

A PROPOSAL OF PASTORAL
SOCIOLOGY LOOKING TOWARD
— The Theological School and the Pastor —

Tadao ADACHI

I Introduction: the Motive of Challenge

Since I am going to speak about "A Proposal of Pastoral Sociology Looking Toward: the Theological School and the Pastor", I will define my terms. By the theological school I mean a theological department of a university, and more precisely, I chiefly mean that of Kwansei Gakuin University where I worked for thirty-one years. Also by the pastor I mean the first-line pastor engaged with pastoral work and evangelism at the church, and mainly the pastor who is a graduate of the Theological Department, Kwansei Gakuin University. It is only a little more than a decade since I was baptised and I am afraid I am not a very ardent Christian. Besides, I am merely an old student of political science, a discipline which does not have much to do with religion. I have not investigated the actual conditions of the theological schools and churches throughout the country. In this sense my discussion may be a reckless trial of an outsider to challenge an extremely professional and excessively difficult problem with little preparation. Therefore, I am ready to be criticized as foolhardy. But I have my own ample reasons and motives for the bold attempt. Let me mention them first.

1. My Betrayed Image of the Pastor (the First Motive)

(1) My Image of the Pastor

Both before and after I was baptized, at least until the college conflict in the late sixties broke out, I had had a fixed image of the pastor, the theological student who will be a pastor, and the ideal Christian, if they are to be true models of Christians. It is as follows. The pastor can say anything and take any action according to his belief. In speech and action he can be involved in any social and political problem. Moreover, it is his duty and responsibility to obey

his belief faithfully. But there is only one limitation to it: his speech and action should not be violent. I used to believe this was not only my image of the pastor, but also that of the majority of the Japanese whom I call average citizens.

Also I am sure the majority of the average citizens used to believe the image of the nonviolent pastor was endorsed by the Bible, needless to quote the passage, "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matthew 26 : 52), if the pastor were the model of Christians, and Christians were to rely on the Bible for the guidance of their speech and action. Biblicists and theologians, however, like jurists, tend to interpret the Bible as they like and some of them assert that even the Bible admits violence as the occasion may demand. Therefore, I am well aware some people will not agree with me. But my point is that the majority of the Japanese, both Christians and non-Christians, have, or used to have, this kind of image of the pastor, although I cannot assert it with scientific accuracy since I have not done detailed research on the actual condition and that this assertion of mine is acceptable.

(2) Nonviolence and Civility

Suppose the pastor is admitted to be nonviolent, there remains a much more troublesome question. That is, where in one's speech and action does one begin to be considered violent? I have used the phrase, speech and action, because when violence is in question today, violence of speech as well as that of action is included in it. Although this is a very serious problem, not much research has been done on it in this country. That is why I insisted we should adopt violence as the theme of the Committee of Religious Activities at the university this year. I cannot, however, discuss it any further now.

Therefore, let me make a little leap in argument and find a standard to distinguish between violence and nonviolence, finding it at the point of whether one bases one's speech and action on the present political regime, especially on *legal order* to express it. In other words, when a certain speech or action is based on the recognition of the legal order, it is nonviolent, and when it is not, it is violent.

Now many people would instantly criticize me: such a standard is to them very conservative, reactionary and proestablishment, and

no speech and action against the present legal order would be admitted. But this is an irrelevant criticism. I am sure most of you will support the standard if I put it in the following way.

One of the ideas clarified in the fields of political science and jurisprudence is civil liberty. Whether a certain speech or action is within the framework of civil liberty decides the violent or nonviolent quality. Some Japanese left-wing people, especially new left-wing people, among whom many pastors are found, do not approve of civil liberty at all. Even if they do, they claim there is no civil liberty in Japan now, or that only a few people enjoy it, trying to justify violence — from my viewpoint — of their speech and action. I do not admit we have one hundred percent civil liberty in Japan. But first, there has never existed one hundred percent civil liberty in this world. The question of liberty is always that of degree and comparison. Secondly therefore, there is more civil liberty in Japan than other countries, say, South Korea, the Soviet Union and China. Even new left-wing people cannot deny this fact, can they? Thirdly, we must pay attention to the fact that such people justify their violence saying there is no civil liberty in Japan, thus remarkably limiting actual civil liberty. For instance, are they not forcing more tabooed phrases and taboos that we should not mention?

But what is civil liberty? What does “civil”, and not “citizen”, mean? Let me introduce, although rather suddenly, one Western scholar’s explanation of the word “civil”. He explains it in relation to “civil disobedience”. According to him “civil” has the following five meanings. “(1) The term ‘civil’ can imply a recognition of general obligations of citizenship and thus the legitimacy of the existing legal order as a whole ... (2) ‘Civil’ can be taken to refer to the opposite of ‘military’ in a broad sense. The customary stress on nonviolence may be construed to signify either (a) a recognition of the state’s claim to monopoly with respect to legitimate use of physical violence, or (b) a rejection of all physical violence as illegitimate or morally wrong under all circumstances regardless of purpose. (3) ‘Civil’ can refer to the opposite of ‘uncivil’ or ‘uncivilized’ ... Most conceptions of civility and ‘*more civilized behavior*’ stress a consistent respect for other people’s — including one’s adversaries — physical inviolability as a crucial attribute ... (4)

'Civil' can also be taken to refer to *public* as distinct from private: as citizens we act in public. Acts of civil disobedience seek not only to affirm a principle in private but also to call public attention to the view that a principle of moral importance is being violated by a law or a policy sanctioned by public authorities. Acts of civil disobedience may be considered acts of public witness to the prior rights of conscience or of God . . . (5) 'Civil' can suggest that the objective of obedience is to institute changes in the *political* system, affecting not only one individual's or group's liberties but the liberties of all citizens." ("Civil Disobedience" in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Crowell, Collier, & Macmillan, 1968, II, pp. 473-4. Underlined by the present author.)

