a church which never offended anything or anybody. It was too genteel, too gracious, too amiable, too susceptible to flattery. It had no backbone." (Baker, p. 167)

Or we can recall the words of a noble missionary of the past, Albertus Pieters who wrote a few years ago, "I think sometimes that I made a mistake, as a missionary, in not paying more attention to Buddhism, and never preaching about it. If it was a mistake, it is one shared by almost all missionaries and by Japanese preachers as well, for you very seldom heard a word from them about Buddhism, and never an address about it intended for Buddhist believers." (Two Empires, p. 63) Thomsen's concluding remarks in his paper on Soka Gakkai are also very interesting. He stated, "The virtual standstill of Christian missions in Japan during the last ten years has been explained in many ways. One pet theory has been that Christianity can never win over the Japanese as long as it is intolerant and exclusive. But is that the only explanation? It is quite interesting to note that the most successful religious movement in post-war Japan, Soka Gakkai, at the same time is the most intolerant and exclusive religion Japan has ever seen." (Japanese Religions, p. 30) We have an exclusive religion. We can speak with the authority of ambassadors of God's only special revelation. Why should we not do so, with courtesy and kindness, but forthrightly?

Paul did not mention the names of the pagan religions or philosophies in his public addresses, or if he did it is not recorded for us, but he did deliberately set the revealed truth of God over against specific errors of his hearers. Knowing that the Athenians believed they originated in a unique way he cut the ground from under them by declaring that all men had come from one and that all were the offspring of the same God. He rejects their polytheism by declaring that the God he preached was the only true God and the One who had appointed the Judge of all men who will not believe and repent for having failed to worship Him alone. We do not have to mention the names of Shintoism and Buddhism in our public introduction of the gospel to the pagan mind in Japan, but we must know what they believe and set the truths of God over against their erroneous ideologies. Paul gave us a good example at Athens.

Third, we need to speak out boldly from our Christian supernatural presuppositions concerning God, man and Christ's redemption declaring them to be obtained from God's only special revelation to men. We must proclaim the doctrine of Christ and His way of salvation forthrightly, refusing to hold back even what we know will be heard as scandalous to the pagan mind, the crucifixion of our Saviour and His bodily resurrection. There can be no justification, in the interests of making our gospel proclamation

winsome and attractive, of withholding or garnishing over its basic tenets.

Finally, I believe we need to repent of our imperfect loyalty to the Word of our Lord and to live out more faithfully our love to Him and to our pagan neighbor, Jesus Christ Himself, as the way, the truth and the life, is the only answer to the pagan man's spiritual need and the only corrective for the pagan man's erroneous thought. If we are to see the progress of Christianity in Japan take a turn for the better, if we are to witness the Christian gospel being heard with a new interest and speak to the Japanese mind with a new authority as it confronts paganism here, then the loyalty of our proclamation of the full Biblical revelation of our God must be matched with that love and concern for lost men illustrated and commanded by Him whom we call our Lord, and manifested in the missionary life of the preacher of Mars Hill who could write: "I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." (II Tim. 2:10)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Gerald H., The Theology of the Christian Mission, 1961
- Angus, S., The Environment of Early Christianity, 1929 Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vols I and II, Eerdmans, 1959
- Baker, Richard T., Darkness of the Sun, 1947
- Bavinck, J. H., An Introduction to the Science of Missions, 1960
- Bruce, F. F., The Apostolic Defense of the Gospel, 1959
- Callaway, T. N., Japanese Buddhism and Christianity, 1957
- Contemporary Religions in Japan, March 1960, Vol. 1, No.1 Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1891
- Durant, Will, The Life of Greece, 1939
- Free University Quarterly, Buddhist Propaganda in the Western World and the Christian Answer, A. Pos, Vol. III, No. 1, June 19717
- Japanese Religions, Vol. 1, No. 2, A Quarterly, 1959
- Living Buddhism in Japan, Bulletin, No. 6, part 2, May 1959
- Nederhood, J. H., The Church's Mission to the Educated American, 1960
- Ono, Sokyo, The Kami Way, 1959
- Richardson, Alan, Christian Apologetics, 1947
- Stonehouse, N.B., Paul Before the Areopagus, 1957
- Van Til, Cornelius, The Defense of the Faith, 1955
- Young, John M. L., The Two Empires in Japan, 1958

THE GOSPEL CONFRONTS HUMAN GOVERNMENT

by Paul C. Johnsen

Luther and Lutherans have often been criticized for their approach (or lack of approach) to the problems of government. Why a Lutheran was asked to deliver this paper I can not say, after feeling that a number had declined. But when I was told that my paper was to be largely concerned with the biblical material which furnishes us with the basic principles for a suitable apologetic for Christian witness in Japan, I realized that the committee felt sure that I was far enough removed from 1517 to keep Luther and Co. out of the picture.

I shall try to present the materials in three parts, namely: 1) general references in scripture to government, 2) specific cases where Paul had relations with officials of the state of his day, and 3) a look at the persecutions of the Christians to see what scripture has to tell us concerning them. Then, lastly, while not attempting to anticipate future debate of these materials, or of later papers to be presented at this conference, I shall try to bring all this a little bit more closely into focus with our present day situation.

It goes without saying that to deal with this problem fully would take much more time than that which is allotted to me. However, we shall try to get the general themes and general application that scripture makes to our approach, namely: the Christian approach to human government, and trust that a discussion can lead from this study.

I. General References

Perhaps the first reference that comes to mind when we think of this theme is that found in Mk. 12:14-17 (Mat. 22: 15-22) where the Pharisees and the Herodians approach Jesus and ask him the famous question, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?"

At the outset we must remember that the questioners were not primarily interested in questioning Jesus about His philosophy of taxation but their primary interest was only to trap Jesus. Therefore, it would be wrong to try to put too much meaning into these few words. Jesus was no revolutionist. He respected human government. To Him, tribute to

Caesar was not so much ... a matter of a coin or, two to be paid once a year. After all, the coin was Caesar's anyway. To Jesus the main problem was giving tribute to God, for that is the daily, continual challenge. To Jesus, God was the Creator of all. Even though Jesus could have greatly criticized the government of His day, especially when He himself was arraigned before it, remained silent. Even before Pilate, the point he most wanted to make clear; was that human power is always secondary to Divine power (Jn. 19:11..."Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above...").

Paul, of course, is more lucid in his approach to this subject. Let us turn to Romans 13 (1-7), where we read:

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. ...(v7) Render to all their due: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." (vs 1-7)

The Roman government was a very permanent feature of Paul's world. It had great bearings on the fortunes of the developing Christian movement. We cannot doubt but that Paul, the traveler, found himself often thanking God for the unification of the world which Rome had brought about, and for the comparative safety of the seas and roads which Rome had established against the pirates and robbers of the time. Paul had established his churches in Roman colonies, and they had grown up in this atmosphere of peace from the government. Paul saw that the towns which he passed through were prospering. The Roman magistrates often protected him. Thus up to the time Paul wrote the book of Romans, he often received protection against the Jewish opposition. The angry mobs that he was protected from were usually those made up of Jews. Yet we know that Paul always recognized Rome as a potential persecutor. We see this unmistakably in 8:35-38 (nothing can separate a Christian from the love of God, even persecution). I am sure that Paul believed God would eventually, or soon, change the government, but until He did it was the obligation of the Christian to obey the government. One must not take into his own hand the responsibility of changing the government. Here we must see the real connection between 12:19-21 (Vengeance is God's ...not man's) and this 13th chapter.

Paul here calls for RESPECT for higher powers. To Paul, "he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed and will incur judgment." (v2) Man must bear all responsibilities, even taxation (v 7), for taxes are a symbol of the respect needed toward government. Whatever a man truly owes to another, he must fully pay (v 8ff).

Let us turn to Titus 3 verse 1, where we read: "Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every good work, (v 2) to speak evil of no man, not to be contentious, to be gentle, showing all meekness toward all men."

The writer of Titus has established regulations for the organization of the church. He has defined the duties of its members, and now he advises how Christians should behave toward civil authority in a pagan society. "We are reminded that the church is not just a voluntary association of persons assembled for certain purposes designated "religious." It is a "people", a "special people" elected by God, joined to him and to one another through the redemptive work of Christ and the indwelling Holy Spirit, a remnant redeemed from the perishing world, hoping soon to be removed from it, therefore, superior to it and not dependent upon it. Established on such a high church-consciousness, Christians might easily conclude that their status as belonging to the people of God lifted them above the necessity of obeying civil rulers. Against such an attitude the New Testament letters generally protest. After all, the church was dependent for existence and prosperity on securing toleration from the empire. And in any case the very nature of the Christian faith is such as to oblige Christians to be ready for any honest work. (RSV says, "good work.")

The double nouns and verbs RULERS AND AUTHORITIES, TO BE SUBMISSIVE, TO BE OBEDIENT, stress the unqualified necessity for obedience. The problem: what shall the Christian do if the magistrate commands him to renounce his faith or otherwise commit sin, is as such, not considered in the passage but it seems that the word "good work" ("honest" work) (Goodspeed uses the word "useful") does seem to qualify the obedience. In any case, what the writer wishes to emphasize here is that beyond a passive, perhaps grudging, obedience, the Christian is to co-operate actively with the government in its public works for the common good.

Christians should be law-abiding. Christians are called upon to demonstrate a social conscience in respect to all laws that do not raise crucial issues for one's conscience.

In Philippians 2:14 and 15 we read, "Do all things without murmurings and questionings; that ye may become blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world..."

Here we see a favorite theme of Paul, that Christians are to be the best evidence of the truth of the Christian religion. Paul says that while living in a corrupt heathen society the Philippian Christians are to stand out as God's children,, showing by their lives to the people around them that they belong to God. The Christian is to shine as LIGHTS In THE WORLD. The Christian is to be a "light-giver" in the world. (v. 16 "HOLD FORTH THE WORD OF LIFE.")

The last general reference we will look at in this first grouping is that of I Peter 2:13-17, where we read:

- 13) Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether to the king, as supreme;
- 14) or unto governors, as sent by him for vengeance on evildoers and for praise to them that do well.
- 15) For so is the will of God, that by well-doing ye should put to silence the ignorance of foolish men;
- 16) as free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness, but as bond-servant of God.
- 17) Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king.

A Christian wherever he lives, is not a "man without a country". He must acknowledge and bear his responsibilities to governmental authority and its lesser authorities in the political realm. Whether that authority is a king, a congress representing the will of the people, or a tyrant such as Nero (who as we must recall, was the emperor at the time Peter wrote these words), the Christian is to honor this power as sent by God properly to order human society, to keep social life from chaos, to be a deterrent to evildoers, and to be a rewarder of those who do right. We know the state is not the church. Thus it is not to redeem men, but to be an agent through which God's witnesses may bear the redemptive Word - the Gospel to all men.

The problem of obedience to Christ and to Caesar has always been the Christians. We know that Augustus Caesar in a strict sense did not claim divine honors for himself while he lived. Yet the genius of the emperor could not be separated completely from the living emperor, and we know that he did accept sacrifices to himself in the provincial cults away from Rome. According to Augustus Caesar, an emperor was

deified when he died. Therefore, worship of the genius of the living emperor or of the dead emperors as divine became the test of patriotism throughout the empire. Such unbalanced emperors as Nero and Domitian demanded worship of themselves while they-lived.

Even though Peter demanded respect toward Nero, he failed to follow this principle to the end. He is St. Peter precisely because he defied Nero to death. Our submission to the state must always be FOR THE LORD'S SAKE, not because the state has an absolute value in itself. For when Caesar demands what is Christ's, even the pinch of incense offered to his image-- harmless as it may seem --borders on an act of worship in which the Christian cannot participate. Because of this, Christians were greatly persecuted. They were willing to be loyal subjects of the Roman Government, but they held that worship belonged only to God. The attitude that Peter tried to convey to the Roman authorities was that the Christian faith was not hostile to good citizenship ...on the contrary, the best citizens were the Christians, but worship was only to God.

In passing it might be well to mention that this teaching of the divine right of kings was not new with the Christians, but was taken from the Old Testament teachings. "Fear God, Honor the Emperor" is a motto taken from Proverbs 24:21 where we read, "My son, fear thou Jehovah and the king."

Also, I might mention here that as we look at the passage immediately following the words "Fear God Honor the King", we read Peter's exhortation for servants to be in subjection to their masters with all fear. It is too early for conclusions in this paper, but do we not see that the writers of the New Testament are not interested themselves in changing the present social patterns by revolution...but they ask for mutual respect, demanding that all parties receive only what honor is rightfully due to them.

II. Paul's Relations with Roman Officials

Let us now look at concrete cases where Paul had direct intercourse with the Roman government officials of his day. In Acts 13:7 and 12, we see the reference to the proconsul Sergius Paulus. This man's desire to hear the Gospel would certainly lead us to believe that Christianity was not a forbidden religion to the Romans.

In Acts 16:35ff we see Paul and Silas confronting the Philippian magistrates. Paul had exorcised the soothsaying maiden thereby causing no little fuss in the city. Because Paul was infringing upon their little fake game of moneymaking, the crowd had him and Silas jailed and beaten. Of course, it was the Roman magistrates that jailed them, but we notice in vs. 20 that they were condemned not as Christians but because they were Jews. We know that shortly before this time the Jews had been expelled from Rome by Claudius, so we can assume there was probably hostility to Jews in much of the Kingdom. But then we see that Paul proclaims his Roman citizenship in vs. 37. Scourging a Roman citizen was illegal according to Roman laws. Thus, Paul not only hid behind his citizenship, but he rather reveled in delight over the fact that the local magistrates were forced to recognize their mistake.

In Acts 18:12ff we again see where a Roman proconsul, this time Gallio of Achaia, refused to side with the Jews against Paul. Gallio's job was to judge criminal offenses, and therefore he was not interested in getting involved in religious squabbles. In other words, Paul had done nothing contrary to Roman law.

In Acts 19:31ff, we see Paul in Ephesus. Demetrius and the other silversmiths stir up a riot. Some of Paul's followers got involved in the mob confusion and in v. 31 we see that Paul was advised by certain of the Asiarchs in the city who were Paul's friends. If, as it is commonly thought, the Asiarchs were provincial officials who had charge of the festival in adoration of the emperor, or other gods, held in the religious city of Ephesus, we can see easily why it was that Luke chose this reference. For it was Luke's thesis throughout the book of Acts that Paul's misfortunes were always due to popular hostility, usually at the instigation of the Jewish people, and that Paul was friendly with the Roman government officials, therefore often protected by them.

Of course, the most revealing passage of how Paul used his Roman citizenship in his defense is that found in chapters 24 and 25 of Acts; namely: Paul before Felix, Festus, and King Agrippa. Felix the procurator of Judea was undoubtedly a very corrupt man, yet he was able to maintain some measure of order in the region for several years. Paul never doubted the authority of even the corrupt magistrates, even though he did not always agree with their procedure. The main four points of Paul's defense were:

- 1) his motive for going to Jerusalem was a religious one in harmony with, and not opposed to, the rites and interests of the Jewish people. In other words, he went to worship, even to bring alms and offerings for his nation. (v. 17)
- 2) He denied that he was guilty of making a disturbance. And
- 3) he challenged his opponents to prove their charge saying they cannot adduce any evidence, and also that the witnesses ought to have been present. Then finally,
- 4) he pleaded that his only offense was that he belonged to a law abiding sect called THE WAY, and that in particular he believed in the resurrection. We know that Agrippa believed that Paul was innocent, but because Paul had appealed to Rome, the case was only to be decided in Rome.

Just why Paul appealed to Rome is not clear. But certainly Paul would not have appealed if he had not thought it was for his own benefit and the benefit of the Gospel. Nor can we rule out the great desire he had that the Gospel also be preached in Rome and to all parts of the empire. Perhaps he felt safer in more "neutral" ground for the trial, because the Jewish persecutors were always agitating against him. Paul did not seek to "hide behind" his citizenship. He was a law-abiding man only asking for that which he by right deserved.

During the period covered by the book of Acts there was not much persecution by Gentiles. On the whole, the Rome authorities were not actively hostile during the greater part of Paul's lifetime. Indeed it is evident that the purpose of Paul's long trial in the record of the book of Acts is to establish the fact that the preaching of the Gospel was not forbidden by the laws of the Roman empire, but that Christianity was lawful religion.

But that a great change came about is most evident. The legal decisions which were favorable to the Christian faith were soon overturned on the occasion of the great fire in Rome, which occurred in July 64 AD. Public sentiment broke out so severely against the emperor (Nero) that to avoid the stigma, just or unjust, of being himself guilty of setting the city on fire, he made the Christians the scapegoats which he thought he needed.

So we come to Section III of this paper, namely: Persecutions by the Government.

I Peter 4:12 to 19 is one of the parts of the New Testament which seems to make direct reference to the Neronic persecutions where we read:

"Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you... if we are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye; because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you..."

But in time of persecution Peter writes that the Christian is to live an exemplary life. See I Peter 2:11-12 where we read, "Having your behavior seemly among the Gentiles; that wherein they speak against you as evildoers, they may by your good works which they behold, glorify God in the day of visitation."

In I Peter 3:14-16 we see that all accusations against the Christians may be false and that all the sufferings would probably be because of ones conviction of dedication to Christ. Of course there are many other quotations about persecutions in II Timothy and in John's Revelation.

Persecution was not accidental. It was the necessary consequence of the meeting of the principles embodied in the heathen Roman government and the essential principles of the Roman government, and the essential principles of the Christian faith. Of course the reason for the persecutions were also political, but primarily they were due to the precepts of the Christian faith itself. Christianity claims the exclusive allegiance of the heart and the life. The loyalties to Christ which the martyrs displayed was believed by the authorities in the state to be incompatible with the duties of a Roman citizen. Patriotism demanded that every citizen should unite in the worship of the emperor, but Christians refused to take part in this worship on any terms. So they continually lived under the shadow of a great hatred which always slumbered, and might break out any time... especially when such a degenerate tyrant as Nero became emperor. The essential absoluteness of the Christian faith was its strength, but this was also the cause of its being hated.

But one of the most powerful causes of the hatred entertained by the heathen against the Christians was that, though there were no citizens so loyal as the Christians, yet, in every case in which the laws and customs of the empire came into conflict with the will of God, their supreme rule was the loyalty to Christ. They must obey God rather than man.

When the state claims to be a kingdom of universal sway, not only over the bodies and the property of all its subjects, but over their consciences and their souls, the Christian cannot give 100% loyalty. When the Roman empire demanded absolute obedience to Caesar as the supreme Lord it was natural that antagonism between the government and Christianity arose with persecution as the inevitable result.

IV.

But what does all this say for us today, those of us who live in Japan? In this fast changing world where governments rise and fall almost as the tide of the sea, what must be the attitude of the Christian? When we too see corruption in government, plots to overthrow the government, designs by certain non-Christian religions to seek control of men's lives ... what position must we maintain?

That we can all learn much from scripture is indeed a great understatement. Certainly it is crystal clear that no Christian should ever seek to take government into his own hands. Government is from God because only when the prevailing laws of the land are respected can peace prevail and evangelism be carried on. Of course, the apostle Paul and the other writers of scripture lived in a day when the prevailing thought was that Christ was going to return to this world in a short time and take all of His redeemed into eternal salvation.

But can we not learn from this? As I prepared this paper the one predominate thought that came back to me over and over again was this; Paul looked only to the final goal of his own resurrection. "To live is Christ and to die is gain." This was the urgent message he had to bring to the whole world. "Prepare to meet Christ!" That every man, woman, and child might realize that they came from the hand of God, and that they must recognize this fact, filled Paul with the intense zeal he had. Every man, whether he was a priest, commoner, scholar, soldier, Roman magistrate, corrupt or not was his potential friend because he was God's creation. Thus anything that would cause revolution, anything that would disturb the peace is such a way that his evangelism would be hampered, must be avoided. The world is God's, all men are God's, and each and every Christian much pray that God in His own time will make the kind of government, the kind of society that would foster the spread of this Gospel entrusted to him.

Let us never forget, God is Lord of all history. Even where tyrannies rule in the world, the hand of God is still present. To deny this is to deny the work of God Himself. Peter, Paul and the other saints of the New Testament times saw that even tyrannical times could be times of testing for the Christian (I Peter 1). We must never be filled with despair over worldly systems and ideologies but seek to discern God's will for mankind, yes, even for the individual Christian in such society.

As any Christian must live an exemplary life, so every citizen must pay all taxes, follow all laws, and respect all people in authority until the day God takes him out of his society. This must be done not grudgingly, but in active cooperation with the government. Never must a man be ashamed of his earthly citizenship, but continually he must pray and work that all men in his society know Christ as supreme Lord.

The life of a Christian is always a life of tension. On the one hand "Fear God; on the other; honor the emperor." The line must always be drawn clearly as to what is the demand of the state and what is the ultimate demand of God. On the basis of scripture, can it not be said that a Christian is wrong when he seeks preferential treatment, on religious grounds, for taxation or interpretation of laws of the state. On the other hand, the state must also respect the principles of men's faith. Government must never become an end in itself. When a human government attempts to take upon itself that which belongs only to God, then the seeds of persecution begins to be sown for the Christian. Worship can be to no one else but to the one God, the Father of Jesus.

Warnings are in order for us who come from more advanced democratic countries. We must be careful that we do not become over-critical of the position of Christians in pagan, and even atheistic societies. The task of the Christian is not primarily to build or tear down systems but to evangelize within these systems. We must be careful that we do not fall into the sub-Christian thinking of far too many westerners when we let ideologies and systems of government color our thoughts concerning the people living under those governments. Man's individual worth is not altered by any political or sociological system or ideology. Christ died for all men and it is Christ's will that all men come into the saving knowledge of Christ.

Also we must be warned that even when governments become so-called "Christian", the task of the individual Christian does not stop in his vigilance to guard against another nor that of seeking preferred positions for the Christian faith by the government.

The words of scripture are clear. The task of the Church and the Christian in the Church is one - to preach, teach and baptize to all the world - and the Lord of the Church will go with us.

THE GOSPEL CONFRONTS PSUEDO CHRISTIANITY

The Beginning of Apologetics

by Evyn M. Adams

By virtue of the success of the early Christian movement, Christians found that many subtle borrowings and amalgamations from their own faith and beliefs soon occurred which gave rise to a type of psuedo-Christianity. Two influences were largely responsible for this attempt at imitation and accomodation, the mystery religions from the east (old pagan religions with new trappings, their cultic rites slightly censored) and the influence of Greek philosophy. These influences combined to produce a broad spectrum of religions and cults some of which frankly imitated Christianity and others which claimed that they were the latest embodiment of truth. The all pervasive influence can be generally attributed to one or another phase of Gnosticism, in which both of the above mentioned influences were at work upon the Christian faith. Hence the Church was compelled to defend the "pure faith", and in its outreach to define its thought and faith in terms that could be understood from the outside in order to win converts from the world which was filled with the Gnostic influence. Gnosticism claimed an esoteric knowledge of salvation. Greek philosophy sought for speculative proofs which would stand before the bar of philosophic reason in order to support an adventure in faith. Hence the wisest of the Church fathers were compelled to spell out the relationship of faith and reason. Is faith completely "reasonable"? How far can reason be used to support the Christian faith? Or Is faith to be achieved or received irregardless of its "reasonableness"? How is it possible to speak to a philosopher or to a gnostic and bring them to a concern to inquire after the "true faith"?

There was not only the problem of refutation of error but also that of winning of converts. Hence here at an early age, even within the days of St. Paul himself, the church had to begin the rudiments of a philosophy of the Christian faith that it might commend itself to the men of its day and that it might understand its own faith in the light of its true approach to the problem of the use of reason. Hence out of this age the church by virtue of its engagement with. the Gnostic religions and deviations of the Christian faith came on the one hand the formation of the "canon", the New Testament as we now know it, which is the measure by which all philosophy is to be judged, and on the other hand, a definition of doctrines in the form of the creeds approved at the

various councils of the Church. Along with this however, there was the constant struggle of the missionary activity of the church to win converts within this environment. It is largely from this point of view that this paper is presented, leaving the problems of the "canon" and the "creeds" to concern itself with the more basic problem of the proper Christian use of reason in commending the Christian faith to non-Christians, which is the problem of "apologetics" in a nutshell.

Richardson in his Christian Apologetics (p. 21) points out the distinctions between general religious apologetics and Christian apologetics. General religious apologetics is another term for philosophy of religion which deals with the theistic world view, the problem of evil from the standpoint of reason without revelation. But Christian apologetics is concerned with the implications of the Christian revelation for the rational understanding of the world. It seeks to show, says Richardson, that revelation as Christians understand it, is not merely compatible with human reason, but is actually a help and guide to the human reason in its attempt to understand. In other words, without the category of revelation, reason by itself flounders, but reason itself by itself alone cannot comprehend revelation. Hence apologetics must also deal with the problem of revelation. Here there are several divergences. The preacher or missionary who would assume that all that must be done here is to present the "canon", the Holy Scriptures and let that affect the mind and reason of the reader is assuming unconsciously that the "reason" of the non-Christian reader can comprehend revelation truth by use of his own unaided reason. Again at this point further divergences must be included in any theory of apologetics, on the one hand the nature and work of the Holy Spirit in confirming "revelation truth" to the outsider, and on the other the fundamental nature of reason itself within the mind of a person who has not yet found Christian faith. Kierkegaard goes so far here to say that Christian truth cannot be "learned", but that the self must be reborn and come into continuing relationship in faith with God through Christ before he can even hope to comprehend the truth - that the truth must first be a living experience before it can be understood. (Philosophical Fragments).

