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PREFACE

Probably the most helpful way to explain why I decided to write on shame would be to describe my own development of thought. This might also be the best way to answer some initial questions most readers will have such as: Why is the topic of Shame important to missionaries? Is there a significant difference between the concepts of guilt and shame? A personalized discussion of how my thoughts developed fits into a major theme of the book—exposure of oneself to others.

Basic questions to be raised are: How does a person preach a guilt oriented gospel to a shame oriented culture? Is the gospel of Jesus Christ as guilt oriented as we Westerners tend to think it is? Are there any cultures where the idea of guilt is unknown?

My interest in these problems was first aroused as I read a comment by Eugene Nida, translations secretary for the American Bible Society. Nida (1954:150) wrote:

We have to reckon with three different types of reactions to transgressions of religiously sanctioned codes: fear, shame, and guilt. . . . This sentiment of guilt is far less common than might be supposed. . . . Fear and shame are much more convenient attitudes for self-centered people.

I had assumed that guilt was a universal phenomenon. After all, the Bible declares that all men are sinners. Are not sin and guilt inseparable?

Previously I had noticed that among animistic tribes fear was a very common reaction in the religious realm. So I decided to investigate the possibility of organizing evangelism around fear rather than
guilt. Could this be justified Biblically? Would the animist respond
more readily to a gospel oriented to deliverance from fear? My con-
clusion was (Noble 1962:220-221):

Fear is centered in a dread of the power of evil
and ancestor spirits. For the animist Satan is
not just a tempter who leads him to commit acts
of sin; to him, spirits are fearsome masters who
have great power over his life. His immediate felt
need is for deliverance from the power and domina-
tion of evil spirits rather than deliverance from
the guilt of sin. . . . Emphasize the person of
Christ (Lord) instead of the work of Christ (Savior).
Jesus Christ as Lord is more powerful than evil
spirits, and thus He can deliver from the fear of
demons. This is not to suggest a division between
Christ as Savior and Christ as Lord, but it is simp-
ly a matter of emphasis in the evangelistic approach.

After resolving to my satisfaction that preaching the gospel within
an "evil spirit-fear-Lord" framework was legitimate and effective, I be-
gan to investigate shame. Could one replace the traditional Western
"sin-guilt-Savior" theme with a "sin-shame-Savior" evangelistic message?

For some time I was quite ambivalent about replacing guilt with
shame. On the one hand, my anthropological study had convinced me that
many cultures, such as Japan, were predominately shame oriented. On the
other hand, shame seemed to be a rather superficial concept when compared
with guilt. Most Westerners tend to think of shame as social embarrass-
ment whereas guilt is deeply personal. Would not a shame framework water
down the gospel? Was not the Bible guilt oriented?

I labored under these misconceptions until two things happened.
First, I read Helen Lynd's book entitled On Shame and the Search for
Identity. This provocative analysis convinced me beyond the shadow of
a doubt that shame, while obviously social in nature, was, in addition,
a deeper and more personal concept than was guilt. Then I decided that
I had better examine the Scriptures and see what I could find out about shame. I was amazed when I discovered that the word shame occurred much more often than guilt. Guilt or guilty occurs 23 times in the King James Version whereas shame, ashamed and derivatives are found 224 times. Finally, I noticed that the fall of Adam and Eve is obviously presented in a shame framework.

Now I was convinced that a "sin-shame-Savior" theme was indeed valid. And more than this that the shame concept opened up a whole new and relatively unexplored area of the human personality.

As I began to engage in more research, I confronted two frustrations. One was the lack of data on shame, especially from the Biblical perspective. Two, hardly any one that I talked to about my ideas on shame seemed to understand what I was trying to do. It was especially frustrating to talk to a missionary from Japan who did not seem to grasp the significance of shame in terms of evangelism except to a limited degree at the very end of our conversation.

A continuing problem in communicating my ideas on shame to others has been 1) defining shame, and 2) clearly distinguishing between guilt and shame. Many persons have felt that I was simply playing semantic games—that there really was not very much difference between shame and guilt. If we restricted ourselves to the present usage of these ideas in our United States culture, there would be some validity to this semantic charge, because here there is a great deal of overlap and confusion between the ideas of shame and guilt.

Helen Lynd (1958:17) says that she became interested in the topic of shame when she realized that the concept of guilt did not adequately
cover important aspects of human personality and identity. Lynd (1958: 19) asserts that "shame is relatively little studied in our society it is so easily linked with or subsumed under guilt."

At one stage in the writing of this book, I was concerned about the need to state clearly the similarities and differences between guilt and shame. I now realize that this is an impossible task. I doubt if it will ever be possible to obtain a consensus on definition because both terms are subjective in nature. So even though I make numerous comments about guilt and shame in this manuscript, my major thrust is the elucidation of the nature of shame. I am convinced that a person will learn more about the nature of shame through a detailed examination of shame than by a contrast of guilt and shame. The scholarly authorities referred to in this thesis have been selected to build the case for the importance of shame, and not to present all evidence to settle the issue of the relative importance of guilt and shame in human behavior. If a missionary finds himself in a shame-oriented culture, this manuscript is specifically designed to help him work more effectively in such a culture.

Personally I am satisfied with my definitions and distinctions between guilt and shame. But I do not expect to convince most Western oriented psychologists and theologians since they have been "raised on guilt." Possibly some one will take my comments on shame and will be able to develop better logical and rational comparisons of guilt and shame which will be valid cross-culturally. Any one who tackles such an assignment ought to include fear also.

To continue acting upon a major theme of the book, I shall reveal my strengths and weaknesses to the reader, so that he will better be
able to evaluate my comments. My strengths are:

1) two years of home missionary work in the Kentucky Mountains.
2) a masters degree in religion with an emphasis on missions.
3) a masters degree in anthropology.
4) eight years of rather intensive spare time work with international students.
5) ten years of teaching experience in anthropology, sociology, and occasionally missions.
6) a deep personal interest in missions; I had hoped to be a foreign missionary, but I was unable to go to the foreign field.

My glaring weaknesses are:

1) no foreign missionary experience; I am an arm-chair theorist.
2) no cross-cultural living experience; in the 1950's I made two brief trips to Cuba, and in 1973 I made a three week trip to West Africa.
3) No knowledge of the Biblical languages except a rusty knowledge of Greek.

At times I have been sharply critical of the missionary enterprise. I intend this to be constructive criticism. Had I made it to the foreign mission field, I am sure I would have made some of the same mistakes. I am deeply concerned that the church of Jesus Christ around the world be as authentic and Biblical as possible.

For those who wish to be able to pigeonhole me theologically, I class myself as a Wesleyan evangelical. The National Association of Evangelical's statement of faith is one I can readily endorse.
PART I

THE NATURE OF SHAME
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

To introduce the topic of shame to an anthropology class, I asked the class to pick out a person for a simple experiment. They chose a pretty girl. I said, "Let's all of us look at her for a few minutes." Immediately she blushed and covered her face with her hands. Then I asked the class to explain why she felt ashamed. They found it difficult to verbalize the dynamics of this shame experience. Obviously, there was no guilt involved.

One of the most elementary but unexamined aspects of human interaction is fleeting eye contact. Under most conditions it is impolite, yea, next to impossible, for two persons to have direct eye contact for more than a few seconds. We feel extremely uncomfortable if we know someone is staring at us. We talk about people "seeing through us"—a very revealing idiom! Normally, one of the persons will soon avert their gaze. If one party maintains eye contact longer than is proper, usually the other party will blush, cover their face, or turn away.

Why this extreme sensitiveness to eye contact? Rationally, we know no one can find out the secrets of our inner life just by looking at us. And yet we almost automatically avoid prolonged direct eye contact. I believe that the avoidance of eye contact is a simple but profound demonstration of the significance of the shame dynamic. We avoid the exposure of the inner self at all costs. Eye contact is so personal that it seems that the inner self is revealed. Only where love and
trust exist between persons is eye contact positive. In such situations, exposure of the self is desired and safe.

Probing Shame

Since the significance and breath of the concept of shame is new to most Western readers, this section is devoted to a brief introduction of the basic aspects of shame. Later chapters will expound in greater depth these components of shame. Four key words to the understanding of shame are: honor, failure, covering, and exposure.

Shame is the loss of honor. Dishonor is a synonym of shame. In another sense, however, shame is synonymous with honor. A person who still has a sense of shame, who feels shame when he does something wrong, is usually considered to have some dignity and integrity. The shameless person has lost all sense of honor. So shame has a double reference; it is both an antonym and a synonym for honor.

Shame is related to several different types of failure. Failure to achieve, failure to measure up to a standard usually brings shame. It may or may not involve moral failure. When a child receives a poor report card, he is ashamed to have his parents see it. When a black man is not allowed to succeed in life because of pervasive discrimination, he and society judge him to be a failure. He is ashamed of who he is; this identity crisis has a demoralizing effect upon him. When a person lies and is caught, he feels shame because it has been revealed openly that he has failed to live up to what is right.

The state of shame is one of covering. The Bible and common experience agree that man lives in a state of shame. Prior to their first
sin, Adam and Eve had no sense of sin. Immediately after they ate the forbidden fruit, they felt shame and covered themselves.

Some modern psychologists find man in a state of shame. The term mask is widely used to indicate that man tries to hide what he really is from others, and in the process he hides himself from himself. "Indeed, self-concealment is regarded as the most natural state for grown men. People who reveal themselves in simple honesty are sometimes seen as childish, crazy, or naive." (Jourard 1964:iii). This is an unhealthy situation because it prevents honest interpersonal relationships. And yet because of the limited amount of love and trust among men, the wearing of a mask seems necessary to protect oneself from exploitation by others and/or to exploit others.

The experience of shame is one of exposure. Not only do all men live in a state of shame in which they cover their real selves, but they also experience shame whenever something happens to remove temporarily that mask.

No one can perfectly anticipate the experiences that life will bring to him. All of us are from time to time caught unawares. What we are is then temporarily uncovered, exposed. Then we experience the pain of shame. Normally we attempt to recover as soon as possible by repositioning the mask so that we no longer stand exposed. The experience of shame has two dimensions: the trauma connected with the specific incident which triggered the shame experience, and the fact that the experience of shame reveals the hidden aspects of the self which normally remain covered as the individual lives in the state of shame.

The type of experience which produces shame varies from person
to person and from culture to culture, but the experience of shame is universal.

The response to shame is one of recovering or change. Since shame is primarily involved with an exposure of what we are or fear ourselves to be (even though what we do may trigger an experience of shame), then unless what we are is changed, the normal way of handling a shame experience is to cover up what has been uncovered and resume the state of shame again. This state of shame is so comprehensive and continuous that a person does not even know himself fully. We learn to know ourselves best as we interact with others. Shame reduces this open interaction so that one ends up not adequately knowing himself or others.

Occasionally a person reacts positively to what a shame experience reveals. He sees what he is, or in some cases, what society is, and wants to change himself and/or society. By will power, the grace of God and/or the help of others he changes himself to some degree, thereby lessening the amount of his life he continually needs to hide from others.

Group therapy of one kind or another, often conducted by laymen, is a rapidly growing modern movement which stresses exposure in an atmosphere of trust and love. Many people find such encounter groups to be a painful but liberating experience (Rogers 1970). However, for some people the positive effects apparently do not last (or at least they seem to fade away), possibly for two major reasons:

1) As they go back to their normal routine of life, the social atmosphere of love and trust no longer exists. Therefore, many individuals tend to revert back to their old patterns of life.
2) Exposure is not necessarily followed by significant change. If what we are is the real problem, what we are must be changed before the problem is resolved. Only when we are secure in what we really are, can we really exercise love and trust in our daily lives.

So the social situation in which we live and the degree of transformation which we experience are crucial in any positive resolution of the shame problem. Americans are so individualistic that they usually do not see the need for continued group support. In fact, they might regard this as a weakness. Ideally, the church is designed to provide this continued atmosphere of love and trust through which one may be recharged and reinforced by God and fellow Christians. Then a person can go out and take the risks involved in loving and trusting in order to help others.

Types of Shame Experiences

There are several different types of shame experiences each of which will be listed below and briefly described. Note that personal guilt is involved in only two of the ten types of shame experiences.

1) innocent shame

some one slanders your character, ruins your reputation; because you know people have heard and may believe the rumors about you, you feel ashamed.

2) guilty shame

you do something wrong; there is an ethical component to this type of shame.

3) social blunder shame
embarrassment over a social error, such as spilling food at a banquet; strangely the intensity of shame felt as a result of a social blunder is often as deep as the shame felt from committing a moral wrong.

4) family identification shame

this type of shame could be broader than the family; it might include close friends or relatives, the significant others in a person's life. Such shame might result from the family's intense embarrassment over a father who is a convict or an alcoholic. The family members are closely and unavoidably identified with the disgraceful conduct of another family member.

5) physical imperfection shame

some bodily defect or a slur about a person's looks such as 'you have big ears' may bring on either a temporary or enduring sense of shame.

6) discrimination shame

a society may downgrade and identify as inferior a racial, ethnic, religious, or class group of persons. Until recently many blacks were ashamed of being black. The poor, the welfare recipient are stereotyped as being lazy; some who are forced by circumstances to rely on welfare feel ashamed because they feel that society condemns them as worthless.

7) punishment shame

deliberate public exposure to let every one know what you did; a historical example: putting a person
in stocks in the public square. Many cultures resort to public ridicule for one of their most effective means of punishment.

8) anticipated shame
serves as a form of social control; you realize you might be caught and exposed so you do not do something you otherwise might be tempted to consider doing. It reduces anti-social behavior.

9) modesty shame
sexual shame represents both the state of shame (covering) and the experience of shame (exposure).
In a few cultures nudity is the norm, but these cultures are the exception to the rule. Even these cultures are not lacking in modesty; modesty is defined differently.

10) personal inadequacy shame
deep-seated inferiority; some people have been so dominated by others, for example, their parents, that they feel like non-persons. Other persons may feel intensely inferior in ability, intelligence, performance, or social grace.¹

To conclude this brief introduction to the topic of shame, let us briefly examine the account of one of the most momentous events in the history of mankind—the fall of Adam and Eve. (The fall will be discussed extensively in a later chapter.)

Two key verses are:

1) Genesis 2:25
"And the man and his wife were both naked, and were not ashamed."

2) Genesis 3:7

"Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves aprons."

Immediately after Adam and Eve sinned, they felt a keen sense of shame. Shame is too painful to remain exposed so they covered themselves. The symbolism is profound. Nakedness should be covered. Shame must be covered. Man now lives in a state of shame because he dishonored himself and broke his relationship with God. Shame affects man's understanding of himself, his relationship to others and his relationship to God.

I have been puzzled about the fact that shame is related to so many diverse types of experiences. Our list of the types of shame shows that there are many experiences of shame in which there is no personal guilt involved. What is the common thread that runs through all of these different types of shame situations? I tentatively suggest that all experiences of shame are related to man's search for identity and his concern for pride. Anything which threatens man's identity or pride may bring shame to him.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1963:125) has an intriguing commentary on the verse from the Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." (Mt. 5:7) in which he liberally uses the concepts of honor and shame in a unique way:

If any man falls into disgrace, the merciful will sacrifice their own honour to shield him, and take his shame upon themselves. They will be found...
consorting with publicans and sinners, careless of the shame they incur thereby. In order that they may be merciful they cast away the most priceless treasure of human life, their personal dignity and honour. For the only honour and dignity they know is their Lord's own mercy, to which alone they owe their very lives. He was not ashamed of his disciples, he became the brother of mankind, and bore their shame unto the death of the cross. That is how Jesus, the crucified, was merciful. His followers owe their lives entirely to that mercy. It makes them forget their own honour and dignity, and seek the society of sinners. They are glad to incur reproach, for they know that then they are blessed. One day God himself will come down and take upon himself their sin and shame. He will cover them with his own honour and remove their disgrace. It will be his glory to bear the shame of sinners and to clothe them with his honour. Blessed are the merciful, for they have the Merciful for their Lord.

Reread the story of the Good Samaritan.

To conclude this introductory chapter, I would like to review briefly the structure of the thesis. It is divided into five major sections with a total of seventeen chapters. The first three sections of the thesis are devoted to a psychological, Biblical, and anthropological study of shame. The final two parts of the thesis apply this information on shame to the preaching of the gospel and the living of the Christian life.

The first section, which consists of four chapters, is entitled The Nature of Shame. This section is primarily a psychological analysis of the state of shame and the experience of shame. Some brief philosophical and sociological observations are made in an attempt to clarify the nature of shame. In this section a chapter is devoted to defining and distinguishing between guilt and shame. Throughout most of the rest of the book additional references are made to the difference between guilt and shame.
Part II is entitled the Scriptures and Shame. A major emphasis of this section is the relationship of sin and shame centering on the role of shame in the fall of Adam and Eve. Other important Biblical themes such as glory, honor, repentance, and trust are related to the concept of shame in an effort to show the centrality of shame in the human experience. This is followed by an exposition of Jeremiah around the theme of shame. In one sense the section on the Scriptures and Shame is a continuation of the section on the Nature of Shame; the Scriptures are used to provide data on the nature of shame from a theological viewpoint.

Part III, Culture and Shame, continues the investigation into the nature of shame from an anthropological perspective. Since the values and behavior of man vary greatly from culture to culture, a cross-cultural viewpoint is essential to obtain a complete picture of the place of shame in the experience of man. By making this cross-cultural comparison, we discover that Western society is unique in its emphasis on guilt. In a sense our culture represents an exception to the rule. If one bases his understanding of man on the basis of his experience in Western Culture such a perspective will be incomplete and misleading. Thus the role of shame in three cultures, Japan, China, and Thailand, is investigated in some depth. In addition seven other cultures or culture areas are briefly examined.