From the above five senses I understand civil liberty and more broadly, civility upon which it is based, as follows: on the one hand, it considers "the voice of God" or "the voice of conscience" the highest. And when it considers the actual social conditions are against the voice, it resists the reality as "public witness", tries to reform them and at times tries to upset the existing political regime root and branch. But on the other hand, speech and action accompanying the resistance and reform are always civil and polite to others — civil meaning polite — . Therefore, even if the existing legal order is against "the voice of God", one accepts it and is ready to receive punishment from it. One never tries to destroy it with violence. In short, civil liberty or civility is a system of consistent speech and action, which from a Christian viewpoint starts with "the voice of God", and because they are witness to the voice, ends in nonviolence.

There are, however, two things which I should refer to concerning "witness to the voice of God". First, one always needs to reflect upon the following point: one's assertion that one's claim is "the voice of God", the cry of conscience and the absolute justice and that one may and should ignore that which does not follow it, is in fact sometimes neither the voice of God nor the cry of conscience, but a mere defence of private interests of an individual or group. There is certainly only one truth as "the voice of God". But what we hear as the voice of God is more than one; we are so imperfect and full of sins. It is clear in the Old Testament that what the prophets told the

people as "the voice of God" were plural and that they contradicted one another. Such sinful people as we cannot hear with absolute accuracy the only and absolute "voice of God". Then if one asserts one's view as the voice of God and ignores the views which do not follow it, one is too proud. Secondly, Western history has learned through its long and severe experience that many of the assertions that one's view was the voice of God and that one should ignore and deny those who did not follow it were not the voice of God according to later history's judgment. The denial of the adversaries based on the voice of God was only useless bloodshed, as the facts of witch hunting tell us. The well-intentioned man of conviction often turned out to be a massacrer. In short, a conclusion that civil liberty or civility begins with "the voice of God" and ends in nonviolence is not only a natural conclusion of Christian ethics, but is based on historical experiences.

(3) The Betrayed Image

From what I have mentioned above, my image of the pastor used to be as follows: the pastor or the candidate for holy orders admits — simply admits, and not observes — national laws and the rules and regulations of Kyodan (the Church of Christ in Japan) and schools, however bad they may be. I used to believe, therefore, that if he violated any of them even if he did so according to his own "voice of God", he would accept punishment from them, and that his speech and action toward his adversaries would never lose a basic civility.

But such an image was utterly confused by the campus struggle of Kwansai Gakuin University and conflict in the Church of Christ in Japan. Of course, I admit the theological students' speech and action at the time of the struggle, and those of the radical pastors at the time of the Church conflict, were respectively quite different from those of the students of the other departments and those of students and people of other occupational bodies. They did not use extremely physical violence. But civility toward adversaries, admittance of the rules and regulations and acceptance of sanctions were scarce and rarely found. Besides, it cannot be denied that their speech and action contained a kind of physical violence: barricading of buildings, strike, insulting remarks about their adversaries, a long-hour kangar-

oo court and deprivation of freedom of speech of the other party. So I must conclude that their speech and action were violent or at least that they lacked civility very much. Also I affirm that it is a sheer fact that they totally smashed the image of the pastor which not only the average Christians like me, but also the majority of the average citizens had.

Then why were the pastors and theological students involved in such speech and action? Even I admit their good intentions; their motive was subjectively good. Incidentally, this is true of all the Japanese, but the Japanese intellectuals including pastors tend to think if one's motive is subjectively good, one's action is good, too. How much does this idea distort our thought and speech and action? I who saw the 5 : 15 case and the 2 : 26 case, aborted coups d'etat by the army, had believed we liquidated such an idea at the end of the war, but in fact it seems that we have more of such an idea than in the prewar days. This is what Max Weber warned the Germans against more than fifty years ago. He says in his lecture, "Politics as a Vocation": "'From good comes only good; but from evil only evil follows.' In that case this whole complex of questions would not exist. But it is rather astonishing that such a thesis could come to light two thousand five hundred years after the Upanishads. Not only the whole course of world history, but every frank examination of everyday experience points to the very opposite. The development of religions all over the world is determined by the fact that the opposite is true. The age-old problem of theodicy consists of the very question of how it is that a power which is said to be at once omnipotent and kind could have created such an irrational world of undeserved suffering, unpunished injustice, and hopeless stupidity. Either this power is not omnipotent or not kind, or, entirely different principles of compensation and reward govern our life — principles we may interpret metaphysically, or even principles that forever escape our comprehension.

"This problem — the experience of the irrationality of the world — has been the driving force of all religious evolution. The Indian doctrine of karma, Persian dualism, the doctrine of original sin, predestination and the deus absconditus, all these have grown out of this experience. Also the early Christians knew full well the world

is governed by demons and that he who lets himself in for politics, that is, for power and force as means, contracts with diabolical powers and for his action it is not true that good can follow only from good and evil only from evil, but that often the opposite is true. Anyone who fails to see this is, indeed, *a political infant.*" (Underlined by the present author.)

Therefore, I had to consider seriously why the pastor and theological student remained politically immature. Political immaturity of all the Japanese including myself is a big problem for me to challenge as a political scientist. But I thought that first I had to elucidate, as a Christian, the immaturity condensed in the intellectual profession of pastorship. Incidentally, I have discussed in detail the Japanese political immaturity in my book, *The Present Public Problems and the Citizen* (Gyosei, 1977). Those who are interested may refer to it.