The Church began to meet these problems even in the day of St. Paul, but around the second century because of the rise and strength of the pseudo religions, and especially Gnosticism, the Christian community had to come to a conscious and careful use of reason, "converted" reason in defining its own faith, and an estimate of "unconverted"

reason in commending its faith to others. For Gnosis is knowledge based on revelation, but is not intellectual knowledge itself. It is a saving knowledge, enabling the soul to escape from the flux and change of life and to find immortality. There were many variations of this interpretation of life of immortality that crept into the Christian community itself. One was the Ebionite interpretation, a Jewish Christian Gnosticism. The spectrum includes not only a Jewish Christian Gnosticism, but also such teachers as Basilides and Valentius in which the Christian factor was basic as well as Marcion in which there was a deliberate attempt to "modernize" the faith and bring it into harmony with the syncretism of the day. Marcion contrasted the good God revealed in Jesus Christ with the Old Testament God of retaliation and vengeance whom he views as responsible for the evil in creation. He brought out his own "canon". One result was that this forced the Church to define the "canon" of Holy Scripture. However, we must remember that Marcion did this out of a missionary motive. He was a practical genius and a very successful missionary establishing hundreds of congregations and over 200 years later a very substantial church remained. But nevertheless the church did not go the way of Marcion, though his approach to apologetics remains with us to this day.

Gnosis generally has the following features. It does not profess to be speculation or religious philosophy, but it is divine revelation. The "spirit" lives in it and brings divine revelations. It seeks to be the world religion in attempting to combine all truth and all religious revelation of the race. It seeks to save the soul by imparting the truth and so teaches the formulas of enchantment by means of which they may achieve the truth. As we delve more deeply into the system we find the extent of the problem. To outline generally the thought which was at the heart of this pseudo Christianity we subsume the following ten points.

1. The world of spirit and matter stand dualistically opposed to each other as good and bad and as above and below.
2. The world spirit because it was agitated by internal tensions and emotions gave birth to the world by emanations and evolution.
3. The Creator of this world was not the supreme God, but a subordinate being, the Demiurge.

4. In matter itself is a remnant of the spirit and the deliverance of this spirit from matter is, the basis for the whole salvation process.
5. The spirit is imprisoned in the body. Sensuousness is the real evil in man.
6. Redemption begins in the world of the spirit. The redeemer is Christ. Here there is much disagreement among the various members of the Gnostic spectrum. Generally, Christ is regarded as a celestial aeon which inhabits a body, practices self-restraint and comes to be of the same nature as the other body. There is a gap between the celestial Christ and the earthly Jesus which is bridged by the theory of eons.
7. Christ brings knowledge to the world and so the spiritual elements are strengthened to release themselves from matter. Self consciousness of the spirit (human spirit) begins and so now recognizes the means of grace and sacred redemption in the formulas.
8. Redemption is that of the spirit. Neither the body nor the soul is really redeemed.
9. Moral philosophy was dominated by a false estimate of sensuousness. Either there was a strict abstinence or a very lax carnality confident that nothing could harm the ones who were favored for redemption.
10. There was no recognition of the resurrection of the dead nor of any early Christian eschatology as a whole.

The expansion of Christianity in the first two centuries after Christ was rapid and far flung. It penetrated Mesopotamia and reached as far west as Spain. Christians were found in Gaul on the Rhine in the north and all across northern Africa. From north to south and east to west, the Church faced the all pervasive Graeco-Roman consciousness. The sharp Christian distinctions between the gods of the current order and the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and their further sharp distinction between themselves and the Jewish community brought them into conflict on all fronts. No wonder they were called the third race. The Roman governmental community looked on the Christians as an

unexplainable cultural manifestation that would not settle down in peace either with its normal neighbors or even with their own early relations, the Jews. "here were continuing persecutions, sporadic and local until the time of Decius in the middle of the third century. Yet by their attacks on the Roman Gods and their refusal to sacrifice to the imperial cultus the Christians were always liable to not only popular vengeance and to criminal persecution by the State, but also to continual difficulty in presenting their own faith to the people as a whole. Later, at the beginning of the fourth century Constantine used the great growth of the Church to bring about a revised Imperial Cultus and now here again new tensions were raised within the Church.

So the matter of apologetics in this early age was far from an academic exercise. It was of the life blood of the church. So it is with sympathetic understanding that in the safety of this 20th century we can read the words of Justin, the Martyr who gave his life for the Faith as he tried to commend the Christian way to the thinkers and leaders of his day.

"To the Emperor Titus Hadrianus Antonius Pius August caesar and to Verissimuss his son, the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, son of Caesar by nature and of Augustus by adoption, a lover of culture, and to the Sacred Senate and the whole Roman People - on behalf of men of every nation who are unjustly hated and reviled, I Justin, son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, of Flavia Neapolis in Syria Palestine, being myself one of them, have drawn up this plea and petition.

Reason requires that those who are truly pious and philosophers should honor and cherish the truth alone, scorning merely to follow the opinions of the ancients, if they are worthless. For does sound reason only require that one should not follow those who do or teach what is unjust; the lover of truth ought to choose in every way, even at the cost of his own life, to speak and do what is right, though death should take him away. So do you, since you are called pious and philosophers and guardians of justice and lovers of culture, at least give us a hearing ...and it will appear if you are really such. For in these pages we do not come before you with flattery, or as if making a speech to win your favor, but asking you to give judgment according to strict and exact inquiry ...not, moved by prejudice or respect for superstitious men, or by irrational impulse and long established evil rumor giving a vote which would really be against yourselves..." (p.242, 243, Library of Christian Classics, Vol I)

Justin begins a long line of apologists up to the present hour. He laid stress upon the transforming power of Christianity and insisted that it was not contrary to reason. The opponents of Christianity basically said two things, that Christianity was irreligious and unethical and that revelation was impossible. Added to this, those who were in the know, the Gnostics, claimed a higher form of knowledge or revelation.

II

The presentation of the Gospel in all its fullness becomes the only and the best defence and the best form of commendation to those who stand without the faith. Paul laid the foundations for the answer in Galatians, Ephesians and Colossians as also did John and Jude. The Church confirmed this answer by the choice of the "canon".

Toward the legalists, the Jewish type of Gnostics, Paul stated that the gospel he preached stemmed from a direct commission from Christ. Further, if acceptance with God was possible under the Jewish law, then what was the point of Christ's death? Third, as the Galatian Christians knew very well, the Spirit of God makes a gift of the Christian life. How could it possibly be a matter of errors? Circumcision of the heart was the true seal of the covenant of God in the gift of the new life of the Spirit, and fleshly circumcision no longer has any meaning. The righteousness of law keeping is all outward, and the new life is inward in which there was joy and freedom in the living of the "new law" of the justified life. Gal. 5:6, 6:2.

In order to clarify the matter of creation properly, to insist that the world was created by God and not by some demi-urge, Paul in Colossians clearly sets forth the Christian belief. He confronts the false "knowledge" or gnosis with the true gnosis, and shows that the revelation of God is the true "mystery". Thus the cosmic significance of Christ is depicted in all its meaning over against the world of lesser deities of the gnostic systems. Christ is Lord of all, all the forces in the universe are subject to Him. To gain the mastery over the dominion of evil and of these cosmic powers it is necessary to be united with Christ and in Him experience victory.

To those who would pervert the grace of God into licentiousness, Jude has an answer. Jude first reminds his readers of the false teachers in the Old Testament. To make the

apostolic faith the foundation of the Christian life, to excel in prayer and to abide in the fellowship of the saints meant the salvation from the sensuousness of the gnostic fellowship.

John insists that Christ did come in the flesh as an answer to the Gnostic heresy of docetism in which the problem of flesh and spirit was solved by ascribing to Christ a body which was not one of true flesh, but only a "seeming" body. The historical facts about Christ are true.

To this basic "canonical" answer, the apologists of the second century from Justin on attempted to fill out the gaps and to speak in terms of the day the truths of the faith. Some went too far and became lost in their own philosophy. Others stayed too close to the citadel to be able to make contact. At the beginning of the third century three distinct questions began to emerge. They were; a) the distinction of revelation and reason, b) the distinction of faith and science, and c) the distinction of nature and the supernatural.

By and large the apologists insisted upon revelation and reason as supplementary. Revelation was to infallible authority for the human mind. Among the philosophers, revelation itself was questioned, but with the Gnostics the problem was not revelation itself, but which revelation, and the relation of revelation with reason.

To the pagan, faith was merely a willingness to be convinced. To the church it was and is the immovable belief in the reality and importance of the future, the invisible and supernatural. Clement of Alexandria felt that faith is more elementary than scientific knowledge. Believing comes first he said.

Depending upon ones viewpoint the supernatural is either above natural principles, or in the case of a philosopher, nature is enlarged to included what is called by the common man as supernature. The Christians insisted there were two realms the eternal and invisible which was primary and the visible and natural which would pass away. But the same God is author of both.

The problems were taken up by Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian summarized by Augustine and became part of the ongoing thought and discussion of the church through the ages. In the Reformation the problems were restated, but ever and again, the basic problem emerged as the relationship of faith to knowledge, or faith and reason. Anyone who

would be a missionary or a preacher today should know his own standpoint before he begins the life time task: of presenting the knowledge of saving truth to those who stand without it. Here let us summarize the main patterns that have emerged through the recent centuries.

Out of the confrontation of the church with psuedoChristianity the apologetic minds of the church were forced to come to some statement of the relation of faith and reason. This problem began because of the influence of Greek philosophy. Plato divides knowledge into three categories. That which we know by the senses is material knowledge, or perceptual-conceptual knowledge. Plato calls this "doxa", or opinion. If we read Plato's Republic we get ideas and judgments. This is ideational knowledge. Plato called this form of knowledge episteme (from which we get the word "epistemology", to know). But there is a further realm of knowledge. This is what might be called "insight" today. For instance, by reading and studying Plato for a number of years, we become at home with him, catch every nuance of his thought, and more deeply begin to feel his personality and spirit. We "know" Plato. This is personal knowledge. It cannot be directly communicated. Plato calls this kind of knowledge, "ginosuko".

In relation to God there are seven patterns (at least) of this kind of personal knowledge. They are as follows.

1. (intelligo) I know. This is the naive realist. He is happy and never realizes that he has not asked the question "How do I know?".
2. (dubito ut intelligam) I doubt that I may know. This is the pattern-of Descartes and all modern idealistic philosophy. The only basic thing of which I am sure is that I think. Doubting everything else I come back to this basic beginning. So thinking comes before acting, or living.
3. (intelligo ut credam) I know that I may believe. This is the position of Abelard. Faith is not denied, but is constantly judged by reason. Hence faith is subordinated to the test of reason. Here there is a rationalism in even all creedal statements. This is the beginning of the Thomism of the middle ages. Faith to be alive must have an ideational trellis upon which to climb. This is usually justified at bottom as an apologetic method.

4. (credo) I believe. This is the religious spirit. It may easily lead to the naive man of religion. It may be extended to a blind surrender to the absurd, e.g. the doctrine of transubstantiation.

5. (credo ut intelligam) I believe in order to know. This is the pattern of Anselm. Here reason is subordinated to faith. Faith becomes a means to an end rather than an end. This is the area of theoretic reason. It consents to truths about God rather than being a faith in God. Anselm himself, of course, saw the necessity of something more than pure reason or rationality.

6. (credo quia absurdum est) I believe because it is absurd. This is Tertullian at his flaming best before his opponents in the Roman empire. It is certain even though from the standpoint of natural reason it is impossible. Tertullian is saying that the facts of Jesus death and resurrection are irrational in the light of pure reason. So he is saying that faith goes beyond reason.

7. (I believe, help thou my unbelief) Mark 9:14-29. This is the pattern of personal encounter. Negatively this man is not believing like Tertullian or Anselm. Positively he is believing against unbelief. He acknowledges that the unbelief is his own. He is living at the end of tension from what little faith he has and is grasping desperately for more faith. It is so stupendous that his reason can ever hope comprehend, and he further realizes that he must make a personal response in order that he can enter the realm of truth.

What then is the place and use of reason in the apologetic task? Here, if a man believes that truth can be stated and communicated in propositional form, then systematic theology or doctrinal truth become the backbone of defense. Hence reference is constantly made to favorites who present truth in this manner, such as Calvin, Barth, or the reformers. If however, reason needs to be converted, and basic truth is truth "of the spirit", then perhaps Pascal or Soren Kierkegaard can guide us.

Pascal posits three orders of reality, the order of body, or material world, the order of mind, or the thinking self, and order of charity, or the spiritual world. Reason, he assigns to the second. The organ of knowledge for the third order is "the heart". Hence all philosophy is relegated to the secondary realm and truths of God, of faith, of revelation

are apprehended in the third realm, after the person himself has entered upon this realm. The "new birth" is the entrance upon the realm of God's "truth". Philosophy itself is not down graded, but placed in a proper relationship with the realm of personal spiritual truth. Hence Pascal can say,

"There are three sources of belief, reason, custom, inspiration. The Christian religion, which alone has reason, does not acknowledge as her true children those who believe without inspiration. It is not that she excludes reason and custom. On the contrary, the mind must be opened to proofs, must be confirmed by custom, and offer itself in humbleness to inspirations, which alone can produce a true and saving effect." (Pensees, No. 245)

"If we submit everything to reason, our religion will have no mysterious and supernatural element. If we offend the principles of reason, our religion will be absurd and ridiculous." (Pensees, No. 273)

Hence the "heart has reasons that reason knows not of".

Soren Kierkegaard has seen deeper in the problems of our time than even most of those who write in the name of Kierkegaard. He was deeply concerned about the problem of reason as it became an obstacle to the reception of faith. Hence all of his works deal with one phase or another of this basic problem of "becoming a Christian". He writes as follows.

"The immediate believer (the naive man of religion in our list above) cannot apprehend the thought that the content of faith is, for the reason and for the third person who is not a believer, the absurd, and that to become a believer everyone must be alone with the absurd.

The immediate believer, in so far as he is immediate, is not composite, can have no reduplication in himself, cannot find room for it. With the best of intentions, when talking to another, he enthusiastically construes the absurd in terms of the most superlative of superlatives ...and hopes that in this way he may succeed in convincing the other directly.

Here there is a lack of the elasticity which is dialectical. To understand that to the reason it is absurd, and to speak of it thus quite calmly to a third person, admitting that it is the

absurd, enduring the burden of the other man looking upon it as the absurd -- and nevertheless to believe it. While naturally it is a matter of course that for him who believes it is not the absurd. But those who are immediate cannot withdraw from direct continuity with others, cannot understand that what for him is the most certain thing of all, an eternal happiness, is and must be absurd to others. Hence the baneful confusion in talking about faith. "The believer is not dialectically consolidated as "the individual" cannot endure this double vision-that the content of faith as seen from the other side is the negative, the absurd. This is the tension of the life of faith, in which one must try to remain. But everywhere there is a tendency to interpret faith as direct apprehension. One such attempt is science, which proposes to understand faith. (The journals, No. 1084)

Perhaps the reason that both Pascal and Soren Kierkegaard could see this so plainly is that both men spent several hours daily with the Bible and reflect the freshness of the insight that comes from immersion in the measure, the "canon" of the Faith.

III

Beyond the province of this paper is the significance of this study for the work of apologetics in Japan. In the light of the forgoing it is probably in line to indicate that the relationship of Japanese philosophical thought, the place of reason in the Japanese pattern of "knowing" needs to be more thoroughly studied. Perhaps, it may be that the whole missionary movement in Japan has built on a wrong foundation of "knowledge", a knowledge that is good as far as it goes, but a knowledge that does not touch the "heart" of the Japanese. Certainly, the Christian faith to the average Japanese person is conceived of either as "teaching" (a kyo) which he can learn in the same way he can learn any other kind of philosophic system,, or else is thoroughly understood as the absurd, the "foreign" and is abhorred. Perhaps the second group offer more opportunities for the winning of converts than the first. It may very well be that those who instinctively recognize the Christian faith as "absurd" and foreign show a deeper work of preparation by the Holy Spirit than those who are deluded as to the approach to the faith by "study".

One further comparison invites comment. The faith of the Jews first met the oriental religions and pagan mysteries in the Holy Land. The Old Testament is a chronicle of the continuing encounter of Israel with "the nations". In the second century the Church met these same religions in the guise of gnosticism. How does gnosticism compare with the "natural" religions in the soil of Japan? The basic similarities are surprising. Pantheism and the basic natural world view spring out of the sane human soil. Hence the "apologetic task" of the Christian Church in Japan has many similarities with the task that faced the church in its initial two centuries. However, today the decadence of the West (the supposed Christian West) has brought about added permutations to add to the problem. If the principle of Pascal is correct, that the heart (of the God-fearing man) has reasons that the reason (of natural man) knows- not of, then the viewpoint of the man without faith is bound to be opposed to the viewpoint of the man with faith. Hence while apologetics must use reason and logic, they spring from another plane. Reason must be placed in the service of the Spirit.

"Spirituality is: the power of a man's understanding over his life. The man who, with a perhaps false idea of God, nevertheless follows out the self-denial which that false idea demands of him, is more spiritual than_ the man who in learning and philosophy, has a correct knowledge of God but upon whose life it has no power whatsoever."
(Kierkegaard, The Journals, No. 1177)

"Here is another result of the fundamental mistake: that Christianity is not proclaimed by witnesses, but by teachers. What is a witness? A witness is a man who immediately supplies proof of the truth of the doctrine he is proclaiming, immediately, well, partly by there being truth in him and blessedness, partly by at once offering himself and saving, see now whether you can compel me to deny this doctrine. As a result of that fight, where the witness perhaps succumbs physically, dies, the doctrine triumphs. The opponents have no such doctrine for which they are prepared to die. This is a continued proof of the truth of the doctrine..." (Kierkegaard, The Journals, No. 1091)

Perhaps in our apologetic in Japan we have too many teachers and too few "witnesses".

EARLY CHURCH APOLOGETIC LITERATURE

Apology of Aristides
 Apology of Justin Martyr and Dialogue with Trypho
 Athenagoras: Petition for the Christians
 Celcus: The True Word
 Clement: Word of Admonition to the Greeks
 Ehiphianius: Haereses
 Eusebius: Histories, Vol. III, 27
 Irenaeus: Against the Heretics
 Origen: Contra Celsun, Stromateis, especially, Book 7
 Tatian: Address to the Greeks
 Tertullian
 Theophilus of Antioch: To Atolykos

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANF.
 F. F. Bruce, Defence of the Gospel in the New Testament
 Cochrane; Christianity and Classical Culture
 Filson, New Testament Against its Environment
 Harnack Expansion of Christianity
 Jonas, the Gnostic Religion
 Soren Kierkegaard, The Journals
 Kraemer Religion and the Christian Faith
 Latourette, The First Five Centuries
 Library of Christian Classics Vol I II
 Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church
 Moffat, The First Five Centuries
 Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture
 Pascal, Pensees
 Richardson, Christian Apologetics
 Seeburg, History of Doctrines

THE GOSPEL CONFRONTS THE ENIGMATIC JAPANESE

Ian MacLeod

It would not be an exaggeration to say, I think, that in all the world there is no nation that presents the foreigner with so wide a variety, not only of different but of contrary impressions as the Japanese. Moreover the impressions gained are not merely mild but are extremely strong ones. If there is one impression that is uniform, it is the non-uniformity of the Japanese character and reaction. If there is anything about which people are agreed, whether they be people who know the Japanese only from a distance or those who have spent years living in Japan, it is that the Japanese are a bit difficult to understand.

It is not merely that there are various kinds of Japanese, as there are various kinds of Englishmen or Americans or Germans. From the standpoint of a foreigner, there seem to be various Japanese residing in the same person. Not only is it true that in Japan one meets extremes of both courtesy and impudence, kindness and callousness, in an extraordinary way one finds that the same individual may express himself in one or the other extreme. It is not that there are in Japan, as in other countries, some very kind and courteous persons and other callous and rude people, but one gains the impression rather frequently that the same person is one thing in one set of circumstances and another in different circumstances. While this may be true to some extent of other peoples, it seems to be more emphatically true of the Japanese, so much so that of all the world's inhabitants they constitute an enigma to members of other nations. I often have the feeling that, compared to the average Japanese, I am a rather simple hearted, simple minded fellow, with only a fraction of the pulls that seem so often to be dragging him in contrary directions.

Now this enigmatic character of the Japanese is not merely a rather quaint and curious trait, fascinating for an anthropologist to study: it constitutes both a problem for the Japanese himself in search of his true self and a real obstacle to the efforts of the Christian Church to present the Gospel effectively. For it seems to me that one of the prerequisites for presenting the Gospel effectively is an understanding of where the person is to whom the witness is being made. Our Lord spoke effectively to people partly because "He knew what was in man." And he knew, not only in a general way that all men were sinners who needed redeeming, but also the specific, individual needs of those whom he confronted with his message. I wonder if our preaching would not be

more effective if we spoke to the specific needs and situation of the Japanese rather than presenting something that is true for all men in a general way, as perhaps we are inclined to do most of the time. It is when a person's specific sin, his sore spot as it were, is touched that he responds to the claims and offer of Christ. Until that is touched, the message rolls off his back. Is it because we have understood the Japanese insufficiently that our message has not been more effective?

I am being audacious enough to suggest in this paper a certain framework of truth against which to view the Japanese people, and offer an interpretation which may help to throw some light on the enigma of the Japanese character, not being fully convinced that the following argument is valid, but offering it for consideration and discussion in an effort to evaluate its validity. This effort will seem like that of Don Quixote battling his famous windmill to those who feel that we tend to over-exaggerate the differences between the Japanese and ourselves. But for those who find themselves from time to time hard put to understand the actions of his Japanese brethren, the following ideas are suggested by way of partial explanation.

First, by way of arguing that we are not setting up a purely straw man, let us look rather curiously but a little more specifically at some of the Japanese traits which impress westerners as being typically Japanese. There is his world-renowned courtesy extended to both friend and stranger when confronted in the second person contrasting with a frequently met lack of manners towards those in third personal relationship. Honesty is a moral value that is highly extolled and impressively expressed, yet the Japanese are reluctant to trust one another. Few if any people have shown such a universal capacity for fanatical devotion and self sacrifice in the cause of country or family, yet the Christian Church is characterized more by lukewarmness than fanatical devotion. Unbending conservatism and pliant adaptability are both Japanese traits. Meticulous scrupulosity about certain rules and customs contrasts with a tendency to easy-going slipshod short cuts in other areas. One is impressed by the extreme sensitivity to the feelings of others in the matter of losing face and causing to lose face, and at the same time a readiness to impose on the good nature of others. Humble self-effacement and driving, self-advancing ambition are both highly characteristic. There is a readiness to overlook and forgive and at the same time a capacity for deep undying resentment. An easygoing tolerance of the conduct of others is combined with a highly developed capacity for criticism. The very vocabulary of psychology is rich in terms that show

deep insight into human nature, yet even scholars express views often that indicate a real lack of perception, or express ideas that seem commonplace as if they are giving utterance to profound insights. Evidences abound of frugality and wasteful prodigality. The Japanese, in certain delicate personal relationships, find the westerner blunt and lacking in a sense of human feeling (ninjo), and in other relationships the westerner feels that it is the Japanese who disregards the feelings of others. A highly developed aesthetic sense and a depreciation of material or physical comfort is combined with a keen calculation of personal advantage, as witness the popularity of the so-called "goriyaku" religions, which appeal largely to self-interest.

It is not that these various qualities do not appear in other people than the Japanese. They are of course common traits found in men everywhere. It is that they are traits so outstandingly true of the Japanese that each one is quoted as a generalization, and every generalization has its correlative opposite. Perhaps there are no other people of whom it is so easy to make generalizations and no other people of whom such contradictory generalizations can be made. Is it not this which constitutes the enigma of the Japanese character?

Is there any way of explaining this strange dichotomy? I suggest that the Japanese people live, like all people, in two dimensions, but that they have never discovered a philosophical or theological meeting point or intersection for these two, and thus live with a hiatus that separates the life of any given person into two discreet segments which never really blend into a single whole.

Man lives not only physically but spiritually in a world of vertical and horizontal dimensions. From one aspect we might consider the vertical dimension as that which connects men with God, whether it be the one true God or a god that men have conjured up by their imagination and worshipped. In any case, man is connected vertically in terms of obedience to and dependence on a being or power or principle which he regards as greater than himself and as standing over him with authority and power.

As a member of human society man recognizes also his horizontal connection with his fellow man, with mutually binding claims and obligations and sentiments.

Within each of these relationships, again, there obtain both vertical and horizontal dimensions. In man's relationship to the Deity, there is not only the vertical dimension of Ruler and subject, authority and obedience, there is the horizontal dimension of fellowship in love, in which God addresses man as "Thou", and treats him, not as a mere object, but as a subject possessing value and honour. In the purely human sphere, there are also the two basic dimensions, the vertical one of justice, enforced by law, and the horizontal one of love. The vertical may be regarded as an essentially divisive principle, as a negative law of prohibitions preventing men from transgressing against one another, as embodied in the Ten Commandments, or the Miaspah Warning. The latter was not a benediction, as it is generally misused nowadays at midweek meetings. It was a warning spoken between Laban and Jacob: "The Lord watch between me and thee while we are absent one from the other - to see that thou dost not steal my cattle while I am not looking and I do not do likewise to thee." The principle of justice, as it operates in the world, is not a positive drawing of persons together, but a prohibition that stands between people warning them not to harm one another. This much men have a right to demand of one another. But the principle of justice and its concrete embodiment in the law does not contain in it any conduciveness to cohesion or mutual affirmation.

The cohesive principle, which is love, transcends the demands of forensic justice, and binds men together as brothers because they are mutually children of God. This horizontal principle is recognized in all great ethical systems, even without a clear, supra-human, vertical point of reference. The sanctions invoked vary, but the principle is recognized in some form or other.