The last two sections, Preaching the Gospel and Living in Fellowship, are an attempt to apply the findings of the first three sections. Part IV wrestles with the weakness of a guilt oriented evangelism in shame dominated cultures. It concludes with positive sermon suggestions illustrating how evangelism can be conducted when tied to the concept of shame.
The last section, Living in Fellowship, focuses on the need of an open life in order to be authentically Christian. Stress is placed on the need for the church to provide an atmosphere of love and trust to encourage honest and open sharing of our lives. Voluntary self-exposure can stimulate renewal and revival.
CHAPTER TWO

HONOR AND EXPOSURE

Honor

One says of a man who delays doing his duty: he will have to do it 'out of shame or out of honor'; in other words, the fear of shame will impose on him what the sense of honour cannot inspire in him (Bourdieu 1966:238).

Insight into the meaning of shame can be gained by contrasting it with honor. Honor and shame are two sides of the same coin. Dishonor is a synonym of shame. Honor refers to upright character, integrity, glory. While honor may be involved in acts of right and wrong, it goes far beyond what the law requires. Honor involves the integrity of one's being in the way he lives and in the way he respects others.

The loss of honor is disgraceful, shameful. Therefore, a person attempts to cover up, to hide, so as to avoid painful exposure. The shameless person has no sense of honor; he engages in disgraceful behavior openly.

Even though there is a painful negative element in an experience of shame, the importance of shame must not be restricted to the negative aspect. An experience of shame exposes what is wrong with the goal of showing what is right and moving a person in that direction. A person can refuse to move towards honorable behavior and again revert to hiding behind his mask to try to cover his shame. The function of anticipated shame is to keep a person doing that which is honorable. Anticipated shame serves as a powerful force for social control.

William Shakespeare is generally regarded as a shrewd observer of
human character. It is noteworthy that Shakespeare uses shame nine
times as often as he uses guilt (a very Biblical percentage for those
who accept the King James Version as the divinely inspired translation!).
In this connection Helen Lynd (1958:26) comments: "Shame is contrasted
not with right-doing, nor with approval by others, but with truth and
honor." (Italics mine) Lynd (1958:26) adds:
The association of the word shame with loss of honor
and of self-respect suggests why shame may be felt as
something different from the guilt involved in a failure
to pay a debt, in violation of a prohibition, or in
transgression of a boundary. The close association of
shame with the self suggests also why further study of
experiences of shame may lead to more understanding of
the meaning of identity.

Some people associate conscience only with guilt and assume that
since conscience (inner) is not closely related to shame (social), that
shame is superficial. Virgil Aldrich (1939:59-60) says that for him
"the voice of conscience . . . is the feeling of shame. . . ." and that
the "shameless person" is "without conscience." Aldrich (1939:61) in
further emphasizing the importance of shame declares that "one feels
embarrassment when he runs counter to convention, shame when he runs
counter to human nature." In his article "An Ethics of Shame" Aldrich
clearly moves the concept of shame towards the dimension of honor.

Greece

To illustrate the relationship of shame and honor we shall turn to
the Greek culture. According to C.M. Bowra (1957:34) the ancient Greeks
were more concerned about honor than morality. While in practice the
pursuit of honor often degenerated into selfish individualism because
it was not controlled by love, still the ideal of honor stressed by the
Greeks is instructive. For the Greeks honor was more positive than
morality. Honor stresses obligations while morality emphasizes prohibitions. Thus Pericles: "As for poverty, no one needs be ashamed to admit it; the real shame is in not taking practical measures to escape from it." Honor moves a person to take positive vigorous action to change a situation.

Bowra (1957:34) stresses that the "ultimate test of honour is human dignity." Human dignity is subjective and unmeasurable, but very real to the individual. For example, the Bedouins of Egypt have a keen sense of honor and shame, but Abou Zeid (1966:245) comments: "Of all the value concepts employed by the Bedouins . . . those of 'honour' and 'shame' are the most vague, most complicated and most difficult to grasp and to analyze."

Dorothy Lee has taken a modern look at Greek culture and she finds much the same emphasis and relationship of honor and shame. Self-esteem (philotimo) or honor is crucial to the Greek self-image. Philotimo does not rest in status of achievement, but everyone as a member of the human family is equal in his philotimo. Since honor is so crucial to a Greek's self-image, it must be treated with tact and care. Naked truth is too brutal so truth regarding persons must be delicately handled. Lee (1959:142) declares:

The covering of the naked fact is essential to the integrity . . . of the philotimo. The inner core of the Greek must never be exposed; and entrope, the Greek word for shame, . . . means "turning inward." This is a concept both positive and negative: you have done something shameful only because you have failed in the positive aspect, in modesty and decency. Out of entrope, a Greek avoids saying things and doing things which would reflect on the philotimo of himself, his family, his country.

Along the same line, anthropologist Ernestine Friedl discusses the role of shame in the transmission of values in a Greek village. Friedl
(1962:85) says:
The quality of shame which the villagers want to emphasize in their children is an inner sense of embarrassment at the thought of improperly revealing oneself—either the physical self (modesty) or the inner emotional self. . . . the process by which the villagers reveal his sense of shame to a child includes exaggerating and parading before others any evidence of possible shamelessness.

Friedl continues:

The elementary family . . . is also a unit of filotimo and dropi (honor and shame). Each individual's actions reflect on his parents and only to a slightly lesser extent on his brothers and sisters and therefore contribute to the family's self-esteem (1962:87).

Lee (1959:143) asserts that philotimo is more than face or pride:

A Greek mother is not proud of her son: she is honored by him. . . . There is something of the notion of face, in that it is insupportable to have one's failures and needs known. But there is more than this; what is really bad is that you yourself should expose your failure or yourself. (Italics mine)

An understanding of the shame-honor syndrome will be essential to understanding the seriousness of failure discussed in chapter three.

Death

Even the prospect of death does not nullify the concern about honor and shame. In 1966 parts of India suffered from severe drought. In the state of Bihar rich and poor, high and low caste alike were in peril. One welfare organization attempted to provide work opportunities for high caste women. The women refused manual labor because they would rather starve to death than to expose themselves to the shame of manual labor. A compromise was arranged whereby such women could weave in the privacy of their own homes. Culturally defined standards of honor and shame can literally become matters of life and death.
In 1966 the Oregonian reported a United States soldier's comments about the prospect of dying in Vietnam as follows: "you hope like hell that you act like a man . . . that you don't disgrace yourself . . . that you won't be ashamed."

Exposure of Oneself to Oneself

To further explore the nature of shame, I would like to refer to and comment upon several additional ideas suggested by Helen Lynd. The first two chapters of On Shame and the Search for Identity bristle with numerous stimulating insights on shame. For example, Lynd gives a brief but helpful discussion of the words for shame in English, German, French, and Greek. Chapter two presents shame in regard to the following six points: exposure, incongruity, threat to trust, involvement of the whole self, confronting of tragedy, and difficulty in communicating shame.

Note the following comment by Lynd (1958:19-20):

It is no accident that experiences of shame are called self-consciousness. Such experiences are characteristically painful. They are usually taken as something to be hidden, dodged, covered up—even, or especially, from oneself. Shame interrupts any unquestioning, unaware sense of oneself. But it is possible that experiences of shame if confronted full in the face may throw an unexpected light on who one is and point the way toward who one may become. Fully faced, shame may become not primarily something to be covered, but a positive experience of revelation. (Italics mine, except for "self-consciousness")

Shame has its painful and negative component, but with the end in view of a positive resolution of the situation. Apparently it is this type of philosophy that is behind the article "Playback—New Aid in the Ordeal of Self-Discovery" in Look (1967) magazine. It describes the reaction of people engaged in therapeutic discussion as they see them—
selves through video playback. The article declares (pp. 26, 29) that:

Detachment is diminished. Hogan and Alger state new patients are shocked. Old patients are revitalized. It's like looking in the morning mirror; no one is indifferent. ..

Video playback is helping some of them to see themselves as others see them, and the enforced honesty holds out a weapon to their hope in the darkness.

A college senior who was planning to be married after graduation stopped Herbert Miles (1967:17-18), who taught the marriage and family course, and asked if he could talk to him about the sexual relationship in marriage. In the ensuing conference Miles could not give satisfactory answers to many of the fifty or sixty questions the student asked.

Although my pride would not allow me to reveal it to him, I do not recall that I have ever been so humiliated. That night I could not sleep. I could not get Jim off my mind. I asked for and received divine forgiveness for my self-centeredness and overconfidence. But I rolled and tossed on into the night. Each time I would shut my eyes and try to sleep, I could see Jim sitting directly in front of me, turning pages and asking questions. His serious, piercing eyes were looking right through me imploring positive answers.

This powerful shame experience motivated Miles to positive action. His failure, his weakness, his unpreparedness had been sharply exposed. He could have withdrawn, but he did not do so. Instead he prepared himself for pre-marriage counseling and now he has an extensive ministry in this area. In addition, Miles has written an excellent Bibliically oriented book on Sexual Happiness in Marriage.

Lynd (1958:27-28) says that the root meaning of shame is "to uncover, to expose, to wound. . . . The exposure may be to others but, whether others are or are not involved, it is always, . . . exposure
to one's own eyes." And Kurt Riezler (1943:457) agrees that "man, as his own observer, can be ashamed of things which no one knows."

Too often in the past writers have stated that shame was basically an **external** reaction to what others thought whereas guilt was the **internal** response based on principle. In its deepest sense, shame is a profound **internal** revelation of one's basic nature and values. Thus while others are usually involved in a shame experience and start the process of exposure, it is the individual's response to a shame situation which determines whether or not his inner self is quickly covered up again or whether he allows the shame experience to move through the painful first negative step to positive improvement of the revealed weak area of the self. So it must be strongly emphasized that while shame usually involves exposure to others, it more profoundly involves "exposure to one's own eyes." (Lynd 1958:28).

Bill Milliken (1968:112) shares such a personal exposure:

> One day I was sitting in the apartment thinking about this girl, and I began to realize that the very things that bugged me about her were the things that were wrong with me. God made me be honest with myself that day. There was no emotional crisis with yelling or crying; I just experienced intense embarrassment over how I had been treating her. It isn't very often somebody blushes when no one else is around, but I felt my face growing very red.

Shame is much more than a psychological construct. It is a basic fact of life. Kurt Riezler (1943:457) states that: "shame is neither a purely social nor merely a sexual phenomenon. Its universality points to a fundamental pattern of human life." If so, one might expect to find shame to be a common theme in literature. Lynd (1958:30-31) analyzes five pieces of literature, *Of Human Bondage*, *Anna*
Karenina, The Scarlet Letter, Stendhal’s Diaries, and The Trial, in order to ascertain the essence of shame and concludes:

... it is the exposure of oneself to oneself that is crucial. The Scarlet Letter, an unfolding of shame, does not fail to note that the deepest shame is not shame in the eyes of others but weakness in one’s own eyes. Public exposure may even be a protection against this more painful inner shame. Dimmesdale said, "Happy are you, Hester, that wear the scarlet letter openly upon your bosom! Mine burns in secret!" This raises the question of when public knowledge re-inforces and when it is an easing of shame known to oneself.

Apparently if there is no resolution of the deep experiences of shame (no known way of resolution or an unwillingness to go the known way), then it is too painful to keep the experience within oneself. The intense inner focus may be partially relieved when others know; the focus can then be, in part, on what others say, think, or do about it rather than upon the trauma of irresolution in the inner self. The process of psychoanalysis at its deepest level is engaged in "the exposure to oneself of the parts of the self that one has not recognized and whose existence one is reluctant to admit." (Lynd 1958:31).

Most people react to an experience of shame by attempting to cover it up in one way or another. Sometimes this is done through diversion; it may be diversion into another emotional channel, such as anger, or making a joke about the situation. Some people become expert at using humor either to divert attention from a potential shame producing situation or to change quickly the focus from an actual shame situation to something less dangerous. In one sense all of these attempts to deal with shame experiences may be natural.
and normal (some might say natural and normal in the unregenerate man), but there should be some occasions when we allow shame to do its complete work, that of exposure pushing us to the correction of that which has been revealed. Usually we cover our shame experiences quickly and refuse to meditate upon them because they are painfully revealing; therefore, we do not perceive the depth of the nature of shame.

Lynd (1958:32) notes the importance of the unexpected in the experience of shame. A person is caught off guard. He is momentarily confused and disorganized. The experience is involuntary. Blushing is the intense and instantaneous physical expression of the inner confusion. Some one has suggested that blushing is the only emotion an actor cannot feign. If this is true it helps to confirm the idea that shame is the deepest of human responses. The immediate reaction is to cover up again. The moment of covering one's face with one's hands gains time to recover from the momentary disorganization of oneself. When the mind and will are partially composed them some remark or diversionary activity by oneself or by a tactful person can move the center of attention elsewhere. Many people apparently think of shame primarily in terms of blushing or embarrassment. Such a view is very superficial. However, it should be admitted that oftentimes the experience of shame is not allowed to go much beyond that of blushing and then a quick recovery. And thus the common idea that shame is primarily an external reaction to others.

Lynd (1958:49) stresses that shame involves the whole self:

Separate, discrete acts or incidents, including those seemingly most trivial, have importance
because in this moment of self-consciousness, the self stands revealed. Coming suddenly upon us, experiences of shame throw a flooding light on what and who we are and what the world we live in is. . . . The shameful situation frequently takes one by surprise. But one is overtaken by shame because one's whole life has been a preparation for putting one in this situation. (Italics mine, except for "self-consciousness")

Arnold Isenberg (1949:12) continues this emphasis on shame being a fundamental part of man's nature with the following observation:

Pride and shame have been defined as feelings. . . . But reflection is continual, so that momentary reactions establish themselves as dispositions, affect the structure of personality and modify the life pattern. . . . that is why . . . shame can become an enduring curse.

And now Lynd (1958:50-51) makes what seems to me to be an inevitable conclusion when she states: "Guilt can be expiated. Shame, short of a transformation of the self, is retained. This transformation means, in Plato's words, a turning of the whole soul toward the light." (Italics mine) Isenberg (1949:14) agrees: "Yet it is as unreasonable to tolerate the fear of shame upon the spirit as it is to permit a wound to fester in the body. . . . Every shame must go." The ultimate choices are suicide or transformation. God offers transformation to those who will receive it. There are less satisfactory solutions which may partially resolve the problem of shame, such as moving away from those who know you and starting life again in a new situation, or engaging in psychoanalysis or group therapy, but transformation is the only whole and positive solution.5

Summary

While it cannot be done with precision, it might be helpful to
think of shame as having two levels.

The first would be an outer level focusing on relationships with others. This is the way shame has usually been defined. On this level the shame experience is primarily negative; fear of exposure is central. Defense mechanisms are developed to aid one in his recovery from experiences of shame. Most experiences of shame are not allowed to progress beyond this point.

There is a second, more basic, level of shame—the inner level. If we allow the experience of shame to run its full course, it will push us in a positive direction. Here is where shame is closely related to honor. It reveals what we really are as persons. If we have the necessary courage to act upon the revelation of ourselves, we can seek help to change what we are into something more honorable. Of course, if we so choose, and many human beings do so, we can decide to live resigned to our shame.
CHAPTER THREE

SHAME AS FAILURE

In this section shame as failure will be discussed both as personal failure and social failure. The failure of society can bring undeserved shame on the individual which, over a period of time, can have a devastating effect upon the individual. Gerhart Piers (1953) has stressed that shame is related to failure whereas guilt is primarily a result of transgression. Definitions of guilt and shame will be elaborated upon in the next chapter.

The most common Greek word for sin is harmatia, literally, missing the mark. Here again we have the idea of a failure to reach a goal or measure up to a standard. This is a part of Paul's definition of sin in Romans 3:23, "...fall short of the glory of God." The most common Hebrew word for sin is chata. Its basic meaning is also "to miss." When used in a moral sense, it emphasizes sin as "failure to meet God's moral standards" or "as failure to meet the standards of right action towards one's fellow men." (McComiskey 1970:35).

Shame in the sense of failure can occur as a result of an individual's act of sin against others and God. This personal sense of failure occurs in the sensitive person who realizes that he has both hurt someone else by his action and has fallen short of God's standard for his life. To the evangelical this sense of shame and/or guilt for personal sin is a familiar theme and need not be discussed further.

There is another dimension of shame resulting from failure that is often overlooked by evangelicals--what happens to the person sinned against?
And especially when many people or society sin against that person or a class of persons.

**Lower Class Blacks**

Elliot Liebow (1967), through the technique of participant-observation, studied Negro streetcorner men in a section of the inner city in Washington, D.C. These are men whom society has never given a decent chance to succeed and thus both the society and the men regard themselves as failures. Perpetual failure is so shameful, so traumatic, that "failures are rationalized into phantom successes and weaknesses magically transformed into strengths." (1967:xii). This is the streetcorner man's way of "trying to achieve many of the goals and values of the larger society, and failing to do this, of concealing his failure from others and from himself as best he can." (1967:xii).

According to Liebow (1967:50-60) the streetcorner man puts no lower values on a job than do others in a society. Most of them do hold menial jobs from time to time. These jobs usually are not steady jobs and they pay low wages. A steady decent paying job is necessary for an American male to earn enough money to support a family. But most of these men come from broken and/or poverty stricken homes, were school failures, and lack job skills; many become chronic job failures. They seldom talk about their jobs to one another because talk about jobs means revealing their failure. "Talk about his job can trigger a flush of shame and a deep, almost physical ache to change places with someone, almost anyone, else," (1967:60).

Most marriages are also failures because the male cannot adequately function as a husband and father since he is a failure as a breadwinner,
a major male function in American society. Most wives want the husband to be the head of the family. These husbands are not able to fulfill this role adequately. This becomes a source of conflict which further accentuates the husband's sense of failure.

Thus, marriage is an occasion of failure. To stay married is to live with your failure, to be confronted by it day in and day out. It is to live in a world whose standards of manliness are forever beyond one's reach, where one is ... continually found wanting. In self-defense, the husband retreats to the streetcorner. ... where the measure of man is considerably smaller, and ... he can be, once again, a man among men (1967: 135-136).