2 . The Antagonistic Relationship Between the Professors of the Theological Department and Pastors (the Second Motive) : the Gloomy Tense Relationship

I have another motive for the attempt to study the problem of the pastor. It is related to the campus struggle, too. At the time of the struggle many of the graduates of the Theological Department, pastors, declared a kind of protest against the Department. Later I learned it was not surprising, but then it was a big surprise to me. The pastor of my church joined the protest, too. His daily speech and actions were not radical at all. That is why I was all the more surprised. While revealing my surprise to pastors and college chaplains, I learned there was a kind of mental tension between the Theological Department graduates, especially first-line pastors, and the Department, especially centering on its professors. In other words, I learned that they did not get along well with each other. This was another big surprise to me. I had firmly believed that the pastor and the professor of theology who fostered him had faith, profession and fate in common; I had believed their human relationship was that of a fellow-pilgrim and his leader in a Buddhist sense, that of spiritual community full of civility, and that even if there was disagreement of opinions, it could be fully solved within the fram-

ework of civil liberty and civility. Some people may criticize such beautification of their relationship as nonsense, but I believe this is what the majority of the ordinary and general citizens and Christians have had in mind.

At any rate, I wondered why there was antagonism between the professors and the first-line pastors, and asked the reason from some professors of the Department and some pastors. I learned from their words, whether they were conscious or not, that their antagonism or tense relationship was very similar to that between the professors of medicine and the first-line practitioners, and between those of law like me and the first-line lawyers. And the antagonism or tense relationship between the professors of the Theological Department and the first-line pastors can look for worse than in the case of medicine and law because the professors and pastors alike put up the flag of beautiful Christian ethics and hold themselves bound by such a principle.

Experiencing the collapse of these two images, I came to think that the pastor was not different from the ordinary and general person and that it was important to study pastorship as a profession. Then I came to see if the occupations of the carpenter, the tailor and the blacksmith are classical crafts, pastorship is the most classical profession. An English dictionary says that profession means a vocation or occupation requiring advanced training in some liberal art or science, especially that of the pastor, the lawyer and the doctor. Their occupations are classical professions. According to the Old Testament men of ancient times were engaged in agriculture or stock farming, and were soldiers at the same time; their occupations were nothing particular. But the priests, as distinct from them, were Levites who were descendants of Levi, one of the twelve sons of Jacob, or Levites who were descendants of Aaron that followed Moses. They were not engaged in agriculture or stock farming, and did not have God-given hereditary property. But instead, they were not drafted to go to war. They received messages from God, gave God's commandments to the general people, received sacrifice from them, which they offered to God and a certain part of which they were allowed to make their own. In this sense, priesthood must have been the oldest profession. This is what H. Spencer clearly says in

his *Principles of Sociology* (1876/1896), too. If a vocation is a calling or Beruf called by (geruft von) God, it must be the most typical calling. Then I came also to see that it is not only possible, but also very important to study pastorship as a social occupation, or as the object of social science. I also came to think that while such study is going on, a solution may be found to fill the gap between our image and reality, and to solve the antagonism and tension between church members and the pastor and between the pastor and the professor of the theological school.

The discussion below is a mere preliminary essay for that. It is an ad-balloon to stimulate later more advanced research which someone will need to be engaged in.

II Pastorship as a Vocation

When we study pastorship as a vocation, it is certain that vocational sociology gives us a clue to it. Although it is an important field of sociology, it is not very developed in this country. The pioneer of the field in Japan is Mr. Kunio Odaka. In 1941 he published an excellent book, *Shokugyo-shakaigaku* (Vocational Sociology). I read it with pleasure in college. He says that one of the classical books on vocational sociology is Karl Dunkman's *Die Lehre vom Beruf* (1922). Dunkman was a theologian-turned-sociologist. Incidentally, I heartily expect that a founder of pastoral sociology, some Dunkman of Japan, will appear from among the theological students of Kwansei Gakuin University.

Now Mr. Odaka says, "The vocation means man's continuous action form in which he aims at demonstration of personality, realization of solidarity and maintenance of living." "The vocation is continuous work in which those who live a social life (1) demonstrate their gifts, (2) perform their role, and (3) make a living with the reward thus gained." He calls the three aspects respectively (1) the individual aspect, (2) the social aspect and (3) the economic aspect.

When a vocation is seen in the individual aspect of "demonstration of personality", the relationship between "an action form" or "continuous work" and personality must be paid attention to. Then the individual's abilities and techniques are chiefly examined, and the

technical factors will become clear. From the second social aspect will emerge moral factors by emphasizing "realization of solidarity", and from the economic aspect, economic (financial) or monetary factors by emphasizing maintenance of living. I am going to discuss below, according to Mr. Odaka's view, a vocation called pastorship in its three aspects or factors.

1 . The Individual and Technical Factor

To discuss the individual aspect or technical factor, we must pay attention to the action form and continuous work of the pastor as an individual professional, that is, to his daily work. I cannot refer to his daily work in detail. I have only observed between ten and twenty pastors of Protestant churches and these mainly from the outside. I have attended the churches sometimes regularly and sometimes irregularly since I was young. If I am allowed, however, to speak about the vocation's characteristics, they are as follows. Let me mention them while relating them to one of my motives above, and comparing them with the work of the professor of the theological school (hereinafter referred to as professor).

The first characteristic of the pastor's work, a remarkable one when compared to the professor's, is its variety. His work is extremely varied.

Many laymen come to church only on Sunday. Therefore, the first work of the pastor which they observe is that in the Sunday service. The most important in the service for the pastor is a sermon. The rest of the services are usually performed according to a certain traditional pattern, and are not a burden to him. But a sermon is very important work for the pastor. It must be a heavy burden for him to write a sermon which should touch the heartstrings of the congregation, and give it impressively week after week, although once a week only.