Prof. Herbert H. Farmer, in his little book The Servant Of The Word, gives a very interesting classification of world religions. He points out that all the great religions rest on an apprehension of Truth as Absolute Demand and Final Succour. World denying religions stress the first as over against the second aspect, and are represented by types of a-cosmic pantheism, which are essentially pessimistic and ascetic. World affirming religions stress the second as over against the first aspect, and are represented by forms of cosmic pantheism, which are optimistic and eudaemonistic. Legalistic religions such as Judaism and Islam hold the two aspects in an uneasy balance, wherein the demand is responded to by obedience in this life, and the succour is received in terms of extrinsic rewards in the next. Christianity alone, says Farmer, makes a true unification of the two, in which obedience to the demand is also the reward, since it is given in joyous love.

This is made possible, of course, by Christ. I suggest that the Absolute Demand to which Farmer refers as one of the two basic aspects of man's apprehension of Truth is the vertical dimension of life, and the Final Succor is the horizontal, whether it is God's mercy and grace bestowed on man or man's love and mercy, reaching out to embrace and succour his fellow man.

Viewing the Japanese with this framework of truth as a background, can we discern sanctions operating vertically and horizontally which will help to explain their ways of acting, and specifically give a better understanding of the seeming contradictions that make the Japanese enigmatic to their western brethren? I believe that we can.

The argument of this paper is that not only can the vertical and horizontal dimensions in Japanese society be distinguished, but their respective sanctions can also be recognized, and in fact that the two are held in isolation from each other unbridged by any uniting factor or principle. The result is a dichotomy which separates life into two separate compartments between which the Japanese move, acting now in accordance with one set of sanctions and now in accordance with another, but never in a way that unifies or harmonizes both. Thus, for example, a Japanese can be fanatical, or even ruthless, in one set of circumstances and tender and sentimental in another, and his problem is not so much how to harmonize both sanctions or modes of expression in any given case but to decide which sanction pertains and which mode of conduct is appropriate.

What then are the vertical sanctions recognized in Japanese society, and what is the pattern of conduct that is based on them? I think that there are two basic vertical sanctions, (1) the ethical system embodied in the Jukyo which is the Japanese expression of Confucianism, and (2) the doctrine of Karma.

Japanese society is bound together traditionally by a network of duties and obligations, with the feudal lord at the apex in feudal times, and the divine emperor emerging as the apex with the Meiji Restoration. Aside from who stood at the top of the ladder, basic ethical decisions were made on the basis of vertical relationships between ruler and subject, father and other family members. The whole system was authoritarian, built on a vertical scale of rank, and absolute obedience was incumbent on each level in relation to that above. Human feelings were incidental. The determinative factor was the

particular rule that governed each given relationship. Every Japanese existed as a member of a vertical hierarchy, and no human sentiment must be allowed to prevent him from carrying out his prescribed obligation to obey the one above him, whatever he required. Rights pertained to the ruler, and duty to the ruled, each sanction operating almost exclusively in one direction. Ethics were a matter of carrying out certain formal, official rules and thoughts and motives, being purely private and subjective, were outside the scope of moral duty.

Thus, for example, in war time, acting in accordance with this principle of the absoluteness of the vertical sanction, officers and soldiers disclaimed any moral responsibility for acts of atrocity on the basis that they were performed in obedience to absolute commands (*settaiteki meirei*). Official duty to obey the command of a superior took precedence over all human considerations and fellow feelings.

Another vertical sanction is the doctrine of Karma, according to which all that happens is a result of previous acts and happenings, and no deed is without its commensurate reward or punishment, in accordance with a universal, impersonal law of justice. Thus any misfortune or suffering is regarded as the proper punishment for former sins, committed either in this life or in a previous incarnation, and should not be interfered with in an effort to alleviate it. The general tendency in the Far East to manifest irresponsibility towards the misfortune of others stems directly, I believe, out of this belief in Karma, which is one way of apprehending the operation of a great law of righteousness, but which contains within it no principle of mercy or regeneration.

This latter must be looked for elsewhere, and is to be found in Buddhism, and notably in the teaching on Amida, who is the personification of mercy, that is, of the horizontal dimension. In Amida there does not seem to be operative any principle of retributive justice, any maintenance of law and order, any judgment upon evil. Amida is pure mercy. He is the highest embodiment of the principle which men feel instinctively must be held in counterpoise to that of forensic justice. But this principle of love and mercy is not for official relationships, but for unofficial, personal relationships. It is fundamentally otherworldly, and comes into operation when men die and commit themselves to the mercy of Budha, with the prayer, "Namu Amida Batsu." It does not prescribe what is incumbent in specific situations and official relationship, but it is recognized as a great

principles undergirding life with the power of amelioration and compensation for the tensions and tragedies of which this life is so full. It is the embodiment of man's need to love and be loved, but is of the category of a sentiment rather than of a binding ethical claim such as the vertical principle imposes.

Thus ethics pertain to the vertical relationships, and sentiment to the horizontal, and neither plays a determinative role in the other. What a man ought to do as an official member of society is prescribed by rules, and feelings must be ignored or suppressed. They are irrelevant. And what a man wants to do in the way of expressing his instincts and urges and of treating his fellow men outside of official relationships is his own business and there are no absolutely binding rules or principles of judgment. In this dimension there need be no rigid sanctions interfering with his desires. His desires may be affirmative and harmonious with respect to others, or they may be anti-social, but they are not subject to judgment in accordance with any objective moral standards. Since, in the words of a priest friend of the Pure Land Sect of Buddhism (Dodo Shinshu) there is no subjectivity in Buddha, there is no supra-human standard by which human conduct is to be judged or called to account.

Thus the Japanese people confront new situations in which the rules of official conduct pertain now situations in which human sentiment only is the guide to conduct, and the response appropriate to each kind of stimulus will be very different, and often outwardly very contradictory when judged from the standpoint of one who believes in the unification of life around a harmony of the basic dimensions or principles.

In a sense, a solution of a given problem is simpler if it can be reached by taking into account only one dimension or sanction. It is the effort to find a true harmony of both dimensions that makes decisions difficult and complicated. But solutions which ignore one of the two basic dimensions of life can never be permanent or true ones. They leave unsolved issues which return to wreak havoc.

Life is whole, and two dimensional, and any effort to live and operate on one to the exclusion of the other throws life out of balance and out of kilter. A truth held in isolation from other truths becomes demonic. Such are the most dangerous enemies of the truth, for they contain aspects of truth and are therefore very powerful. But one truth can fight against another when no principle of harmonization, no need of mutual adjustment, is recognized.

Thus the Japanese oscillates between two dimensions of life, in each of which he sees different sanctions obtaining, and he has no philosophical or theological key by which to bridge the gap and bring the two together. And so great official rectitude may be, and often is, combined with very lax personal standards of conduct, without the tension which a Christian, for example, would feel, since the Christian views life as a single whole and not as something to be divided into separate compartments, official and personal.

What is it which not only enables but compels the Christian to see life single and see it whole? It is the revelation of the nature and will of God as righteous love, which is found in the Bible, and reaches its culmination in the Cross and Resurrection. The Cross, by its very physical shape, is the meeting point of the vertical and horizontal dimensions, but possesses more than a merely accidental pictorially symbolic meaning. It is the cosmic act by which God's righteous demands and his infinite mercy were perfectly expressed and fulfilled. In the Cross we discover that God's love is not something over against his righteousness but that his righteousness is his love, and that both judgment and mercy are the expressions of his love, not identical, but complementing each other in such a way as to reconcile and save men. Love expressed as pure judgment or as pure mercy could not be reconciling. It is love expressed as both judgment and mercy that is reconciling. No human problem can be solved without doing full justice to both these great, eternal dimensions. No real reconciliation can be brought about, either between God and men, or between man and man, without a true harmony of these two great dimensions of truth. Without the Cross of Christ, man is without the key to this harmony. He cannot even see the true nature of the problem and of his predicament. He can only flounder about, and stumble back and forth between partial apprehensions of the two great dimensions of life, without seeing where they join, or how he ought to obey both.

This is where the Gospel of Jesus Christ has a word for the Japanese, and for all people, which is entirely unique. It offers the only true unification of the two basic dimensions of life, whether for personal life, or national, or international. All solutions must be based on the correct harmonization of judgment and mercy which is given to us in the Cross. No reconciliation can be found on any other basis. All man-made solutions are one sided and end-in disruption and confusion. Until the Japanese find the Cross as the

central event of time, and the fundamental principle by which the moral issues of the universe and the moral issues of human life must be settled, they will continue to hold partial insights and goods, which in the end lead, not to the truth but away from it, as they draw away to themselves a total allegiance that should be given to the truth alone, the full truth as it comes to us in our Lord Jesus Christ.

JAPANESE CHARACTERISTICS WHICH CONDITION RELIGIOUS RESPONSE

by William A. McIlwaine

I am glad to talk on this subject though it has been very hard to draw anything up. It seems to me the lines are pretty well fixed. To understand the Japanese, one must go back into Japanese history and learn what they live by and the things that have conditioned them. Now, I believe that there are such things as racial characteristics to a certain extent. For example, almost every Japanese has manual dexterity to a very high degree. I do not think that is a matter of training. That is something, which is in, it is a natural, it is a characteristic of them racially, I should say. I do not think that it is necessarily transmitted. It is something that may be transmitted, transmitted hereditarily and, of course, can be developed highly. They are the things which I believe are in them which have bearing upon their reactions. But, if I am considering the Japanese as he is today, I have to end up by saying after all he is not any different than we are.

That is what we finally come to, namely that we must know something about Japanese history. Now, I am not an expert on Japanese history. I just know it in general. But if you want to know the Japanese, you have to *know* the history. You must know the original Shinto, its various beliefs and the sort of the thing that is in their twilight of history there. You must know the beginnings, where myth and history are so mixed that you cannot separate them. The way things were considered is inherent in Shinto itself. Then, you come into the long feudal period. That feudal period was already having its effect when Xavier came to Japan. The early Catholic missionaries spoke about how the Japanese could not be trusted to tell the truth. They would not tell the truth to each other. Well, that is simply the result of a life in a totalitarian system. You cannot tell the truth, because your head will come off if you tell the truth to the wrong fellow. And that thing is going on during all the generations, you see. Remember that is there.

I was a chaplain in the United States Army for three years. And I did not get overseas. I went into work with Japanese prisoners of war. The good old Army gave me every thing else except that at the last. But I did have a chance to talk a great deal about Japanese characteristics to the Army in the various units where I was stationed. I was scheduled to go to Chicago to talk to the Headquarters of the 6th Service Command on the day Roosevelt died. It was called off and I heard no more of it so I did not become famous. Probably could have become famous otherwise, in a different way, if I had gone. But I have been very glad that anything that I had to say about Japanese characteristics was not publicized over on this side of the war. I tried to tell the truth because I was not in the totalitarian system. But the thing I used to say to them was that remember the Japanese have a code. They live by a certain code you have got to know the code. When you know the code that they are going to go by then you can tell what their reactions are going to be to a certain extent within that. Of course, they are always variable, A feudal system gave a slant to the Japanese and they have not gotten out of that fully, even since the war though the young people sometimes, I think, are even less channeled by convention than our American young people. Though if you get under the skin very far you still find that old thing working with them.

Now, Macleod talked last night about the vertical and horizontal. I do not know why he chose that figure. I have not talked to him. But that is not a new thing to the Japanese. That is the Japanese way of doing it. Tate no Dotoku, Yoko no Dotoku. They go by the Tate no Dotoku, as they say, that is from above. And there is the thing. How is it that the Tate no Dotoku has nothing to do with religion as we consider it? Now, the Tate no Dotoku was a religion. And may become a religion again. And yet, it is not a religion as we think of religion in its very essential and most important forms. It is the authority from above. That authority from above may be of the family, may be of the feudal lord, afterwards transferred, of course, to the emperor. And the Japanese was brought up in that thing. And whatever he did was to be under this matter, under this thing of Tate no Dotoku. Now, the Tate no Dotoku you see, is different from the Christian theistic Tate. It is another thing that may be parallel to certain extent and is short and does not get but so high. They tried to make it infinite but they cannot. It is only so high because it is human. It is limited by the concept of the divine emperor but the divine emperor was the descendant of the sun goddess who is just like the Greek gods and goddesses; just about

as human as the rest of them. So, 'there is no real deity. I would like you to remember what I believe is true. I remember Mr. Okada of our seminary giving an address and I hope to get it published in America, as a matter of fact, on Guzo no Nihon. He pointed out there that idolatry that is polytheism is basically atheism. I think we should remember, I want to go into that later. But it is basically atheism because it does not recognize the true God. It makes all sorts of substitutes, recognizes this or that but the true concept of God is not there. That is the thing we should remember. And they have this Tate thing which controls them. That was the feudal lord. Then the masterstroke of the Meiji Restoration was to transfer that loyalty of the feudal lord to the emperor, And then, that made every Japanese a Samurai. Before, the majority of the Japanese nation was the downtrodden group. He had a downtrodden man psychology. He was underneath and did not dare lift his head, did not dare tell his truth to his neighbour or anybody else. He had to go on with that load upon him. He was free in the sense of being raised to the same status as the top level man who was loyal to his feudal lord or shogun. And then, that man, as well as the man down below, (and the Samurai was relived of his special status) but all of them were now loyal to the emperor. And that Tate was raised just that much higher but still it was the human Tate. And everything was regulated on that basis. Now then, where is your conflict? Did you ever look at Kabuki? Look at the masks the Japanese make. Look at the way the Japanese draw their old characters, the Samurai characters. The strain, the thing they had admired, being a Samurai, getting your mouth set just so.

Today, I remember, I was privileged to work at a Japanese prisoner's camp. They sent me up there. The commandant did not want any chaplains around. And, by the way, this is the psychology of the American, you had better learn. I went there. They said "Well, Chaplain you know we do not want you. We do not want you." I said that I had three weeks temporary duty as an experiment. See, I was getting over with his head. "That's all right," I said. He said "Do you know why we do not want you?" We had a conversation later. As a chaplain, of course, you can talk back a little more than an inferior officer can in ordinary circumstances and he told me, "You know why we do not want you, I get along at this camp with a very small compliment of men." He had a few Nisei. He did not have a single man there who really knew Japanese. I said "I'd get along on this. They'd tried to follow what you are talking about and I'd get divisions here.

I'd have a whole lot of trouble. Your policy here is to protect the Japanese who wish to hold on to the old Japanese ideology and loyalties-and not to protect a man who wants to come our way. Is that your idea?" "Well," he said, "It looks like it. That's what we've been doing." Of course, I sassed him, but I could not help it. I had to. That is what you have in the American Army. And the fool's stuff that went on in the American Army. I was a prisoner of war after that. But while I was at that camp the medical officers there were awfully cooperative. And they brought in a man one night. They had him there sleeping on the floor. They did not allow him near an iron bed. They were afraid that he would use it somehow to commit suicide. The officer said that he just quit being a Samurai. Now he is lying on the floor. So I met him there. He was just tense. He had been captured, probably was wounded and could not help himself. They had kept him from committing suicide. There, he was just tense and he would not talk to anybody. So I got down and knelt down on the floor and spoke to him in Japanese and said "I am so and so" and so on. He began to listen a little bit and pretty soon, he sat up. You see, I did not talk to him standing up. I got down there on the floor as a Japanese, bowed to him and went through all the aisatsu and then we were on a proper line so he talked there. We could get along fine. And, see there is a code.

Now, there are certain things which have to be-done. And that code runs all through life. My father told me that, this of course is 60 years ago, or so, I asked him "How, do you. ..What is the proper way to lay your pen on the table? Do you lay it with the point from you or toward you? What is the proper way in America?" He did not know, of course. Those little things are fixed. Now, these things are fixed from above in that line, you see. There is no divine, absolute compulsion. These things are settled by a common agreement, in a sense. If you go to analyze it further, I suppose these things which they say are vertical, have really been on the horizontal level. These things are determined by what is best for society. Japanese society is formed on a basis that maintains a secure society, free from explosions. That is the idea that is behind it. They worked it out during the centuries. Customs and mores that are going to take care of this and see to it that the society is orderly. They have an orderly society, and they want it to be orderly, and having it orderly, is their duty. In the Japanese Constitution, the clause on religious liberty was "Japanese subjects shall, in so far as it does not interfere with their duties as

subjects or disturb public peace and order, enjoy the right of freedom of religious belief." Well, of course, you say it does not give them anything. But it does. It did not give them religious freedom that we know. But see, society was maintained. What is the purpose of a government? The purpose of a government is to maintain law and order. And, that is the purpose to be carried out in the Japanese society. There is the Tate runs it. But the Tate is a human Tate. There is no divine up there which has the judgment, the final judgment which is to be administered and the responsibility down here is to that thing above, regardless of society. It is a part of what is to be done as the element of this whole complex of society according to the rules which have been, which have grown up in this society. And these are not bad.

I remember one, well, one of the leaders of our church, came out, this is nearly 40 years ago, and he had been in Japan and China. He was perplexed. He said "Why is this? I go to China, and here in Japan. I see these men. They are not Christians and yet, look at their lives whatever we can see of them. They seem to be good citizens. They are helping everybody else. They are models so far as we can tell in their public service and we do not see anything that is different in their lives from the Christians." Of course, the other way around is something wrong there. But I said, "Here is the whole point." This is part of the society. These men are in society and they are keeping the rules of society but those rules allow for many weaknesses of human nature. And they provide for them. The whole Japanese system of licensed quarters was part of that. That was part of the way society went. The home had to be maintained, if you call it the home. The wife had to be faithful to her husband but as far as a man was concerned, he had to have a loop or vent somewhere and they provided it in that way or in drinking. Look at the Japanese attitude toward drinking. You have seen those latest posters and photographs of a man with a bottle. He is attacking a girl. The poster has the Police Headquarters name underneath. I suppose they have them all around Kobe now. I suppose they have them in this part of the country. No longer will drunkenness be excused. Japanese law will now punish the drunkard who violates the law. This is a western concession. The drunkard formerly had a loop hole there and he took advantage of it. That was his escape and he needed his escape from the oppression which was necessary for the maintenance of society. Whatever he did when he was drunk was permitted. This has changed. This has broken into the Japanese order of things as they have known it.

In Korea they have taken authority again and have put in laws for the girls and how they are to dress and what they are to do. Well, you know, that is not a bad law. The chaplains had to give addresses on sex to the men and I recall talking to men thus: In America we either have to turn back to God or we will have to do what the orient does in order to maintain order in society and keep the country from going to the dogs. That is, the segregation of the sexes. Christianity has ideals. All of our customs between men and women are based on Christian ideals and since they have permeated society to a very large extent, you can trust young people together. Now, those things have broken down in America but you still have the same freedom. You know as well as I do what has happened. The difference between what things were in my boyhood and now is terrible. When a girl was ruined that was the end of it. Probably ninety percent of the girls entered marriage in virginity. Some people say fifty percent do now. I think contraceptives are to blame but the moral standard is gone and the Christian standard is no longer the standard of society. The cure is either back to God or segregate your sexes. And the segregation of the sexes was the only way you could handle that element in human nature. It is man made. It is utilitarian. Remember, the whole thing is human expediency.

Now let us go back to the fellow that was acting like a Samurai. What is the reason for acting like a samurai. The reason is that his code is going against his God-given conscience. He has a moral instinct which requires kindness to others. There is something which tells him that it is not right to have the attitude that was given by the Japanese military. It was the attitude of putting a human Emperor in a position that violates the urgings of the human heart. This conflict in the Japanese has been nurtured. The Occupation prohibited the showing of the Chushingura, the play of the forty-seven ronin. Do you realize what this play has done to the Japanese people? It has been on the boards since 1700 in the guise of a feudal period of 150 years before as the occasion for the samurai attacking the superior lord is changed in the play, but all the other things are as they were. What is done through this? Every moral standard is broken in order to carry out that supreme duty to avenge the death of the lord. It makes no difference what the matter is. Every standard must be subordinated. Ooishi, the leader goes to the licensed quarter in Kyoto and lives there. His wife comes to plead for him to come back but he kicks her out and pays no attention. Now, he doesn't turn himself loose, though he is guilty of sexual offence there but that does not make any difference for him.

Basically he did not throw away his life and yet he did as far as the form is concerned. He did it because he had to in order to carry out a higher loyalty which violated these moral principles.

There is the case of the man who was disgraced who could not take place in the vendetta but he had to do something and he ordered a sword. Maybe that would help. He did not know how to purchase his sword so his wife sold herself in order to get money for the sword. Half the money was given to the man's father. The man then went hunting and instead of shooting a boar killed his own father. He then learned that he had killed his father and also about the fate of his wife. He regretted it all but it was too late as he committed suicide. All the tragedy is culminated in the end. This comes out in the Bunraku-za and puppet show but remember, that play was acted in every theater in Japan sometime every year and has been done until the Occupation came and now it has been revived and the same is being done again. Now, the Japanese may be freed from that in a sense because the pressures are off but there is the ideal that is held before them. It is held before them as a god but the problem is that the Emperor is not the true God. The feudal lord too, though not called a god, was the motive that gave drive to the Japanese.

You see, the code is based on what society demands. That society is represented by these vertical things. A man, Arita Seimatsu put out a cure for venereal disease called doragu. Some of you remember the exhibits he had. In the stores were accurate exhibits of the genital organs showing various stages of venereal disease. Doragu was the cure. In his statistics he admitted that Japan had a higher venereal disease rate than other nations. But in his full page advertisements he did not mention doragu but instead he attacked America and Europe by criticizing their Yoko no dotoku. Yoko no dotoku ruled American's relationships on a democratic basis. He said Americans find their partners in a dance-hall and then get married. Japan chooses their wives by tate or vertical and we see to it that order is maintained in the family. This idea of order was foremost.

About forty years ago, I went to Nojiri to see about building my house. I was at Kashiwabara Station and spoke to a Japanese from Shinonoi whom I knew quite well. The benches were full so I went over to the baggage window and sat on the ledge. In back, I heard a voice saying, " Aayu seishin wa seiyo ni aru kashira, Nihon niwa nai"

That fellow had been drinking just enough to say what he thought. He then came close to me and said, "Kora! Are wa nimotsu o oku tokoro de aru, koshikake wa sochira ni aru. Utsure!" You see, I had violated their order of things by sitting where baggage was to be put. That may sound crazy, but you see the man was drunk and I did not want to get up. I am a little stubborn sometimes, I guess. You see, the Japanese is governed by that which he has come to through all these years. The defeat has broken a lot of it, but it is still there. A mother corrects her child, "Don't do that. Soshitara hito ga warauzo", or "warawareru zo!" That is the method used to train the children. It is not that, "this is wrong" but rather, "You'll be laughed at". They have grown up in fear of society. They are afraid of each other. Notice a Japanese conversation. They ask all sorts of questions but what is the answer? e.g. "Dochira ni ikimasu ka?" The answer is, "Sochira e." Or "Can you do this tomorrow?" "No, I can't." "Doshite?" "Tsugo,ga warui." That is enough. It may be conversation but they haven't said a thing. In America when I buy land I'm like the Japanese. I do not tell the man how much money I have and am willing to pay but you wait to see how much he wants. You do not lay all the cards on the table to start with. Well, in Japan every conversation is like that, except among those who are intimate. Conversation among Christians is not like that. I have said this before Japanese audiences and they kept laughing. But you see, when I say something, the man doesn't reply to what I ask or what I said. He tries to figure what I was thinking when I said it. He then replies to what he thinks I meant by that and then I reply to what I think he meant by his statement. This is not exactly what he said. Boude Moore said that he had never been cheated. He had been lied to but the other fellow knew he was lying. I'd add a word and say that the other fellow knew that Boude knew that he knew that he was lying. Now, this is their society though they are no worse than we. But ... do you not see, there is no Almighty God there. That is the real problem.

Tied up with this problem is the idea of my relation to my fellow. Suppose a woman drops a handkerchief. "Has anybody picked up that handkerchief?" "No." The other party then goes over there and picks it up. Why? One can not get mixed up in someone else's things. If something would happen, I'd be responsible. The extent to which I can afford to offer kindness is to point out this thing and let another party right it but I cannot touch it. I could be accused of all sorts of things. I might be under suspicion. The old gonin gumi of the Tokugawa Period consisted of five heads of families. Each one

was responsible for what the other did. They had to make reports of names and villages and these required the stamp in black ink to show that the people were not Christians. If the top man of the gonin gumi was found at fault, he was to blame for all of them. Each was responsible for the other and no one could let the other fellow get into trouble. No Japanese intends to be responsible for the other person getting into trouble.

When the Religious Bill was passed and the law went into effect, each religion had at the top a torisha. One might want to be Presbyterian or Congregational but there would have to be a pope or nearly a pope, that is, a tourisha instead of a democratic rule in the church because that way they could control the organizations. If Mr. Tomita, the first graduate of our seminary did anything wrong or off color, the whole church would be blamed for it. If anyone in the church did anything wrong, Mr. Tomita would be blamed for it. In a sense, Mr. Tomita was a hostage through which a whole group was controlled. That was no accident. It was carefully worked out and goes back to the totalitarian system of learning things.

You see, what is really governing the Japanese is not the Tate no dotoku but rather society. It is what people think. When the incident of the shrine issue came up in the Mino Mission in Ougaki, I was living in Nagoya. There the police questioned the mother of a girl who dropped out of the procession of those going to a shrine and said "you are not Japanese. Go back to the Jews country where you belong. That is where Christianity came from. You are not Japanese anymore." She could not belong to the community where she was. Back of that was the old Ujigami and every child in the village was an Ujico (a child of the tutelary deity). That society was controlled by such a public opinion system. That worked also on a larger scale. In Japan, at the beginning of the Meiji era, when missionaries first came, there were phallic images all over Japan. Shinto is basically phallic. In fact Prof. Kato who wrote the book on Shinto makes its phallicism its basis of being a religion. He argued that the states position which denied it as a religion but his point of argument was that it was phallic, as all religions are. Why did Japanese take away the phallic images? It was because they did not want their nation to be considered inferior by European nations. The people who came to Japan talked about this. When the Yurakurai embassy went overseas they went and found what others thought about this sort of thing. They then cleared those things out in a hurry.