If children are born to the marriage, the sense of failure increases. A father's responsibility increases but his ability to provide does not. To keep their sanity, many men leave their own children and live officially unattached to another woman whose children are not his own. Thus he feels no deep sense of responsibility to them. If things get bad he can easily pick up and leave and rationalize that it was just a temporary arrangement anyway. To the streetcorner male, it seems to be the best way out of a bad situation.

Much of these men's lives is spent on the streetcorner among men who have had similar experiences. They are superficially friendly, rationalize their lot with each other, but these streetcorner men stand essentially unrevealed to one another. Each male politely supports the other, and each wears a heavy mask to cover the intense shame of his constant and nearly total failure as a human being.

In large part this state of failure has been caused by the discrimination and exploitation of the larger society. Most of these men have never had a decent chance to succeed. Their sense of personal failure is
real, but it is the sin of the larger society that is the cause of their shame.

Lee Rainwater's (1970) research in the slum public housing project in St. Louis—Pruitt-Igoe—reveals exactly the same overwhelming sense of failure. Primarily a failure to be able to be. Rainwater uses words like impotence, weak, failure—"shamed and impotent identity." There are no satisfactory ways of handling such pervasive shame; constant failure is incredibly demoralizing. Two attempts are commonly made to develop some kind of pride to counteract their sense of shame. One approach is an attempt to adhere to "standards of respectability." Given the surrounding conditions this is next to impossible so such an approach is very vulnerable to failure. The other approach is to be shameless—tough, cool, always on top of the situation. Most fail here also because this life style is too demanding; most persons simply do not have the personality, resources, or courage to pull it off. "Pride is, therefore, a tenuous accomplishment in the ghetto whichever strategy is chosen, and the individual himself learns that fact intimately." (Rainwater 1970:228).

Black Pride

Until recently (the rise of Black Power) most blacks have suffered from a pervasive sense of inferiority—a crisis of identity. The dominate white society has continuously in numberless ways forced blacks to live as inferiors. Andrew Billingsley (1968:38-39), a black sociologist, declares that:

Negroes, under the tutelage of white Americans, have long viewed their African background with a sense of shame. To be called an African when I was growing up in Alabama was much worse than being called a "nigger."
For one black it took a visit to West Africa before she "felt the great burden of shame of her slave past lift from her shoulders." (Isaacs 1963:79).

Marcus Garvey headed a black power or black pride movement in the 1920's. According to Charles Silberman this short-lived movement had a lasting impact on black self-identity. Silberman (1964:137) quotes Harold Isaacs as saying: "The inner shame over blackness was by no means exorcised, but after Garvey it was never again quite the same as it had been." In the past blacks have usually handled their shame by passive withdrawal, mockery of whites, and occasionally with violence.²

A black psychiatrist, Alvin F. Poussaint (1969:148-150), says many middle class blacks used to avoid soul food out of shame until the rise of black power. Now many middle class blacks are proud of their soul food. Poussaint still finds much ambivalence among middle class blacks, however. Many are still ashamed of their blackness when around important whites. When around blacks the same persons may proudly proclaim their Afro-American heritage.

White Shame

As sensitive whites become aware of what white society has done to blacks, they begin to experience shame. The white experience of shame is different from the black experience of shame. Black shame is an imposed shame—imposed upon blacks by whites with no justification. White shame is based upon responsibility and/or identification with a racist society which started and perpetuates racism. Black shame is a guiltless shame; white shame is a guilty shame. At the death of Martin Luther King I experienced a deep feeling of shame. Next to my conversion this was
probably the most powerful experience in my life. Prior to this experience I had done very little writing. Since then I have been strongly motivated to write on race and shame. For me, this experience of shame had positive results; it moved me to honorable action. I wrote the following to some black Christian friends in Portland, Oregon (1968).

I am ashamed that I am a white man; I am ashamed that I am an American; I am ashamed that I am a church member (I am not ashamed that I am a follower of Jesus Christ).

I am ashamed of the above because of the racial attitudes whites, Americans, and church members too often hold. I am ashamed that most of my life, I held these same attitudes. I am ashamed that it took me so long to see the light and to begin to walk actively in the light.

Among many of my best friends, the primary problem is ignorance (my own problem in the past) of the facts of the racial situation rather than vicious prejudice. Unfortunately the results are nearly the same.

There is no such thing as an inferior race, but if we talk in these terms, the American Negro represents the superior race. Only a small number have resorted to violence in an extremely frustrating situation. Instead some are like Martin Luther King—capable of genuine forgiveness of the white man.

I am now experiencing some of the psychological feelings of the Negro even though I am white. I see the incredible injustices and the incredible resistance of whites to see, admit, and act upon their attitudes. I am now spending much of my spare time talking to whites about the problem. At times I feel like I am knocking my head against a stone wall. Yet here and there whites are beginning to see the light.

I ask my Negro friends to forgive me and my fellow whites. We do not deserve forgiveness, but your own future will be more solidly built if built on forgiveness and love. I pledge myself to continue to work for racial justice. I trust that my white friends will join me so that some day I can again be proud that I am white, American and a church member.
Increasingly I find it more and more difficult to be identified with the evangelical institutional church. I now sense how much it is conformed to the world. The dominant values of our society--racism, materialism, impersonalism--are so often part and parcel of the church. It is well known that the church is one of the most racist institutions in our society. And I feel that our massive investments in buildings (as contrasted to people) significantly reflects the materialism of our society. And in many churches the bureaucracy needed to run the institution, the gulf between the clergy and the laity, and the monologue sermon provide minimal opportunities for vital personal fellowship. What a shame!! It is the church which should provide an abundance of warm personal contact, lead the way in resolving racial tensions, and invest in the needs of people.

America is, in many respects, a great nation. Yet there is an increasing amount of unease about some of our glaring weaknesses. Possibly we sense our failures more keenly than some other countries do because of our high standards of freedom and democracy. Helen Lynd (1958:215) expresses my agony about the institutional church and our country as follows:

But this is a time that sharpens awareness that it is one's society, as well as oneself, that stands uncovered. Values, ways of life that one has accepted without question may appear in this new light to be cruel, hypocritical, destructive of the individual freedoms and possibilities they proclaim. If this is my society, my country, then the world is not good, I do not belong here, I want none of it--this, as well as self-insight, may be the revelation of shame. Just as shame for one's parents and shame for others may be an even more searing experience than shame for oneself, so the questioning of certain dominant values presented by society can for some people be more disquieting than the questioning of one's own inadequacy in living up to these values.
School Failure

Our schools are one example of our society's massive institutional failure, according to William Glasser, a psychiatrist. Glasser (1970:42) believes that for at least 50 percent of our children their school experience is a failure due largely to irrelevant education and an overemphasis on memorization. Failure is especially painful to youth who are in the process of trying to find their identity. So an increasing number of youth are attempting to escape the shame of failing by shooting drugs, engaging in sexual promiscuity, running away from home, or withdrawing from life, says Glasser.

... students who generally judge themselves as failures become identified increasingly with failure. And failure hurts. It becomes a part of their every move, and so they decide, quite consciously, to withdraw or become antagonistic—or both (Glasser 1970:43). (Italics mine)

Charles Silberman (1964:268) discusses the consequences of many black children failing to learn to read properly in the first two grades. This failure reinforces "the negative image he already has of himself because of his color..." Silberman continues:

When failure has been repeated frequently enough, it is almost inevitable that the child will begin to hate himself—and to hate school and the teachers which make public the evidence of his failure.

When a person accepts the society's judgment that he is a failure (it may be more society's fault than his or his failure may be judged by invalid standards), then responsible behavior is not very rewarding. Self-esteem, personal worth, a sense of identity are fostered primarily through continuous positive personal relationships. Our highly institutionalized and thus impersonalized society makes it difficult to establish continuous
positive personal relationships. Unless one has the ability and willingness to sell his soul to our society, often he is regarded as a failure. Only a few strong individuals realize it is not they, but society, that has failed. Most are shattered by the experience of being judged a failure. Constant failure means loss of identity—a lowering of a sense of honor. Shamelessness develops on the part of some. Others put on a thicker mask by withdrawing from society—their best way of covering the shame of their failure.

From Failure to Success

Bill Milliken works with Young Life on the Lower East Side of New York. To describe his experiences Milliken wrote the book Tough Love. A significant portion of the book deals with the positive and negative aspects of failure and how to build successfully upon a foundation of failure. Milliken (1968:35-36) discusses the mask or shell that we wear:

When I discovered the city ripping off my shell, I was embarrassed to see how skinny I was—as naked and funny-looking as a turtle that had lost its shell. I wasn't nearly so muscular as I thought. But without the big shell of society ... around me, I discovered another shell of my own making.

Because this exposure in the city made me insecure, I shrugged deeper and deeper into my private shell. I wasn't unique in this. Lots of kids come to the Village from upper- and middle-class communities in rebellion against the shell which their society has built around them. After they leave home they discover they have nothing within themselves to fall back on; they have that "naked" feeling, so they just build up a different shell.

For hours each week, while I was trying to escape my own nakedness, I sat in a tiny cafe in the Village, talking with other rebels, escaping the
problems we found all around us. Slowly it became apparent to me that all we were doing in our rebellion was taking on a new-shaped, new-colored shell. At first this looked like freedom because we were free to let our hair grow, free to stay out all night, free to come and go as we pleased. Nobody cared what we did. But this wasn't really freedom; it was just a new shell to fit the new habitat. Village habitues who are smart enough soon see this. Some of the most creative people come out of this type of situation because they are able to pull themselves out of this preliminary deception and break the new shell in some healthy way. Others just sit down in the cafes, in the parks, on the stoops and die inside. They walk around without any form, no way to go; and everywhere they turn they bump into the real question: "Who am I?"

One of the "benefits" of a ghetto society is its enforced exposure. There is not much to hide behind. Ghetto life will either make you or break you. Failure is a very real part of ghetto life. Milliken (1968: 43) remarks:

It became very apparent to us that the person who is failing in life senses this failure deep down inside himself, and that it acts as a weakening force throughout his whole personality. It almost castrates him—but he's forced to live with it.

Many people who are forced to live with failure find it so painful that they cannot stand it. Therefore, to escape the naked realities of life they resort to drugs, sex, etc.

Milliken learned that a person needs group support during failure. Through living in small groups in the love of Christ, some individuals found that they could move through failure to success. Along with the group experiences, it was necessary to develop a positive philosophy regarding failure by showing a person that failure could help him understand himself better through self-exposure.

The group living situation was, in part, designed to foster honesty.
and exposure. Sometimes the exposure would be so painful a member would leave for a week or so; shame pushed them away. Paradoxically, the members of the group also began to learn that a person needs "the group more than ever when you have failed." (1968:52). Love in a group can both allow the painful process of exposure to take place, and it can provide the healing balm needed to relieve the hurt.

When you are to move out into the middle of life, Christ allows an explosion of love to take place between people. Soon the trust builds up between you, and you are not afraid to explode and let the badness out. . . . We had been keeping the weakness, the resentment, the envy, the anger inside us, all covered up. . . . We began to find out, in the group, that we could expose the hurt and sensitivity that welled up inside us to the healing of Christ through the community of love (1968:53). (Italics mine)

Milliken (1968:54) reveals that after exposure and healing through love had taken place, he was "always amazed at the fantastic potential and beauty of the inner city person."

Japan

To close the chapter on shame as failure, we shall briefly examine Japanese culture.

"Giri to one's name is the duty to keep one's reputation unspotted." (Benedict 1946:145). This aspect of Japanese culture illustrates the relationship of shame and failure. If a Japanese fails to keep his name clear he has no right to respect himself. The teacher cannot admit he does not know something in his field; this would be a failure to measure up to high professional standards. It is not proper for a student to challenge the teacher at point of his ignorance either. And the businessman cannot admit his business failures. Nor can the diplomat admit the
failure of his international policies.

Benedict (1946:153-157) uses such phrases as the following tying the ideas of shame and failure together: "'wears a shame' for such failures," "possible shame of failing," "shame of failure," "feel shame if he fell short," and "failure might be shameful."

The shame connected with such failures can have two effects. If it is not too severe, it may serve as an incentive for greater effort. Certainly the fear of shame often accomplishes this. Otherwise, such shame may demoralize or depress one so that a person becomes angry or melancholy. In extreme situations suicide is used to solve the problem.

Americans hear a great deal about the stress of Japanese competitive examinations and the occasional sensational suicide among those that fail. For the most part, however, the Japanese avoid competitive situations as much as possible to lessen the occasions of failure (Benedict 1946:154-155). In elementary schools teachers do not compare one child with others in the class; each child's aim is to better his own record.
CHAPTER FOUR

SHAME AND GUILT

What are some of the problems related to delineating the differences between guilt and shame? The major thrust of this book is not to prove that shame and guilt are different, but to elucidate the nature of shame and its relationship to man and the Christian faith. However, since most Westerns seem to be blocked at this point, as your author once was, it seems to be necessary to discuss the relationship of guilt and shame. The concepts of guilt and shame are highly subjective so the chances of obtaining agreement on their differences and similarities are minimal. In fact, the whole idea of guilt and its significance is still rather hotly debated in the Western world.

Theoretical Problems

Western Freudian psychology and Western theology have apparently broadened the concept of guilt to include much of what many cultures include under shame. Shame has largely been ignored. Thus Western thought has not made available the data necessary to establish fully the similarities and differences in the ideas of guilt and shame.

To illustrate, let us briefly examine Paul Tournier's excellent book *Guilt and Grace*. Guilt is obviously the dominant theme. Again and again shame and guilt occur in the same phrase, sentence or paragraph. No precise distinction is made between the two concepts. Shame is subsumed under guilt. Guilt is used in a very broad sense. For example, Tournier (1962:17) writes:
For true guilt is precisely the failure to dare to be oneself. It is the fear of other people's judgment that prevents us from being ourselves, from showing ourselves as we really are, . . . (Italics mine)

This is an unusual definition of guilt; note the phrase "true guilt". In my opinion the essence of shame is being described in this passage.

In the Western world Tournier may be writing relevantly since we apparently have broadened the meaning of guilt and restricted the meaning of shame when compared to the Bible and most other cultures. It might help us though, in analysis, if we realize what we have done.

Introducing cross-cultural data complicates the problem even more. For example, as compared to the West the Japanese have little or no concept of guilt; they are almost entirely shame oriented. Even without adding dozens of other cultural variations, it would be difficult logically to handle the radically different Western and Japanese perspectives on guilt and shame and arrive at a cross-cultural consensus for a definition of guilt and shame.

Another related problem is how one can determine what is absolute or universal and what is relative about shame. Biblical data which I accept as divine revelation is expressed in Greek and Hebrew cultural forms. In the Scriptures, then, there is a mixture of the divine and human, the absolute and the relative.

It is difficult to sort out what is universal and what is relative in any specific unit of behavior. And in addition it is a problem to ascertain how the universal and the relative relate and interact with each other in a specific human situation. For a more sophisticated analysis of this problem see the extended footnote from E. Mansell Pattison.1
Is shame a cultural universal—a basic aspect of human nature? Apparently so. The evidence for this assumption will be found throughout the book. Is guilt a universal? Probably, but to a lesser degree. What is significant is the degree of emphasis each culture puts upon shame and guilt, and in what types of situations a person reacts with guilt and/or shame. The Western missionary must be constantly aware of the fact that he will be likely to read guilt into many situations where, in the national's eyes, it does not exist. Or the missionary may realize that guilt does not exist and lament the "inferior ethics" of the national who feels bad only if he gets caught doing something wrong.

There is a recent positive development in the West which has created a climate that may be conducive to accepting a shame emphasis. There appears to be increasing disillusionment with the intrapsychic perspective characteristic of a psycho-analytic approach to personality. The intrapsychic approach focused too much on individual analysis; not enough recognition was given to the fact that man the individual is a social being. Kurt Riezler (1943:458) states that "though not 'merely' social, shame is still a social phenomenon. The individual himself is a social phenomenon." A rising interest in interpersonal relationships has developed among the masses highlighted by mushrooming participation in various types of small groups featuring honest open dialogue. On the professional level Sidney Jourard (1964) has been advocating self-disclosure as a means of achieving a healthy personality.

I am convinced that the shame dimension fits this new interpersonal emphasis much better than the more individualistic guilt oriented approach.
Shame is both profoundly personal and significantly social.²

Francis L.K. Hsu, a Chinese-born, Western-trained anthropologist, who specializes in psychological anthropology (culture and personality), has suggested a revised approach to the study of man's behavior. Hsu (1971:23) declares:

Personality is a Western concept rooted in individualism. . . . What is missing is the central ingredient in the human mode of existence: man's relationship with his fellow men.

Hsu allows for an inner psychic core to the human personality, but he insists that the Chinese concept of jen, which puts the primary emphasis on interpersonal relationships, is crucial for a balanced perspective of man. In relationship to Hsu's observations, I suggest that shame experiences initiated in the jen area open up a personality to reveal the inner psychic area.³ Shame, then, has a double reference both to the jen and the psychic nature of man.

Eric Erikson's use of the word identity seems to come close to Hsu's emphasis on the jen. Identity has a double direction covering both the inner and outer dimensions of life. Or to put it another way the self is seen as subject and object (Lynd 1958:204). Again shame seems to fit the concept of identity better than guilt.

Definitions

Having examined the problems and pitfalls of exploring shame and guilt, we shall attempt to clarify the essence of and differences between these two concepts. As we attempt to define shame and guilt, we will be using some Freudian terminology. I use such terminology because much of the research has been done by Freudian oriented persons and not
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because I favor Freudian theory. First, allow me to summarize my major conclusions so that they may serve as a guide through the following discussion.

Guilt is essentially a legal concept; when you transgress a law you are guilty. When a person commits such an act he may or may not feel guilty in a psychological sense. For example, in the Scriptures guilt is used in a theological or legal sense; shame carries the psychological or feeling aspect. In modern Western culture guilt is both a legal and psychological concept.