The second work is to have a leading role in the Bible class and the prayer meeting, usually held once a week. He must prepare quite much especially for the Bible class.

Thirdly, the pastor is a teacher of a church school in most cases, too; he also works as a teacher. Suppose the first and second work are called pastoral work, this can be considered its extended work.

But considering the pupils are mostly elementary and junior high school ones, it must be considered to contain quite different elements. If you imagine the pastor taking a lot of children to a camp site in the mountain or by the sea as a program of a summer school, you will instantly see the difference. This is very troublesome and delicate work.

The fourth work is that of a counselor. This is to listen to his church members' or would-be members' spiritual trouble, pray with them and counsel them. This is equivalent to the Catholic priest's listening to one's confessions. Although the fourth, it is one of the most important and delicate.

The fifth work is to lead a women's society, a middle-aged men's society, a young people's group, outdoors service, a bazaar and so forth, making his church members' spiritual fellowship more intimate. Visiting sick members, and encouraging those who suffer from trouble and visiting them at their house belong to this category.

Sixthly, the pastor plays a leading role in social service activities for the community where the church is located. Besides inevitable sufferings like sickness, aging and death, man has various troubles. The church must open its door to such troubles of non-Christian residents of the area. Then the pastor has to hold a mission rally for them, and play an active role in the volunteer activities of nursing the sick and the aged, which have finally become active recently. All of these are troublesome and delicate burdens to him.

Seventhly, he conducts weddings and funeral ceremonies. It may be a fashion of Japanese of Western taste recently, but more and more non-Christians want to have their wedding ceremony conducted at the church. It is a question to accept every application for it, and concerning its approval sometimes troublesome opposition is caused among the church members. This kind of work becomes a delicate burden to him.

As far as the pastor's work is pastoral work and evangelism, various other works can be mentioned as related to them, and they are too numerous to cite. But finally what is so important that it must not be overlooked is his administrative work or work of general affairs. It ranges from the maintenance and management of the church building to church accounts. These tasks are lightened

through church members' cooperation. But in such a case a delicate opposition tends to appear between the pastor and the members: this kind of work is also troublesome and delicate to the pastor.

What one should pay attention to concerning the variety of the pastor's work is that it includes not only the variety of the kinds of work, but also that of people he has to deal with. The occupation or work one is engaged in is often called service whose idea is originally based on Christian ethics. As public worship is called service, the pastor's work is typical service. The object of service is called a client. Besides that of the clergy, one of the most classical professions is medicine. We are clients to a doctor who ask him to cure our disease; we are his customers. In the same way we are clients to a pastor who ask him for peace of mind; we are his customers to ask for his service.

At any rate, the pastor's clients are extremely various. Some are aged, and some young. Some are men, some women. Some are college professors like me who try to examine and accept everything critically, while others listen to edifying words only, trying to be immersed in the ecstasy of religious exaltation. There are both conservative businessmen and progressive laborers. Some have advanced knowledge of the Bible and Christian doctrines, while others do not. There are long-time members and new-comers. There are healthy people and weak people. Some are rich and some are poor. Some consider the church the place for holy fellowship, and some for social gatherings.

The pastor must give a sermon to such various clients. If he gave a little sophisticated sermon to satisfy a part of them, most other worshippers would not understand him. But if his talk were too easy and detailed, many people would be bored. Besides, he has to listen to various worries of the various clients, and respond to them. I have often used the phrase, "troublesome and delicate", partly because I have paid attention to this variety.

The above variety of service (work) and clients is not had by the professor of theology, at least one who does not have a church to take care of. The professor's work is chiefly limited to research and education. His clients have much in common: intellectual background, degree of faith and age. The difference between the pastor

and the professor at this point can be compared to that between the only general medical practitioner in a depopulated area and the professor of basic medicine in the medical school. The general practitioner has to take care of surgery, internal medicine and gynecology. Sometimes he is required to interfere with the social conditions which have caused his patient's disease. For instance, to cure the farm woman's disease (such as anemia) he has to be involved in the problems of improvement of farming work, and of the husband's cooperation in the home. On the contrary, the professor of physiology at the medical school can be engaged in his work in his study room or laboratory, sometimes by himself and sometimes surrounded by his obedient students, cut off from the outside world. The general practitioner is not only required to have professional knowledge and techniques of every medical field, but also needs to know the existing social problems, how people suffer from them, and how to come into contact with such people's mind. But all the professor of physiology has to do is to devote himself to research and education in his field. It is impossible for us ordinary people to have perfect knowledge and techniques of every field. Therefore, wide knowledge of medicine which may be shallow would be required of the general practitioner, while profound knowledge which may be narrow would be required of the professor. From the difference of work and techniques between both, the practitioner criticizes the professor that he knows neither practical medicine, nor the practitioner's hardships, while the professor says the practitioner lacks medical knowledge and training. Thus antagonism or tension between the both parties emerges.

I believe that about the same things as the above differences in work and requirements and the antagonisms emerging from it do arise, although to a different degree, between the pastor and the professor of the theological school. The antagonism arises in a different form, however, which I shall mention later.

2 . The Social and Ethical Factor

Let us consider the second aspect or factor of pastorship: its social or ethical (moral) factor.

It would be a self-evident fact that the pastor greatly contributes

to the community through his work where he lives, and in return, is highly respected by the people there. It is because he is engaged in the work of bringing peace to their mind. But this may be a self-evident fact in Christian countries only. It may not be self-evident in Japan, where Christians constitute only 0.7 percent of the whole population and people tend to be secular economic animals. Besides, many of the Japanese rate pastors, Buddhist priests and Shinto priests as being high in principle, but rate them low in real intentions somewhere in their mind. And they do not realize the discrepancy between their principle and real intentions. Then it is still all the more questionable whether it is self-evident or not.