The division in public bath houses was put in for the same reason, thus making a men's side and a women's side. Though the division started some distance from the floor and end before the top, it was a division there. They knew the west would frown on having men and women in the same building, so they changed that.

Infanticide was stopped. They had a word Osu The farmer would kill a girl baby he did not want. As a father, he had the right to kill the child. The forehead was pressed in but actually heavy paper was put on the child's nose and mouth and the child would suffocate. Why did they stop it? Because of foreign opinion. Now through foreign opinion they allow abortion because there is no condemnation from abroad. This has a lot to do with religious response.

When I speak about religious response, I am talking about Christianity and the gospel message. Just take John 3:16. What is involved there? First it involves a god who is supreme overall. Whoever believes shall not perish. God sent his son. There is involved absolute Power and Authority over all things. To carry out the purpose which conquers death and gives eternal life, there you have the absolute, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, all-powerful, all-wise God. That is involved there as a concept that is not found among the Japanese.

The other day coming back on the train between Kyoto and Osaka, there were two young fellows next to me who had been skiing. I started talking to them and found out that they were brothers. They were both graduates of a Buddhist University in Kyoto, the Shin sect of Nishihonganji. One was teaching primary school and the other was teaching physical education in a Christian school. I began talking to them about Christ and they listened. Soon they said that they were Honganji Buddhists. Out of the conversation came their belief that Buddhism was superior to Christianity because it grows in such an orderly fashion. The inga or Benin kekka (cause and effect) is at work. There is no conflict between Buddhism and science whereas Christianity has these conflicts. I replied that the order of Buddhism was mechanical and sort of like an autonoman. In Christianity there is God as person who is cause and effect and he works in these orderly ways but he has set up the order. We have a responsibility to him and his purpose and we know that his purpose is going to be accomplished because the

infinite God is all of his power and wisdom has ordained it and he will carry it out. I gave these men little books to read. By the way, whenever I am talking to a man on the train I give him a little book and not just a slip of paper. Give him something that looks as if it is worth something and he will appreciate it and he will read it. He will often sit right there and read it. The Japanese like to go into things. These young men also talked about other things in the Shin sect and the Amida. I told them that they had no historical background for the Amida. You probably know the story about one of the images at the Nishihonganji temple. On the image is a copy of the Gospel of Matthew in Chinese in the handwriting of Shinran Shonin. That copy of the Gospel of Matthew is used in the ordination of the chief abbot of that sect. I asked a Buddhist priest about it and he said, "Itai tokoro o tsutsuita na." Matthew was the gospel used by the Nestorians and there is a monument on Koya-sag, which is a duplicate of the Chinese Nestorian monument. By the way, there are certain miracles attributed to Shinran and also to Kobodaishi that sound very much like the miracles in the Synoptic gospels. For example, when Kobodaishi was returning from China his ship ran into a storm and for his sake the storm abated and the ship was immediately at the land of Japan. There is also the story about walking on the water. They have in the Shin sect of Buddhism the vicarious atonement idea which has been denuded of all historicity. It does not have to be historical and there is no need to be but the idea is there. These men then said something which can be attributable to Karl Barth, "We do not teach that by calling on Amida Buttsu that we are saved. We tell them that everyman is saved but they do not know it and so we tell them that they are saved." You see, religion is in a separate compartment and is not affected by the laws that govern our life. It is extra historical. I do not know whether you want to say that it is Urgeschichte but anyway, it is extra-historical and to my mind, that is the place that we must take hold of, i.e. the historicity of Christianity. We have to be saved out of the situation in which we actually are which is within history. We are a part of history. We are here now and we cannot separate ourselves from the essential or spiritual element of what we are talking about. Both go together and you cannot separate one from the other. The whole experience involves both. One by itself becomes meaningless because the reality of it is gone unless you have this physical, historical basis for it. God has given us this in history. When we put this in history then we begin to insert a true tate no dotoku. In the beginning God created the heaven and the

earth. You need that to start. Man is in God's image. Man is responsible to God. He is not caught in the blind circle of retribution or transmigration or continual development, etc., He is not in something where he is not in any sense responsible but he is a responsible creature granted the privilege along with the other beings who are responsible in the image of God. Man has broken that image or rather he has degraded that image and he is responsible and has to give answer to Almighty God. You see, there is an atheism about all religions. What Paul spoke to Athenians is also applicable to Japan. Everyone wants to learn some new thing. Why? He had no old thing that was satisfying. He is bound to learn something new. He has curiosity. He has excellent mental equipment. He has the tools there for learning and investigating all sorts of things and he wants to get that main thing he has missed. He is after it but he doesn't know where to look. Paul said that God had appointed a day when he would judge the world and a man by whom he would judge the world and there is evidence of that man that he has raised him from the dead. But why did they not appreciate Paul? It was because he had a new doctrine of the resurrection. They did not appreciate a kind of resurrection for judgment. All religions that do not have the responsibility before Almighty God are dodging God. They are substitutes and are running away from the judgment to come.

I believe there is the hidden, unrecognized motive which is in Japanese society and you have to unmask that and show that underneath against which they have been fighting. They call it ryoshin. Someone has said you should call it that because ryoshin is good and no unregenerate man is good. We have to show that is from God and we have to follow that no matter how distorted it might be.

This God so loved the world that He gave His only son in history. In history he worked out our salvation. This is not something on the side and which can be put into equations as mathematical or scientific formulas. It is something which has all the complications of the give-and-take of human life and the evil of this human life is tied up in it. And all the evil which the Japanese will recognize that is not necessarily immoral but are there is involved too. Christ has come into that evil as sent of God and he has made for us the way of salvation by going into the very depths of it for us and rising from it for us. The essential is to give this message where there is the lack of the true tate.

NOTE: IN THE PUBLISHED BOOK THERE IS NO PAGE 74 – UNNUMBERED
BLANK PAGE

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS IN JAPAN: AN HISTORICAL SURVEY

(N.B.: This is not a final report, but merely a blueprint for further study.)

January 1962 James M. Phillips

6 of 13 Kudan, 4-chome Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan

Contents: CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS IN JAPAN: AN HISTORICAL SURVEY

	<u>Page</u>
A. The Era of Appropriation (1868-1890)	1
1. The pre-apologetic stage	1
2. Six attacks on Christianity by Japanese antagonists.	2
3. Two scholarly antagonists against Christianity.	3
4. The replies of the Christian apologists.	4
5. Uemura Masahisa's early works.	5
6. Kozaki Hiromichi.	5
B. The Era of Growing Nationalism (1890-1919)	6
1. Uchimura Kanzo and the "disloyalty incident".	6
2. The renewed attacks of Inoue and Katou.	7
3. Uchimura's subsequent career.	8
4. Uemura Masahisa's subsequent career.	9
5. The re-establishment of Roman Catholic Apologetics	11
C. The Era of Liberalism (1919-1931)	12
1. Liberal theology.	12
2. The theology of Takakura Tokutaro.	14
D. The Era of Militarism (1931-1945)	15
1. Japanese Barthianism.	15
2. Japanese Thomism.	16
3. Japanese "apologetics" during World War II.	17
E. The Era of Opportunity (1945-)	18
1. The surge of new freedoms.	18
2. Some recent views of Christian apologetics.	18
3. Some tentative conclusions.	20
A Selected Bibliography of Books in English	21
Footnotes	22

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS IN JAPAN: AN HISTORICAL SURVEY

A. The Era of Appropriation (1868-1890)

Christian apologists have been compared to the builders of the wall in Nehemiah's time. Neh. 4:18 says: "And each of the builders had his sword girded at his side while he built." This is a symbolic picture of the Christian apologist; one who wields a sword for the defense of his faith against its attackers and who at the same time builds an explanation of the faith which he hopes will be adequate for his own people in his own time. Japanese Christians in the early Meiji Era were apologists of this type. To be sure, apologetics was not the first task they set their hands to, any more than building the wall was the very first task of Nehemiah's community. There were the more urgent problems first of all of winning converts organizing them into churches, providing for the converts' spiritual nurture, and the like. Before these Christians could begin the work of apologetics proper, they had to get their spiritual bearings, so to speak. This early period may be characterized as "the pre-apologetic stage."

1. The Pre-apologetic stage. The Meiji Revolution tried to bring changes to Japan in a very few years which had taken centuries in Western nations. The early Japanese Protestant community therefore had a twofold task incumbent upon it before it could begin apologetic work. It had to assimilate the Christian faith, and at the same time it had to assimilate the changes which were then sweeping through Japanese society.

The Meiji Emperor in his 1868 Charter Oath had announced that "Knowledge shall be sought from all over the world and thus shall be strengthened the foundation of the Imperial polity."¹ The culture of the West was indeed appropriated at first in large undigested portions. There were of course counter-pressures, but the major tides of the early Meiji period were in the direction of an uncritical acceptance of large areas of Western culture. The effects of this process may be seen in the lives and writings of some of the Christians of that period. Before he returned to Japan from his studies in the United States, Nijima Jou expressed to his friends the Hardys his conviction that to educate any person properly there had to be full cooperation between education and Christianity.² For Nijimaas for many of his countrymen, it seemed only natural that Christianity and culture must go hand in hand. One sees this same point of

view in some of the writings of Uchimura Kanzo, where he holds, for instance, that Columbus' great discoveries were due to his grounding both in Western learning and in the Christian faith.³

2. Six attacks on Christianity by Japanese antagonists. The period of apologetic writing proper began as a result of some of the renewed attacks on Christianity by Japanese writers. Of course attacking the religion of Jesus was nothing new in Japan. One recalls the signboards prohibiting Christianity as well as the strenuous efforts which were made to prevent the introduction of the new faith. Hence some of the attacks on Christianity in the early Meiji Era were little more than warmed-over prejudices from previous years. As such they did little harm to the Christians. This is what the Christian periodical Rikugou Zasshi (The Magazine of the Universe) said about a pamphlet entitled The Irrationality of Christianity, which was published by the Honganji Branch of Shin Buddhism:

“We understand that up to the present they have published about seven hundred thousand copies of this pamphlet and distributed them widely. The many people who have attended the recent Buddhist lecture series in Tokyo have received copies. We believe that, rather than harm, this will benefit Christianity... Distributing such pamphlets is like passing out advertisements for Christianity.”⁴

There were many examples of such attacks, to be sure, and it is worthwhile to examine some of their contents because it was on these that the early Christian writers cut their apologetic teeth, so to speak. Six of the critics' principal charges were these:

- (1) Christianity is a source of rebellion and disunity among the people.⁵ Many of the early converts to Christianity had been supporters of the Tokugawa shogunate against the imperial forces, and this aroused latent fears of Christianity that went back to the Shimabara Rebellion. Closely related with this were charges (2) and (3):
- (2) Christianity attacks family and clan loyalties with its concept of individual rights. Yasui Sokken's pamphlet Exposure of Falsehood (1873) said that "People who profess Christianity would rather desert their lord or father than be untrue to their religion."⁶ Close to this charge came the following:

(3) Christianity provides an avenue for foreign intervention in Japan. The Japanese were all too aware of the close relations which had existed between Christian mission work and European colonial policy in countries like India and China, and were determined that foreign intervention would not take place in Japan.

(4) Christianity is a religion which is totally alien to Japanese life. One scholar wrote with national pride: "Japan is the land of the gods and of the Buddha: the land which reveres its gods, reverences the Buddha, and follows only the Confucian way of humanity and justice." 7

(5) Christianity teaches absurd and fantastic doctrine of the resurrection in particular was held up to ridicule. Shimaji Mokurai's New Thoughts on the Resurrection stated: "If the resurrection of Jesus himself is wild fantasy, how much more so is resurrection for man in general," 8 The idea of an incarnation, for instance, did not seem to be much of a problem to a culture long influenced by Mahayana Buddhism, but the resurrection seemed to be as much of a stumbling-block to Japanese society as it was to the early Greek world.

There remains a sixth kind of charge which was leveled against early Japanese Christianity which did not assume much importance at first, but which was to take on major proportions later on. This was:

(6) Christianity is intellectually at variance with true science and philosophy. Some of the early arguments here centered around the theory of evolution, which was of course a hotly-debated issue in Western countries at this time as well.

3. Two scholarly antagonists against Christianity.

The sort of attack which tried to show that Christianity was at odds with the best of Western culture centered around scholars in Tokyo Imperial University, of whom two were very influential. Kato Hiroyuki was a scholar in politics, who at first advocated a constitutional system for Japan based on a theory of natural rights, but in time changed his views under the influence of a theory of evolution to espouse a theory of acquired rights based on the idea of the survival of the fittest. His Jinken Shinsetsu (A New Theory of Rights, 1882) made the claim:

“The fact remains that the survival of the fittest is easily proven by the historical evidence of societies from ancient times to the present, and perforce, wipes out any specious proof of the existence of natural rights to liberty, independence, and equality.” 9

It is evident how such a theory would reinforce practices of political absolutism, and take away the legal rights of a religious minority in Japanese society such as the Christians. One also notices how such a theory foreshadowed later political developments in Japan.

The second scholarly antagonist of the Christians was Inoue Tetsujiro, who attacked the new faith from the standpoint of his own syncretistic blend of Eastern and Western philosophy. In his Rinri Shinsetsu (New Theory of Ethics, 1883), he tried to join Sidgwick's utilitarian theory of happiness and Spencer's evolutionism to the Oriental idea of the "sage" -- a combination which many other scholars have found agreeable in recent years.

Actually, the attacks of such scholars as Katou and Inoue which fall into the sixth category mentioned above were not very effective at the time. The reason is simply that both Western and Japanese culture were still very largely in flux. It was hard to denounce Christianity as either non-Japanese or non-scientific when there was no common agreement as to what normative Japanese culture was, or what was the best in Western culture. Lack of certainty on the former point began to come to an end with the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890, as shall be seen presently.

4. The replies of the Christian apologists. The replies of Christian writers in the early Meiji era were for the most part self-confident, and even sarcastic. Uemura Masahisa made this comment on a short article by Inoue attacking Christianity:

“We have heard for a year that you were writing a splendid book. We have long known that you were the greatest scholar in Japan. We feel sure that anything you write will be outstanding, and should be used as a model for our own work. We have wanted to see it as soon as possible, but up to now we have heard nothing; our despair is complete.”¹¹

One may easily imagine the replies of the apologists in regard to the details of their antagonists' charges. The apologists stressed that far from being disloyal or rebellious, the Christian was the very best patriot.¹² They pointed to Christian contributions to the wholesome growth of nationalism in terms of widespread relief of suffering, the promotion of positive social well-being, and the deepening of devotion. They asserted that Christianity gave new depth to loyalty and filial piety through its teachings of forgiveness and redemptive love. Christian writers also carried their attack into the

camp of their enemies by pointing out, for instance, examples of immorality and unsocial actions on the part of many so-called Japanese patriots. A sound national ethic could not be built solely on the virtue of dying for one's country -noble as that may be -- but must proceed from the promptings of pure hearts, as Christianity teaches. Only a good tree can bring forth good fruit.¹³

5. Uemura Masahisa's early works. So much for the Christian apologists' replies to their attackers. The positive side of their apologetics is to be found in such works as Uemura Masahisa's Shinri Ippan (Common Truth, 1884). He rejected the positions of evolutionism, materialism, and agnosticism, and attempted to demonstrate the existence of God with the cosmological and moral arguments. Uemura was no intellectual slouch, for he buttressed his arguments with ideas he had drawn from Western philosophers such as Hegel and Pascal, as well as the classical Christian apologists. He wrote, for instance, "When we realize our weakness and shortlivedness we must also be able to conceive of an omnipotent and eternal being."¹⁴ Uemura's writings, especially after 1887, served to introduce to the Japanese public some of the finest literature of the West, together with his critical commentary on that literature.¹⁵ He also delved deeply into Japanese culture for his apologetic materials. He knew a great deal about Japanese Buddhism, and was quite an admirer of Honen the founder of the Jodo sect. His Fukuin Michi Shirube (Guide to the Way of the Gospel, 1884) contains many references to ancient Japanese poems. From the pathos expressed in such poetry he drew hints of the felt needs of Japanese life, which he went on to explain that only the Gospel of Christ could fulfill.

6. Kozaki Hiromichi. The Christian book which caused more of a stir than any other at this time, however was Kozaki Hiromichi's Seikyou Shinron (A New Theory of Politics and Religion, 1886). In this work Kozaki made repeated references to his times as an era of newness and of reform:

"Truly today our country is being reborn; it is a day of the creation of a new Japan and can be said to be an unprecedented period of great reform."

He went on to argue that what was needed before all else was a reform of the public mind through Christianity in order to accomplish any truly great and lasting renovation.

Kozaki insisted that if the revolution in Japanese life that had begun with the Meiji Restoration was to have any lasting consequences, it must go deeper than the mere importation of Western techniques and gadgets. Others in Japanese society were sensing this same need about this time. Indeed, some governmental officials -- themselves non-Christians -- even went so far as to urge that the government make Christianity the state religion in order to facilitate the nation's modernization 7.

When the governmental authorities did begin to try to lay down the normative patterns of Japanese society, however, these patterns were of course not primarily Christian ones at all. Take, for instance, the celebrated Article 28 of the Meiji Constitution (1889) on freedom of religion:

Japanese subjects shall, within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief. 18

At first the Constitution seemed to be guaranteeing new freedoms, and many Christians accepted it as such. 19 But it was not long before the other side of the coin became apparent: that is, that this new freedom was set within the framework of the demands of the imperial system. This was made more explicit in the Kyoiku Chokugo (The Imperial Rescript on Education, 1890), which exhorted Japanese subjects as follows:

“Always respect the Constitution and observe the laws: should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State, and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of our Imperial Throne, coeval with heaven and earth.” 20

The attempts of authorities to implement this Rescript ushered in a new situation for Japanese Christians and hence -- while all efforts such as this one to divide up history neatly into "eras" involve a measure of artificiality -- it will be convenient to discuss the years following the issuance of the Rescript on Education as the "era of growing nationalism."

B. The Era of Growing Nationalism (1890-1919).

1. Uchimura Kanzo and the "disloyalty incident." The event which triggered a whole series of repercussions was the, so-called fukei jiken (disloyalty incident), when Uchimura Kanzo as a teacher in a government school refused to bow before the

Emperor's signature on the Imperial Rescript on Education. A Buddhist newspaper found out about the incident and spread the news all over the country. In evaluating this incident, one needs to be reminded of the strong strain of nationalism in Uchimura. He once wrote of the "two J's" which he loved, Jesus and Japan. 21 He also expressed his kinship of feeling with the nationalist Iwasaki Yukichika by saying "We both had the feeling that we would rather die than eat the foreigner's bread!" 22

2. The renewed attacks of Inoue and Katou. In spite of Uchimura's evident patriotism, his critics began to level at him and at Christians in general the charge of disloyalty. Of the many attacks on Christianity which the "disloyalty incident" provoked, the best known is that of the above mentioned Inoue Tetsujirou, who published his Shukyou to Kyouiku no Shoutotsu (The Conflict between Religion and Education) in 1893. The old arguments were repeated, but this time with a new vigor because of Uchimura's example. Inoue charged first that Christianity was internationalistic:

"In a word, the main idea of the Rescript is nationalism; but Christianity is deficient in the nationalistic spirit... Therefore, it is naturally incompatible with the nationalism of the Rescript." 23

In the second place, Inoue contended that Christianity preached disloyalty to one's parents and the nation:

"Paul's attitude is that one should obey the rulers because they represent God's will... One obeys the rulers because he owes obedience to God. In other words one does not obey the rulers themselves, but only God... If Christians pay their highest fealty to Paul's opinions, they cannot be loyal to Japan's Emperor. 24

Katou Hiroyuki several years later also took the opportunity to hurl the same charges at Christianity in his Waga Kokutai to Kirisutokyou (Our National Structure and Christianity, 1907). It is significant that the very term kokutai (national structure) was to be further developed through the 1930's as a weapon against the Christians. Katou wrote:

"The doctrines of Christianity are quite irreconcilable with the Imperial Rescript on Education. In the Imperial Rescript on Education there is not a single word about the Heavenly Father who is the object of absolute love and reverence in Christianity. The rescript speaks only of the Imperial Ancestors. For this reason they (the Christians)

cannot have it in their hearts at all to read the rescript acceptably. They must practice deception.²⁵

Katou's charges went even further, in words ominous for the future, to allege that "It is altogether impossible to assimilate Christianity to the national structure of Japan... As long as Christianity possesses its characteristic nature, it can never be said that it is not injurious to our national structure. One may see from quotations like these that the issues were far from academic. In the years to come Christianity was to be offered a life-and-death challenge from such proponents of Japanese nationalism.

3. Uchimura's subsequent career. Uchimura was, of course, not without his defenders. Uemura and others wrote an article for the Christian periodical Fukuin Shinpou (Gospel News) entitled "An Open Letter on the Case of Lese Majesty," but the government banned the distribution of that issue of the magazine. Uchimura strongly defended his own conduct, but he nevertheless had to resign from his teaching post. ²⁷

Unintimidated though he was, Uchimura nevertheless was henceforth a marked man, and had to rethink carefully his subsequent attitudes toward events as a Christian. In 1892 he wrote in Japan's Mission: "I believe that the mission of the Japanese Empire is to develop the conservative East by means of the progressive West."²⁸ In this spirit he justified the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-5, on the grounds that Japan was the champion of progressivism whose task it was to awaken the conservatism of China. But after Japan's victory in that war led to its hypocritical seizure of the war's spoils in Korea, Uchimura reversed his position and denounced the war, claiming that it had corrupted Japanese morality. By the time of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5, Uchimura was opposed to this and all war. In an article How I Became a Pacifist, he explained that he based his opposition to war on religious and moral grounds, and even on the basis of Japanese national policy. In this he was joined by a group of socialists, who were opposed to the war purely on economic and political bases. This uneasy coalition between Uchimura and the socialists was not to last long, however, since Uchimura regarded social improvement as merely a "hobby" or a "plaything," but held that opposition to war was a basic Christian conviction. This led Uchimura to, oppose participation in World War I in no uncertain terms: "War places faith on trial," he wrote. "Those who oppose, war are Christians, those who do not are not Christians."²⁹ In view of the fact that most Christians supported Japan's participation in all three of these

wars, it is not surprising that Uchimura's convictions gradually isolated him not only from Japanese society but also from the Japanese Christian community.

In the meantime, Uchimura had buried himself deeply in his study and teaching about the Bible, which came to consume more and more of his time and energy. His withdrawal from involvement in public life brought a virtual end to his role as a Christian apologist. By the end of World War I, he had involved himself so deeply in pure Biblical study that he ceased even making homiletical interpretations of Scriptural truths to current events.³⁰ He concentrated on studies of Biblical apocalypticism, especially in the prophetic and the Book of Revelation, which led him to work with the Kirisuto Sairin Undo (Christ's Second Coming Movement) in 1918. He also led evangelistic campaigns at the Kanda Y.M.C.A. in the following year, and later sprang to the defense of Japanese honor at the time of the American Immigration Act in 1924. For the most part, however, the chain of 'events which followed the "disloyalty incident" forced Uchimura more and more into a dualistic position which H. Richard Niebuhr's book Christ and Culture would characterize as "Christ and Culture in Paradox;" he recognized deeply the claims of Christian faith on the one hand and of Japanese culture on the other, but he was not able to put these two claims into any relationship with each other except that of polarity and tension. Yet it should be pointed out that Uchimura has remained to the present day one of the best known and most widely read Japanese Christians. The arresting journalistic style of his prose matched with the memorable episodes of his life have left a deep impression on the Japanese public.

4. Uemura Masahisa's subsequent career. One notices in the career of Uemura Masahisa the development of a similar dualistic tendency during this "era of growing nationalism," but it was to lead him to a quite different course of action. While Uchimura was to bury himself in Biblical studies, Uemura was to become preoccupied with church organization. But the transition in Uemura's case was more gradual, and he came at the problem from quite a different angle. Uemura was disturbed by the tendency of liberal Japanese Christians toward creating a "Japanese Christianity" that was highly syncretistic. These liberals were swayed by the theologies of American unitarianism and German "higher criticism," as well as by Japanese nationalism. Uemura himself called for a more authentic Japanese expression of Christianity, but what the liberals were doing was going much too far for him. For instance, Kanamori Tsurin in his The Present and Future of Christianity in Japan (1891) prophesied that the then-existing orthodox

form of Christianity would give way to a liberal Christianity which would in turn merge with other twentieth century influences into a new eclectic religion.³¹ Kanamori subsequently left the church, but was to return to its service later still as an evangelist. In much the same vein was Yokoi Tokio's The Problems of Christianity in Our Country (1894), which urged the replacement of traditional theology by a doctrine of natural and moral revelation, based on "the demands of mankind's moral sense."³² Yokoi also left the church, and never returned.

The leading spokesman for the liberals was, however, Ebina Danjo, with whom Uemura crossed swords in the celebrated exchange of articles on Christology in 1901-2. The two were pastors of large city churches in Tokyo, and each had his own periodical in which to reply to the other. (Symbolically perhaps, Ebina's was The New Man, while Uemura's was entitled The Evangelist.) Some of the crucial issues debated by the two were summarized by Uemura in the following manner:

“Mr. Ebina lays stress on the current ideas of the age. He believes that Christianity in many respects is the compound product of the ideas of the age of its origin. We also recognize the historical development of Christianity, but more than that we trace it to the Divine revelation. We put more stress on the work of God. Mr. Ebina does not believe in the deity of Christ; he denies Him worship, and says that Christianity is not centered in Christ himself. We believe in His Deity. We believe that He is God made man. We believe in Christ's omnipresence and immanence. We worship Him and pray to Him. Mr. Ebina looks up to Christ only as a teacher. We do that, but believe Him also to be the Savior.