Shame is essentially a personal concept usually related to or triggered by social or interpersonal experiences. In a state of shame you cover what you are. An experience of shame results from an exposure of self. A core element of shame is failure to achieve a standard or goal.

Obviously there is some overlap in meaning, at least in the West: Both shame and guilt may be present in the same experience. Both may be internalized. Both may result in withdrawal or aggression.

John Honigmann, a leading anthropologist in the field of culture and personality, has made the following distinction between shame and guilt (1954:291).

The term guilt refers to a quick sense of wrongdoing that attaches to a forbidden act even in the absence of a disapproving witness. Shame, on the other hand, denotes covert behavior that follows wrongdoing when the forbidden act is known to other persons.

Ruth Benedict, a major proponent of the shame-guilt analysis of cultures, also emphasizes the external or social nature of shame and the internal nature of guilt. This emphasis has been the classical
anthropological distinction between shame and guilt; it leans heavily towards an either-or polarization so that, in some circles, talk about shame and guilt oriented cultures is somewhat discredited. Benedict (1946:223), in her renowned study of Japanese culture, asserts:

True shame cultures rely on external sanctions for good behavior, not, as true guilt cultures do, on an internalized conviction of sin. Shame is a reaction to other people's criticism. A man is shamed either by being openly ridiculed and rejected or by fantasizing to himself that he has been made ridiculous. In either case it is a potent sanction. But it requires an audience or at least a man's fantasy of an audience. Guilt does not. In a nation where honor means living up to one's picture of oneself, a man may suffer from guilt though no man knows of his misdeed and a man's feeling of guilt may actually be relieved by confessing his sin.

Gerhart Piers and Milton Singer, in their short book entitled Shame and Guilt, A Psychoanalytic and Cultural Study, have contributed significantly to a fuller understanding of guilt and shame. Piers (1953:11), a psychoanalyst, observes:

Whereas guilt is generated whenever a boundary (set by the Super-Ego) is touched or transgressed, shame occurs when a goal (presented by the Ego-Ideal) is not being reached. It thus indicates a real "shortcoming." Guilt anxiety accompanies transgression; shame, failure.

While the relationship between sin and shame will be investigated in a later chapter, it is interesting to note here in connection with Piers' definition of shame the famous statement on sin made by the apostle Paul as found in Romans 3:23, "All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." Here we have a failure to reach a goal.

Piers (1953:17) continues:

Indeed, it is not the malevolently destructive eye, but the all-seeing, all-knowing eye which is feared
in the condition of shame, God’s eye which reveals all shortcomings of mankind.

In addition Piers (1953:24, 28) states:

Anger and rage can conceal or even overcome either guilt or shame. . . . . . . . . . . . .
that guilt and shame are: (a) clearly differentiated; (b) that one can lead to the other; and (c) that one can conceal the other. . . .

It is clear that Piers and Singer believe that there are significant differences between guilt and shame.

To conclude the attempt to distinguish between guilt and shame, we shall list Lynd’s summary of the basic differences. Lynd (1958:208-209) stresses that her list is not to be conceived of as polar opposites, but as emphasizing the major thrust of each concept:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guilt axis</th>
<th>Shame axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with each separate, discrete act</td>
<td>Concerned with the overall self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves transgression of a specific code, . .</td>
<td>Involves falling short, failure to reach an ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves an additive process; . . deleting</td>
<td>Involves a total response that includes insight, .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong acts and substituting right ones. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure of a specific misdemeanor, . .</td>
<td>Exposure of the quick of the self, most of all to oneself; . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surmounting of guilt leads to righteousness</td>
<td>Transcending of shame may lead to sense of identity, freedom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lynd also lists nine additional distinctions; I have chosen those which I believe are most pertinent.
CHAPTER FIVE

SIN AND SHAME

The Western Christian tends to think of sin primarily in terms of guilt rather than shame. This attitude is reflected in Biblical scholarship. I found it next to impossible to find any extensive Scriptural study of shame. Shin Funaki (1957) said that he had great difficulty in finding theological and psychological material for his study of "losing face" in the Old Testament.

While definitive conclusions cannot be drawn simply on the basis of a word count, if the word shame is commonly found in a sin context, then there may be a Biblical basis for suggesting a "sin-shame-savior" theme for evangelism as an alternative to the more common "sin-guilt-Savior" framework. A "sin-shame-Savior" theme should communicate with greater effectiveness in shame oriented cultures. So in these next chapters we shall examine the Scriptures in depth to see how important the concept of shame is. The church needs more cross-cultural contacts between its theologians and commentators in order to gain new insights that are often missed due to tradition and cultural blindness.

In the King James Version guilty and guiltiness is found 23 times in the whole Bible and 6 times in the New Testament. In sharp contrast shame and ashamed and derivatives occur 224 times in the total Bible and 39 times in the New Testament. In the Revised Standard Version (based on Nelson's Complete Concordance) a somewhat different word count is found. Guilt and guilty occur 155 times in the Old Testament and 8 times in the New. Shame and its derivatives appear 195 times in the Old Testament and
46 times in the New Testament. The total number of Biblical references to shame in the RSV is 241; guilt, 163 times.\(^2\) Sometimes the words translated as iniquity, blood, or sin in the KJV have been translated as guilt in the RSV. In Leviticus, for example, the phrase translated as "sin offering" in the KJV has been rendered "guilt offering" in the RSV; the change is found 28 times in Leviticus.

It appears that the Scriptures use the term guilt in an objective theological sense—a legal state of guilt rather than a feeling of guilt. There seems to be little emphasis on a psychological feeling of guilt although it is possible that when a person commits an act of sin and becomes theologically guilty he usually feels psychologically guilty.

According to Alan Richardson (1962:225) shame has both subjective and objective meanings.

Subjectively, (i) a sense of shame may act in a good sense as a deterrent from wrongdoing. . . . I Tim. 2.9. On the other hand, some may shrink back from right conduct for fear of what may be said or thought about them, such as those who are 'ashamed of the Son of Man' (Mk. 8.38).

(ii) More commonly, however, a sense of shame follows shameful action. (a) Occasionally, this is shame for a wrong suffered, as those men were ashamed who had been misused by Hanun the Ammonite (II Sam. 10.5). But (b) usually it is shame for a wrong done, and where this is a first step towards contrition and repentance, it is frequently praised (and its absence blamed) in Scripture. . . . Repentance (or failure to repent) is involved in such passages as Ezra 9.6, Jer. 6.15, 8.12, Zeph. 2.1, 3.5, Rom. 6.21. . . . (Italics used in section ii are mine except for the words: follows, suffered, and done.)

Shame is commonly used in the Old Testament in an objective sense, especially in the Psalms and Prophetic books. "Let them be ashamed" is a judgmental type of prayer in terms of expressing ignominy or disgrace in a public sense. A New Testament example of this type is the public shame
in Jesus' death on the cross, Heb. 12:2. In this case the person suffering shame was innocent of any wrongdoing (Richardson 1962:225).

While both shame and guilt have their objective and subjective characteristics, in the Scriptures guilt is primarily objective in nature whereas shame is more subjective although not entirely so. Even when shame is objective in nature it gets its meaning and impact from the profound subjective feeling involved in an experience of shame.

The Bible is rather prolific in the number of words available to express shame and its closely related concepts. Note Psalm 44:13-15:

Thou hast made us the taunt of our neighbors; the derision and scorn of those about us. Thou hast made us a byword among the nations, a laughingstock among the peoples. All day long my disgrace is before me, and shame has covered my face.

Dishonor and disgrace are synonyms for shame. Dishonor and its derivatives are found 28 times in the whole Bible (RSV) and 5 times in the New Testament. Disgrace and its cognates occur 30 times in the Scripture; but only 2 times in the New Testament.

Other words which are less directly synonymous than are dishonor and disgrace, but which often have some quality of shame as a part of their meaning are: naked, mock, scorn, reproach, confound, deride, ridicule, taunt, humiliate, and scoff. Care should be used in interpreting these words as meaning shame; the context should be carefully evaluated.

Naked and nakedness occur 89 times in the Bible. Sometimes naked simply means the poor, the destitute, or physical nudity. But many times naked is used as a symbol for shame or in connection with prohibited types of sexual intercourse with close relatives as in Leviticus,
chapters 18 and 20. Because such acts are sinful, shame is involved (Lev. 20:17).

Reproach and cognates are found 49 times in the Scriptures; reproach means rebuke, reprove, shame and disgrace. At times shame and reproach are directly associated in the same verse. (Ps. 69:7, 10, 19; Jer. 23:40).

Scorn and derived words occur 28 times. Scorn means to mock, disgrace, scoff, jeer, and disdain. Job 22:19; "laugh them to scorn".

Mock and its cognates occur 49 times. Mock means scorn, contempt, ridicule, and derision. It is used in direct connection with shame in Job 11:3 and Luke 18:32. Mocking was an important part of the public shame involved in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

The standard definition of confound is to confuse, bewilder. Although the dictionary indicates that confound in the sense of shame is archaic, the RSV associates confound with shame 12 of the 21 times confound is used in the Scriptures.

Scoff, which means to mock, contempt, scorn, deride, jeer, and taunt, is found a total of 26 times in the Bible. Taunt occurs 28 times; it means reproach, scorn, jeer, mock, and ridicule. Deride, which means to ridicule, laugh at in contempt, is found 18 times. Humiliate occurs 7 times. It means to mortify, to lower the pride or dignity of a person.

One meaning of confusion is embarrass; to cover with confusion means to embarrass greatly. Confusion is associated with the idea of shame in Ps. 35:26; 40:14; 70:2; Isa. 45:16; Dan. 9:7, 8. Confusion is found a total of 23 times in the Bible.

The idea of "face" is often a very expressive idiom in Hebrew. To hide the face expresses awe, anger, wrath, and shame. Often this idiom
is connected with sin. Here the idea is that sin is shameful. God cannot look on sin so He must cover His face. Hide my face or hid my face is found 29 times in the Scriptures.

Greek contains several words for shame. Aidos refers to a sense of shame in a positive sense related to honor and modesty. "Aidos would always restrain a good man from an unworthy act,..." (Trench 1880:101). Aischunë and entrope are more concerned with the actual experience of shame and its negative and painful results. Entrope emphasizes the confusion or disorientation that the experience of shame brings upon a person; aischunë focuses upon the actual experience of shame, and according to Trench the fear of aischunë might restrain a person from committing a bad act.

The Fall

In the Genesis account immediately following the sin of Adam and Eve, neither of the words shame or guilt are used directly to indicate their reactions. Unquestionably Adam and Eve immediately stood theologically guilty, but their response apparently was not one of guilt. Instead they reacted with a profound sense of shame as is indicated by the repeated reference to the word nakedness.

The use of the word nakedness is a vivid way to express the exposure connected with an experience of shame. Apparently the Hebrew view of nakedness is similar to that of the modern day Kabyle of Algeria. Among the Kabyle "the taboo against nakedness is absolute, even in sexual relationships. Moreover,... dishonor is described in popular expressions as being placed in a state of nudity:... he has left me naked;... as if he had stripped;... I have been unclothed in
everybody's presence." (Bourdieu 1966:241). Ernest Babel has made an exhaustive study of nakedness in the Old Testament in a master of theology dissertation. Babel (1969:2) states that "the early Hebrews had a characteristic horror of nudity which was definite and deeply rooted."

The English word pudendum is derived from the Latin word *pudere* which means to be ashamed. Pudendum refers to the external genitals of the female primarily, but it can refer to the external genitals of either sex. The English word pudency means modesty, embarrassment, or bashfulness. These words indicate a close correlation between shame and nakedness.

The seriousness with which the Hebrews took the exposure of oneself in nakedness (even to people of the same sex) is indicated by the fact that Noah cursed Ham's son Canaan because Ham had seen his father's unclothed body (Gen. 9:20-25). Noah should not have allowed himself to be naked, and his son should not have looked upon his father's nakedness.

The expression "shame of your nakedness" is used in Revelation 3:18 in referring to the poor spiritual condition of the Laodicean church. Isaiah 20:3-5 vividly records the relationship of nakedness and shame:

> The Lord said, "As my servant Isaiah has walked naked and barefoot for three years as a sign and a portent against Egypt and Ethiopia, so shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians captives and the Ethiopians exiles, both the young and old, naked and barefoot, with buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt. Then they shall be dismayed and confounded because of Ethiopia their hope and of Egypt their boast."

Sin and nakedness are related in Lamentations 1:8:

> Jerusalem sinned grievously, therefore she became filthy;
all who honored her despise her,  
for they have seen her nakedness;  
yea, she herself groans,  
and turns her face away.

Again sin, shame, and nakedness are found together in the judgment
Nahum proclaimed against the wicked city of Nineveh:

Behold, I am against you,  
says the Lord of hosts,  
and will lift up your skirts over your face;  
and I will let nations look on your nakedness  
and kingdoms on your shame.  
I will throw filth at you  
and treat you with contempt,  
and make you a gazingstock (Nahum 3:5-6).

Verse 25 of Genesis 2 clearly indicates the connection between shame
and nakedness—"And the man and his wife were both naked, and were not
ashamed." In their state of innocence there was no feeling of shame. This
shows that there is nothing inherently wrong or shameful about sex as some
are prone to believe. Paul Tournier (1962:96-97) notes the common miscon-
ception held by many in this sensitive area of life:

All psychotherapists, analysts or not, and to
whatever school they belong, are agreed on this
point. They all denounce the false shame, still
so widespread today, which presents sexuality in
its entirety as culpable, a false shame which so
many people believe to be biblical in origin,
whereas the Bible speaks of sexuality with such
simplicity and realism as to scandalize these
same good people.

Shame is a rather nebulous concept that is difficult to communicate
(Lynd 1958:64-71). It is more easily communicated by a concrete type of
symbol such as nakedness.

Immediately after Adam and Eve sinned the Genesis account states:
"Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew they were naked; and
they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves aprons." No other
human beings were around to see their state of nakedness, so Adam and
Eve did not cover themselves because of what others would think. They had not yet confronted God in the garden, so they had not covered themselves because God would see them. Of course, God knew what was going on before He appeared to Adam and Eve in the garden.

In the section on the nature of shame it was stressed that in its profoundest sense the experience of shame exposes oneself to oneself; from the Christian standpoint this exposure is related to a failure to measure up to God's ideal or goal for us. For Adam and Eve the immediate result of their act of sin was an exposure of themselves to themselves. The Hebrew idea of personality stressed man as a united being. He was not neatly compartmentalized into will, emotion, mind, body, soul, etc. The body was important in expressing what happened to a person. Man was thought of as animated body, not incarnated soul. "When some member of his body reacts to a situation, his whole being comes to bear on the situation." (Babel 1969:7).

So nakedness in this context is not to be thought of in an isolated physical sense. It expresses something significant to the whole man. "Their shame before God was overwhelming and they lost the most precious thing in life—freedom with God." (Smallman 1969:7). "Shame is the overpowering feeling that inward harmony and satisfaction with oneself are disturbed." (Babel 1969:91). With sin comes shame, and shame must be covered. Shame is too painful to remain exposed. Thus the symbolism of nakedness immediately being covered with fig leaves is highly expressive. Adam and Eve's act of sin had broken the loving and trustful relationship they had experienced with their Creator. They were exposed as ungrateful, unloving, distrustful rebels. They had broken God's command. They had slapped God in the face for no good reason. Erich Fromm (1956:9) says:
"The awareness of human separation, without reunion by love—is the source of shame." Adam and Eve separated themselves from God by their act of distrust and non-love; after their act they had an immediate and profound shame response. Helen Lynd (1958:160) states: "A person who is unable to love cannot reveal himself." Therefore, you cover yourself. And before long the process of continually covering ourselves becomes a way of life and only at sporadic intervals do we see ourselves as we really are.

The fallen state of man is reflected in the human concept of honor. Part of the human concept of honor is that one should not expose the shame of others. Before the fall the idea of honor would not have had this negative element. The fall distorted every aspect of human nature. After the fall, for example, nudity took on an entirely different meaning. Dorothy Lee (1959:142,147) describes the modern Greek concept of self-esteem and honor as follows:

The Greek philotimo is easily bruised, or molested; . . . The covering of the naked fact is essential to the integrity . . . of the philotimo. The inner core of the Greek must never be exposed;

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

The covering of the philotimo and the covering of the naked fact find their counterpart, if not their basis, in the body. The body is never naked. . . . The naked body, like the naked word, is stark and grim and incomplete.

The Genesis account continues: "And they heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden." Here we have the second attempt to cover their shame by avoiding the Person offended. It might be argued that hiding indicates a feeling of guilt and possibly this is involved, but the context clearly
indicates that shame is the prime response. Note that Adam and Eve did not run and sew themselves aprons after they heard the Lord walking in the garden. Their awareness of shame—exposure of themselves to themselves—came before they came into direct contact with God. When we are suffering from an experience of shame, we avoid others as much as possible.

"But the Lord God called to the man, and said to him, "Where are you?" And he said, "I heard the sound of thee in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."

God did not tell Adam that he was naked. Adam confessed this to God; Adam already knew it. God said, "Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten of the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?" (the test of love, loyalty, and trust).

Then comes the inevitable attempt to cover up through diversion, to try to dodge responsibility. If some one else or something else can be partially blamed for the failure, the intensity of shame will diminish. Adam replied, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me fruit of the tree, and I ate." This was true, but it was also an attempt to dodge his own responsibility. Even though others—our parents, our friends, our society—may greatly influence our lives towards evil (and may have to bear some responsibility for their actions), still this does not excuse us from responsibility for our own actions.

"Then the Lord God said to the woman, 'What is this that you have done?' The woman said, 'The serpent beguiled me, and I ate.' Again a true statement, but again a diversionary attempt to avoid the personal blame and shame involved. That God did not accept any of their partially true answers as satisfactory is indicated by the punishment that Satan, Eve,
and Adam received in the following verses.