I have a reason why I have referred to the Japanese characteristics concerning the pastor's social contribution. It is because when one discusses the social aspect of pastorship as a vocation, one tries to discuss in detail people's image of the pastor before his social contribution.

As is well known, Christianity is basically different from Shintoism and Buddhism. I have neither ability nor space to discuss this difference, but only point out that Christian teachings are fundamentally different from traditional Japanese religious and ethical views. Let me mention the following three points.

Christianity, to begin with, believes in an only and absolute God, and in this sense has a distinct and strong religious view, while the traditional Japanese religions do not have one as they accept both gods and the Buddha together. This is seen in the fact that the majority of the Japanese have their wedding ceremony conducted in the Shinto shrine and funeral ceremony in the Buddhist temple. It has made the religious consciousness of the Japanese very vague.

Secondly, Christianity, both in religious and ethical views, is very individualistic or individual-centered, but the traditional religions of this country are family-centered. The imported Buddhism or the Japanized Buddhism, not to mention Shintoism, cannot be separated from the idea of ancestor worship. Just compare the passage in the Old Testament written more than two thousand five hundred years ago, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son," (Ezekiel 18 : 20) and the one, "One's crime influences nine generations," which expresses the

Chinese idea of a penalty one thousand five hundred years ago and had influenced the Japanese idea until about a century ago. (*Zuisho*, *Keihoshi* — nine generations means one's great-great-grandfather, great-grandfather, grandfather, father, oneself, son, grandson, great-grandson and great-great-grandson.) These first and second points are seen in the fact that although we publicly declare we do not believe in any religion, we admit we have a family religion.

Thirdly, Christian ethics is very different from that of the traditional Japanese religions. This is found in every area of our life. In the Lockheed scandal every Japanese suspect felt guiltier toward betrayal of his companions than toward telling lies. But the biggest difference is that in sexual ethics. Before Christian Western culture was introduced to Japan, polygamy had not been considered unethical at all in this country. As the saying, "A faithful woman would not marry a second time" shows, sexual faithfulness was demanded of women, and not of men. In Japan, until 1945 prostitution was an open social occupation, and employers of prostitutes were protected by a national law. Also a system centuries old existed until the Meiji Restoration that one wrote his mistress's name in one's family register. These things would be incomprehensible unless one realized the basic difference between Christian sexual ethics and that of the traditional religions.

Western civilization which we have liberally adopted since the Meiji era came to Japan with Christianity which is quite different from the traditional religions in the three respects. Therefore, the scientific, materialistic and technical aspect of Western civilization perfectly agreed with the Japanese policy of national prosperity and defense in the Meiji era, and was enthusiastically supported and adopted. But the spiritual or religious aspect, which was inseparably related to the other, was accepted by few people only; the majority of the people showed hatred and dislike to it at first, and would never accept it. Of course, we have quite a different situation now and many people have come to observe Christmas Eve. But they are still indifferent to Christianity as a religion and its ethics: at best, they keep them "at a respectful distance". Even today when monogamy is provided for in the law and bigamy is prohibited by the criminal law, a prime minister of the country has more than one

mistress. And even when it is known to everybody, mass communication media which are unusually enthusiastic about disclosing politicians' misdeeds mostly keep silent. This fact well shows their attitude of keeping Christianity at a respectful distance.

My point is that the attitude of the majority of the people in the society toward the pastor is clearly expressed in the phrase: to keep him at a respectful distance. It becomes the image of the pastor which we ordinary and general people have. That is, the pastor is an exceptionally moral person who preaches noble ethics against what has not been traditionally considered guilty. I learned from a pastor that when he laughed in the talk after giving a lecture at a high school, some of the students wondered, "Oh, does a pastor laugh, too?" This may be an extreme example, but it shows that the majority of the people consider a pastor an excessively moral person. If we saw a pastor play golf or bowl, most of us would say, "The pastor shouldn't do that!" Frankly, even I, who constantly say the pastor is human, cannot deny hearing such a voice somewhere in my mind. Then if people saw a pastor going to a beer hall, playing pachinko (pinball) or going to a horse race, most of them would criticize him even more harshly. But needless to say, these actions are ordinary ones for people other than pastors. General society members' image of the pastor influences church members' image of their pastor since they are members of society, too. Or rather I think church members, who have more contact with the pastor than the majority of the non-Christians, more often say, "The pastor shouldn't do that!" In short, the pastor's speech and action are watched both by Christians and non-Christians according to a very high ethical standard.

More significantly, people not only watch the pastor's professional activities, but also his purely private life with his family. He is exposed to severe ethical watch round the clock: "The pastor shouldn't do that!" Further, his wife and children are watched likewise, and if they deviate from any ethical standard, the responsibility is shifted on him. His children's misdeeds are to be criticized as a result of his improper education. According to his clients' variety, their ethical standards by which to watch the pastor become various. This may be an extreme case, but the pastor and his wife

who have a lot of children are almost criticized as sensual, while those who have none, are criticized as carrying out indiscreet birth control. And as will be discussed below, the pastor's salary is generally low. When he has a side job to make up for it, he may be frowned upon as being too businessminded for a pastor by some church members. Afraid of being thus frowned upon, he does not have a side job and suffers from poverty, and then he may be criticized by others that he impairs the honor of pastors. At any rate, it is a taboo for him to mention materialistic scarcity. The majority of the ordinary society members and church members tend to consider the pastor such highly ethical person that I would like to say they appear to believe he can live on mist or clouds.

Variety of ethical standards to watch by, constant watch of the pastor's activities in every part of his life, numerousness of watchful eyes and consideration of him as an exceptionally moral person force constant mental tension upon him. As he is as human as we ordinary people, this mental tension becomes heavy mental pressure. But it is very difficult to get rid of this pressure. It is because he often preaches high ethics in his sermons. Thus the pressure gets doubled.