Mr. Ebina emphasizes learning from Christ. We believe in Him, are united to Him and depend on and entrust ourselves to Him in life and in death.”³³

The Uemura-Ebina debates in themselves are a subject of great fascination, because they reveal the maturity of Japanese apologetics even at this early period in Japanese church history. The debates used materials from the Christian apologists in the early centuries of the church, but made them particularly relevant to the Japan of that era.

Uemura thus showed his concern lest Christians become so involved in Japanese culture that they lose their unique character and message. Uemura was to feel this tension grow

in the subsequent years. He opposed the Russo-Japanese War, while Ebina defended it. 34 The point of no return for Uemura in regard to collaboration with culture may be said to be the Three Religions Conference of 1912, when Christian representatives set down with Buddhist and Shintoists to pledge their common concern "to assist Imperial prosperity and to foster popular morals." 35 Like Uchimura, Uemura was opposed to the conference even though he was not in the country at the time it met. 3 Uemura was by this time fully occupied with his various duties as pastor of a large metropolitan congregation, the head of a theological seminary, a writer of numerous books, articles and hymns, and a denominational leader with wide responsibilities. In this way he almost completely withdrew from public affairs in order to concentrate on the primary task, as he saw it, of building up the Christian Church. For the church, he held, is the only place where the life of God and the life of man come into full union. He was convinced that "finally the church would swallow society, absorbing every rebellious element, in the fulfillment of God's purpose for the race. Hence Uemura like Uchimura came to hold the claims of Christian faith and national culture in a dualistic, paradoxical tension, even though his responses to these claims were quite different from those of Uchimura.

There are other examples of a similar kind of dualism which Japanese Christians developed at this time in response to growing nationalism. The cultural climate of Japanese Christianity was rapidly changing, so to speak. In their efforts to keep up with other competing institutions, the Christian schools were concentrating so heavily on Western cultural studies, English in particular, that courses in Japanese culture gradually dropped out of the curriculum. This made it far more difficult for the graduates of Christian schools to have an appreciation for their own national culture and thus be able to express the Christian faith in terms of it. It was easier for Christians to isolate themselves from the claims of society. Indicative of this change was Kozaki Hiromichi's Kirisutokyō to Seiji (Christianity and Politics, 1911), which departed from his earlier viewpoint of church and society mentioned previously in order to embrace an essentially two realm interpretation of their relationship. 38

5. The re-establishment of Roman Catholic apologetics. Mention should be made of the re-establishment of apologetic work by Roman Catholics, who possessed the tradition of apologetics produced during the "Christian Century" in Japan. Some of the centuries-old works were actually reissued, but the times obviously called for new materials

which Roman Catholics were not quite ready to produce. Apologetic work among converts in the Meiji era made slow progress, largely because their educational preparation in a "pre-apologetic stage" began later than that of the Protestants. It was not until 1913 that Jouchi Daigaku (Sophia University) was founded, a good many years after Protestant universities had been in operation. 39 The high calibre of instruction at Sophia and elsewhere, however, soon enabled the Roman Catholics to overcome the "apologetic gap."

In the meantime, Roman Catholic apologetic work was carried on by foreign priests, mostly French who felt the same necessity as did the Protestants of refuting the attacks of Japanese critics of Christianity. The Societe Franco-Japonaise was established in Tokyo in 1909, and published a number of tracts which sought in particular to refute the charges that Christianity was philosophically unsound. 40 But even though one author has counted 51 Roman Catholic apologetic works which appeared between 1875 and 1915, it appears that the extent of their influence was rather limited. 41

C. The Era of Liberalism (1919-191).

To call the period from the end of World War I to the Manchurian Incident an "era of liberalism" may be something of a misnomer, but the title will at least remind one of the strong currents of political and theological liberalism which swept through Japan at this time. Dr. Charles Germany's excellent dissertation on Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, 1920-58, points to two main theological tendencies which flourished during this period. They sometimes ran parallel to each other, sometimes in opposition. These were the so-called "liberal" theology, and the theology of Takakura Tokutaro.

1. Liberal theology. Ebina Danjo was still the leading spokesman for liberal theology during most of this period. His apologetic continued to call for the accommodation of Christianity to the dominant currents of the day. According to Ebina's Kirisutokyo Daikan (A Comprehensive View of Christianity, 1930), the Christianity of the future must be scientific, artistic, and ethical. It must relate itself to philosophy and philosophic methodology. Not only that, but Ebina believed the day had come for a creative rapprochement of Buddhism and Christianity on a philosophical level, where the depth of thought of India and the East could be introduced to enrich the thought of Christianity and to hasten the fulfillment of its worldwide responsibility. 42 Ebina even sought to identify the Christian's Yahweh with a Shinto kami of creation, Ame-no-Minakanushi-no-Kami, and with the Jyotei (Heavenly Emperors of the Jitsugaku school of Confucianism). 43

In defense of Ebina, it has been said that he wanted Christianity to accommodate itself to culture in order ultimately to be able to transform culture. But it is an open question whether if in so doing, Christianity itself is not dissolved.

Not all liberals went so far as Ebina, however. Osuka Setsuji, the Chancellor of Doshisha University, has been mentioned by Dr. Germany as the representative of a much more discriminating and socially-minded liberalism. Through the students of the Doshisha and the Kumiai (Congregational) Churches, Osuka sought to restore the power of the spirit within the church, and at the same time to restore the church to a position of leadership in society.

The inclusion of Kagawa Toyohiko within the ranks of "liberal theology" may be surprising, for his general treatment of most of the doctrines of the Christian faith was conservative. Yet, as Dr. Germany points out, Kagawa's eschatology and ethics reflect an extreme optimism about human nature and man's ethical possibilities.⁵ This optimism led to his numerous social action projects, and it is after all on them and not on his theological writings that his chief importance as a Christian apologist rests. Behind all the many social welfare movements which Kagawa helped initiate lies his intense personal concern for human welfare, as demonstrated in his famous move into the Kobe slum district on Christmas Eve of 1909. His autobiographical novel about his experiences in Kobe, Across the Death Line (of which the English edition is called Before the Dawn, 1925), has been a best-seller in Japan and reflects its author's valuation of the deed above the word. Kagawa always insisted that Christianity's most effective witness was not in reading matter but in cross-bearing:

“How did it come about that Christianity spread throughout Japan in the Meiji period? Perhaps it was partly because people read books and read the Bible. But this was far from being the sole reason. It was because such men as Nijima, Paul Sawayama, Juji Ishii, and others, bore the Cross, and thus showed Christ to the people of Japan. Not only such as these; Christianity exists today in Japan because there are many saints who bore the Cross in unseen places 46.

Another such "saint who bore the Cross" in deep concern for human needs was Yamamuro Gumpei of the Salvation Army. The apologetic importance of social work should not be underestimated, for through it many Japanese became keenly interested in

Christianity. It is interesting to note that when the Japanese government was asked in 1956 to name the four most outstanding leaders in the field of social work in Japanese history, it listed Yamamuro and three other Christians.⁴⁷ At the same time, Yamamuro did not neglect the importance of apologetic writing. His Heimin no Fukuin (The Common Man's Gospel, 1899) -- which went into its 484th edition in 1954 -- was written in a clear, easily understood fashion, and is probably the Christian book more widely read by non-Christians than any other in Japan.

2. The theology of Takakura Tokutaro. Running parallel to the developments in the 1920's in liberal theology and social work, and indeed often running counter to them, was the theology of Takakura Tokutaro. He fell heir to Uemura's mantle, both as president of Uemura's seminary and as pastor of many of Uemura's former parishioners - though in a new church. Takakura tended to continue Uemura's emphasis on maintaining the pure proclamation of the Gospel, free from cultural embellishments. The results of this tendency on his apologetic concern may be seen in the following passage from his Fukuinteki Kirisutokyo (Evangelical Christianity, 1927):

"Saved through the gospel we are in this world and in the midst of this culture, but we do not belong to this world. We do not become, so called, men of culture. We are sent of the Lord into this world, into this culture. Our battle will not end until the world is purified and the Kingdom of God has come. The spirit of civilization is idolatry and the glorification of man. We must purify this spirit and elevate it to the spirit of the worship of God alone, to the adoration of the Savior Lord only. 48

Takakura and his disciples looked askance at programs of social action such as Kagawa was advocating. Even though Takakura urged his followers to participate in their society, he did not give them much help as to concrete ways in which their concern might be expressed. His chief emphasis was, as Dr. Germany has pointed out, on "the pure proclamation of the gospel within the community of the redeemed, and through the members of this community to Japanese society."⁴⁹ Hence Christian apologetics was at best only a by-product of the church's work and not a primary function. One may view the so-called "Takakura theology" as the bridge between the work of Uemura and that of the Japanese Barthians who came into prominence in the 1930's. The work of this-group came into prominence in the next period of this study, which may be called "the era of militarism."

D. The Era of Militarism. (1931-1945).

The selection of the Manchurian incident to mark the beginning of the "era of militarism" is again arbitrary, but at least it indicates the start of a period of growing military preparations and ventures which led to Pearl Harbor and ultimately to the nation's defeat. There is no need to repeat here how the general climate of Japanese life was changed during this period due to the growing repression of the police, the curtailment of civil rights, the expanding power of the military, increasing censorship in writing and thought, suspicion and hatred directed against foreigners, etc. The sort of attacks which had been made on Christianity from the Meiji era onward were here repeated, but in much more savage form. How were the Christian apologists to answer such charges, and at the same time to build their own explanation of the faith?

1. Japanese Barthianism. The clue for the response of many churchmen came from Germany, starting with the late 1920's, through the dialectical theology of such men as Brunner, Barth, Gogarten, Heim, and Thurneysen. In Europe, particularly in Germany, dialectical theology was addressed to churchmen living in a culture which for centuries had been predominantly Christian, warning them that if the church become too embroiled in culture it would lose its central purpose, which is listening to and proclaiming the living Word of God. Such a theological stance with its apologetic implications made it possible for Barth and the signers of the famous Barmen Declaration to stand apart from the so-called "German Christians" who Hitler was using in order to make the churches subservient to the purposes of the Nazi state.

In Japan, circumstances were quite different from those in Germany. Japanese Christians had always been a small minority in a non-Christian culture. Dialectical theology was introduced to Japan for quite a different purpose and with quite different results than were the case in Germany. The study of dialectical theology was begun in Japan primarily to combat what were felt to have been the excesses of the liberal era. One of the leading spokesmen of the advocates of dialectical theology, Kumano Yoshitaka, made this clear in his Bensholzoteki Shingaku Gairon (Outline of Dialectical Theology, 1932), where he wrote:

“In order to open up a new and independent path in separation from the materialistic, atheistic, socialist movement, our theologians considered that the most urgent matter was to seek a renewal of the church and to correct the mistakes of modern theology.

Until the glory of God receives its proper place man shall not have this world. This is the original motivation of the dialectical theology movement.” 50

In order then to free the Christian faith from the entanglements of liberalism and socialism to which it had been subject in the previous decade, Kumano and the other dialectical theologians wanted to relieve the church from its anxiety over a social program. In his Shumatauron to Rekishu Tetsugaku (Eschatology and the Philosophy of History, 1933), Kumano said:

“The ethic of the Christian and of the church via-avia the world should not be a 'program ethic' but an 'interim ethic', a listening for the divine command within the concrete situation.” 51

Early studies such as those by Kumano and Kuwada Hidenobu's Benshohoteki Shingaku (Dialectical Theology, 1933) did not make many distinctions between the German dialectical theologians. But in time Barth's emphases -- particularly on the discontinuity between culture and the church -- began to count more in Japan than those of any other. Brunner was left behind after his encounter with Barth over "natural theology." Before Japanese Barthianism -- and one must remember the distinction which Barth himself has made between "Barth" and "Barthians" -- the "liberal theology" of the earlier era withered away in Japan. The liberals were of course also losing ground because of the oppressive measures of the government at this time. There were voices raised in criticism of Barthianism during this period to be sure, but there was hardly a rival to challenge it among Protestant theologies.

2. Japanese Thomism. Among Japanese Roman Catholics, the leading scholar of this era was Iwashita Soichi whose Katorikku no Shinko (The Faith of Catholicism, 1930) presented a creative and well-written apologetic introduction to the Catholic catechism. The foundation of Ftr. Iwashita's thought is Thomism, which he and Yoshimitsu Yoshihiko helped establish in Japanese philosophical circles.

Iwashita became widely known in Japan not only for writings, but also for his willingness to minister personally to human needs, a trait which he shared with such figures as Schweitzer and Kagawa. He set aside his academic duties in order to become the director of a church leprosarium. Of this experience he later wrote:

“It was a surprising event for me, one who had lived solely in schools and books until I was more than 40 years old, to come suddenly out of the world of ideas to be confronted day and night with the most miserable 'lumps of life, not human' (the lepers)... For the first years after I came here I repeatedly asked myself, 'What is the use of philosophy?' But I came to know that their groaning was just that cry which demanded the most adequate philosophy.”
52

The use of natural law by Japanese Thomists has had both advantages and disadvantages from an apologetic viewpoint. On the one hand, Thomism has provided a framework for the wholesome Christian appropriation of broad areas of Japanese culture. At the same time there has been the tendency for Thomism to accept in rather uncritical fashion various Confucian and other viewpoints as embodiments of natural law. For instance, the eminent Roman Catholic jurist, Tanaka Kotaro, who was to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in postwar Japan and the author of the monumental Sekai Ho no Riron (The Theory of World Law, 1954), regularly maintained that the basic principles of the Imperial Rescript on Education were nothing else than natural law. It is curious to note then how Japanese Barthianism and Japanese Thomism resembled each other in this, that neither was able to furnish the theological basis for a critique of the tides of militarism that swept over Japan in the 1930's.

3. Japanese "apologetics" during World War II. Apologetics can of course be put to uses both good and bad, and the record of so-called "apologetic" writing during World War II contains many examples of the latter. In the interests of extreme nationalism some Christians made the effort, for instance, to syncretize the Christian faith with Shinto elements which the government was laying heavy stress upon. Ebina's suggested identification of the Christian God with a Shinto kami of creation was taken up again. This was due to the alleged similarity of the title in Acts 17:24, "The Lord of heaven and earth," with the title of a kami as "the Deity Lord of the August Center of Heaven." One Christian author claimed that these two designations "agree like a seal and its counterpart."⁷³ The same impulse led others to make extravagant claims for a uniquely Japanese Christianity. Some maintained that Japanese Christianity possesses worth which the Christianity of no other nation does. Others held that Japan's conquests in East Asia would bring a rich spiritual harvest.⁵⁴ Other examples could be given, but these give the flavor. Needless to say, this sort of apologetic expired after the nation's defeat in 1945.

Not all Japanese Christians shared such views, however. There were some who continued the dualistic tendencies which had been handed down from Uemura to Takakura to the Japanese Barthians. They sought to maintain the purity of the church's proclamation of the Gospel while they passively accepted the government's control. One writer maintained, for instance, that the Christians' recognition of the authority of the state implied two things: "(1) The protection by the state of the right of the church to perform her function; (2) The responsibility of obedience to the state as citizens." 55

A small number of Christians sought to resist governmental pressures, and their lot was often brutal persecution. Belief in the imminent return of Christ sustained some of those whose convictions led them to prison or even to death. The great majority of Christians, however, did not follow such a course. And hence the majority found the going hard for Christianity in spite of the era of opportunity which dawned upon the church after the end of World War II.

E. The Era of Opportunity (1945 -)

1. The surge of new freedoms. After World War II the doors were thrown open to freedoms which Japanese society had never known before. This was particularly true in the realm of religion. Article 20 of the new Constitution promulgated in 1946 reads: "Freedom of religion is guaranteed to all. No person shall be compelled to take part in any religious act) celebration, rite or practice. No religious organization shall receive any privileges from the State, nor exercise any political authority. The State and its organs shall refrain from religious education and other religious activity." 56

Christian groups were thus given the opportunity to engage in evangelistic and apologetic enterprises as never before. At the same time, the surge of new freedoms gave opportunities to the antagonists of Christianity as well. Anti-Christian works were freely published, such as Honda Akira's Seisho, Gusha no Rakuen (The Bible, A Paradise of a Fool, 1957), and Japanese translations of works by H. J. Laski and Bertrand Russell. Able Buddhist writing appeared in Niasutani Fumio's Kirisutokyo ni taisuru Bukkyo no Shucho (Buddhist Opposition to Christianity, 1951), as well as less scholarly publications by Soka Gakkai, the extremist offshoot of Nichiren Buddhism. 57 In addition, the postwar era-saw the Japanese Communist Party operating legally for the

first time in history. In the midst of the chaos and rootlessness which followed Japan's military defeat, large numbers found in Marxism a secular religion, and Communists launched many an attack against the Christian faith.

How have Christians responded to this "era of opportunity," fraught as it is by its accompanying hazards? It is far too early to make any accurate judgments here. One may only list some of the apologetic works which have appeared in recent years.

2. Some recent views of Christian apologetics.

From the standpoint of Christian apologetics, Roman Catholic studies may be said to be leading the field in recent years in many respects. The Neo-Thomist works of Yoshimitsu Yoshihiko on the philosophy of religion and of Tanaka Kotaro on law -- to give but two examples -- continue to exert profound influence.

Among Protestants, the tradition of Uchimura Kanz and non-church Christianity is continued by such works as the late Yanaihara Tadao's Kirisutoko Pumon (Introduction to Christianity, 1952), while an able conservative apologist has appeared in Okada Minoru.

Carl Michelson's Japanese Contributions to Christian Theology devotes considerable attention to the recent works of Hatano, Kumano, and Kitamori. It is his opinion that "Hatano's philosophy of religion is Christian apologetics of the most subtle and sophisticated variety, the variety best suited to the Japanese spirit."⁵⁸ He considers the strong point of Hatano's works, especially his Shykyo Tetsugaku (Philosophy of Religion, 1946) and Toki to Eien (Time and Eternity, 1949), to be his use of existentialist categories which throw open the doors of the church's theology to the voices of philosophy and culture which demand a hearing. By revealing the metaphysical profundities of the Christian faith, Hatano hoped to make a contribution to Japanese philosophy and thus to make the Christian faith a live option for Japanese intellectuals.⁵⁹

Michelson holds that "even the most thoroughgoing Barthians do not find Barth averse to apologetics."⁶⁰ In this way he can find apologetic significance in the postwar works of Kumano, his Kirisutokyo Gairon (Outline of Christianity, 1947), and the first two volumes of a projected four or five of his Kyogigaku (Dogmatics; Vol. I, 1954, Vol. II, 1959). Valuable, for instance, is the distinction which Kumano holds between the intellectual activity produced by the knowledge of faith and that of the knowledge of

philosophy. Faith is knowing God as He has made Himself known, and this must of necessity involve reasoning. But it is reasoning based on historical revelation, and this puts it in quite a different category from the subject matter of philosophy. 61

If Hatano maintains many of the traditions of liberal theology, and Kumano upholds Barthianism, it is Kitamori Kazo who tries to mediate between them in his Kami no Itami no Shingaku (Theology of the Pain of God, 1946) Both Barthians and liberals have excluded the inescapable reality of the pain of God, Kitamori contends, which arises out of God's anguish over human sin. The Barthians emphasize the absolute opposition of God to man, while the liberals stress God's immediate communication of His love. Both are in error since they lack the concept of the pain of God. 62 The apologetic implications of this view can be seen in relation to the very deep motif in Japanese literature and life of pain which is suffered in order to give another life. The revelation of the pain of God may then he said to open a door for both those inside and outside the Christian faith to gain a new apprehension of the Christian Gospel.

3. Some tentative conclusions. On the basis of this historical survey, the following are offered as tentative conclusions about Christian apologetics in Japan:

- (1) The main tendencies in Japanese apologetics were set down rather clearly in the Meiji era, and have been elaborated in many facets over the years. Post-Meiji Christians have not been so concerned with apologetics, but one wonders if this change of emphasis has been altogether wise.
- (2) Japanese apologetics has been of a very highly developed theological variety, even though the direction of its theological tendencies has been given by impulses from within Japanese society and not primarily from within Christianity itself.
- (3) Japanese churchmen have shown great ability in thinking through the apologetic task of Christianity in their own country, although they have been greatly helped in the process by contributions from abroad.
- (4) There is no single "ideal" apologetics for Japan, since apologetics over the years has faced a number of different challenges and opportunities, and will continue to do so in the future.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS IN ENGLISH

Gorton, Hugh. Japan's Modern Century. N.Y.: Ronald, 1955.

Ebizawa, Norimichi, ed. Japanese Witnesses for Christ. London: Lutterworth (World Christian Books No. 20), 19-57.

Germany, Charles H. Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, 1920-58. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation for Columbia Univ., 1959).

Hammer, Raymond. Japan's Religious Ferment. London: S.C.M., 1961.

Holtom, D.C. Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism (rev. ed.) Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947.

Iglehart, Charles W. A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan. Tokyo: Charles Tuttle, 1959.

Kishimoto, Hideo and Howes, John F. Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era. (Centenary Culture Council Series). Tokyo: Obunsha, 1956.

Kosaka, Masaaki and Abosch, David. Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era. (Centenary Culture Council Series). Tokyo: Pan-Pacific Press, 1958

Laures, Johannes. The Catholic Church in Japan: A Short History. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1954.

Michalson Carl. Japanese Contributions to Christian Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.

Kakenaka, Masao. Reconciliation and Renewal in Japan. N.Y. Friendship Press, 1958.

Trout, Jessie M. Kagawa, Japanese Prophet. London: Lutterworth (World Christian Books No. 30), 1959.

Van Hecken, Joseph L. Un Siecle de Vie Catholique au Japon, 1859-1959. Tokyo: The Committee of the Apostolate, 1960

Yanagita, Tomonobu. Japan Christian Literature Review. Sendai: Seisho Tosho Kankokai, 1958.

FOOTNOTES

1. Quoted in H. Borton, Japan's Modern Century, p. 72.
2. N. Ebizawa, Japanese Witnesses for Christ, pp. 18-19.
3. J. F. Howes, "Uchimura Kanzo on Christopher Columbus" Japan Christian Quarterly, October 1960.
4. H. Kishimoto and J. F. Howes, Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era, P.233.
5. Ibid., p. 184.
6. Ibid..
7. Ibid., pp. 184-5.
8. Ibid., p. 231.
9. M. Kosaka and Aboch, Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era Ibid. p. 156.
10. Ibid., p. 242.
11. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, pp. 233-4.
12. D. C. Holtom, Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism, p. 82.
13. Ibid. This paragraph is based on Holtom's analysis.
14. Kosaka, Japanese Thought, p. 182.
15. Ibid., p. 183
16. Ibid.
17. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 191.
18. Quoted from Borton, Japan's Modern Century, p. 494.
19. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 253.
20. Quoted from C. Iglehart, A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan, p. 8U.
21. Ebizawa, Japanese Witnesses, p. 55.
22. Kosaka, Japanese Thought, p. 346.
23. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 256.

24. Ibid., p. 257.
25. Holtom, Modern Japan, p. 81.
26. Ibid., pp. 81-2.
27. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 256.
28. Kosaka, Japanese Thought, p. 347.
29. Ibid., p. 351.
30. Iglehart, A Century, p. 154.
31. C. H. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, 1920-58) p. 19.
32. Ibid., p. 20.
33. Ibid., p. 127.
34. Ibid., p. 56.
35. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 299.
36. Iglehart, A Century, p. 139
37. Ibid., p. 155.
38. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents Christianity, 1920-~, p. 25.
39. J. Laures, The Catholic Church in Japan, p. 239.
40. J. VanHecken, Un Siecle de Vie Catholique au Japon, P. 139.
41. Ibid.
42. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, p. 38.
43. Kishimoto, Japanese Religion, p. 274. See also Takenaka, Reconciliation, p. 18.
44. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents Christianity, p.43
45. Ibid., p. 63.
46. J. M. Trout, Kagawa, Japanese Prophet, p. 34.

47. Takenaka, Reconciliation, p. 28.
48. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, p. 155.
49. Ibid., p. 158.
50. Ibid., p. 182.
51. Ibid., p. 200.
52. T. Yanagita, Japan Christian Literature Review, p. 14.
53. Holtom, Modern Japan, p. 112.
54. Iglehart, A Century, p. 252.
55. Germany, Dominant Theological Currents in Japanese Christianity, p.228.
56. Quoted in Raymond Hammer, Japan's Religious Ferment, pp. 176-7.
57. The above works are listed in Yanagita, Japan, Christian Literature Review.
58. Carl Michalson, Japanese Contributions to Christian Theology, p. 103.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., p. 142.
61. Ibid., pp. 128-9.
62. Yanagita, Japan Christian Literature Review, p. 35.

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPT OF AUTHORITY VS. JAPANESE PATTERNS

By Frank Cole

This topic is exceedingly complicated because it involves so much. In the first place, within what we may call "Christendom" there are many concepts of authority. Were my topic "The Biblical Concept of Authority" my task would be somewhat simplified and I could avoid controversy.