In the story of the fall, then, we find a close relationship between sin and shame. Shame appears not as a superficial reaction, but as connected to the basic nature of man. Is this same type of association of sin and shame found elsewhere in the Scriptures?

Sin and Punishment

By far the majority of the 195 Old Testament references to shame occur in the Psalms (46) and the Prophetical books (110). Among the three main Prophetical books shame is found in Jeremiah 42 times, in Isaiah 29 times, and in Ezekiel 16 times. The Psalms and the Prophetical books are more personal and spiritual in content than most of the rest of the Old Testament; sin is emphasized clearly and sharply.

Among the Hebrews the crowning sin was idolatry, and idolatry is the sin that is most often associated with shame. Hear the prophet Isaiah (42:17):

They shall be turned back and utterly put to shame, who trust in graven images, who say to molten images, 'You are our gods.'

Makers of idols engage in a sinful activity, and as a result shall be put to shame (Isa. 44:9-11).

All who make idols are nothing, and the things they delight in do not profit; their witnesses neither see nor know, that they may be put to shame. Who fashions a god or casts an image, that is profitable for nothing? Behold, all his fellows shall be put to shame, and the craftsmen are but men; let them all assemble, let them stand forth, they shall be terrified, they shall be put to shame together.

Again Isaiah (45:16-17) declares:
All of them are put to shame and confounded, the makers of idols go into confusion together. But Israel is saved by the Lord with everlasting salvation; you shall not be put to shame or confounded to all eternity.

See also Jeremiah 3:24-25 and 11:13.

In addition to idolatry, shame is specifically related to numerous other sins.

1) Prostitution.

Israel often engaged in prostitution in connection with her idolatrous practices. "Because your shame was laid bare and your nakedness uncovered in your harlotries with your lovers, ... I ... will uncover your nakedness." (Ez. 16:36). For punishment the Lord delivered the Israelites to the heathen Philistines. So degraded was the Israelite immorality that the "Philistines, ... were ashamed of your lewd behavior." (Ez. 16:27). Chapter 16 of Ezekiel which deals with the exposure of Jerusalem's unfaithfulness uses words like shame, naked, disgrace, reproach, confounded, etc., 21 times.

2) Theft.

"As a thief is shamed when caught. . . ." (Jer. 2:26).

3) Folly.

"If one gives answer before he hears, it is his folly and shame." (Pro. 18:13).

4) Gluttony.

"A companion of gluttons shames his father." (Pro. 28:7).

5) Idleness.

"A son who gathers in summer is prudent,
but a son who sleeps in harvest brings shame." (Pro. 10:5).

6) Lying.

"A righteous man hates falsehood, but a wicked man acts shamefully and disgracefully." (Pro. 13:5). Lying is a form of covering something up through a diversionary attempt to avoid exposure.

7) Disobedience to parents.

"He who does violence to his father and chases away his mother is a son who causes shame and brings reproach." (Pro. 19:26).

8) Bad example.

"Come to your right mind, and sin no more. For some have no knowledge of God. I say this to your shame." (I Cor. 15:34).

9) Lawsuits before the unrighteous.

"... why do you lay them before those who are least esteemed by the church? I say this to your shame." (I Cor. 6:4-5). See also Proverbs 25:8-10.

10) Undisciplined child.

"but a child left to himself brings shame to his mother." (Pro. 29:15).

11) Ashamed of Christ.

"For whoever is ashamed of me ... of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, ..." (Mk. 8:38).

It should be clarified that shame can be related to social errors which have nothing to do with acts of sin. In Luke 14:9 Jesus told the parable of the marriage feast to illustrate humility. A person should not seek honor, but he should be given it by others. The person who
seeks the highest place at a feast may be displaced by a more eminent man. He will be told, "Give place to this man," and then you will begin with 

\textbf{shame} to take the lowest place."\textsuperscript{5} Jesus (Lk. 16:3) told another story about the steward dismissed by his rich master who did not know what to do. He said, "I am not strong enough to dig, and I am \textit{ashamed} to beg."

Not only are various sins considered shameful, but shame is also regarded as a form of punishment. David often cried, "Let the wicked be put to \textit{shame}." (Ps. 31:17; also 35:4 and 35:26). Jeremiah prophesied shame as a form of punishment: "Behold, I will bring you to judgment for saying, 'I have not sinned.' . . . You shall be put to \textit{shame} by Egypt as you were put to shame by Assyria." (Jer. 2:35-36).

By contrast the righteous are promised that they will not be put to shame: "Then you will know that I am the Lord; those who wait for me shall not be put to \textit{shame}." (Isa. 49:23). And God promised Israel: "And my people shall never again be put to \textit{shame}." (Joel 2:26).

In his Ephesian letter Paul lists numerous sins and says:

\textbf{Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. For it is a 

\textit{shame} even to speak of the things that they do in secret; but when anything is exposed by the light it becomes visible, . . .} (Eph. 4:11-13).

\textit{Sin} is pictured as something done under cover of darkness. Exposure to the light lays sin bare for all to see. By contrast the Christian is urged to walk in the light—to live uprightly and honorably.

\textbf{Jude vividly portrays the sinfulness of apostate men: }\ldots\textbf{ wild waves of the sea, casting up the foam of their own \textit{shame}, wandering stars for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved for ever.}" (Jude 1:13).
In conclusion, there is abundant evidence that shame is correlated with sin in the Scriptures, and in a much deeper sense than just social embarrassment.
CHAPTER SIX

GLORY, REPENTANCE, AND TRUST

Honor

Shame is not only associated with a personal act of sin or a social blunder one has committed. Shame is sometimes tied to honor in a positive sense. Honor and derivatives are found 115 times in the Old Testament and 73 times in the New Testament.

When some one else seriously violates one's own honor, a sense of shame may follow even though the individual has not done anything wrong. The act of the other party is sinful; you are the innocent victim. In the Old Testament the story of Amnon's violation of his sister Tamar is recounted in II Samuel 13:12-13:

She answered him, 'No, my brother, do not force me; for such a thing is not done in Israel; do not do this wanton folly. As for me, where could I carry my shame.'

The willingness to suffer unjust shame is a test of loyalty to Jesus Christ. The apostles were beaten by the Jewish council because they had been preaching the gospel openly in Jerusalem: "Then they left the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer dishonor for the name." (Acts 5:41). Christianity is always a minority group in society. So there is strong pressure to conform to the standards of the world. Christians are called to identify themselves unwaveringly with what is right and true in spite of intense pressure to do otherwise. Jesus Himself said:
For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels (Mk. 8:38)

If we choose to identify with this corrupt world, then Jesus Christ, the embodiment of honor and glory, can no longer identify with us. Breaking a personal commitment, being disloyal to one who has loved you and helped you, is the conduct of a traitor. Such disgraceful behavior breaks the relationship of trust. So Peter declares: "If one suffers as a Christian, let him not be ashamed, but under that name let him glorify God." (I Pet. 4:16). The apostle Paul is the prime example of this verse. Paul gladly suffered beatings, stoning, and imprisonment, for he was "not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation. . . ." (Ro. 1:16). See also II Timothy 1:8 and 1:12.

Shame is always measured by a standard of values or a code of honor. As Christians we live in two worlds: the kingdom of God and the sin-dominated world. The world may mock and persecute the Christian for his faith. In relation to the world's values the Christian suffers shame. But this same encounter with shame is considered a badge of honor in the kingdom of God because it is an expression of loyalty that brings great glory to God. In addition, when the righteous suffer for no good reason, their innocent suffering becomes a witness to the truth. Their lives, by contrast, expose the lives of their persecutors and put them to shame. Peter says: "and keep your conscience clear, so that, when you are abused, those who revile your good behavior in Christ may be put to shame." (I Pet. 3:16).

A Jewish judge was discriminated against while he was attending law school in an eastern university. At the time he said that he felt very
ashamed; his honor, his worth as a human being had been minimized. Later he discovered that there was no good reason to feel ashamed. He realized that it was really the one who did the discriminating who should feel ashamed.

Glory

Glory is an antonym to shame.¹ Note man's tendency to seek his own glory and how God will turn this type of glory into shame.

Thus says the Lord: "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, let not the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich glory in his riches; but let him who glories glory in this, that he understands and knows me, that I am the Lord who practices steadfast love, justice, and righteousness in the earth;" (Jer. 9:23-24).

Paul, in I Corinthians 1:26-29, continues the contrast:

For consider your call, brethern; not many of you were wise according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth, but God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise, God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong. . . . so that no human being might boast in the presence of God.

In the Old Testament Hosea attempts to reveal the love of God to Israel. But Israel hardened its heart and engaged in every type of sin. Thus Hosea (4:17) declares:

A band of drunkards, they give themselves to harlotry; they love shame more than glory. . . . and they shall be ashamed because of their altars.

And again:

The more they increased, the more they sinned against me; I will change their glory into shame (Hosea 4:7).

Paul also describes rank sinners in much the same way: "For many, . . .
live as enemies of the cross of Christ. Their end is destruction, their god is the belly, and they glory in their shame," (Phil. 3:18-19).

The 39th chapter of Ezekiel vividly contrasts the holiness and glory of God with the sinfulness of man. Sin is pictured as something too shameful for the Lord to look upon, so He hides His face.

And I will set my glory among the nations; . . . And the nations shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity, because they dealt so treacherously with me that I hid my face from them . . . . I dealt with them according to their uncleanness and their transgressions, and hid my face from them. (Ezek. 39:21-24).

Then Ezekiel prophecies the restoration of Israel after the Lord has vindicated His holiness among the nations. He says of Israel: "They shall forget their shame, . . . I will not hide my face any more from them," (Ezekiel 39:26, 29).

In the death of Jesus Christ upon the cross the themes of glory and shame are again contrasted. It is not difficult to see the glory of God in the Son of God as Creator, as the Resurrected One, or as the coming Lord of Glory. But to connect glory with death, and especially death on a cross, seems highly implausible to the human mind. Paul said, "we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and folly to Gentiles," (I Cor. 1:23). At the time of the crucifixion the chief priests mocked Him: "He saved others; he cannot save himself. He is the King of Israel; let him come down now from the cross, and we will believe in him." (Mt. 27:42). To this day Moslems refuse to believe that the "prophet" Jesus was crucified because the death of Jesus would reveal the weakness of God. Moslems reason that since God is all-powerful He would not allow one of His prophets to die on a cross.

In the Roman empire death by a cross was only for foreigners and
slaves, not for Roman citizens. Cicero said, "Let the very name of the cross be far away not only from the body of a Roman citizen, but even from his thoughts, his eyes, his ears." Death by crucifixion was the most disgraceful way to die during Roman times. The condemned man had to carry his own cross, was executed naked before the public, and the public mocked the dying man adding to his humiliation. Hebrews 12:2 refers to the shame of the cross: "... Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, ..."

Had Jesus been just a human being, His death on the cross would have been a tragedy. But since Jesus was the Son of God He was able to transform the instrument of shame into a symbol of glory. Hear Hebrews 2:9:

But we see Jesus, ... crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one.

To man the cross means shame, disgrace, dishonor. God's power makes the cross stand as an eternal mark of defeat for the powers of Satan. Now the cross represents the greatest glory of God.

Repentance

In our discussion of the nature of shame, it was noted that one of the positive purposes of an experience of shame is to reveal and expose what a person is really like. The deepest purpose of shame is to reveal oneself to oneself with the implication that one ought to change what he is. Otherwise, a person can hardly live with himself; that is, unless he hardens his heart or resigns himself to his situation. In the Old
Testament Judah is pictured as being so depraved that sin no longer brings a sense of shame. "Were they ashamed when they committed abomination? No, they were not at all ashamed; they did not know how to blush." (Jer. 6:15; 8:12). See also Jeremiah 3:3. The shameless person is considered to be nearly beyond hope and certainly far from repentance. The first chapter of Romans pictures the sinfulness of mankind and lists many sins including homosexuality which is called a "shameless act." Three times Paul repeats "God gave them up."

Most men still have some sense of shame. For such there is hope that the Holy Spirit will be able to use shame to move them towards repentance. Psalm 83:16 indicates this hope: "Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name, O Lord." Ezra, in a repentant attitude, prayed:

O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift my face to thee, my God, for our iniquities have risen higher than our heads, and our guilt has mounted up to the heavens. . . . and for our iniquities we, . . . have been given . . . to utter shame as at this day (Ezra 9:6-7).

A major function of the word of God under the ministry of the Holy Spirit is to expose sin. Note how vividly Hebrews 4:12-13 presents this ministry:

For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart. And before him no creature is hidden, but all are open and laid bare to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

The Corinthian church was full of problems—divisions, immorality, selfish use of spiritual gifts, lawsuits, etc. Paul wrote a very pointed letter to the Corinthians, not just to shame them, but to shame them into
repentance. "I do not write this to make you ashamed, but to admonish you as my beloved children." (I Cor. 4:14). In addition, Paul several times pointed out specific sins, and then added, "I say this to your shame." (I Cor. 6:5 and 15:34). It is possible to be brutally frank, point out a person's errors, and shame them deeply. Such an attack may simply drive them into remorse or deeper sin. It takes delicate skill and love to expose frankly a person's sin in such a way that they feel a deep sense of sin, but so that they also see the way out. The psychiatrist probes deeply, but carefully, into a person's life in an effort to expose the roots of his problem. He does this slowly maintaining his patient's confidence so that the patient is not overwhelmed by shame and hopelessness.

II Corinthians reveals Paul's tender concern for the wayward Corinthians. Paul refrained from visiting Corinth because he did not want to cause the Corinthians too much "pain." In his first letter Paul had recommended strong discipline by temporary excommunication of one who was engaging in immorality. But there is a limit to the amount of shame one can bear so Paul wrote: "For such a one this punishment by the majority is enough; so you should rather turn to forgive and comfort him, or he may be overwhelmed by excessive sorrow... reaffirm your love for him." (II Cor. 2:6-8).

Paul was apparently afraid that he might have been too hard on the majority of Corinthians, that they might have been overwhelmed by his exposure of their many sins, for he wrote:

For even if I made you sorry with my letter, I do not regret it (though I did regret it), for I see that that letter grieved you, though only for a-while. (II Cor. 7:8).
When a frank exposure of sin is accompanied by love and a willingness to forgive, then the person may seek a positive solution to his experience of shame. This is what the Corinthians did to Paul's great joy.

As it is, I rejoice, not because you were grieved, but because you were grieved into repenting; ... For godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret, ... For see what earnestness this godly grief has produces in you, what eagerness to clear yourselves, ... (II Cor. 7:9-11).

Traditionally evangelicals have hoped that a feeling of guilt for sin would lead one to repent and seek forgiveness for his sin. So also it is God's purpose that a sense of shame which results from an exposure of one's sin, will drive him to repentance and the transformation of himself into a person of honor, integrity and truth through Jesus Christ. Guilt can be relieved through forgiveness of acts of sin; shame can be relieved only through transformation of what we are—from a rebellious person going our own selfish way to a creature willingly submitted to the control of God.

Trust

To trust is to risk.

To avoid hurt one should never love or trust another deeply. Human beings will always let you down. Heed the admonition of Aldous Huxley who despaired of the human being because he felt "that any expectation of positive response from other persons inevitably ends in humiliation." (Lynd 1958:44). By contrast God promises:

He who believes in me will not be put to shame. (Rom. 9:33).

Does a person dare to make such a commitment to One they have never seen?
In the passage from Romans 9 Paul is contrasting righteousness obtained by works and righteousness by faith. Work-righteousness seems to be more tangible. You can count your works. Paul is demanding naked faith—pure trust.

If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved (Rom. 10:9).

What a risk! What if this turns out to be just another wild religious story? Do I dare take the risk of looking like a fool if the gospel is not what it claims to be?

No one who believes in him will be put to shame, Paul repeats in Romans 10:11 (Also quoted by Peter – I Pet. 2:6; taken from Isaiah 28:16). Paul realizes the risk of such a commitment. He is talking to Jews who are familiar with the Old Testament concept of being "put to shame." "No one . . . will be put to shame. . . . every one who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved." Jews and Greek!!

Harold O. J. Brown (1969:3), paraphrasing Karl Heim, stresses that there are two ways of achieving knowledge. For knowledge about objects, one makes careful observations. For certainty about persons (subjects) observation is not adequate. It must be replaced or supplemented with trust. Persons cannot be adequately known apart from trust.

trust is not merely my one-sided, subjective evaluation of another person; it is a relationship that engages us both. It really teaches me about the other person. . . .

If both persons are trustworthy a rich relationship can develop. If one person turns out not to be trustworthy, the one who trusted may be deeply hurt. One of the two parties must take the initiative in trusting. The person who takes the initiative risks most. He does not
know how the other person will respond. Paul assures us that God is utterly trustworthy, absolutely dependable. It is safe to take the risk of committing your life to Him. He will never let you down. What appears to be a great risk turns out to be a sure thing. But apart from the leap of faith one never knows this.

Risk is the price of rewarding relationships. The one who withdraws to avoid risk lives a lonely, dull, stagnant life. Some one has said, "We cannot be ourselves unless we can trust the people around us; how imprisoned we are behind our masks when we dare not disclose ourselves to others." The essence of life consists of meaningful personal relationships based on trust and love; thus "exposure of misplaced confidence can be shameful. . . . The greater the expectation, the more acute the shame." (Lynd 1958:43-44).

The marriage relationship illustrates the crucial nature of faith and the tragic effect of unfaithfulness. Marriage is a relationship of trust and love. (This analogy, of course, refers to the Scriptural ideal for marriage; in practice many cultures tolerate or even approve of adultery). Adultery represents the final step in the betrayal of trust. In the Scriptures the marriage relationship and its failure is often used to illustrate spiritual truths. When one partner knows that the other partner is no longer faithful, it has a devastating effect upon his sense of identity. A breaking of trust produces a deep sense of inner shame for the person who has trusted and lost. It is an insult to them as a person.