You may think the professor of the theological school hardly has a different situation concerning the point of receiving mental tension and pressure from the majority of the people and church members. But the professor has fewer clients and their variety is very little. There is much difference between the two, which should not be overlooked. Let me give you an example to show the difference.

The church, without exception, has a slogan, publicly or not: those who suffer are always welcome there. Once a young man came to a church and begged the pastor to give him some money as he was very poor. When the pastor learned his situation, he could not think that he was so poor. When the pastor gave him further questions, he showed dissatisfaction as if to say why the pastor who preached God's way asked such detailed questions. The pastor had to give him a thousand yen and he went back. If the pastor had sent him away without giving him any money, church members as well as the young man would have criticized him that he was too unkind for the poor. The pastor's salary was less than seventy thousand yen a month, and one thousand yen was much to him. But if he later had

asked a church treasurer for the money, he would have been criticized as too greedy. He managed to give the money out of his little pocket money. Such an example would never happen to the professor of the theological school.

The Rev. Tanetani case is another example. A high school student, who often came to his church, was once chased by the police because of a kind of subversive activities. He took refuge in the church. Mr. Tanetani sheltered him in his friend's house and was prosecuted for a crime of criminal law. If the pastor had not sheltered the boy but surrendered him to the police, he would have been blamed that he considered the national law higher than God's commandment, which the pastor should not do. But he who sheltered the boy was unfavorably criticized by the national power, and some citizens and church members. He was finally given a verdict of not guilty in the court. I highly evaluate the verdict as the national power's concession to civil liberty and as the expansion of civil liberty. Anyway, such a case would scarcely happen to the professor of the theological school.

In relation to the pastor's mental tension and pressure, his residential conditions must be pointed out. Most pastors live either in an apartment in the church building, or in a house very near it. His official life and private life are mixed. His clients, according to their variety, visit him day and night. His family cannot enjoy complete privacy. This increases their mental tension and pressure. Let me say something that Christians should not mention, although I am one. I once said to a marriageable daughter of mine: "You can marry any man, but please avoid marrying a pastor as much as possible." To the pastor's wife aged male church members are more or less her fathers-in-law, aged female members her mothers-in-law and young men and women her brothers- and sisters-in-law. The professor of the theological school has no such mental tension and pressure based on residential conditions.

Now even if the pastor got jealous of the professor of theology who belongs to the same ministry, I could not blame him unless he were an exceptional saint or something. Therefore, I think it natural that when the professor, especially that of the theological school the pastor graduated from, shows an authoritative attitude toward

him, his jealousy turns to envy or hatred.

Concerning this point let me add the following. Once again the pastor is human. In my church life for ten plus, years sometimes I went to church with exalted joy and faith, and sometimes very reluctantly as my faith declined. To confess frankly, I once suspected that what the Bible teaches was basically wrong. It may be a mistake to judge the pastor's faith by my naturally weak faith as a standard. But as long as the pastor is human, too, I do not believe there is essential difference between the pastor's faith and mine. Even the pastor must have experienced both exaltation and decline of faith. Actually I know quite a number of people who used to be pastors but have given up Christianity now. It must be difficult to keep the fire of faith burning in any other country, but it is even more difficult in this country. It is because Japanese culture and customs in daily life are essentially heterogeneous to Christianity, and further, wonderful passages of instruction, even equivalent to biblical ones, are found in Buddhist teachings which have fully harmonized with culture and daily customs in Japan during many years. At any rate, we have a lot of temptation of abandonment of faith or apostasy in this country. And paradoxically, those who believe dogmatically or philosophically tend to be more often tempted than those who believe pureheartedly, or believe, "Faith will move a mountain." To put it plainly, apostasy is more likely to be caused among cultivated people than among uneducated people. Apostasy is what Japanese intellectuals are very good at. It is my firm conviction because I have seen the following. The leading journalists, who had cried out, "Hurrah for Marx, Lenin and Stalin!" in the 1930's, gradually shifted their voice to "Long live the Emperor!" in the former half of the forties, one day in 1945 suddenly shouted, "Hail to Gen. MacArthur!" and presently shouted, "Hurrah for Stalin!" and a few years later began to cry out, "Various evils originated in Stalin!" We intellectuals are more or less ideological acrobats. Besides, the general members of society go this way and that sensitively responding to what Mr. Shichihei Yamamoto calls the "atmosphere" of society, and are comparatively generous to ideological apostasy. Whether it is good or bad, we are very used to intellectuals' apostasy. College professors like me are allowed to change ideology by developing self

-criticism in the paper we publish. Rather, such self-criticism is praised, and even change of ideology without self-criticism is allowed. But the pastor, not only at the time of possible apostasy, but when his faith declines, has to deceive himself inwardly, and outwardly pretend to be exalted with faith. Otherwise, he would have to receive a cross fire of blame from his church members. Moreover, apostasy leading to abandonment of faith has to end in that of his vocation. It would be impossible for him to change jobs in Japan where specialization is highly developed, unless he were an exceptional pastor. His decline of faith and apostasy would cause him to be exposed to the crisis of unemployment: his family would be literally turned into the streets. The pastor's vocation is full of tension and hardships, indeed.

In this point the professor of the school of theology may not be different from the pastor. Certainly, there is no difference between the two in basic ideal or principle. But I think there is much difference in actuality. It is because at the time of apostasy as well as at the time of decline of faith he can escape into the world of theology shut off from practice, or sometimes into the more general world of science of religion and philosophy, comfortably living there. It is often said in the Christian world, "Theology prospers and faith dies out." If you understand its implication, you will realize I am not simply playing with strange words.