Again, my task has been complicated by the addition of "versus Japanese Patterns" to my subject. On September 25, I received a letter which stated that my topic was to be "Principle and Pattern of Authority." On December 12, I received the program and a letter stating that my topic was "The Christian Concept of Authority versus Japanese Patterns." Due to a very busy Christmas schedule, I was unable to do any research on this additional subject. I have simply added a few personal impressions of Japanese patterns at the end. This way you can straighten my ideas out in the discussion period. In anticipation for the discussion period, may I say now that my paper lacks two things: It lacks depth of discussion in the topics that I discuss. It also lacks discussion on enough related topics. I do not see how it can be otherwise considering the topic

I. THE SOURCE; OF ALL RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

All who call themselves "Christian" agree that all religious authority is centered in God. However, practically speaking, to say this is meaningless unless God transmits His authority to us in some way. He does so by revelation, and that revelation is primarily in the Bible. A policeman may have authority, but this authority has no relationship with us if he is on perpetual vacations. Let us begin by looking at the various alternatives.

II. AN INFALLIBLE CHURCH

As far as I can understand Roman Catholic theology, God speaks to the Roman Catholic believer through the Bible and through the church. In actuality the churches' authority is superior to the Bible in that it alone can interpret the Bible. I see no practical reason for reading something which I cannot interpret to determine its meaning. Of course, it might be proposed that one should read the bible as a reminder of the true interpretation which has been given by the church; however, the church has produced far more condensed reminders, so why bother with the Bible?

What is meant by the infallibility of the church is not really as clear as it may seem. Evidence may be produced to indicate that it includes all of the following:

1. Unanimous consent of the church fathers.
2. The teaching of the general councils.
3. The Pope when speaking ex-cathedra.

Present teaching indicates that the Pope is superior and, therefore, the only one with real infallibility. Conway (Question Box, p.162) says, "The Primacy of the Popes has always been the teaching of the Catholic church and the chief Bishop, alone, has the authority to give its decrees binding force. The general councils have always acknowledged the primacy of the Popes."

A problem now appears. Conway admits that, "The council of Constance ...did erroneously declare that the council was above the Pope, but these decrees never received the force of law in the church, and were deliberately set aside as null and void by Pope Martin V. .."

From this we can conclude that general councils do not agree. This is also true of the church fathers. The councils, therefore, cannot be infallible. This leaves us with the center of authority as being found in the Pope. But, on what authority does the Roman church claim that the Pope is infallible? That many Popes claim infallibility is obvious. But how is this claim to be vindicated? Conway says, "The council of Florence in 1439 decided finally the true position of the Pope..." Thus, the council of Florence vindicated the Pope's claim. But, who will vindicate this council? Having decided that the councils are not infallible, we find it hard to accept the decisions of the council of Florence anymore than the council of Constance which pronounced against Papal infallibility. Perhaps next year a new council will reverse the previous decision and "settle the issue finally " If, however, the Roman Catholic church will give us the freedom to examine the Scriptures to see if Papal infallibility is taught therein, we must confess that we do not find it. While a number of passages are appealed to, the passage usually referred to is Matthew 16:16-19, Now I think, considering how important this whole matter is, we may expect the evidence to be obvious to any unbiased seeking person. God certainly would not leave us to base our whole doctrine of the church on one or two vague implications of a few unclear passages of Scripture. But, when we find Rome's own theologians disagreeing (Augustine for example) as to the meaning of the passage, we must conclude that even an unbiased person may not see what Rome now claims is cleanly revealed in this passage.

Let us not make the mistake of letting the discussion revolve around the question of whether or not Peter is the rock. In order to prove Papal infallibility this passage must clearly teach all of the following:

1. Peter is the rock on which the church was founded.
2. This passage teaches ex-cathedra infallibility.
3. This passage teaches that this infallibility is only for Peter and not for the other disciples. (See Mt. 18:17-19 etc.)
4. That this infallibility is passed along to Peter's successors.
5. Peter established the church at Rome.
6. This refers to the Roman church and no other church that Peter is supposed to have established.
7. The present Pope must also be proven to be in this line of successors. To by-pass this historical difficulty by saying that God knew the true Pope even though at times the church did not only opens the door to say that this may be true today, that is, that the present Pope is not the true one.

As far as I can see, not one of these points has been established in the least. We must, therefore, conclude that God's authority does not come through an infallible church.

III. FALLIBLE MEANS.

It may be suggested that God's authority need not come through an infallible channel. Police have authority and transmit it even though fallibility pervades the whole system. Most of what we learn and trust from science comes from fallible authorities. Can we not have authority in religion also without infallibility?

There are serious differences between science and religion. In the first place, scientists have a common object which they can observe, draw conclusions, and test these conclusions. In religion, the nearest thing to such an object which we can observe is what we might call "natural theology" and "religious experience." The only conclusion that one can reach in such an examination is that from neither can we learn anything basic and certain concerning salvation and eternity.

Furthermore, in science, truths which for practical purposes are important usually become commonly agreed upon. When the scientist's knowledge is limited, if we must make a decision, we must take a chance simply because we have no choice. Without infallible revelation this leap in the dark would be necessary and no one should criticize

another for the direction of his leap. In religion, amongst those who deny infallible authority, there is little common agreement on basic issues. Doctors agree basically eventually on the cause and cure of disease, but these theologians differ on such basic issues as the nature of Christ, the Trinity, the resurrection and heaven and hell. (Those who accept the infallibility of the Bible with rare exceptions agree on basic doctrines.)

Lastly, scientists are rarely greatly hampered in their research by their sinful nature. Thus we see great scientific progress in the world. However, in the field of morals and religion we see very little. In this area of study man's sinful nature is a great hindrance.

To summarize, let us compare a doctor's authority with Biblical authority. Those who do medical research have no particular bias, yet are fallible. Despite their fallibility they come up with many reasonably reliable conclusions because they can unbiasedly investigate objective reality and test each others conclusions. Our family doctors are essentially reliable because they base their conclusions on agreed results of many unbiased researchers. Since infallibility does not exist in the medical world, we have no choice but follow our doctor's advice under normal circumstances. In the religious world all is different. We do not have unbiased researchers, nor do we have objective matter to examine if the Bible is rejected. As a result scholars in this field do not come to agreed upon conclusions; and we aren't willing to trust them when we know an infallible God exists who can and ought to give us enough reliable knowledge of basic issues in this field.

Therefore, we cannot be satisfied with fallibility. Yet most modern views are basically views which logically teach that the infallible God communicates to man fallibly.

IV. AUTHORITY COMMUNICATED THROUGH AN ENCOUNTER.

To some the infallible God speaks to man infallibly in the "encounter." Some hold that this encounter takes place through the Bible which is in itself only a fallible record of God's acts; while others hold that God encounters man through many means. In either case, God meets man person to person. The "encounter" may be said to be infallible; but what is taken away from the experience is fallible. Thus man simply knows that he met God. He does not know infallibly what God is like, or how He is working.

Besides this experience in which one learns nothing, there is a certain amount of knowledge gained from the Bible which is considered fallible. The Bible points to Jesus Christ who is the Word of God, but it is up to the individual scholar to decide how accurate the picture of Christ is. Admittedly there is good evidence of certain truths such as the Deity and resurrection of Christ even if the Bible is fallible, but we are left to interpret these truths for ourselves if we ignore Jesus' view of inspiration. Besides, those who hold this view take a very dim view of evidences, therefore, there is no particular reason for believing in the Deity of Christ or His resurrection if this view is held.

Baillie does seem to indicate that we may consider the repeated themes of the Bible as infallible, but the way he discussed this subject gives one the impression that he is not really serious about this idea. Certainly the repeated themes of the Bible do not support his view of inspiration.

The folly of this system of authority is that God's authority really never reaches man. This can be seen by the fact that those who hold this system of authority differ greatly as to what the infallible truths of Christianity are. Barth and Brunner accept more Scriptural truths than do Bultmann, Tillich and Niebuhr. The differences are so pronounced that the former accuse the latter of not being Christians. Thus Barth and Brunner inconsistently admit that there are certain things which must be believed in order to be properly called, "Christian." But, how are we to decide what must be believed in, in the infallible Bible, and what shall be rejected. It appears that all these men approach the Bible with a self-made sieve in which they strain out the good of the Bible from the bad. Barth's and Brunner's sieves have smaller holes so more is retained. Nevertheless, this method boils down to the fact that God does not infallibly reveal Himself. And, what fallible revelation we have must be handled by sinful men with no God given principle to determine truth from error on a subject which no amount of human research can be of any substantial help. Even the encounter, which is meant to make Christianity personal and practical leaves man floundering. We cannot be sure we met God, not Satan, in the encounter. Perhaps the whole thing was just our imagination.

It is often claimed that this view is the Biblical view. That such is not the case appears to me quite clear, but time does not permit a discussion of the pertinent passages at this time. I must refer you to books which deal with this subject such as Henry, Revelation and the Bible; Geldenhuys, Supreme Authority; Ramm, Pattern of Authority; Ramm,

Special Revelation and the Word of God; Young, Try Word Is Truth; Walvoord, Inspiration and Interpretation; and especially Wenham, Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament. It is significant that Brunner once taught that his view was the Biblical and reformation view. In Revelation and Reason he admitted that the 2nd generation reformers including Calvin did not hold his view. In Doctrine of God he admitted that Luther also held a different view; that his view is not found in the Old Testament; and finally that Paul and the other disciples were also "fundamentalists." He still contended that Christ taught his view. (He apparently felt that the authors of the gospels misrepresented Jesus at this point; but since there are no other records on which to support the idea that Jesus believed and taught his view, it is hard to see how he could be sure.)

V. DYNAMIC INSPIRATION

There are perhaps three well known theories of inspiration which grant to the Bible at least some degree of true infallibility. They are: dictation, verbal plenary, and dynamic. We may dismiss the dictation theory as not worthy of our time. I am not sure that it even exists. It seems to be a "straw man" constructed for the purpose of opposing the verbal plenary *view* of inspiration.

The dynamic view as held by A. H. Strong, teaches that the Bible is ignorant when touching on salvation. Actually, a careful examination of this view indicates that it is also inerrant in matters relating to the Christian life. This would include historical matters relating to these two subjects. Thus it is said that there is only room for minor errors. As properly exegesis, there is practically no danger of error. Thus, this view does give some principles of guidance which prevent the reader from subjectively deciding what he shall believe and what he will not believe. For example, even though Strong holds that errors exist in the Bible, the view holds a high enough view of inspiration for Strong to see that the Bible teaches that believer's baptism by immersion is one infallibly taught truth. (It is apparently so clearly taught that even Barth with his lower view of inspiration cannot escape the conclusion.) (These last remarks are not really a part of this message, so you will not be charged for them.)

In Strong's opinion the strength of this view may be summarized as follows:

1. It solves many apparent discrepancies in the Bible.
2. It permits the human personality of the authors be seen.
3. The Scriptures have real authority and infallibility.

4. It has no more possibility of error than the dictation theory which teaches that only the original autographs were without error.
5. Furthermore, it does not have the weaknesses of the dictation theory such as the different wordings of the same statements by different gospel authors.

VI. INERRANCY. OR VERBAL PLENARY INSPIRATION

Verbal plenary inspiration properly defined, teaches that the original manuscripts are inerrant. The word "verbal" should not be confused with "dictation". God only controls the authors sufficiently to insure inerrancy and that which is written is what He desires written even if it is stated differently in different passages. Many who hold to "verbal plenary" inspiration refuse to use the word "verbal" because they feel it does imply "dictation." Whatever name is used, the essential part of the theory is that of inerrancy. It seems to me that this view is superior to the dynamic view in many ways. Consider the following:

1. The discrepancies solved by the dynamic view have, for the most part, been solved without resorting to the dynamic view; but the real thorny problems confronting the conservative apologists are not solved by either view. For example, we are often asked, 'How can there be joy in heaven when one should remain suffering in hell.' Neither the verbal plenary view nor the dynamic view is particular help in relieving the problem. Strong's view of inspiration leads him to the conclusion that there is eternal punishment just as much as does verbal plenary inspiration.
2. Strong's criticisms were leveled against the dictation theory. He seemed unaware of the verbal plenary view as herein defined which is not touched by his criticisms. The human personality of the Biblical authors is apparent.
3. While errors of copying and translating are no doubt present, for the most part we know where such possibilities or error are and where there is no possibility, whereas the dynamic view permits errors most anywhere in addition to copyist's and translator's errors.
4. Although nearly all those who hold to dynamic inspiration are quite conservative in theology, this is not necessarily the logical out-come of this view of inspiration. The dynamic view is still too subjective. In one sense the entire Bible can be said to be related to salvation and how to live, hence no errors should exist. In another sense one

might so interpret Strong's principle as to permit error to permeate the Bible. The line of demarcation is still vague and subjective to some extent.

5. It appears that Jesus Christ taught inerrancy. If so, to deny it reflects on His Deity. This is by far the most important reason. By far too little attention has been given to this point by those who reject inerrancy. Orr, for example, seems to begin his approach to the problem of inspiration by working from the apparent problems in the Bible which he cannot satisfactorily solve. He concludes that there are a few errors, so with this presupposition he attempts to build a theory of inspiration. In so doing he pays little attention to the Biblical doctrine of inerrancy. Strong likewise makes no attempt to deal with the matter of Jesus' teaching on inspiration as far as it touches the subject of inerrancy. We do not want to lightly dismiss the problems from our viewpoint, but certainly a few unsolved apparent discrepancies in the Bible can be brushed aside with the hope that in the future more light will be received, much more easily than doing injustice to the Deity of Christ by denying His teaching on inspiration.

VII. APOLOGETICAL ORDER

A brief word needs to be said concerning the method by which we reach inerrancy. The following is an outline of the order which we would like to suggest:

1. The Bible can be shown to be essentially historical and reliable to any person in whom the Holy Spirit is working, as long as he does not resist the Holy Spirit.
2. Contrary to the idea of Bultmann and others, without historical truth there is no value in Christianity. The incarnation including the orthodox view of the Deity of Christ can be proven from an essentially historically reliable Bible.
3. Jesus, the God-man stamps His approval on the inerrancy of the Bible and so we must accept it since He never errs.

Now, the most obvious loophole in this reasoning is that some feel Jesus could err. Since Jesus emptied Himself, may it not be that His knowledge was limited in some matters? Thus, He erroneously assumed the orthodox view of His day according to this view. To this we must answer in part that if Jesus erred we have no criteria to determine when He did not err and once again we lose all connection with God's infallible

authority. Logically one could also say that Jesus was in error when He told Nicodemus that he must be born again. Jesus' knowledge may have been limited but limitations do not necessarily imply error.

One more theory ought to be dealt with briefly at this point. Carnell who professes to believe in inerrancy suggests that just as inspiration does not guarantee the inerrancy of Stephen's sermon but rather only the accurate recording of it, so also the Chronicler may have accurately recorded the errors of the manuscripts which he copied. Thus Carnell uses hermeneutics as a cloak to permit errors while still denying them. One need only carry this sort of thinking to its logical conclusion to see the fallacy. In like manner it could be said that Luke copied the errors in the stories of Christ given to him and so soon we have nothing we can trust with certainty. We must not ignore many problems facing us which are often related to hermeneutics, nevertheless we need not reject a theory because of minor unsolved difficulties. A theory stands or falls on the strength of its basic principles.

VIII. THE HOLY SPIRIT

So far we have greatly neglected the Holy Spirit in our discussion. In regard to His place in this subject, we wish to avoid two extremes. The first is to assume that evidences or interpretation of the Bible can be carried out without His work. The other is to assume that the Holy Spirit works apart from means at all times. It is true that He does usually work apart from evidences. However, this does not mean that it is God's will not to use evidences. God's word tells us to be "...ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, yet with meekness and fear." We can see the apostles in the book of Acts using the resurrection evidences continually. Furthermore, many of the New Testament books were essentially apologetics. Matthew, for example, is an argument intended to prove to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah. The Holy Spirit must and does work with or without evidences, but we are to "...prove the spirits, whether they are of God because many false prophets are gone out into the world." The Holy Spirit does work whether we obediently use apologetics or not, and unless He works apologetics are useless.

We readily acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is responsible for every step leading to salvation as well as "keeping the Christian after salvation. We feel, however, on the basis of the word of God, that the Holy Spirit does often wish to work through evidences.

We summarize the Spirit's work in relation to evidences in three ways: 1. He reveals new evidences. 2. He illuminates the seeker's mind so he can see the validity of the evidences. 3. He seals on in faith. Thus it is through the Spirit's work that a man seeks to know the truth. The Spirit leads that man to the necessary evidences. He shows him the validity of evidences. He gives the man assurances that on the basis of the evidence, the seeker can believe, and He gives the man saving faith.

We are not here trying to give an exhaustive summary of the Holy Spirit's work, but we are trying to point out that the Scriptures teach clearly that evidences are to be used and yet, at the same time, they teach that the Holy Spirit's witness is what brings men to faith. The simplest way of harmonizing the two is to say that the Holy Spirit uses evidences, just as He uses the preaching of the Gospel etc.

IX. THE PURPOSE OF INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY

Space only permits a word or two concerning the object of God's revelation in and through the Bible, but this should not be considered as an indication that it is relatively unimportant. Although Jesus is the center of the Bible and can be seen on nearly every page, it would be erroneous to say that the aim of revelation is exclusively to reveal Jesus the :Son of God. "The only Christ known is the Christ of the scriptures; and the only Spirit known is the Spirit of Jesus Christ. No wedge can be driven between the Spirit and the Bible, the Bible and Christ, and Christ and the Spirit. They form an inseparable mosaic of divine authority" (Ramm, *The Pattern of Authority*, p. 46) We may add that Jesus reveals the nature of God. The purpose of all this can be found hinted at the Peter's 2nd epistle, "...seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that called us by his own glory and virtue; Whereby he hath granted unto us his precious and exceeding great promises; that through these ye may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world by lust." From this we can see that the object of revelation is to reveal to us what we need to know to be saved and to live the Christian life in order that we may glorify God and enjoy Him forever.

X. THE JAPANESE PATTERN

It is my impression that most of the theological trends around the world are found in Japan, both good and bad'. We have already dealt with these concepts. Therefore, in

many ways there are similarities. On the other hand, many differences are also apparent. A number of trends which seem to be peculiar to Japan are worthy of comment.

1. Sub-orthodoxy seems stronger in Japan than in the U.S.A. It is said that most of the pastors even in the Nihon Kirisutokyodan are conservative, even though most of the literature published is sub-orthodox. However, it appears to me that the influence of sub-orthodoxy has strongly influenced many who claim to be conservative. In the U.S.A., according to Christianity Today magazine, only 26% of the pastors are sub-orthodox. I think it would be accurate to say that the figure is far higher in Japan.
2. There is the non-church movement which points out a most important trend in general. While much can be said concerning the good features of this movement, it has said we are only interested in important matters. Minor matters may be ignored. For those non-church men who hold a low view of inspiration this is perhaps no serious inconsistency; but for one who holds to a high view it appears greatly inconsistent to ignore minor commands which our Lord clearly made. Thus more and more I have seen an inconsistency between profession and life. Many who claim to hold to an infallible view of inspiration lightly dismiss plain Scriptural injunctions by the comment, "That is what the Bible teaches, but we have a practical problem here in Japan." Usually this is done to avoid walking the difficult road of obedience.
3. I further sense a trend in Japan towards relativism. This has permeated orthodox circles as well as liberal. I wonder if this is not the real reason for dismissing Scriptural injunctions so lightly. If one is really not sure that God has spoken there is little desire to obey when it leads to difficulties.

CONCLUSION

Christianity needs to know that through the Bible and only through the Bible is God's authority infallibly transmitted to mankind. Even when the Holy Spirit speaks apart from the Bible, we are to "prove the spirits whether they are of God" by the Bible. Even the life of Jesus which reveals the nature of God, is revealed only in the Bible. This is not to say that God is not working in history and through His church, nor is this to say that we can learn nothing from church tradition; only that all of these must bow to Biblical authority because God has chosen to transmit His authority infallibly through the written word.

Not only must we know these facts with assurance of their truthfulness, but we do need an "encounter" with the God of the Bible in such a way that we will recognize His authority in our daily lives no matter what the cost may be. Japanese custom and our own desires must also bow to God's authority in and through the Bible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. Defending Inerrancy for the most part
 - Goldenhuyts, Supreme Authority
 - Haley, Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible
 - Packer, Fundamentalism and the Word of God
 - Wenham, Our Lord's Use of the Old Testament,
 - Ramm, Pattern of Authority
 - Ramm Special Revelation and the Word of God.
 - Young, Thy Word is Truth
 - Henry, (editor Revelation and the Bible
 - Walvoord, (editor) Inspiration and Interpretation

- II. Defending Dynamic Inspiration or similar views
 - Orr, Revelation and Inspiration,
 - Strong, Systematic Theology,
 - Carnell, Case for Orthodoxy

- III. Defending Neo-orthodoxy or similar views
 - Baillie, John, The Idea of Revelation in Modern Thought,
 - Tillich, Paul, Systematic Theology
 - Barth, Karl, The Doctrine of the Word of God
 - Niebuhr, Faith and History
 - Brunner, Revelation and Reason
 - Bultmann, Jesus and the Word

- IV. In Opposition to Neo-orthodoxy
 - Carnell, the Theology of Reinhold niebuhr
 - Jewett, Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation
 - Ribberbos, Bultmann.

- V. Defending Roman Catholicism
 - Conway, Question Box.
 - Butler, The Church and Infallibility (An answer to Salmon)

- VI. In Opposition to Roman Catholicism
 - Salmon, The Infallibility of the Church
 - Stewart, Roman Dogma and Scripture Truth

- VII. The Witness of the Spirit
 - Ramm, The Witness of the Spirit

CHRISTIANITY CONFRONTS TOTALITARIANISM, LEFT AND RIGHT

Hideo Aoki

"We have democratized Japan and they like it" -- these were words blared over the Far East Network in 1957. I have not been able to conclude whether this statement has intended to off-set Communist propaganda that makes communism the true defenders of democracy or whether this statement expressed an erroneous but optimistic claim.

In the study of Left and Right wing politics in Japan, one is confronted with two movements running side by side--democracy on the one hand and nationalism on the other hand. We must appraise left and right in the political milieu.

My thesis is that democratic roots in Japan are shallow and weak, therefore this analysis of the weakness of democracy leads me to the belief that there exists the danger of a sudden revolutionary shift toward either left or right.

Let us consider first the status of democracy in Japan. Democracy is not something that blossoms suddenly but is a long process.

In the first place, no occupied nation democratizes another country-- in spite of the fact that General McArthur forced Japan to adopt a new Constitution which guaranteed, human rights, including women's suffrage, religious liberty, and disestablished Shintoism as a state religion.

In the second place, democracy is not set of tenants which we give mental assent to but is a dynamic process which often require generations to develop ... Have you ever stopped to consider that less than two hundred years ago the Quakers who persisted in their belief were put to death? Ambassador Reichauer's analysis of democracy in Japan after the demonstrations of May and June 1960 is incisive. He writes: This brings me to what I feel is the real threat to democracy in Japan. This is the lack of natural democratic reactions on the part of many people. Especially among intellectuals, democracy seems to be too much a matter of the mind, and not enough a matter of the heart--the spontaneous feeling that the other person's right must be defended and his views respected, even if not accepted.

This weakness, I believe, is the result of the relative speed with which Japan has come to democracy. Other peoples, who have lived with democratic ideas for many generations, naturally have developed stronger democratic instincts, on which their democracy is more securely based.

As we trace the pre-world war II history of Japan, she has been a totalitarian nation with an educational system to maintain and further this political system.

After Japan's defeat in 1945, the Occupation's prime task was to democratize Japan. In addition to the land reform, the formulation of a new constitution, and other reforms, the most drastic reform was in education. Never in the history of any nation in the world, has there been such drastic reforms in education.

There were two phases to this process of democratizing Japanese education. The first was to eliminate all undemocratic materials from the curriculum. Let me mention, two important items.

1. The Imperial Rescript on Education which was a Shintoistic, and Confucianistic creed which perpetuated ultra-nationalism from the year 1890. This philosophy of education was eliminated by the Occupation.
2. The course in morals which was required for all elementary school children and which indoctrinated the Shintoistic ultra-nationalism was prohibited.

The second phase of democratizing Japanese education was to institute a democratic system of education such as extending compulsory education to nine years from six, providing a single-track system of 6-years elementary 3years etc., making schools co-educational, on the elementary and secondary level. On the level of higher education the Occupation "suggested" (anything which was suggested was taken, to be directive) General education, the increase in numbers of universities and colleges from 47 to 227, and 550 Jr. Colleges.

In other words, the American Occupation stripped the Japanese nation of its ideology and its philosophy of education which gave it clear guidance and did not provide a dominate ideology but gave the Japanese merely the democratic system and methods of education. We have planted a democratic system of education in an undemocratic soil.

In the post-war vacuum says, Takeyama Michio, lecturer at Tokyo University, the communists were the only ones who pointed out a future for the Japanese. What was more, the Occupation authorities' policy was to encourage the Left-Wing in an effort to suppress old influences and to teach the Japanese the progress made by the West. 1

Nationalism continues now, as before the war, to be identified with the rightists. However, it is a force that can be especially exploited by the political extremes. The extreme left and the extreme right are both characterized by strong nationalistic attitudes and by a determination to pursue nationalists objectives by forceful, or even violent, means. For example, the attacks that were directed at the Prime Minister, Mr. Yoshida, for his alleged policy of subservience to foreign countries came equally from the extreme left and the extreme right. Again, both extremes had in common a form of anti-Western, pan-Asian nationalism. For this reason, let us briefly consider post-war nationalism.

The revival of post-war nationalism may be divided into two periods:

During the early period of the Occupation, nationalism temporarily went underground. The Occupation instigated the wholesale reform in education, but the Ministry of Education had no intentions to reform pre-war ultra-nationalistic education.