At times the so-called innocent party may have contributed to the break. Many marriages fall far short of the ideal of honest open communication; it takes two to communicate. Both partners may hide behind their
masks afraid to let themselves be known. If this is so, it is understand­able (though not right) that one or the other partner might seek a relationship with another person who at least appears to be more honest and open.

For the person who secretly cheats on his partner, there is the fear of exposure. He engages in massive self-deception and tries to rationalize his behavior and at the same time cover his tracks. Lying becomes a way of life; one is no longer true to oneself. The offender works hard to cover his shameful conduct; the offended's faith in his partner is exposed as misguided, foolish, a mistake.

The Psalmist (25:2) cried:

\[ \text{O my God, in thee I trust, let me not be put to shame.} \]

God and Israel are pictured as "married" in the Old Testament with God in the masculine role and Israel in the feminine role. When Israel strays from God her actions are described as adultery. The book of Hosea is built on this analogy. William Hulme (1965:17) comments:

Hosea is asked to live the analogy as well as proclaim it. God directs him to marry a whore by the name of Gomer who proves to be as wayward after marriage as before. Each time she leaves him for her harlotry he seeks her out and takes her back . . . . Hosea could empathize with God because of his own experience with Gomer . . . . Like Hosea, God remains faithful to Israel.

One reason why suffering, the problem of evil, and personal tragedies, such as the death of a child, are so traumatic is because they appear to reflect on the integrity of God. God appears to have failed. The ultimate source of meaning and trust seems to be inconsistent. If God cannot be trusted, then life is a tragic experience subject to the fickleness of fate.
Also we have failed in that it seems that we have made a poor choice, a wrong commitment. The rug has been pulled out from beneath us. In such situations we must again claim the promise:

He who believes in me will not be put to shame.

A promise pregnant with meaning once a person grasps the depth of the concept of shame.
Among the prophetical books, shame has its most widespread use in the book of Jeremiah, so we shall engage in a brief exposition of Jeremiah highlighting the shame concept. Shame, ashamed, and shamed are found forty two times in Jeremiah's fifty two chapters. Twenty chapters contain the word shame. In addition, there are thirty two synonyms or near synonyms for shame including some phrases like "lift up your skirts" which imply shame. Words like dishonor, disgrace, reproach, blush, derision, and hiss are widely used.

The book of Jeremiah presents extensive documentation of the total apostasy of Israel, Judah, and Jerusalem. Jeremiah predicts the judgment of God which includes devastation of the land and the Babylonian captivity. These disasters do not mean the final doom of Israel, however, because God promises to establish a new covenant with a remnant of Israel. Other nations such as Egypt and Babylon play a key role in God's judgment of the Hebrew nation. Reliance on other nations and their gods failed.

The Hebrew people were engaging in every type of open sin including rank idolatry, and at the same time denying that they should be condemned because they were still offering sacrifices at the temple (7:4). Jeremiah (3:3) declared that Israel had become shameless:

You have a harlot's brow,
you refuse to be ashamed.
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When a person or a nation has lost a sense of shame for sin, God has to resort to extreme measures to renew that sense of shame. The present generation may have to be sacrificed as an object lesson for the next generation. Jeremiah attempts to warn Israel (2:26,36).

As a thief is shamed when caught, so the house of Israel shall be shamed:

\[
\text{You shall be put to shame by Egypt as you were put to shame by Assyria.}
\]

Idolatry had become so extensive that the word shame became a synonym or substitute for the name of the gods. Bosheth, a Hebrew word for shame, was sometimes substituted for Baal, e.g. Ish-bosheth for Ish-baal. Thus Jeremiah 3:24-25:

But from our youth the shameful thing has devoured all for which our fathers labored, their flocks and their herds, their sons and their daughters. Let us lie down in our shame, and let our dishonor cover us; for we have sinned against the Lord our God.

In the New Bible Commentary, F. Cawley (1953:615) makes these additional observations:

To mark the People's sense of horror at the heathen custom of infant sacrifice the vowels of the original tephath were changed so that the word was read and spoken as tophet. This was a parallel process whereby the term melek (king) became Molech, a heathen deity, i.e. by using the vowels of bosheth (shame). . . .

To the Idol Molech child-sacrifices were offered and to Yahweh worshippers the term Molech, signifying 'shame', fitly expressed their abhorrence. The valley of Hinnom lay over against the Kidron valley. It was here that such awful sacrifices were made, and thereby passed on to the valley (ge) of Ben-Hinnom the appellation of shame. The agonizing vision of Jeremiah was that that foul place overflowed with dead bodies. . . . Gehenna (ge, valley) a synonym for hell, derives itself from this place-name.

The Hebrews did not use shame in a superficial sense; instead shame was deeply associated with the worst possible ideas and practices imagin-
able to the human race. So when Jeremiah found the Hebrew nation at its lowest spiritual state, he liberally uses the idea of shame in a dramatic attempt to picture the depths of the apostasy. A striking expression of the complete self-deception of Jerusalem is found in Jeremiah 6:14-15 and is repeated in exactly the same words in 8:11-12.

. . . saying, 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace. Were they ashamed when they committed abomination? No, they were not at all ashamed; they did not know how to blush.

It was the false prophets who were leading the people in "perpetual backsliding," so Jeremiah (8:9) asserts:

The wise men shall be put to shame, they shall be dismayed and taken;

The social consequence of this low spiritual state is evident from 9:4-5:

Let every one beware of his neighbor, and put no trust in any brother; . . . Every one deceives his neighbor,

Apart from some integrity of character, trust is impossible. When a people become shameless there is no basis for trust.

Apparently a glimpse of future repentance or at least a realization of the depth of judgment is contained in Jeremiah 9:19:

For a sound of wailing is heard from Zion: 'How we are ruined! We are utterly ashamed, because we have left the land,'

The farmer's will suffer judgment through poor harvests so "they shall be ashamed of their harvests." (12:13). And the same idea is expressed in 14:3-4:

they are ashamed and confounded and cover their heads. Because of the ground which is dismayed,
since there is no rain on the land,
the farmers are ashamed,
they cover their heads.

The symbol of nakedness is used to expose sin (Jer. 13:22, 26):

it is for the greatness of your iniquity
that your skirts are lifted up,
I myself will lift up your skirts over your face,
and your shame will be seen.

As Jeremiah began to feel the intense social and spiritual pressure against him as a result of his pessimistic predictions, he asked that his persecutors be put to shame:

Let those be put to shame who persecute me,
but let me not be put to shame;
let them be dismayed;
but let me not be dismayed;
bring upon them the day of evil; (17:18).

See also Jeremiah 20:7, 8, 11.

And in a moment of self pity while he was in stocks Jeremiah (20:18) exclaimed:

Why did I come forth from the womb
to see toil and sorrow,
and spend my days in shame?

As the day approached when Nebuchadrezzar, King of Babylon, would finally and completely demolish the glorious city of Jerusalem, Jeremiah used such descriptive phrases as: "Everlasting reproach and perpetual shame," (23:40), "a reproach, a byword, a taunt, and a curse," (24:9), "I will utterly destroy them, and make them a horror, a hissing, and an everlasting reproach." (25:9).

There is one clear expression of repentance in Jeremiah by Ephraim (31:19):

For after I had turned away I repented; . . .
I was ashamed, and I was confounded,
because I bore the disgrace of my youth.
Chapters forty six through fifty two focus primarily upon the prophetic judgments against the surrounding nations of Egypt, Moab, and Babylon. Trust in their gods will bring shame to the nations for their gods will fail them. Contrast this with the true God: "He who believes in him will not be put to shame." Regarding Egypt (46:12, 24-25):

The nations have heard of your shame,

The daughter of Egypt shall be put to shame, ...

Behold, I am bringing punishment upon Amon of Thebes, and Pharaoh, and Egypt and her gods and her kings, upon Pharaoh and those who trust in him.

Regarding Moab (48:13):

Then Moab shall be ashamed of Chemosh, as the house of Israel was ashamed of Bethel, their confidence.

See also 48:1, 18, 20, 26, 29, 37, 39.

Regarding Babylon (50:22):

'Babylon is taken,
Bel is put to shame,
Merodach is dismayed,
Her images are put to shame,
hers idols are dismayed.'

See also 50:12-13; and 51:17, 37, 41, 43, 47.

The last references to shame in Jeremiah find Jeremiah exhorting the exiled Jews to remember their Lord and the condition of Jerusalem (51:51):

'We are put to shame, for we have heard reproach; dishonor has covered our face, for aliens have come into the holy places of the Lord's house.'

Other references to shame and related ideas not mentioned in the previous discussion are: 14:21; 15:9; 16:17; 17:13; 22:22; 23:23; 33:5; 49:10. Shame in Jeremiah, then, is not an isolated concept found in a few proof texts. The idea of shame is an integral and expressive part of
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of the main message of the book.

Losing Face

Shin Funaki (1957), born and raised in Japan, completed a Masters of Arts thesis entitled *The Significance of the Old Testament Concept of Losing Face.* Funaki (1957:2) states that most Westerners regard "losing face" as a sort of unnecessarily sensitive "primitive social reaction" which is inferior to the more direct and mature Western approach to interpersonal relationships. Therefore, most Westerners do not recognize the concept of "losing face" in the Old Testament or, if they do so, they fail to grasp its full significance.

According to Funaki losing face does not occur as an idiom in the Old Testament. But the idea is obviously present to a Japanese and is sometimes expressed in such words as shame, confusion of face, and ashamed and confounded. The idea of losing face may be present apart from the specific use of such words. Occasionally "face" is directly related to shame as in II Samuel 19:5 where Joab tells David; "You have today covered with shame the faces of all your servants,"..." In Chronicles 32:21 the defeated King of Assyria "returned with shame of face to his own land." Other similar references are: Ps. 34:5; 44:15; 69:7; 83:16; Isa. 50:6; Jer. 51:51; Ezek. 7:18.

Such shame is not merely temporary blushing or embarrassment. It is a shame of the whole self—a deep-seated loss of honor. Honor is an integral part of man's sense of identity, says Funaki. When "face" is lost, a basic part of man is lost. Not until "face" is regained is a man whole again.

Funaki (1957:14) states that Webster's definition of shame is totally negative:
"Losing Face" is more than shame as defined by Webster. It is the loss of something which gives and maintains a person's proper relation to others. It demands restoration. . . . Conscience may compel one's face to go down and thus make one ashamed, but 'losing face' is literally a losing of something. . . . When this desire for restoration is satisfied, honor and dignity are maintained. When it is not satisfied, the loss becomes unbearable.

While there is the possibility that a Japanese might read "losing face" into the Scripture, it does appear that the Hebrew and Japanese viewpoints on "losing face" have much in common.

How does one regain face—restore honor? Funaki (1957:15) believes that the means one uses reflect a person's moral nature. Thus some men will use any means to recapture honor as defined by them and/or their culture. The basic dynamics of the shame-honor syndrome are the same in all situations. The goals, values or standards by which shame and honor are measured and achieved vary greatly from situation to situation, from culture to culture, and from human and divine perspectives.

Saul lost face when the Israelites sang:

Saul has slain his thousands,
and David his ten thousands. (I Sam. 18:7).

Prior to this time David was recognized as a valiant soldier serving under King Saul. As David achieved greater and greater fame he was compared with Saul, and Saul was rated inferior to David in the eyes of the people. Saul's self-esteem, his dignity, as king was shattered. Saul's judgment was that only by eliminating David could he restore his honor. From a divine standpoint Saul's judgment was erroneous; from a human or cultural viewpoint what Saul felt when he lost face and what he attempted to regain honor is understandable.
Funaki (1957:17) says that "the biblical concept of honor is based on harmonious fellowship with God." When this is lost man loses his sense of balance and security and struggles to establish a human based honor.

Usually man substitutes fellowship with men in place of fellowship with God, and this immediately involves him in a tremendous concern for his social relationships and his social standing. In such a substitution of fellowship honor becomes man-made even though it may still be regarded as true honor.

Funaki cites the following Scriptures as illustrating man-made honor:

Num 24:11; II Sam. 6:20-22; 10:3. I Kings 3:13; II Chron. 17:5 are examples of God-given honor.

Man, then, can lose honor in two ways:

1) failing to measure up to God's standard.
2) failing to measure up to man's or society's standard; these norms may at times reflect God's standards, and at other times reflect man's distorted sinful standards.

Saul sought honor from the elders of Israel after he had been forsaken by Samuel and God (I Sam. 15:30).

The concepts of shame and honor seem to go deeper than acts of right and wrong. At times they outweigh personal feeling and family ties. Chapters thirteen through nineteen of II Samuel illustrate the complex dynamics of shame and honor.

This real life plot begins with Amnon, David's son, raping Absalom's sister Tamar. Tamar felt her honor had been violated so she lived "a desolate woman," in Absalom's house. Absalom and King David felt the honor of the family had been damaged by Amnon. So Absalom avenged the family
name by assassinating Amnon, but upon Amnon's death Absalom fled fearing the king. According to the principle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, the killing of Amnon was justified, and, in a sense, necessary.

David seemed to have ambivalent feelings. He grieved Amnon's death and yet he also "understood" Absalom's action and longed to see him again. David finally sent Joab to bring Absalom to Jerusalem. Absalom did not repent so David refused to see his son. Honor, especially the honor of the king, demanded that Absalom repent even though, in a sense, his act of murder was justified. Finally, after two years, Absalom insisted on an audience with the king, saying, "if there is guilt in me, let him kill me." Absalom felt he had to press the issue and have it resolved. He was a beautiful and popular person, and the king's refusal to see him made him lose face. Funaki (1957:22) states:

So desperate was his loss that he was prepared to give his life in order to obtain it. By David's consent Absalom finally saved his face.

At the same time that Absalom partially restored his face through an audience with the king, he felt humiliated for having been treated as an outcast for so long. Absalom attempted to regain in full honor again by "stealing the hearts of the men of Israel" from David. This, of course, was a carnal man's only way of restoring face. Finally, Absalom was proclaimed king. This was the final step in re-establishing his honor. Unfortunately, Absalom's moment of glory did not last long, for his army was defeated and as a result he was slain by Joab.

Joab's act saved the country, but David, as a father, was overcome with grief at the death of his beloved son. This caused serious problems in the nation (II Sam. 19:1-8):
So the victory that day was turned into mourning for all the people; for the people heard that day, "The king is grieving for his son." And the people stole into the city that day as a people steal in who are ashamed when they flee in battle. . . . Then Joab came into the house to the king, and said, "You have today covered with shame the faces of all your servants, who have this day saved your life, and the lives of your sons . . . because you love those who hate you and hate those who love you. For you have made it clear today that commanders and servants are nothing to you; for today I perceive that if Absalom were alive and all of us were dead today, then you would be pleased. . . . go out . . . to your servants; . . . if you do not go, not a man will stay with you this night; . . . Then the king arose, and took his seat in the gate.

The king had outwardly appeared ungrateful for the victory made possible by the faithful elements of the army and people, for there was no public victory celebration to honor those who had risked and given their lives for king and country. Thus they lost face. This was so serious that David was forced to cut short his deep personal mourning for Absalom.

Elements of justified and carnal attempts to recover lost face are mixed in agonizing complexity in this tragic history of David's family and the people of Israel. Literally honor and shame become life and death matters illustrating the seriousness of these concepts. For the Hebrews the preservation of dignity was the preservation of life.

The fear of "losing face" usually acted as a form of social control in the nation of Israel. A person was considered to be an integral part of the community. His sin and shame reflected on the community. If the Hebrew society had a high moral standard upheld by the king, then there was strong pressure on the individual to conform to the standard. When Israel gradually strayed after other gods, the moral standard was lowered,
and the people degenerated into committing the worst of sins with little or no sense of shame.

In most societies just a cultural sense or fear of shame acts to restrain bad conduct. Add to the social standard some divine values, and shame becomes an even more potent factor in social control. Only occasionally does a society degenerate so badly that it becomes shameless as Israel did in Jeremiah's day. In regard to the restraining power of shame in social relationships Funaki (1957:76) quotes G. F. Moore's *Judaism* as follows:

R. Elazor of Modiim considers the man who put his neighbour to an open shame as guilty as the one who nullifies the covenant of Abraham in his list of those who have no share in the world to come. Making one's neighbour's face blush before others was considered as bad as shedding blood.

To one sensitized to the significance of shame and losing face by his own cultural upbringing, the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament, are full of examples dealing with the most basic issues of life.
PART III

CULTURE AND SHAME
CHAPTER EIGHT

JAPAN

In this section several cultures will be examined to show how shame works within the framework of a specific culture, and to show the culture variation which exists in shame oriented cultures. Shame is a universal part of human nature, but it always must be understood within the context of relationships that exist within a specific culture. And within a specific culture a person should be aware of: 1) generation differences, especially during a time of rapid culture change, 2) class differences, 3) regional differences, 4) sex differences, and 5) the in-group (family, clan, or community) versus others, outsiders. Be alert to the following basic ideas as you read this chapter: 1) the function of the shame-honor syndrome as a form of social control, 2) the weakness of a human-based shame-honor concept, and 3) the need for deep-seated changes to resolve the shame problem.

This section will emphasize three cultures: the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Thai. One major reason for choosing these cultures is that they consciously stress shame; and secondly, a large amount of research data is available. Eight other cultures will be briefly explored.

Introduction

The Japanese Government has upped its original contribution to Pakistan for refugee relief from $150,000 to 1.5 million dollars. Embarrassment apparently was so widespread among leading Japanese that they pressured the Government into second-thought generosity. As one Tokyo businessman put it: "Japan is now matching international standards and is not at the 'underdeveloped nation' level."
We will examine the Japanese culture most extensively for several reasons. The Japanese come close to being direct opposites to Americans in many important aspects of life. Basic ideals of Japanese life are: the shame-honor syndrome, group relationships, hierarchical social structure, order, loyalty, and obligations. In contrast some American culture themes are: the guilt-righteousness syndrome, individualism, equality or democracy, freedom, and rights.