3 . The Economic Factor

The economic factor, the third one, can be shown in comparatively clear figures. The sources of the pastor's income differ according to churches, and therefore hard to discuss uniformly. But as far as the salary he gets from the church is concerned, it is the average of sixty thousand to seventy thousand yen a month. It is so little that he would be better-off to have the Daily Life Security Law applied to. The rent and water and fuel expenses are usually paid for by the church, and some members say his salary is not very low. But it must be considered that the pastor has to sacrifice his private life for that. But the professor gets a pay proportionate to that of a national government employee at least. He is often invited as a lecturer by many Christian schools in Japan, and sometimes appears

in Christian journalism. He must have a good income. I cannot show an accurate figure since I have not made detailed investigation, but probably a forty-year-old male professor's annual income is three to ten times as much as a forty-year-old male pastor.

A young pastor can get by with such low income. It is heavy pressure on a forty-year-old pastor with a wife and children, especially ones going to enter a school of higher grade. Even if he got jealous of a professor who was one of his classmates and thought as follows, I could not blame him: "He was not a very excellent student. He only got into favor with professors, studied abroad a couple of times and now is spotlighted as a professor." And when the professor shows an authoritative attitude toward the pastor with the theological school, their Alma Mater, as a background, it is natural that the jealousy should turn to envy and enmity.

What should be pointed out by all means here is that he cannot openly show dissatisfaction with his low salary. It is because he is supposed to be contented with honest poverty. He is bound tight by the beautiful and noble ethics and principle that the pastor should not talk about money. Dissatisfaction not openly expressed is pushed back into subconsciousness. But it never disappears but persistently remains. It becomes so serious that it would erupt upon some opportunity. I have referred to the delicate and gloomy relationship of tension and antagonism between the pastor and the professor because I pay attention to this point.

To make up for the low salary, most pastors or their wives have some side job. But even if the income from it is added, their total income will hardly reach the professor's. When a church runs a kindergarten, however, and the pastor substantially controls the management, he can get a good income. But in such a case dismal conflict is caused between church members and him. And when it is brought into court, it turns out to be so sharp that it has astonished a non-Christian lawyer, a friend of mine.

III Some Proposals

I have finished explaining the three factors of pastorship as a vocation. Again, it is only an explanation based on my limited observation. I sincerely hope someone will do full-scale research on

it and establish an independent field of learning called pastoral sociology. I shall be happy if this discussion starts its establishment.

However, let me proceed boldly and give some proposals below based on what I have discussed.

1 . A Proposal to Church Members

This is a request to church members. They must well understand difficulty, tension, pressure, suffering, poverty and so on which accompany pastorship. I am afraid Japanese Christians including myself offer opinions, and not money, If we give opinions to the pastor, we must supply him with materialistic guarantee to carry them out, but we do not do so. We think, if unconsciously, that although we cannot be contented with honest poverty, the pastor should. Again the pastor is just as human as we laymen are.

I said we offer opinions, and not money, but the fact may be that we do not offer either opinions or money. It seems that more often than not we backbite him among us, and do not complain to him directly. Originally Japanese prefer indirect and roundabout expressions to direct and straightforward ones, and backbiting to a face-to-face plain talk. Backbiting is our special skill. But backbiting literally exists behind one's back, and when it is prevalent, dismal tension is produced between the pastor and church members. When it becomes serious, it suddenly breaks out one day, causing endless antagonism or conflict.

But not only church members are responsible for their backbiting. The pastor is partly responsible, too. Let me move on to a proposal to the pastor now.

2 . A Proposal to the Pastor

As I have mentioned, the life of the pastor and his family are exposed to various people's watchful eyes. Therefore, his living attitude cannot help being defensive. But however hard he may try to defend himself, watchful eyes are always there. Afraid of criticism based on the watch, the pastor comes to abhor any criticism from the outside.

This feeling of hatred expresses itself in many complicated ways. Suppose someone made a request to the pastor about his sermon.

Whether he agrees with the request or not, he would listen to it willingly at least outwardly. But in fact his sermon would hardly be improved according to the request. If he did not agree to it, he would not adopt it taking an ambiguous attitude. Even if he did, he would not adopt it, either, afraid of a different criticism from someone else. Under these circumstances church members would lose the willingness to make a request to him directly. I want him not to produce such circumstances, although I know it is extremely difficult not to, as he is a Japanese.

I want the pastor more than anything else to realize that his vocation is not only full of extreme tension, pressure and hardships in the three aspects, but also that they have delicate and gloomy nature, and that he must take care of himself both physically and mentally. I know this is a difficult request, too. Therefore, let me propose as follows. One is usually aware of one's physically abnormal symptoms. Besides, the need of a periodical health check-up is widely emphasized. So I would hardly need to refer to it. But since very few people talk about the pastor's mental health, I want to mention it. If I had become a pastor, I would certainly have been a psychiatric person because of tension and heavy pressure. To put it very cynically, except for exceptionally gifted pastors, the very pastor that can affirm he has no mental disorder is likely to be the most psychiatric. Also, the pastor who is actually not psychiatric at all is either a genius of recreation, or a lazy one who does not tackle his work seriously. My point is that the pastor needs to have a periodical mental examination or character test as well as a periodical physical examination. But in the Christian world, bound by noble ethics or principle, both laymen and pastors believe every mental problem can be solved by reading the Bible and praying to God. I am not denying the effect of reading the Bible and praying to God. I believe in the effect more than anyone else. But today when psychology and psychiatry are developed, reliance on the effect only is just as unscientific and unrealistic as trying to heal a disease by prayer only without seeing a doctor.