SCAP directives which aimed at the elimination of militarism and ultra-nationalism were interpreted as measures to condemn nationalism in general. In addition, public reaction against the extreme type of pre-war nationalism resulted in a general disfavor of any form of nationalism during the immediate post-war years. A minority group, however, made early attempts to advocate a "new nationalism" as essential to the welfare of the nation. At the time of the Korean War, it took on a positive and contagious form. Taking advantage of the Korean conflict the nationalists whipped up strong nationalistic sentiments.

1. Japan Quarterly, Vol VII, No. 3 July-Sept. 1960, p276

At the outbreak of the Korean War, the National Police Reserve came into existence which later developed into the present Self Defence Forces. In addition, the American Occupation began preparations for a peace treaty with Japan. They instigated a purge and arrested leading Communists. At the same time, militarists and ultra-nationalists were de-purged. General Matthew Ridgeway, permitted the Japanese government to re-examine the directives and regulations of the American Occupation. These factors concomitant with the rearmament program and peace treaty negotiations contributed significantly to the rise of nationalistic trends. By the fall of 1950, the Yoshida Government had formulated nationalistic policies for education. Succeeding conservative governments have carried these policies much further. The introduction of moral education in April, 1958 has been interpreted as a step in the direction of pre-war nationalistic education by the Socialists as well as a number of educators.

Three other controversial issues in education are: (1) the singing of the national anthem (Kimigayo) (2) the raising of the national flag (Hinomaru); and (3) the observance of the founding day of the nation Kigensetsu) in schools.

Kigensetsu was abolished by the Occupation in 1948. Its revival was discussed in the Diet as early as 1951. In Nov. 1954, Shintoists and Nationalists jointly established the Headquarters for the Encouragement of Establishing Kigensetsu. The following year, the Central Shinto Office issued a circular which ordered every Shinto Shrine to conduct its first post-war Kigensetsu ceremony on February 11. John M. L. Young warns of the potential threat of Shinto Nationalists:

"The reactionary Shinto nationalists will go just as far as they think the public will let them go in turning the clock back and infringing the Constitution. If no such voice of protest is raised... and taken to the public and the proper Ministerial authority, then religious freedom will be lost to the Christian by default." (The Two Empires in Japan, the Bible Times Press, Tokyo., p. 224)

The Liberal-Democratic Party has made several attempts to introduce a bill to amend the Law of National Holidays to include Kigensetsu as one of the nation's holidays. Each time strong opposition forced the bill to be withdrawn before it could be discussed in the Diet. Many historians in Japan, including Prince Mikasa, brother of the Emperor, question the historicity of Kigensetsu and the ultra-nationalistic emphasis and protest its revival.

The tendency of evangelicals, especially in Japan, to veer away from political issues have made the Christians indifferent and lethargic to the vital issues at stake. The past century of Japan's history may be termed as a long struggle for human rights including religious liberty. The present turn of events may cause history to repeat itself with Christians losing their privilege to preach the gospel freely. Democracy in Japan is still weak because it is being stifled in a feudalistic society by undemocratic practices. The return to the old paths in the form of prewar nationalism can easily tip the precarious scales of democracy upon which human liberties rest.

Ivan Morris in his summary and conclusions writes that "The presentation of the present democratic structure depends to an important extent on the success of the economy. In case of severe and prolonged economic crisis, there is a considerable chance that Japan will swing to one nondemocratic extreme or the other. The crucial importance of economic factor in undermining an insecure democratic structure and in promoting political extremes is, of course, not limited to Japan. It was, for example, the 1923 inflation in Germany that provided the conditions of economic and psychological instability in which the Nazi movement achieved its first successes and in which the Communists too were able to win a substantial increase in their following. With the improvement of conditions after 1924 the two extremes suffered a temporary decline.¹

This brings us to a crucial question of whether it is the extreme left or the extreme right that stands to profit more from a crisis of the type that we have envisaged. The Communists have certain clear advantages. They are infinitely better organized than the extreme rightist groups and are free from most of the principal weaknesses that beset the latter. They are able to present a positive image of the future and one that supposedly involves a steady improvement of living standards and a permanent elimination of unemployment and of the other aspects of economic injustices that would be so conspicuous at a time of crisis. In addition, the communists are in a far better position than the rightists to exploit certain prevailing sentiments, such as those against war, nuclear weapons, and the remilitarization of Japan; they are also better suited than the

1. Ivan Morris, *Nationalism and the Right Wins, in Japan*, Oxford University Press, London 1960, p 409-1-0

rightists for exploiting nationalist feelings on issues like American bases in Japan and the future of Okinawa. Again, while the right wing organizations exist in a virtual vacuum, the Communist Party has allies among certain elements of the Socialist Party, organized labor, the student movement, the teachers' union, and the intelligentsia.

Morris, however, feels that in the event of a breakdown of the existing democratic regime, Japan is more likely to swing to some form of extreme rightist politics than to Communism. He gives five reasons:

1. First nationalism remains the strongest underlying force in the country and in a period of crisis it is likely to become intensified; the extreme right is more closely attuned to Japanese nationalism than is the left.
2. Secondly, the extreme rightists are far more in tune than the Communists with Japanese traditions in general.
3. The traditionalist appeal of the extreme right is especially operative in provincial and rural areas. This brings us to his third consideration, namely that farmers and other country-folk, with their strong traditionalism, their deeply ingrained anti-urban sentiment, and their suspicion of foreign innovations, would in a period of crisis be more susceptible to the ideas of a reform from the right than to the internationally slanted theories of the extreme left.
4. Fourth, in case of a critical weakening of the existing system the powerful conservative elements in the country such as the politicians, bureaucrats, and business men can be expected to support the right in preference to the Communists.
5. A final advantage of the extreme right in a country where the principle of continuity is so highly valued as in Japan is that their rise would in all probability not require any violent or abrupt change in the existing patterns of political power. 1

On the other hand, there are potential threats from the extreme left. Although, an official estimate of Communist strength speaks of 125,000 members, a better of measure of

1. Ivan Morris, *Op. cit.* P. 414-418

Communist strength in Japan may be found in the election returns of the House of Representatives in 1955, when the Communists polled 733,000 votes. The actual number of Communist supports at the polls seems to hover around 1,000,000 mark. By contrast in 1949 the Communist ticket attracted 3 million votes. The gap between the two figures is accounted for largely by voters whose political preferences fluctuate between Socialist left wing and the Communist Party.

The Communist Party of Japan now proclaims itself vociferously as the champion of a "united democratic front of national liberation." Many Japanese intellectuals are swayed by a blind faith in the validity of Marx's economic and political theories. Even more people, including the great majority of Japanese intelligentsia and labour leaders believe in Marxist-Leninist tenets as the primacy of the class struggle, the intensification of imperialist exploitation and the inevitable decline and downfall of capitalism. As a consequence, the Communist party finds in Japan an unusually congenial atmosphere. In what other non-Communist country could a book of dialectics move to the second place on the best-seller list (fiction and non-fiction combined) as happened in 1956 in Japan. *Bensho-ho wa do ii kagaku ka* (Why is dialectics a science.) listed in the February, 1956 issue of *Shuppan Nyusu* (Publishers News). And where outside the Soviet block could a translation of *Political Economy*, as dry-as-dust textbook used by the USSR Academy of Science, sell close to a million copies within a single year.

The factors which encourage formation of a people front might normally be balanced by widespread fear of Communist extremism and dogmatism, by the bitter experiences Socialist have had in the past when they allied themselves with the Communists, and by a general awareness of the dangerous implications of the Japanese Communist's ties with Moscow. However, the three-pronged Communist tactics today claiming to promote "peace, independence and democracy" are admirably suited to counter objections based on past experience and to promote the idea of a popular front in Japan.

From the left there are disturbing factors which challenge Christian work in Japan.

1. As stated already, Marxist-Leninism have captured most of the minds of the intellectuals.

2. Majority of the professors in economic and history in the Japanese universities interpret their subjects from a Marxian point of view.
3. Large quantities of high quality literature and books which have been subsidized by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

According to Seki Yoshihiko, the failure of parliamentary democracy would cause the Japanese to give themselves over to a totalitarian system of the left or of the right. 1

The late Dr. Tadao Yanaihara, former President of Tokyo University, wrote in the Chuo Koron, January, 1961, "what the Japanese are wanting today is not the spirit of patriotism, but the fundamental conception of man himself. Unless they learn to assimilate fully the idea of the inviolable right of each individual to enjoy freedom and equality, they will never be able to accomplish the task of building a new democratic Japan."

In conclusion, it is not Christianity confronting totalitarianism left and right but, totalitarianism challenging Christianity in Japan. Japanese thinkers agree that for the moment the Japanese seem to lack any unifying core of ideas and ideals.

1. Japan Quarterly, Vol. VII, No. 2, April-June 1960, p. 151

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS TO THE WORLD

By Robert Wood

What I say in this first part on stating the context is one way of saying it. I do not pretend that this is the only way of saying it but it is the only way that my thoughts move when I place myself in this conference and tune my mind to what is happening here. It is one way of setting it forth. Let me add a further word. In the conference theme or conference set-up there seem to be three words operating as foci of the conference, namely, apologetics, communication and witness. These are all important words and are not identical and I think we have been touching on them at certain points and there has been a certain amount of buck-shot fire in this

I want to talk on witness as my subject but my talk also involves communication as well and I think it involves apologetics as a by-product of our witness.

Where do we begin now when we begin about witness in the world? For the Christian community, as distinctly Christian, we begin in a distinctive way with Christ. We begin with Christ as over against faith. While we often say that man lives by faith or is justified by faith, etc., the faith which we proclaim and by which we live is namable by a certain name - which is Christ and not simply faith. We do not find our beginning, I believe, in tradition although we are probably most traditional men. We orient ourselves on the Japanese scene by Uemura, Takakura, Ebina as very powerful orienting foci for our lives. We might also be oriented by Luther and Calvin or Wesley and yet we often mistake these witnesses to Christ for Christ himself. It is a very profound and relative word of Pauls, Is Christ divided, let no one boast of men, for all are yours - or whether Paul or Apollos, Uchimura, Ebina, Calvin or Luther. It is Christ and not these men. It is Christ to whom they bear witness. Or we perhaps seek it in the Bible for we know that in our conversation with scripture that the word which has come to us is the Word of God. It is mysterious and awe-inspiring as it has come to us in scripture and without scripture we should not have met him who is our Lord. We cannot reach him except through a church that bears the scripture in which and through which we find our Lord. The church and the Bible belong together but the Bible itself is not our beginning because as someone has suggested there is a Biblicism which does not make God so

much as scripture the object of its interest and faith. For us our interest is God as the God who reveals himself in Christ. The Bible itself does not point to itself but it points to Christ and that the Word is laid within the words. Altner, I think, has stated this very well when he says, "All the great reformation watchwords, sola scriptura, sola fide and sola gratia, has one essential meaning which is Sola Christus. This is the source of Christian faith and the content of Christian theology and the source and center of the Christian community. Jesus Christ is the Christian dogma and everything else derives from. Or perhaps we sometimes seek our beginning in the church. This so often we find true today but the church itself is an ambiguous entity. In our definitions we flounder in our attempt to say what it is and we use many images, facets and dimensions. We need not go into them but our problem is that we cannot begin with the church because it is not something in itself and cannot be described in itself. Though it is a unique community, we still cannot begin with something in itself because it points beyond itself as Eduard Schweitzer, the N. T. scholar strongly and rightly urges. We cannot speak of a "people" without speaking of a "people of God". Or if we describe ourselves as a body, this is incomplete without first saying something about him who is the head of the body. If we speak of ourselves as the sheep, this is meaningless without first saying something about the shepherd. All of these ways, it seems, as we try to begin at various points, we are driven by and to him who is our beginning - Jesus Christ. He is the one whom we preach .. we preach Christ. If we live, we live in Him and by his grace. We witness to him, we minister to him, we minister in his name, we walk in his light. We live and die and are raised with him. Sola Christus.

And yet, when we begin with Christ, we do not begin with a Savior up here who is somewhat disengaged from the world but that this one is both a central and a mediatorial figure who directs our attention in other ways as well and points beyond himself to the Father. He in turn points back to us so that we can see ourselves and discern the nature of our sins, of the lives we have made and of the life for which we were made. And so, when we speak of Christ, we use various terms. We speak of him as God and man, man for God or God for man or as God-man. All of these point to this in a sense mediatorial and two directional drives that are in this Christ. He directs our attention to God and to the world. He directs our attention to God in a specific way. He illuminates what seems to be a drama between God and man. This is not simply doctrines or propositions to the

world but a living God. He reveals not so much the love of God but he reveals the God who loves. This is an active thing. The God who chooses man chooses the world in creating it. He suffers with and for man and elects man as Barth would say, as his companion. He enters the world and gives his son for us because the world and man are the object of a love of Almighty God. It seems then that we are directed to God and to the world when we try to place our selves and understand ourselves and where we begin.

What does it mean then to be directed back to this world? It is not an alien sphere that is somewhat separated from us but it is a sphere in which we live and exist as men. We have to say that if Christ leads us to God, he also leads us to the world-not to some ideal world, not to some future world or not to some partial world of the spirit alone nor to the world as utterly a realm of darkness but to the world in which we live and belong to him. It may perhaps be rebellious to him but he has entered it and Christ has died for it. This is important because God's action is to men and to this world and not to us simply as church. Whatever we are as church is relative to this primary relation in action and concern of God to the world. The world then becomes the world of men and reclaimed by God for us. He reclaims this world around us and the life of men rebellious though they are. It is an affirmation of this world and not a denial of it...the affirmation of this world by God's grace and not by our desires.

It seems sometimes we are betrayed by ourselves in our concern for our community of faith and our mission and often see the hand of God and God's acting where we preach or where we administer the sacraments or where the faithful are gathered together in a room and neglect the world at large. We forget that they are other sheep who are not of our fold. One author made the category correct when he said that there was no Christ without the world and no world without Christ. In him we are offered the possibility of partaking of the reality of God and of the world and not one without the other. This is closer to our beginning than to begin simply with church as church. This relationship of God to the world through the incarnation, throws light upon we are and where we begin as well. "Jesus Christ"; in Bonhoeffer's words, "the man, now means the right and the obligation to be men before God." Not simply to be Christian but to be men. If we trace out the implications of this, we have something profound when we speak about witness

because our witness, in a sense, is to be men. This is not simply man in himself but man in relation to God. This defines for better who we are and where we are than to label ourselves "Christian", which may make a select group out of us and which sometimes misleads us. We are called by God as men and to be men ... not religious men or secular men but men before God. We are not to be rich or poor, Jew or gentile or anything else. The two basic categories are God and man.

To tie this into witness is to begin with this wholeness of our manhood and being men but not being special kinds of messengers. We are messengers but we are first of all men before God. We are not men in the abstract but men in his wholeness and earthiness. We are sometimes prone to be suspicious of this creaturely life which God has given to us and in which he has called us. We sometimes cut off some of this creaturalness as being alien to God or something which God may have made us for but which may have been a mistake as man is in his wholeness and his earthen-ness. This means there is a claim upon us not only in our Bible study and church life or life of good works but it does mean our life at work and play, in the joys we feel, in the suffering we undergo, in our merrymaking, in our eating and drinking, and in our relaxation. We are called as men in our full earthiness and our full creaturalness as creatures whom God has made. As men we forget that we eat and drink as Christ ate and drank, that we enjoy the accompaniment of companions, the joys of laughter and talk, physical activity and rest even as these belong to us. The gifts are of God who made us men. The marriages we enter are blessed by him, the children we procreate he calls them to himself, the sweat of work was also his. All of these are part of our life under God and all of these, in a sense belong to our witness to Christ. Dr. McIlwaine stated that the fabric of language changes in the church. It is different from that which you find in other groups. This is true. Language and our shikata in all ways is somehow marked by this stamp.

This totality of our life as a witness to God has further explained by the relationship of God and creature. We are the creatures of God. We sometimes speak of the image of God in man. This does not seem to biblically mean that man is somehow like or analogous to God in the sense that we embody, parallel, continue or express the creativity and works of God for if we are creatures, we are creaturely creatures and our creativity is a creaturely activity and not a God creativity. When we describe this we

have to say that our existence is one in response and not of itself. It is not an emulation of God but rather that of a creature responsive to its God between whom there is the vast gap of difference between God and man or Creator and creature. To say this in another way is to say that ours is an answering existence. We may speak of our life as that of obedience or responsive. Perhaps the word "praise" is more adequate and describes the mood of our existence as men. In this mood we point not to ourselves but to him who is our Lord and respond to him. This has implications not only in our professional life and what we do as Christians but this is the character of life as such. It is the existence of man as man and the life for which we are made and from which we fall.

To carry this out... there is a blight on this world we know and we describe this as sin but it is not as a distinctive mode of existence and the totality of witness can perhaps be described in terms of the word "Praise" in all that we are and do ... our speaking, our thinking, our play, our eating, our fellowship, our talking with friends, our work, our political activity and our economic activity. This is the dimension of our life as men before God. It is our witness.

When we speak of witness we are not beginning with a special task. We are dealing with a dimension of life as it is given to us and claimed by God for himself. This establishes the sphere of our witness not simply in the transmission of a message but in the totality of our life. We are driven then to ask what it means to live thus as men before God concretely in 20th century Japan in our particular spheres of life where we are called. We must be men today in this particular situation. This content drives us to see this not simply as witness as church men, clergy or professors but as men who are members of political communities, men who are involved in a life of work among men necessary to the continuity and preservation of our life, men who are involved in families with wives and children. It applies to the whole fabric of our living and this is the basic context of witness and not simply the witness of the church to the world. This is why I would rephrase this title to say, "The Christian witness in the world to God."

I would like to use the last 15 minutes for the other pole in this context. We must take seriously then this world in which we are placed and not take seriously simply what we are saying to the world. We must not be concerned simply with the message but also that to which that message testified, namely, God's concern for the world and his

activity in it. The message points to our life today in this concrete situation. This conference has dealt with this concrete world and not just a generalized world. There are problems of nationalism, syncretism, idealistic philosophies and the authoritarian state. The fabric of Japanese society so often escapes us as a "Johnny come lately." The older men among us can help us in these things that escape us for the most part. Dr. Aoki dealt with 'the political pressures on man which determine the kind of man that lives in 20th century Japan.

One dimension that I think that may be added to this is what we call a technological society. This is a phenomenon here which is not simply the addition of gimmicks to our lives or the mechanization of aspects of our lives, but a change in the fabric of our living which began many decades ago but in the last two decades has taken on a break-neck-pace. This has produced a different kind of man. I think we see signs of that new kind of man in Japan too which makes his problems akin to many of ours in the West. We see it particularly in the cities in Japan and that is where rural and urban situations are vastly different. My experience is urban and I doubt whether Boudé Moore would say the same about rural Japan.

The world has always known the use of techniques as the extension of man's power. The hammer is the extension of man's power to drive a nail. With the modern period from about the 18th century on we have seen a curve going up and in the 20th century going up very radically, which has changed the character of society. I say this not of my own but relying upon readings. Twentieth century man lives in a man-created world. It is not the world of nature but one which is constructed by man. Examples are asphalt roads, telephone, automobiles, trains, airplanes, canned goods which defy the ravages of age decaying and growth, synthetic fibers, synthetic light by which we turn darkness into day etc. All of these cause a transformation of the character of the world in which we live. It is not by natural rhythm but it is a machine age. This is very true of the industrial worker and it is also true of our own lives. Space and time are mechanically measured. We know the destinations of the measurement of *chronos* and *kairos*... serial time and the time which is fulfilled. We might call it. natural time and the rhythm of nature and man created time which is measured in special categories, by the movement. of a cog wheel which marks off the hours, our living, our sleeping, our eating, when we go to work and when we return. All of these are measured by this man created time than by

the natural rhythm of man's life. In the rural area, the farmer sits down by the road when he is tired. A worker in an industrial factory cannot do that neither can the white collar workers in the world today. They eat when the clock tells them to do so. They sleep and they relax according to the clock. There are other aspects of this mechanization, namely, that man must work by the dictates of a machine, that of a mechanism of an inter-related economy. Factories are dependent upon other factories for the production of goods at specific times in order to keep their productive process moving. Modern industrial society is characterized by continuous production, which is produced at a fixed rate and it is seen most graphically in fluid processes where you cannot stop but must continue. Man is increasingly a part of this whole fabric of economic and industrial life which is interrelated and which operates to which he must condition himself to this machine. There is a British film that recently gave a very graphic picture of this life. In this man participates six days a week and on the seventh day he lives. During the six days he does not live. There is such estrangement here. The rhythm of life and work is changed in this. Time itself is mechanical.

This is an organizational revolution too, though we cannot go into that. We see know phenomena in massive broad seals unions, while are not simply evidences of man's power or desire to power or the unions desire to power but are a necessity in an industrial society in which there is so much inter-relation between factories. Massive unionism is actually desired by management more than dealing with isolated man. This is also true of our government in contrast to the early American idea of the less government the better. It is simply a phenomenon of a counterpart of a change in our society which is not brought about simply by the evil machinations of politicians. It rather is a counterpart of something that has happened in our society.

What are some of the effects of this? There is a standardization of product and the work function. Uniformity and replacability are some of the characteristics that are brought out. Man is not valued or necessary in himself but is replaceable in his work. He does his work as any artisan does and it is adequate in the whole machine. If he varies from the usual, he will be sacked and another man will be brought in. Power and valiancy become the important values. The manager cannot be concerned with the personal lives, problems and feelings of his workers. He is concerned with an organizational machine

which has to have a job done and he has to deal with his workers as a digit or cog or in considering operating functions of this machine. Efficiency and regularity become important. Health is important for man but not because man is good for man but because only a healthy man can work. Utilitarianism and instrumentalism press upon the situation and we ask, "What happens to man here?" With this it seems to me that technology has brought on a new kind of society but in a sense this has made a mark upon man himself. In America, England and Germany but also in Japan where man is caught in this industrial, technological sphere, the image of man changes. His own understanding of himself and his own specific need changes. Probably the most relevant word for industrial man today is not "the forgiveness of sins" but is as Barth said in *Deliverance to the Captives*, is "deliverance".

There has been a de-personalization of man. Sociologists, in describing this new type of man, are not referring so much to other men but also to ourselves; Organization man, radar directed man, mass man. The Dutch theologian, Hoekendyke, calls him 'the warped man' and says he is a new kind of post bourgeois mass. Whatever the descriptions given, they seem to say that there is a new form of man and a new self-understanding of man. This means that this is that man with whom I talk when I talk to the labourer in the city or to the white-collar workman. The characteristics which are relevant here spell out a de-personalization in human relations. Relations today have changed from the "I-thou" to the "I-it" relations. There is a loss of the self which is probably the most disturbing thing. The laborer goes through the operations through the day in a company he does not own and on materials that he has no real *kimochi* (feeling) relationship and works on a product which he may never see.

What does he do on his day off? He goes to the pachinko hall which is perhaps a symbol of what has happened to man when he loses his sense of worth and creativity.

THE FINALITY OF THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST

submitted by: Hugh Harris

OUTLINE

Introduction

Procedure

The Gospel

Definition

OT/NT Background

Differentiated from the Christian Ethic

The Gospel as Message

"The Good News set forth as an objective body of facts about God, His Kingdom and His relation to men; and centering in God's redemptive act in Christ."

"The Gospel of God"

"The Gospel of the Kingdom" Death, Resurrection, Ascension

The Gospel as Person

"More than creed---the Gospel is inextricably bound up in the Jesus of History, the Christ of Eternity."

The witness of the Angel The witness of Christ

The witness of the Apostles

The Finality of the Gospel

Seen in Christ's attitude toward His message, person and work

Restated, proclaimed by the Apostles

Notes of Caution

The Danger of Compromise

The Danger of Neutrality

Conclusion

THE FINALITY OF THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST

Introduction

It should be mentioned at the outset of this treatise that the subject of the finality of the Gospel will be discussed from the point of view of one who believes in and is committed to this proposition. And the fact that the reader is also of this persuasion will be taken for granted. Little or no effort has been made to answer directly the arguments or critical problems that might be brought to the subject from the standpoint of the unbelieving world.

My objective is not to convince the unbelieving mind that the Gospel is God's final revelation to man as sinner. Rather it is to remind those of us who believe that this is so of our sacred responsibility to act accordingly.

In order to get into the material simply and quickly I will try to proceed along the line of basic definition; at the same time attempting to come to terms with some of the problems which those who affirm these truths must inevitably face.

First of all, then, let me try to define the Gospel; for in order to speak of it as final we must see clearly what is meant by the term.

The Gospel

Most authorities agree that our English word comes from the Anglo-Saxon "god-spell," meaning "God-story," or very simply "the story about God." The word as generally used today is descriptive of the message which the church announces to the world about Christ.

The main source for the Christian usage is found in the book of Isaiah. In 61:1 the prophet describes the function of the Servant of Jehovah in these words: "The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me; because Jehovah has anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek..."* The meek in this specific instance are the captives of Babylon. Good tidings are announced to them. God is coming to save them, and He is near.

A similar reference is used in Isaiah 52:7: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace..." These instances exhibit clearly the meaning of "good tidings," and both are claimed in the New Testament to describe the Christian message. The Apostle Paul quotes Isaiah 52:7 in Romans 10:15;

* All Bible quotations from the A.S.V.

and Jesus makes Isaiah 61:1f the text for His sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:18f). This use of the word by Jesus stamps it at once with its Christian significance. "And he began to say unto them, 'Today hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears'" (Luke 4:21). He claimed to be a preacher of good tidings to the meek, or poor. The poor, the captives, the blind, the bruised, are no longer political exiles. They are the bond-servants of sin, those who waited for the consolation of Israel, the poor and outcast to whom Judaism had no living message of hope. Jesus describes His Messianic function by the use of this word: "I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: for therefore was I sent" (Luke 4:43). In particular, Jesus appropriated the name "gospel" for the contents of His message (cf Matt 24:14 26:13, Mk 1:15 8:35 10:29 13:10, Lk 7: .22). It is not surprising therefore that the word came into general Christian usage to describe the contents of the preaching of Jesus.