As a result of these different values, Japanese behavior is often an enigma to Americans and vice versa. For example, during World War II few Japanese soldiers were captured alive so extreme was their loyalty to country and Emperor. Yet many of those few soldiers who did surrender soon were voluntarily revealing a wealth of valuable military information to American officers, and at times even guiding our pilots to Japanese military targets (Benedict 1946:41). To the Japanese surrender was a betrayal of honor, a great shame, and in the eyes of his countrymen a captured soldier was as good as dead. Now the old values no longer applied; the soldier was living in a completely new situation. Why not be a model prisoner and cooperate with the Americans, reasoned the Japanese soldier. American prisoners, on the other hand, requested that their names be reported to the American government so that their families would know that they were still alive. To the Japanese it appeared that the American soldier felt little shame or loss of honor in being a prisoner of war.

Guilt and/or Shame

Before discussing Japanese culture further, we shall examine the evidence cited by scholars in regard to the controversy over the existence
of guilt in Japanese society. There is no question about the importance of shame in Japanese life; this is recognized by all students of Japanese culture. But some experts believe that there is more guilt present than there appears to be on the surface.

There is considerable difference of opinion among anthropologists about the presence and amount of guilt in Japanese culture. Some, such as Ruth Benedict, say there is little guilt manifest; others, such as George De Vos, think there is considerable guilt along with shame.

De Vos (1961:26-27) believes that the "strong achievement drive" in the Japanese is related to "a deep undercurrent of guilt." This guilt does not spring from relationships with deities; instead it arises from the "system of loyalties which cements the structure of their traditional society." According to De Vos, Westerners do not recognize guilt because the Japanese have different family relationships, and "because conscious emphasis on external sanctions helps to disguise the underlying feelings of guilt which, severely repressed, are not obvious to the Japanese themselves."

In another article De Vos (1967) clearly recognizes that shame can be internalized and is among the Japanese. He apparently rejects the distinction Piers and Singer made between guilt and shame; that guilt is primarily associated with transgression whereas the major thrust of shame is in the area of failure. De Vos admits that if one accepts Piers and Singer's definitions of guilt and shame, then the Japanese people would represent a shame oriented society with a minimum of guilt. De Vos (1967:262) includes failure as a significant part of his definition of guilt and comments that most observers have "little sensitivity to the possibility that guilt is related to a failure to meet expectations.
in a moral system built around family duties and obligations."

In De Vos's redefinition of guilt it does not seem that there is much left to distinguish guilt from shame, except that among the Japanese shame is more conscious phenomenon than guilt, and that guilt is so severely repressed that even the Japanese do not recognize it. The concept of guilt seems to have been expanded into the area of shame—a repeat of what has happened in Western culture. Since no one has yet established a clear-cut universal distinction between guilt and shame, this could easily be done even while attempting to allow the empirical data to speak for itself.²

R. P. Dore in his study, City Life in Japan: A Study of a Tokyo Ward, indicates that he likes David Riesman's (1961) connection of shame with tradition-directed cultures and guilt with inner-directed cultures. However, Dore (1958:382) notes that "moral sanctions in Japan cannot be easily and satisfactorily dealt with in terms of any simple shame-guilt dichotomy." Dore illustrates this point with the following:

... a poster originating from the local Fire Services' propaganda department. It said simply 'Fires (kaji) bring shame (haji).' Another notice nearby said, 'If you have a conscience (ryooskin) do not deposit rubbish here.'

Dore apparently assumes that conscience is related to guilt, not shame.

Dore (1958:383) states that the changes of modern city life have reduced the family's importance in the individual's life, so that letting the family down is of lesser importance in motivating a person's conduct today. Yet Dore says that mothers still make wide use of shame in disciplining and motivating their children. Theoretically, a Japanese can live quite an isolated life in the city, but practically neighbors are still important motivators of behavior. Those who attempt to live in
partial isolation "are often motivated by an exaggerated fear of their neighbor's criticism." To avoid shame avoid the neighbors. And "to start a fire to the danger of one's neighbors still, . . . 'brings shame' and the culprit can only try to mitigate the wrath of his neighbors by making a full and abject apology." (1958:384). Because of the crowded living conditions in the city "fear of what the neighbors will think weighs heavily on housewives."

The city does give more mobility than the rural village, and to a degree mobility provides an escape from unbearable experiences. A Japanese proverb indicates this: 'the traveller leaves his shame behind.' This is more theoretical than actual in most cases. "Most Japanese are involved in a network of stable personal relations." (1958:384). (Italics mine) This network of personal relations is of great importance even in modern bureaucratic organizations where employees take great care to fulfill their obligations and to avoid the displeasure of their superiors. Shame is apparently the prime motivating factor in such relationships although Dore also believes that guilt may be present. Dore apparently defines guilt as internal and shame as external and draws his conclusions on this basis. Piers and Singer (1953:52) have warned that "we cannot distinguish shame and guilt in terms of external and internal sanctions respectively, for there are 'inner' forms of shame paralleling almost exactly the forms of guilt."

Dore (1958:385) says that the Japanese do talk about conscience in terms of right and wrong. He apparently assumes that if the Japanese have a sense of conscience they also have a sense of guilt and sin as is the case in America. A Japanese friend told me that conscience is
primarily related to shame among the Japanese.

A former student, Charlene Wildermuth, wrote to her father, who is an experienced missionary, and asked him to comment on guilt and shame in Japan. Mr. Wildermuth (1966) replied:

Japanese social structure . . . is centered around the avoidance of shame. A mother will discipline a child by saying, "If you do that they will laugh at you." Several days ago I was working with Komi San on some translation . . . . He has a very difficult time with the word "guilt." He wanted to translate it "sin" or "crime." I tried to tell him guilt dealt with the responsibilities for sin and the moral consequences. He told me he understood what I was getting at but that there wasn't a word that adequately gave this meaning in Japanese. He told me that the Japanese do not feel a sense of guilt or moral responsibility for their wrong. They feel the shame of the act but not the guilt for it. This all does affect our approach to preaching the gospel.

In response to my question about the presence of guilt in Japanese culture, Tim Toba, a Japanese Christian, replied that one word for sin zaika includes the idea of guilt to a degree since it means "sin and its result" or "what sin left behind."

My conclusion is that the Japanese have a very limited sense of guilt. Shame is by far the most dominant reaction among the Japanese people. Shame, and its opposite, honor, are at the heart of the Japanese understanding of ethics. For the Japanese shame is both profoundly personal and vividly social.

Dominant Themes

Some of the following data will reflect pre-war (1940) Japanese culture. Rapid changes have taken place in Japan since World War II so before any attempt is made to apply these ideas, they should be checked.
again with both the older and younger generations. Other data comes from post-war studies and is more apt to reflect the present situation, but even here this data should again be checked before use, especially with the youth of Japan.

In this section we will be concerned with core values in Japanese life which center in interpersonal relationships. Changes occur less rapidly in these areas than, for example, in the economic sphere (Haring 1967:141; Vogel 1963:255-268).

According to anthropologist Douglas Haring (1956a:426-427) the main features of the unusually homogeneous Japanese culture are:

The Japanese conform almost eagerly to numberless exact rules of conduct . . . .
The major sanctions of conformity to Japanese codes of conduct are ridicule and shame. . . .
The Japanese are extremely polite. Politeness is conceived of as adherence to a code that prescribes correct treatment of others in order to maintain one's own "face" and self-esteem. . . .
Because Japanese families and Japanese society are rigid hierarchies, individuals must ascertain their precise status in every social situation. Otherwise one may blunder and treat a superior as an inferior or vice versa.

Individualism, in the American sense, is minimal in Japan. The group and proper relationships among group members is primary (Vogel 1963:117, 118, 140, 141, 149, 258, 260, 264). Traditionally the family group set the pattern for the rest of society. Filial piety was a prime value (Benedict 1946:51; Vogel 1963:165ff).

Individual rights are subordinated to the family welfare. The family is structured on a hierarchical basis, a model followed throughout Japanese society. Haring (1967:135) declares:

Within the family, members are never equal. The status of each is defined from childhood. . . .
First is the father, ... next ... the eldest son ... other sons ... mothers and daughters are lowest in the hierarchy. ... Except for very "modern" urban households, all Japanese learn similar fundamental ideas of status and social relations from family experiences in childhood.

While respect to one's superiors in the hierarchy of one's group is of the greatest importance, this does not mean that arbitrary authoritarianism is the rule. Important family decisions are not made solely by the head of the family. A family council decides such issues on the basis of what is good for the family as a whole and maintains the family honor. Individuals are willing to sacrifice their desires for the good of the family. What is best for the family is, in the large picture, best for them.

Ezra Vogel, in a recent study of Japan's New Middle Class, especially the salary man and his family, discusses the changes in modern Japan and how these changes have affected Japanese society. Vogel (1963:249) also notes some of the stable values that have been retained by the Japanese and asserts that the new middle class still uses shame to mold their children. One might think that the new urban generation would have changed, but "children show an amazing sensitivity to what people might think of them, and the standard device for getting them to behave properly in front of company is the fear of what outsiders might say or think."

Vogel (1963:255) declares that the Industrial Revolution in Japan did not bring about the "massive social disorganization" that it did in the West. He asserts that Japanese society still "presents a relatively orderly and controlled life." Apparently the key to this stability is the existence of well ordered groups:

Although there has been considerable mobility in Japan in the past century, it has been a movement
from one tightly-knit group to another through prescribed channels. . . . This insures that the child has the proper sponsorship of his family, his community, and his previous school and serves as a powerful sanction for an individual to avoid incurring the disapproval of his own group (1963:258). (Italics mine)

Vogel (1963:147) states that the core of Japanese society has remained tied to interpersonal relationships within a defined structure to a high degree:

Despite changes in the nature and direction of expression, loyalty of the individual to his group remains the most important attribute of the respected person. . . . He should avoid any situation that might be embarrassing to a member of his group and always maintain an interest in the welfare, comfort, and sense of honor of others. (Italics mine)

Tim Toba, in a personal communication (1968) said that the Japanese concern for status is manifested in the hierarchal structure which is based largely on age differences. These are found in the political world, the business world, and the educational system, and are modeled after the family structure. The older person must be given all respect; the younger college professor, for example, cannot outrank the older professor no matter how brilliant or superior the younger professor might be. "We say, 'give shame on him' meaning disgrace him, if you break the above iron rule, so in college teaching the younger professor has a hard time to get a good position as a professor."

Now that the basic values and organization of Japanese society have been briefly outlined, with this context we shall begin our discussion of shame.

Discussion of Shame
It is within this intense interpersonal atmosphere of the group, be it the family, school, or work group, that honor and shame are most keenly felt. Japanese conceive of interpersonal relationships primarily in terms of debt, duties, or obligations, not rights. Persons in an inferior position in the hierarchy owe respect and obedience to their superiors. Parents do not have to demand obedience on an authoritarian basis as in Germany. Japanese children feel that they have a strong obligation to obey their parents (Benedict 1946:102). This strong sense of obligation is reflected in a Japanese word for 'thank you.' It is katajiikenai, which is written with the character 'insult,' and 'loss of face.' It means both 'I am insulted' and 'I am grateful.' The all-Japanese dictionary says that by this term you say that by the extraordinary benefit you have received you are shamed and insulted because you are not worthy of the benefaction (Benedict 1946:106).

According to Benedict (1946:116) on refers to "obligations passively incurred." All persons have this type of obligation. They receive these debts from significant others, such as the Emperor, parents, teachers, etc. Repayment of on falls into two categories: "gimu. the fullest repayment of these obligations is still no more than partial and there is no time limit." The significant others in this category are people like parents, ancestors, and the Emperor, and even duty to one's work. The second category of repayment of on is "giri. these debts are regarded as having to be repaid with mathematical equivalence to the favor received and there are time limits."

Harry Kitano, a Japanese-American, has recently described the sub-culture and experience of Japanese Americans. Kitano (1969:104) says
that among Japanese-Americans the ideas of *giri* and *on* have largely disappeared, but that the norm of *enryo* (modesty in the presence of one's superiors) has been enlarged in meaning. Among other things *enryo* refers "to how to cover moments of confusion, embarrassment, and anxiety." Apparently a wide range of behavior in a variety of social situations is explained by the concept of *enryo*:

> The inscrutable face, the noncommittal answer, the behavioral reserve can often be traced to this norm so that the stereotype of the shy, reserved Japanese in ambiguous social situations is often an accurate one.

Another aspect of the *enryo* syndrome is the idea expressed by *hazu ka shi*, meaning "embarrassment and reticence." Concern for others and how they will react to one's behavior is central. A person is very careful not to make himself look foolish in the eyes of others and thus experience shame. Such concerns tend to emphasize withdrawal as a means of coping with difficult situations. Thus the "yes" nod of the head which may actually mean "no" in terms of "I don't want to cause you embarrassment or trouble by disagreeing. . . ." (Kitano 1969:104).

Kitano observes that many Japanese would appreciate it if Americans could learn something of the tact, honor and sense of shame that goes with the practice of *enryo*. He feels that it helps "one to look beyond self and to act in relation to others," and that it might help reduce American tendencies toward a self-oriented materialistic individualism.

If some of the crucial interpersonal Japanese values have survived in Japanese-American culture, it is likely that they remain even stronger in modern Japanese culture, so we shall drop back in history again to some of Ruth Benedict's observations.
In order to be regarded as a person of honor, one must put obligations to others before individual rights and desires. To fail to treat others with proper respect and tactfulness is the worst possible behavior. Such insincerity is worse than lying or murder (Benedict 1946:160).

Shame, they say, is the root of virtue. . . . 'A man who knows shame' is sometimes translated 'virtuous man,' sometimes 'man of honor.' Shame has the same place of authority in Japanese ethics that 'a clear conscience,' 'being right with God,' and the avoidance of sin have in Western ethics (Benedict 1946:224).

Shame is a two-edged sword. It involves individual self respect as well as meeting obligations to others. These two aspects are intimately related; one cannot exist without the other.

'You must respect yourself' is constantly on parents' lips in admonishing their adolescent children, and it refers to observing proprieties and living up to other people's expectations (1946:220).

The institution of the go-between reflects the delicateness of interpersonal relationships; it serves as a way to reduce personal confrontation in a bargaining or competitive situation. Whenever a man might feel shame if he fails in what he attempts, he employs a go-between. They are used "in negotiating marriages, offering one's services for hire, leaving a job and arranging countless everyday matters." (Benedict 1946:156).

Westerners find it hard to understand how a modern industrial society can function without strong competition among individuals. But the Japanese tend to view American individualism as selfishness. Vogel (1963:146) says that the two fundamental characteristics of Japanese society are loyalty and competence:

Group loyalty means not only identification with group goals but a willingness to co-operate with
the other members and to respond to group consensus enthusiastically (1963:156).

The second value, competence, is defined as a combination of talent and hard work (1963:156). Competence is valued primarily for how it contributes to the group, because a person's performance affects the success of the group enterprise. To be loyal and competent is honorable; to fail in either reflects on the group and thus is shameful.

The power of the values of loyalty and competence to motivate behavior in the absence of individualistic competition is vividly demonstrated in terms that the average American can understand—economic growth. Throughout most of the 1960's the Japanese economy has been growing at the rate of approximately 12 per cent a year. By contrast the United States economic growth rate is approximately 4 per cent a year.

Vogel (1963:264) states that "the basic mode of integration of the man into the economic order is not through his occupational speciality, but through his firm." Next to his family the firm is the most important group in a worker's life. Most employees stay with a firm for life. In return the firm paternalistically gives employees a wide range of fringe benefits. When you ask an employee what work he does, he will usually reply by giving you the name of his firm, not his occupation.

The honor-shame syndrome puts strong pressure on the worker to produce quantity and quality. To fail to do so would lower the firm's reputation and bring a strong sense of shame to both the firm and the worker.

The average American would probably admire some of the principles
behind Japanese child rearing, but question the possibility of putting them into practice. Vogel (1963:227-252) has an excellent chapter on child rearing among the salaried middle class from which the following is drawn.

The mother has almost total responsibility for the children. The father is gone most of the day; the mother is lonely and thus gives to and receives affection from her children. They are in almost constant interaction including sleeping together. Dependency is encouraged in numerous ways. By American standards the child is spoiled. Little "discipline" is used. Negatively, fear and ridicule are used to control behavior. Positively, the mother teaches the child what is right only when the child is in a cooperative mood. "Her aim is to establish a close relationship with the child so he will automatically go along with her suggestions." (1963:244-245).

The Japanese mother avoids going against the child, challenging his will. As a result the child does not develop a strong will of its own. The mother tries to be very sensitive to the child's feelings and desires. She anticipates his wants and tries to be a step ahead with solutions or alternatives. Therefore, with a non-authoritarian, but highly personalized approach, Japanese mothers succeed in producing well-behaved, polite children who are very considerate of others. And this type of training produces adults who are sensitive to the shame-honor dynamic which is so important in Japanese life.

In Japanese culture there are situations where personal obligations and thus shame are not present. Among total strangers one can be quite rude; "you can throw off your shame when travelling." One
reason for the popularity of geisha girls is that the husband can
totally relax, be emotionally free, since he has no obligations or
responsibilities to the geisha girl. Also among some close friends
of the same sex, the standards related to the shame-honor syndrome
are relaxed. Wives may find neighborhood wives with whom they can
share almost anything (Vogel 1963:136, 137).

A summary statement on this chapter on Japan hardly seems neces­sary. It should be abundantly clear that the Japanese people repre­sent a culture with an unusually strong shame dynamic.\(^3\)
CHAPTER NINE

CHINA

It is not enough that the Americans leave Viet Nam; they must understand that they are leaving in shame.