Concerning this point, if I am allowed to speak boldly in spite of every possible misunderstanding, pastors' violent or uncivil speech and action at the time of the campus struggle came from their

frustration partly which had been caused by many kinds of pressure for many years.

3 . A Proposal to the Professor of the Theological School

Thirdly, this is a request to the professor of the theological school. In short, I want him to understand more deeply various heavy pressures accompanying pastorship, and to foster pastors based on the understanding.

For this understanding personnel exchange between professors and pastors can be considered since professors are ordained ministers, too, with little exception. I understand some pastors have become professors, but that very few professors have given up professorship and become pastors. More serious effort should be made to improve the relationship between them. The curricula of the school would have to be changed partly to realize it. I shall refer to it again below.

It is often said that both the pastor and the professor belong to the same ministry of serving God and form one spiritual community. To act up to the principles, I want them to share alike what little they have, although this is a very materialistic problem. The professors of the law school like me or those of the medical school are not blamed for having a car and enjoying golfing or a trip abroad. The first-line lawyer has a more income than the professor at the law school, generally speaking, and the medical practitioner a more income than the professor at the medical school. But the professor at the theological school can be blamed for doing those things, and it is because such pleasures are unattainable for the first-line pastor who has many hardships. A good many pastors have complained to me that the professor's pleasures at his leisure time are unattainable for them. Some people may take such a complaint as too childish toward pastors. I am not referring to it with contempt for the pastor. The pastor, the professor, and all of us human beings are mediocre. I would like the professor to pay attention to this mediocrity and judge his own living style in order to act up to the principles of the spiritual community.

Also I want the professor at the theological school to consider

whether he does not show an authoritative attitude. At the time of the campus struggle I punished some students as dean of the Law Department. I still believe my actions were proper. But if I affirmed that I had no authoritative attitude in any process of the punishment, I would be a liar. That is, if I affirmed that I was not inactive at all to secure the maximum of the students' and graduates' civil liberty, and to concede to it, I would be a liar. This is my self-criticism. But in relation to it, I say it out of kindness so that he may not commit the same mistake as I did.

4 . A Proposal to the School of Theology

Before I make a proposal to the school of theology, look at the following table.

Statistics Concerning the Theological Department, Kwansei Gakuin University (as of January, 1977)

Years	Freshmen(A)	Graduates(B)	Graduates who became Churchmen(C)	$\frac{B\%}{A}$ (decimals omitted)	$\frac{C}{A}$	$\frac{C}{B}$
1950-68	343	181	118	52	34	65
1950-54	78	50	38	64	48	76
1955-59	101	52	36	51	35	69
1960-64	106	42	29	39	27	72
1965-68	58	37	15	63	25	40

Remarks: (C) includes not only pastors and school chaplains, but also others engaged in Christian work in some way or other.

This is merely a record of about twenty years at a theological school called the Theological Department, kwansei Gakuin University. It may lead to an error to get a conclusion out of it. But it can be affirmed that it becomes doubtful whether the Theological Department is a professional school for fostering pastors or not, and this is because since 1960 only a quarter of the incoming students have become pastors or been engaged in Christian work.

A similar problem has been happening to the medical school, too. But there, more than ninety percent of the freshmen have become doctors or been engaged in medical work. If we look at the law school in this country, it has long since given up being a training institution for jurisprudential vocations (judges, public prosecutors and lawyers). Throughout the country only a bare one to two percent of the freshmen of the law departments take up jurisprudential jobs. Therefore, many of the departments aim at the training of intellectual citizens with jurisprudential education. Therefore, it is a serious problem to be discussed whether today's school of theology should continue to exist as a professional institution for fostering pastors, or change to one for training intellectual citizens with theological education. In other words, it is a question whether it should continue a medical school way, or follow a law school way.

I am not qualified to discuss this point very much. To put my opinion boldly, however, I believe it should continue the former way. It is because the majority of the Japanese think in the same way as I, and I am afraid we have very few vocations which would accept intellectual citizens with theological education. Let me make some proposals below on the assumption that the school of theology ought to continue as a school for cultivating pastors.

First, the school should let students thoroughly understand the characteristics of pastorship, and supply them with intellectual equipment for various pressure accompanying it. It cannot be helped that theological subjects are main ones in the curriculum, but much more emphasis should be placed upon psychology, sociology, political science, economics and others. When pastoral sociology should come to be established, it should be adopted first of all.

If such wide knowledge is required, the school of theology should stop being at an undergraduate level, and become one of a graduate level only as is seen in the United States. Cynically speaking again, many of the eighteen-year-old high school graduates who make their mind to dedicate their life to ministry are full-blooded persons, yet somewhat immature: they are easy to warm up and cool down. I am afraid it is natural that they should drop out if they face various pressure and hardships accompanying pastorship. Only twenty-five percent of the past freshmen are engaged in Christian work partly

because of this point. The excellent pastor in the future may appear from among those who go to the theological school and become a pastor after graduating from some other department like that of economics or law, and sometimes living in business circles for a few years or experiencing the hardships of the world, because they cannot give up service to God. From this viewpoint, too, I want to propose the need of the school being at a graduate school only. Of course, I do not deny some people are chosen to be pastors by God when they are young.

Now I have finished the proposal of Pastoral Sociology. I am sure it is full of my dogmatic prejudice. I am not such a man of character as to be exempted from any prejudice. Also I am afraid I have neglected the positive aspects of pastorship such as God's blessing and joy of fellowship, and have exaggerated its negative ones such as mental tension and pressure. Therefore I sincerely hope that whatever prejudices and exaggerations I have may be corrected by those who will be engaged in the establishment of the Pastoral Sociology discipline which I have enunciated.

P.S. This paper was reported in the speech of January 14, 1976.

(Received 11 October 1990)