Closer examination, however, shows that the term was not used by the Evangelists to describe all that Jesus said; nor was the verb "preach good tidings" descriptive of all His work. In Matthew's Gospel this sentence occurs twice; "And Jesus went about ... teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease..." (4:23, 9:35). From the standpoint of His basic work among men, it would seem therefore that Jesus' task was threefold: He preached the Gospel, He taught, and He healed. And it seems clear that Jesus distinguished the Gospel that He preached from the teaching that accompanied it.

Proclamation of these good tidings then was the proclamation of certain facts rather than instruction in the art of living well. The Gospel was offered to believe, and its acceptance was to be preceded by repentance (Mark 1:15). A distinction needs to be drawn between the Gospel which Jesus -preached and His ethical teaching. The church's teaching of the Christian ethic must in some senses be a changing message in order to rightly apply the principles of Christ 'a teaching to present conditions. While the Christian ethic develops and is modified by circumstances, however, the Christian Gospel does not change. It is good news about facts. Care must be exercised in its communication, that men may hear and understand it. But in essence it remains the "old, old story," the same in the twentieth century as in the first. If this distinction is remembered, it will help explain the confusion that is felt in modern times as to the Church's true function. All are agreed that this is to preach the Gospel. But very different views are held as to what is included under the term. Jesus used the term "gospel" to refer to a definite message, distinct from His ethical teaching or from His healing ministry. But from the Apostolic age and onward we find a gradual broadening

of the meaning of the term to include also the ethic that Jesus taught and as well the social service that He practiced. It is open to question, however, whether the Church has not suffered loss by broadening the reference of this word, for often in trying to interpret and apply the Gospel to the problems of modern times the pit and strength of the Gospel as proclaimed by Jesus and the Apostles has been tragically diluted. The Gospel must ever be the foundation upon which the Church builds, for among the religions of the world it is unique. The ethical structure which rests upon this foundation, though important and necessary, is in many points similar to other ethical systems and must therefore never be confused with the foundation upon which it rests.

For the sake of clarity and consistency in a day of confusion and obscurity it would be well to reassert the truth of the Gospel by bringing it back to the unshakable facts upon which it is based. To be more specific, let me further define the Gospel in relation to its message content.

The Gospel as Message

In the New Testament fully a dozen descriptive forms are used in connection with the word "gospel," but two or three should suffice to set forth its basic message.

In mark 1:14 Jesus is spoken of as preaching "the Gospel of God." This would indicate a message from God and about God that is good news to men. It is certain that Jesus gave the world a new idea of God; and this gospel of Jesus was the revelation of God as "our Father in heaven." And we see mirrored in the life and words of Jesus all of the love and concern that would draw sinners into a personal relationship with One who is not only Creator, but also a Father who loves and who welcomes men to trust Him implicitly for all of life's needs.

The phrase "the Gospel of the kingdom" (Matt 4:23, etc) describes the good news brought by Jesus in its relation to the Kingdom of God or of Heaven which He proclaimed. The hopes of Israel had hovered for centuries round a kingdom. But only Jesus disclosed the true nature of that shining city of God. Basically, the good news was that the Kingdom of Heaven is opened to all who believe. Without regard to background---whether racial, cultural, or family---men are summoned to respond to this good news by the simple act of faith. The conditions of entrance make it accessible to all. 'It is offered not to the rich or to the wise, but to all who in respect to faith will become as little children (Matt 11:25, 18:3, John 3:3).

The kingdom as Jesus preached it offered the highest conceivable good to all men. Because it spoke meaningfully to the problem of man's sin and his relation to God it was meant to satisfy the basic religious instincts of man as a race. And because these are the deepest and most noble instincts of man, the message that they could be satisfied was indeed "good news!"

At heart and center of the Gospel as Message lies the grounds upon which man has access to the privilege of participation in the Kingdom. These grounds are found in the work of Christ as our Redeemer. Jesus was conscious of a profounder mission than preaching or of teaching. More than once He gave utterance to words that touch the deepest mysteries of redemption. He came to give His life a ransom (Matt 20:28). He was the Good Shepherd giving His life for the sheep (John 10:11). He foretold His death and resurrection (Matt 16:21). On the betrayal night in the upper room He gave the cup, saying: "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many" (Dark 14:24). Though Jesus left the articulation of the meaning of His death to Paul and the other apostles it is certain that He referred to His death as achieving a wonderful deliverance for men in respect of sin. Jesus looked upon His own death as having a peculiar significance; awful for Himself (Mark 14:32,39), but blessed for men (John 12:32,33, 14:3). It is certain that His followers accepted this interpretation of the cross, as at once the death of Jesus, followed as it was by His resurrection, was made the main theme of Apostolic preaching.

Further Apostolic development of this thought under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit shows the significance of Christ's Death, Resurrection and Ascension. His Death as a sacrifice for the sins of the world provides the basis whereby all men may be forgiven and reconciled to God (Rom 3:25, II Cor 5:20,21, I Pet 1:19, I Jn 1:7, 2:2, etc). His Resurrection is the earnest of the new life into which all who are born anew by faith in Him are introduced (Rom 6:4, I Jn 3:2,3). He is the first fruits of them that sleep: His resurrection involves the resurrection to eternal life of all in whom He lives (I Thea 4:13--5:10, I Cor 15). His Ascension is the pledge of the glorification of all who are united to Him (Rom 8:29,30, Phil 3: 20,21). Again, the means by which this message is to be appropriated is by repentance and faith on the part of the individual who hears. Jesus' message was that "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel" (Mark 1:15). To sum up, then, the Gospel as Message is the Good News set forth as an objective body of facts about God, His Kingdom and His relation to men, and centering in God's redemptive act in Christ.

Finality - 5

Before moving on to consider the Gospel as the final revelation of God to man it is important to see the centrality of the person of Christ in this Gospel.

The Gospel as Person

The presence of Jesus Himself in the world was in itself a gospel. The angel who appeared to the shepherds of Galilee announced that the coming and presence of Jesus in the world was "good tidings of great Joy which shall be to all people." Thus the gospel was intimately connected with His Person. Jesus Himself moved in a consciousness of His Messianic Office. He often referred to Himself as the Son of Man, the Son of God, the Judge and King of men. Jesus' presence in the world manifested the love of God (John 3:16). It proved that God had not forgotten men, but had come to their help. As God in ancient days saw the affliction of His people in Egypt and in hearing their cry sent them Moses, so in this latter day a greater than Moses was to appear.

Jesus did not come simply to tell men of the way to God: He declared that He was that way. He did not proclaim only a way of life for men to follow, but presented Himself as that life. And so truth, light, love, forgiveness---all the basic things which bring security to the heart of man are declared by Jesus to be inseparable from His person. For this reason it has been an age old problem of the church to communicate in words all that is meant by the Gospel. The severe limitations of language are keenly felt at this point.

The Gospel as Person is also clearly seen when we pass from the Gospels to the Acts and Epistles. Here we find the apostles busily seeking to obey the Lord's command to "preach the gospel to the whole creation" (Mark 16:15). Yet we note that their interpretation of this injunction was to urge their hearers to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. True, the basic facts of the Gospel are always set forth; but a consistent appeal is then made for the hearer not simply to give assent to these facts but to repent and believe in Christ. In apostolic thought the Gospel could never be preached apart from Jesus Christ, nor could the significance of Jesus be understood apart from the Gospel. In Him alone God's redemptive purposes and the sinner's acceptance of them meet. Thus He becomes the central figure of History and as well Eternity (Col 1:15-19).

Though never out of harmony with written revelation, the Gospel cannot therefore be limited entirely to it. More than creed---the Gospel is inextricably bound up in the Jesus of History, the Christ of Eternity. Arguments and evidences may point to Christ, but Christ Himself must be encountered in the dynamic of personal fellowship. Therefore those to whom the facts of the Gospel have been committed must seek through these

facts to lead men to the Person of Christ. Only in this personal relationship are the deepest truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ fully understood. Defining the Gospel therefore in terms of its biblical connotations let us now turn to study briefly the question of its finality.

The Finality of the Gospel

In saying that the Gospel is final we simply affirm that it is complete; it is fully settled; it is perfectly and infallibly revealed. It is complete in the sense that anything added to it, taken from it, or given in substitute for it perverts it into a hollow replica void of its intended meaning (II Cor 11:4, Gal 1:6-9). The Apostle Paul boldly sets forth this line of argument in his letter to the Galatian churches.

That the Gospel is final in the sense that it is God's clearest and most authoritative word to man may be seen in Christ's own attitude toward His message, His person and His work.

The message brought by Jesus was not entirely new; it had its beginnings, its roots in the past. But whereas the earlier preaching was the faint light of dawn, His was the strong light of noonday. The Gospel preached by Jesus gave full substance and final form to the faint and tremulous hopes of centuries. Old Testament prophets, receiving their revelations only at such times as Jehovah desired to reveal His will, could exercise their functions only intermittently; whereas Jesus, living in uninterrupted communion with His Father, was in receipt of a constant revelation of the purposes and will of God. In His own words, His was an office not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them. And standing as He was at the focal point of history, Jesus looked back over the ages and set Himself as the consummation, the fulfillment of the prophetic utterances of the past. Certainly this is the view of the Evangelists, who saw in the life and words of Christ a fulfillment of that which God had revealed through the prophets aforetime. "Thus it is written" or "that it might be fulfilled" are favorite expressions constantly on their lips. At the same time Jesus was bold to declare that "though heaven and earth pass away, yet my words will not pass away" (Matt 24:35). Looking down through the ages to come then, Christ declared that in a world of change and decay His words were the one thing that should remain.

Throughout the whole course of Jesus' utterances there is also the claim in unmistakable language to His absolute infallibility as a Teacher. In truth, His consciousness told Him

that He could not be wrong, for He knew where He had received that which He taught. "For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (John 12:49. See also 14:10,24, 8.:38).

Christ's attitude toward His person and His sacrifice is also in harmony with the confidence and authority He expresses as an infallible teacher of truth. The prophets had encouraged lonely exiles with the cry, "Behold your God cometh!" But it was not until Jesus appeared that one who waited for the consolation of Israel could say, "Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation" (Luke 2:30). So Jesus as the "salvation of God" incarnate (of Isa 52:10 with Luke 3:6) presented Himself as such to men. "Today is salvation come to this house," were His words to Zacchaeus (Luke 19:9). Received as He was into the house, He brought into it by His very presence this heavenly blessing. "Except ye believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins," (John 8:24) said Jesus; expressing in the strongest possible terms the confidence that He Himself was the Light of the World, the representative sent from the Father in heaven. The words "I am" are frequently upon the lips of our Lord, and particularly in the Gospel of John are intimately related to His self-consciousness of His Divine Person and His redemptive work among men. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he..." (John 8:28). Perhaps implicit in His words are those from the Song of Moses which was taught to the children of Israel from early times down through the centuries:

"See now that I, even I, am he, And there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; And there is none that can deliver out of my hand." Deuteronomy 32:39

That the Gospel has been decisively or conclusively set forth in Christ is the central theme of the book of Hebrews. The Apostle Paul gives a large part of his letters to the Colossians and Ephesians to this subject. In short, the writings of the apostles simply buttress the great fact that the last, ultimate, unalterable word has been spoken in Christ. The author of Hebrews declares that Jesus remains the same yesterday, today and forever. Therefore the good news about Him and inseparable from Him must be the unchanging element in the church's message. Being news about God and His Kingdom, it cannot change until they change

Therefore those of us who live and witness in this second century of Protestant missionary effort in Japan need to move in this confidence. With great insight the Psalmist declared:

"For ever, O Jehovah, Thy word is settled in heaven" (Psalm 119:89). The temptations belonging to the spirit of this age and in particular to the country and people among whom we labor will constantly assail this truth. But as our confidence is placed in the perseverance of the church throughout history, the revelation of God through the apostles, and finally in Christ Himself we shall not be moved from a faith in the unchangeableness of the Gospel.

In relation to our moving in this confidence, however, a note or two of caution need to be sounded.

We live in an age saturated with the idea that nothing is sure but change. There is no eternal truth. Everything is relative. The principles of Pavlovian psychology are being applied unmercifully to entire segments of society and even to whole nations. The problem is not unique to this age, however, except for the possible fact that never before has the world as a whole come so vitally under this kind of influence. The resultant pressure will inevitably drive men to retreat or escape of one form or another. Some have already proved the fact that they would rather be "red than dead," and others may well follow. But the tensions characteristic of this age also seem to be significantly common to the culture in which we as missionaries live and work here in Japan. Very subtly we may be drawn because of a desire to lessen tensions to the false escapes of accommodation, compromise or neutrality.

The Danger of Compromise

Historical precedent for accommodation of the Christian message to the culture in which it is preached are numerous. Many of the earliest heresies, dealt with in great detail by the early church councils, sprang from this problem.

The Jesuit missionaries to India and China from the end of the sixteenth century into the eighteenth century developed a systematic method of accommodation which did not flinch at great distortions of the Christian message. The one aim was to establish the Church in an inhospitable soil. One of the approaches used was the vindication of the so-called best elements in non-Christian religions by the doctrine of natural religion as a preceding stage to revealed religion. This tactic undoubtedly accounts for some of the success of the Jesuit mission here in Japan during that same period. Although condemned by Papal decree in 1744 one can yet find traces of this same method of operation today.

This was a natural course to take because the Japanese themselves have a remarkable

capacity for adaptation. This is clearly seen from earliest history in Japan's borrowing of Chinese cultural forms. Japan first adopted, then adapted; the second part of the process far more important than the first. This same factor may be observed in her reception of ideas from abroad even today---in the fields of commerce, technology and even theology.

Thus when Christianity first came to Japan's shores it was often taken for a new form of Buddhism. It was a perfectly natural process, therefore, to capitalize on this feeling, and perhaps sensing the Japanese obsession with the hoben, the convenient, the early missionaries quickly "adapted" the Christian message themselves to fit more harmoniously into the Japanese scene. But adapting---whether on the part of the missionary himself or his Japanese counterpart---is not adopting! And surely we see today the tragic results in the church of an "adapted," an "accommodated" Christianity which has shown itself unable to speak prophetically to problems of this age because it lacks the deeply needed roots of wholehearted adoption. As in the early centuries of the Christian Church, the Japanese are to a greater or lesser extent still so strongly enchanted by the basic notions of the culture to which they belong that their presentation of the faith is often an adaption which may fall far short of the biblical message.

Although the reasons why this is so are exceedingly complex it may help to consider one basic trait of the Japanese nature. Because he is essentially a product of the herd, with his drives and affections to some degree controlled by a consciousness of his relation to others as a responsible agent, the Japanese lives and moves in a world of compromise. The question is seldom asked "Is it right?" but rather "Is it expedient?" or "Will it be the best this way for everybody involved?" Of course the light of the Gospel exposes the error of this way of thinking for what it is. Yet one does not have to look far to see unmistakable traces of it still imbedded in the thought and action of the church.

And so those of us who work in a cultural milieu where the expedient is the acceptable must guard our hearts with great care. Whether or not this element of compromise with the truth is present in the Protestant Christian effort it is at least a very real and virulent temptation. We, too, may succumb to this pressure in order to soften the austerities of our existence as proclaimers of truth in a hostile atmosphere. One of the great problems which we face in communication is how to adapt the Christian message to the understanding of the people without compromising in the attempt. The church often vacillates between the Scylla of succumbing in the attempt or the Charybdis of shunning it. Because the Gospel of Jesus Christ. represents such a radically different world and life view it will always find opposition from the hearts of men and nations. And it is an unquestionable fact that the church and the individual Christian will in the process

become an object of this opposition. The world hated Jesus and rejected His message. We have been promised a share in this rejection. On the other hand, we also share the promise that as some believed in Him, they will believe because of us.

Another form of escape from the severities of facing reality may be found in a professed neutrality.

The Danger of Neutrality

Though this is one of the predominant characteristics of the spirit of the age in which we live Jesus was no stranger to the problem.

One day as He was teaching in the temple and preaching the Gospel, certain chief priests, scribes and elders questioned Him about His authority to do so (Luke 20:1-8). He in turn asked them a question which they found exceedingly difficult to answer. "Was the baptism of John from heaven or from men?" asked Jesus. In their reasoning they became immediately suspended upon the horns of a dilemma, for to answer either way would be to put their reputations, yea even their lives in serious jeopardy. And so because they were sensible men, concerned with their own preservation (for the sake of the preservation of the sacred traditions, of course!) they answered in this way: "We refuse to testify on the grounds that what we say might tend to incriminate us. We plead the Fifth Amendment!"

And so the leaders of the Jewish nation in Jesus' day, faced with an opportunity to declare their convictions openly and honestly, chose the ground of a professed neutrality because to tell the truth would have meant a threat to their own personal security. The application of the principle to our work and to the church situation in this country should be obvious. The issue involved is a moral one; and there can be no moral neutrality. The man who is neutral where the problem of moral choice is involved either shows his lack of any moral conviction or that he is immoral because he refuses to follow his convictions. In the latter case-the expedient again becomes the rule of action.

Speaking to this problem in our modern day framework we are faced with a similar situation. The forces of Christianity and of communism are engaged today in a life and death struggle. More specifically, a system which emphasizes the freedom and dignity of man as a potential child of God is being ruthlessly-and until now it would appear rather successfully--assaulted by an ideology which reduces man almost to the level of an animal. And because of the problems of survival created by Neucleophobia many are finding neutral ground an exceptionally attractive place to buy into. Real estate in Neutraland, however, can be purchased only at a very dear price. For the Christian to

remain neutral in this struggle is tantamount to a denial of one of the basic truths of the Christian Gospel; that of the Fatherhood of God and man's relation to Him as sinner. It also involves tragic errors in logic, for to remain neutral is only to remain indecisive in order to preserve the status quo. This usually serves, however, only to perpetuate the state of anxiety and apprehension--postponing the time when decision must be made. And unknowingly, like the scribes and elders who faced Jesus from the supposed safety of neutral ground, the man who remains neutral in today's struggle will likely find in the end that he has been opposing God. "He that is not with me," said Jesus, "is against me" (Luke 11:23).

These are just two of the many temptations which face the Christian and which seek to hinder an effective witness for Christ here in the land of Japan.

Conclusion

A united study was made recently by twenty-three national Bible societies to discover what happens to thirty million Scriptures distributed by them annually. C. W. Larson, a study secretary for the American Bible Society Record made this observation as a result of the survey: "It is ... what a congregation holds the Bible to be that is revealed in the fervor with which it uses the Book."

In the same way, if the Gospel of Jesus Christ is God's final revelation to man, as Christian witnesses our belief or unbelief in this great fact will be clearly revealed either in the fervor or in the apathy with which we address ourselves to its defense and propagation.

Tokyo, January, 1962

Bibliography and Suggested Reading

Horner, Francis J. A Case History of Japan. Sheed & Ward, London, 1948

Hunter, Edward. Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defied It. Pyramid Books, New York, 1957

Kraemer, Hendrik. The Communication of the Christian Faith. Lutterworth Press, London, 1957

Pascal, Blaise. The Provincial Letters. (The Modern Library Edition) Random House, New York, 1941

Roberts, J. Edward. A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Article: Gospel. T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1909

Speer, Robert E. The Finality of Jesus Christ. Fleming H. Revell Company, Westwood, New Jersey, 1933

Young, John M. L. The Two Empires in Japan. The Bible Times Press, Tokyo, 1959

Closing Worship by Kenneth Mc Vety

I would like to turn our thoughts chiefly to II Corinthians Chapter 4. These thoughts' are ones that I consider quite vital and I hope they will help us to keep things that we have discussed at this conference in proper focus. I shall try to pass on some thoughts that have become precious to my own heart in recent weeks.

I find here repeated mention of what I believe is the great imperative of the minister of the Lord Jesus. We all recognize the danger in the type of responsibility in which we are engaged. It is a responsibility of leadership but also passing on to the people of Japan the message and vital living reality that is portrayed for us on the pages of scripture. We all recognize the very real danger of giving stones instead of bread to those who come to us to find the need of their souls met and it is in connection that II Cor. 4 gives some clear cut answers.

The last verse of Chap. 3, "We all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord." I choose to pick just the phrase paraphrased as, "We all beholding the Lord in his glory are changed into the same likeness." This, I believe is the great imperative of the true minister of the Lord Jesus. It is to have had an encounter with the living Christ himself and to know the continuing experience of that encounter that is here phrased for us in these words, "We all beholding the Lord in his glory, are changed into the same likeness." This is not new to any of us. We recognize the imperative, I am sure, of having met Christ in such fashion as this and going from that place of meeting to present a living, vital, real faith to those who come to us. But I submit to you this afternoon that we have need to stand in quietness before the living God himself to have renewed in our own hearts the reality of this experience. Day by day we must know what it means to meet the Lord himself and to go from him as his ministers. To say this may sound heretical, and of course, it is in one sense, but I have come to believe rather keenly that our need as missionaries in Japan today is not for more prayer but for less prayer. What I mean is this; that we have come, to equate prayer with the saying of words to such a tremendous degree that we-have missed one of the exceedingly vital elements of Bible

prayer. It is something to which we need a vital return in these days. If we mean by prayer as the saying of words, whatever our backgrounds might be, I have come to feel that we could get along with less of it. But, we should mean the coming into the presence of a living God and meeting with him, beholding the Lord himself in his glory, waiting perhaps in meditation, perhaps in simply waiting upon him for his revelation of his will and the understanding that he answers the problems facing us. We need that quietness of soul before God in which he will reveal himself to us in such manner that his likeness will be impressed upon our souls and he made real to those round about us. We, of course-in verse 18, that we see him only dimly as in a mirror or reflected in a glass and it is true that today we see only dimly. Yet, here is one of the great needs of our souls; that we come to see him. Verse 4 goes on then to describe our ministry. I believe that without having met this one great condition of experiencing this encounter, not as a once-for-all experience only but as a continuing experience of our lives, we lack the one great condition of a fruitful and effective minister of the Lord Jesus.

I pass on to two or three other phrases we have in the 4th Chapter. Verse 7, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." If we can append this to the earlier phrase, "We all, beholding the Lord in his glory are changed into the same likeness-that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." God will not share his glory with another, however well educated we may be, however high in our own estimation, it is clearly laid out for us in scripture that God will not share his glory with another. The story is told that when we have come to the end, God will take all the glory to himself and will not share it with us. I recall a very precious Japanese minister speaking on one occasion speaking along these lines. The burden of his message was that by all means gain all the education you can get but then as a servant of Jesus Christ stand as though you had none and as though you are utterly and absolutely dependent at that moment on the Spirit of God for enlightenment and his empowering. Get all you can and yet stand as though you had none. The same is true with experience along with our training and our education. I believe we are on good solid ground in sharpening our instruments to the finest turn possible that we might be the most effective instruments possible in the ministry of the gospel. When it is all said and done, no matter how many degrees we may append to the end of our names, we must learn that secret of being able to stand before God in such fashion that all of the

glory shall be his. "That the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us."

I pass on to one other phrase that can again be appended, namely Verse 10. "And that the life also of Jesus might be manifest in the body ... we all beholding the Lord in his glory are changed into the same likeness ... that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." This does not say that the spirit of Jesus be manifest in us, that is, in the sense that the spirit he manifested is imitated by us and we reflect that spirit in a rather distant sense in our lives. These words, if they mean anything at all, mean that at the heart of the Christianity revealed for us in the Word of God is the fact that we have the privilege of experiencing the very life of the resurrected Jesus in our lives and through us in the lives of others round about us. Coming at this thought from perhaps a slightly different viewpoint, I have often thought in chagrin about the common usage we have given to the phrase, "bearing the cross." We refer to "cross-bearing" as grimly gritting our teeth and holding up under some grievous trial that has come our way. There are legitimate aspects of course to that, and yet, I believe that what the Spirit of God is seeking to teach us through such phrases is that the cross is not some symbol of some irritant that has by some accident or otherwise come into our lives. It is the symbol of a complete and total death that crosses out completely any dependence on our part on the power of the natural man, however well educated, however thoroughly refined we might be. We are called upon to bear the cross the symbol of the total crossing out of our worth. Again, that our total dependence might be on the living Christ.

Coming back to the phrase before us, "that the resurrection life of Christ may be manifest in us:" We all recognize, I am sure, the need of today for men again of this stamp to be manifest here in Japan. These Japanese people do not need our education as such or our superior mental faculties and what have you. The great crying need is for a revelation for a life of Jesus manifest through us today and unless our intellectual facilities and our finely turned plans and programs are all bent to that end, I believe from the scriptures that we have missed the very part to which God has appointed us.

Then I go on to another phrase in Verse 18 of Chapter 4. "For the things that are seen are temporal and the things that are not seen are eternal." We are here in Japan' not as men of another country only. We are here as men of another world, whose end is

something totally different to that commonly known. Of course, we vary perhaps widely in our interpretation of eschatology and yet somewhere we find a place for such words as these in Luke 21:27. "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." We move to an end that, if you will, is other-worldly and not just further advanced of what we see among men in this day. We are men of another world called to a different set of values, of aims and ambitions. I believe we have need particularly often such a conference as this to quietly wait in the presence of our God and once again fix our eyes on the eternal values and the things that are not temporal and fleeting and therefore have only passing value. We must fix our hearts and our hopes on those things that are eternal. And so I leave with you these appended phrases, "We all, beholding the Lord in his glory are changed into the same likeness.. .that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us...that the life also of Jesus might be manifest in our body ... for the things which are seen are temporal but the things which are not seen are eternal."