This remark was made by Mao Tse-tung in 1964 to a visiting Frenchman. It reveals a continuing Chinese concern for the importance of shame in human behavior. Apparently Communist ideology has not eradicated this basic dynamic of Chinese behavior. Some have suggested that the Communists severely weakened the concept of face (Hu 1960:492-493). In 1937 Mao criticized the notion of face as standing in the way of progress, honesty, and truth. Open criticism by oneself and others was encouraged to root out old values. It may be, however, what some have interpreted as an attack upon the old concept of face, has really been an attack upon the old values on which face was built. A new idea of what it means to lose face may have been built around Communist values. Radical change does not necessarily eliminate all of the old values; it may simply redirect some of the old cultural patterns.

Guilt and/or Shame

In 1967 Wolfram Eberhard, a sociologist and a sinologist, published his research on guilt and shame under the title of Guilt and Sin in Traditional China. While most of his research into the written literature of China dealt with the concepts of guilt and sin, extensive comments are made about shame also.

Eberhard (1967:3) notes that there are no pure shame or guilt cultures,
and that when one refers to a specific culture as a shame culture, he is only indicating "that shame is a more prominent agent than guilt, not an absence of guilt."

Eberhard (1967:6) claims that he has not used any "Western psychological frame of reference for the concepts of guilt and shame." Instead he has allowed the literary documents to speak for themselves. Eberhard cautioned that there is a difference in the way the lower class masses and the Confucian elite view shame and guilt. He believes that the masses were primarily guilt oriented whereas the Confucian elite were primarily shame oriented. Shame, for the Chinese, was closely related to status (1967:122).

Throughout most of the book I received the impression that Eberhard was assuming the traditional Western distinction between guilt and shame—guilt being internal and shame as external and social. This impression may have been in error, because at the end of the book, Eberhard (1967:124) discussed how the Confucianist internalized shame. The Confucianist did not formulate a long list of rules and specific acts of sin in order to guide behavior but he did have a clear sense of morality based on a high concept of honor and propriety. A Confucian gentleman operated on the basis of principles, not a list of specific prohibitions. Eberhard (1967:124) states:

Like the religious person, he has his code in his heart, he has internalized his social code. He feels ashamed not only in case of exposure, but even if no one knows of his bad actions—or at least he is expected to feel this way.

In upper class society, one is especially conscious of the fact that "shame is the reverse side of honor," asserts Eberhard (1967:124). Accord-
ing to the literature he studied, Eberhard believes that by the nine-
teenth century the Confucian elite had lost much of their sense of
honor and were engaging in many activities previously regarded as shame-
ful.

As in other cultures, it is easier to define guilt than shame. In
Chinese society, "guilt-crime-sin are one chain." (Eberhard 1967:12).
Etymologically, shame has the connotation of being dirty or smelly and
has "no connotation related to visual exposure, nor to a loss of accep-
tance by society. The connotations of words for shame are the same as
connotations of "sin." (1967:13). (Later we shall examine Hu Hsien-chin's
comments on Chinese words for face for a fuller discussion of the psycho-
logical and sociological implications of shame.)

Eberhard (1967:13) was surprised to find guilt and sin referred to
so many times in the literature he examined, whereas specific references
to shame were far less. He does not know why shame references occur
less often, because he says shame is undoubtedly an important part of
Chinese society. For those who might be interested in sentence or brief
paragraph illustrations of shame situations, Eberhard has listed on pages
90-93, 100-105, and 108-110 numerous examples under various categories
such as "exposure of sinful acts," "exposure of conceit, ignorance or
mistakes," "justified suicide to expiate guilt and avoid shame," etc.
Sources in the literature are included so that one could obtain the ex-
panded version of each example of a shame experience if he desires. One
book that Eberhard analyzed dealt specifically with stories about sin.
Eberhard (1967:108) found shame mentioned much more often in themes dealing
with sin than in any other type of literature he examined. Seventeen such
The Chinese concept of face seems to involve both the ideas of shame and honor. One can gain or lose face. In an article by Howard and Scott Boorman, Richard Wilhelm is quoted as saying:

Fear of 'loss of face' is perhaps the strongest of all moral urges in China, much stronger certainly than the fear of hell is for the Christian. But just for that reason it is also the sensitive point at which patience stops. If you injure someone in his sense of honor, leaving him 'without face,' he becomes irreconcilable (Boorman and Boorman 1967:147).

The Boormans' declare that "face is strategic self-respect" in an interpersonal setting. There is room for strategy in the Chinese game of life, but the basic rules are carefully proscribed:

The quantity and type of face possessed by a given person at a given time are functions not only of his situation alone but also of the situations of all other persons in his environment and the interactions of their faces (Boorman and Boorman 1967:147).

As the Chinese plan military strategy and engage in negotiations with their enemy, they are very conscious of the psychological as well as the military factors involved. They are inflexible as far as the end desired and the preserving of face, but very flexible in the methods used to achieve the desired end. Even in defeat the principle of the preservation of face affects how the surrender is negotiated. During the fighting negotiations may be conducted in order to gain time, to estimate the strength of the conflicting views on the appropriateness of the war in the enemy nation, to determine the enemy's strength, weak-
nesses, and determination. To illustrate, in the Vietnam War the United States has superior military power but much of the American public desires to get out of Vietnam as soon as possible. Even the President is committed to peace and withdrawal as soon as it is feasible. The Chinese would regard this as a golden opportunity and would conduct military operations and negotiations designed to increase the homefront divisions. They would exploit our loss of face situation.

With this introduction of the importance of face in Chinese life, we shall investigate the meaning of face further. Hu Hsien-chin (1956:447) states that there are two words for face:

\textit{mien-tzu}, stands for \ldots prestige \ldots a reputation achieved through getting on in life\ldots . For this kind of recognition ego is dependent at all times on his external environment.

\textit{Mien-tzu}, then, is closely related to the concept of status.

The other kind of face is \textit{lien}. "\textit{Lien is both a social sanction for enforcing moral standards and an internalized sanction.}" (Hu Hsien-chin 1956:447). \textit{Lien} is both personal and social. It is personal in the sense that a person with \textit{lien} is a person of integrity, honor, one who fulfills his obligations. It is social in the sense that others are affected by the individual's behavior (a good person builds or loses \textit{lien} for the group with whom he is identified as well as for himself); also, others serve as a judge of the individual's behavior and decide whether or not the person is behaving in a way to earn the respect of society.

When a person loses \textit{lien} it is as a result of some behavior which the group condemns as immoral or socially disapproved. A person being
exploited or abused has the right to expose the person engaging in wrong behavior. This provides significant protection, especially to the lower class person, because the upper class person who has more power to use is also more vulnerable to losing face.

Chinese appear to be modest and humble to Western observers. In one sense this modest appearance is not what it appears to be on the surface. It is self-protection as well as modesty. To avoid the possibility of unnecessarily losing face, a Chinese normally will understate his capabilities. Then if he fails he will be measured by a lower standard. His shame will be less intense. On the other hand, if one had boasted about his abilities and then failed, he would be ridiculed by the group. Hu Hsien-chin (1956:452) has concisely summarized the positive and negative aspects of face:

We have seen that all infringements of the moral code, all acts contrary to behavior of a person of ego's status cause a depreciation of character. The loss of esteem is felt acutely and is symbolically expressed as "loss of lien." The fear of "losing lien" keeps up the consciousness of moral boundaries, maintains moral values, and expresses the force of social sanctions. Behavior that is usually not classed as immoral: the self-confidence of the opportunist, the criticism of another in the absence of control of one's own conduct, the failure of an undertaking through lack of judgment, also are punished by "loss of lien." "Loss of lien" is felt acutely, for it entails not only the condemnation of society, but the loss of its confidence in the integrity of ego's character. Much of the activity of Chinese life is operated on the basis of trust. As the confidence of society is essential to the functioning of the ego, the "loss of lien" has come to constitute a real dread affecting the nervous system of ego more strongly than physical fear. (Italics mine)

Others are usually directly involved in the loss of face. However, anticipated shame may be felt by an individual who knows about an action...
of his own which affects another person even though the other person
is not yet aware of the action. He will say, "I have no lien to see
so-and-so," especially if the person offended is a superior. For ex-
ample, government ministers may commit suicide if they fail to perform
their task adequately because they would have "no lien to see the

Shame Experiences

To illustrate the role of shame in personal situations the following
examples are cited.

A betrothed girl who was soon to be married was taken from her home
and raped by some bandit soldiers. Armed peasants soon rescued her. The
girl promptly committed suicide even though she had done nothing wrong
herself; she had been the victim of circumstances. She had, however,
lost her virtue. This fact would lower her status in the eyes of her
prospective husband. Rather than face the shame involved she committed
suicide (Wong and Cressy 1952:262).

This personal experience of the betrothed girl had its implications
for the clan also. "Virtue was deeply rooted in the people's minds. If
one woman lost her virtue the whole clan felt it had lost face. That
this called for revenge was a universal conviction buried in the hearts
of all." (Wong and Cressy 1952:262).

A girl student did not do well either in chemistry or in writing
Chinese characters. Her elder brother told her, "It is a shame that a
Chinese cannot even write good Chinese characters." As a result of her
failure she was "sentenced" to spend the whole summer in isolation work-
ing on her studies (Wong and Cressy 1952:290).

The personal decision of a grandmother who had become a Christian to have a simple funeral proved to be embarrassing to one of her aunts. Elaborate funerals with expensive coffins were the custom. The grandmother, making her funeral arrangements before her death, bought a plain coffin. The aunt was very much afraid that the clan would lose face if the customary expensive funeral was not held (Wong and Cressy 1952:369).

An illustration of the impact of personal failure upon the individual comes from the area of business. A good businessman suffered severe financial reverses which resulted in the loss of his business. As a result he lost his will to live. He did not return to his family until the serious illness of a grandmother required him to do so. His loss of face kept him from returning (Wong and Cressy 1952:376).

Plum Blossom, a slave girl employed in a household, became pregnant. The wife, Second Sister, was barren so the husband turned to the slave girl to bear a child. This practice was acceptable in China if the slave girl was officially and publicly made a concubine. In this case Plum Blossom had not been made a concubine. Plum Blossom was an excellent slave and she was very close to Second Sister. Plum Blossom was called before a family court. The grandmother said:

You have done a great injury to Second Sister, . . . and have caused a great loss of face to both families, particularly to ours. How do you have any face to go on living?

Plum Blossom would have willingly committed suicide if the grandmother had insisted. Because of the close relationship between Plum Blossom and Second Sister all the grandmother asked from Plum Blossom
was an apology to Second Sister. This Plum Blossom sincerely performed. This solved the problem within the immediate family circle, but not with Second Sister's husband's family.

The resulting child was a boy. Custom decreed a feast should be given at the end of the first month. This feast was given by the husband's family. Wong commented:

... they had prided themselves on being a strict Confucian family, and an irregularity of this sort caused them to lose considerable face and this they felt keenly, so much so indeed that at the end of the first month, ... nothing at all was done and the whole thing hushed up as much as possible.

Still the family kept the child. It was the first and possibly the only boy of that branch of the clan. In order to guarantee the perpetuation of the clan the child had to be taken as a legitimate part of the family (Wong and Cressy 1952:241-246).

Most of a family became Christians and started attending church. In doing so, they ceased taking part in the ancestor worship at the clan tomb. One reason this family gave for ceasing ancestor worship was so that they would not "lose face with the church." The clan, in retaliation, cut off the family from the financial aid they normally received. On their way to church services the Christian family would meet neighbors and relatives. Wong stated:

Walking through the streets was an ordeal, for we always met people we knew, and all of them looked at us in the greatest astonishment and stared unmercifully. We would lower our eyes and hurry past, blushing down to our necks. This at length became unbearable, so we got up at cockcrow, walked to church in the early dawn, and thus avoided meeting any of our relatives.

The head of the clan who had cut off funds to the family that had
become Christians had acted illegally. Years later an occasion arose where he was confronted by a lawyer in the Christian family. The lawyer stated frankly the injustice the head of the clan had done. The head of the clan experienced "a terrific loss of face" but there was nothing he could say in reply (Wong and Cressy 1952: 190-192 and 345).
CHAPTER TEN

THAILAND

And at all costs one avoided embarrassment, to others and oneself. That's why one giggled and said mai pen rai, never mind, whether one minded or not (White and Conger 1967:93).

Thai peasant society, roughly speaking, seems to be a combination of an age-status hierarchy and individualism built around a shame motif. Note the following similarities and differences in the Thai and Japanese cultures.

Similarities:
1) A hierarchical structure of society in which superiors are genuinely respected and in which superiors carry out their obligations to inferiors.
2) Interpersonal face-to-face relationships governed by extreme politeness. Shame prevents unpleasant truth from being shared.

Differences:
1) Loyalty a prime virtue in Japan; very casual loyalty among the Thai.
2) Strong family relationships in Japan; a loose family structure, among the Thai, roughly similar to the Western nuclear family, which any member may leave as he chooses.
3) Group relationships primary among the Japanese; no binding group ties among the Thai.
4) Strict division of labor by sex in Japan; casual exchange of labor between the sexes in Thailand.

4) Marriage partners picked by parents in Japan; a Thai chooses his own partner with advice from parents.

Hierarchy and Individualism

We have already noted that Thai social order is built on social position in the hierarchy and respect and obligations related to those positions. Each person knows where he stands on the hierarchical ladder of superiors and inferiors. From infancy the child is taught obeisance to elders:

Thai children do learn to be courteous and respectful at a remarkably early age. . . . His parents will press his palms together and hold them to his forehead to show respect for the monks, and he soon learns to raise them to his face for his parents (Burling 1965:101).

The Thai language reflects the fact that everyone is seen as either superior or inferior. One cannot speak without indicating status. A child does not ask a superior for anything. Elders fulfill their role by taking care of inferiors. This hierarchical arrangement is non-authoritarian; it works by being mutually beneficial.

It seems that there is little trust in or obligation to persons apart from their status. Personally, one is an individualist even in the family. At the same time that children are being taught respect for their elders, they are also being trained (or allowed) to be individualistic and self-reliant.

Babies are cuddled and "spoiled" according to Western standards.
Little discipline; no toilet training. Walking and toilet training are developed by each child at his own pace, not at the insistence of his parents (Burling 1965:101). The story is told of a baby that died because the mother did not give him the needed medicine. The mother said that the baby did not like the medicine, and that it was better not to give him the medicine than to hurt his feelings. This story illustrates how deeply respect for the wishes of the individual, even a baby, is held.

To Americans this strong emphasis on individualism seems to be contradictory to the Thai emphasis on respect for elders. Somehow the Thai have merged these two ideas and made them work side by side.

Only as long as husband-wife or parent-child relationships are mutually beneficial are relationships stable. Anyone can break the relationship any time he chooses. A husband can leave his family; a child can leave his parents. Everyone, the family and the world, are unpredictable so each person must learn to rely on himself. Loyalty for life is virtually unknown.

Thai individualism does not have to be proven through skill, hard work, knowledge, etc. Every person, including children, is respected because all have the dignity of being a human being. The lowest person in the hierarchy deserves as much respect as the highest person because all are full human beings. Equality is based on humanity, not democracy of social class.

Everyone has the right to choose his own values within the general cultural framework which is strongly influenced by Buddhist principles. There is no set norm or standard that everyone should follow. Life is
quite existential. There is little concern for the future even if disaster may overtake one in the long run. The prime concern is for individual dignity in the immediate face-to-face situation. It is much better for either or both parties to suffer from neglect or a bad decision, than for embarrassment or conflict to occur in a face-to-face relationship.

Divorce occurs by mutual agreement. It is not regarded as a catastrophe. There is little sexual division of labor. Either the husband or wife can support the family by working the rice paddies. Some men even act as midwives.

Americans, who pride themselves on being rugged individualists, conform much more than Thais do to societal norms. Thais really practice what they preach. There is great and genuine tolerance for the individual. From infancy on his desires, pace, and decisions are respected. No one is dependable so a Thai early learns to depend only on himself. Truly a rugged individualist.¹

Role of Shame

A missionary to Thailand, Don Beyers (1965), has provided me with definitions of guilt and shame. His source is the Thai-English Dictionary by George McFarland.

The common word for guilt is pet, meaning "wrong, mistake, falsehood." (McFarland 1937:447). This is the fact of wrong-doing, as well as the feeling of guiltiness because of the accumulation of sin. The idea of shame is conveyed by three terms: ai can have both a positive and negative value. It can simply mean "shy, modest, bashful, timid, diffident before strangers." (McFarland 1937:993). This idea is socially acceptable. This word can also denote a negative value, and here it is used
more often. McFarland (1937:993) defines this usage as "to be ashamed, to be abashed, to be confused by consciousness of fault or impropriety." The other two words can be considered together for their meaning is essentially the same. They are khaṇ naa and seeāh naa, which respectively mean "to sell face" and "to lose face." Khai naa is used most often to convey "shame, to lose respect, standing, place among fellows, and reputation." It has a strong orientation towards the society.

According to Herbert Phillips (1966:51-52), the Thai resist strong emotional affiliations with others. Without such bonds "they develop no sense of guilt for those they injure and stand ultimately responsible only to themselves." Thus the Thai saying 'Invest not thy love in a shadow.' Steven Piker (1968:200) discusses the lack of trust in Thai society and an attempt to compensate for this lack:

The typical villager approaches his interpersonal world, in virtually all of its aspects, with a pervasive sense of distrust . . . and with a degree of caution and hesitancy that makes durable interpersonal commitment . . . unlikely. This . . . is verbalized by almost any adult villager.

To compensate for this lack of trust in interpersonal relationships, many Thai villagers choose a special friend with whom they make a binding, total commitment. Both parties pledge "mutual devotion and unconditional loyalty" in times of need. The special friends usually live in different villages and see each other only a few times a year. Piker (1968:202) feels that while there is some reliability to the pledge of loyalty, the friendship to the death idea serves largely as a psychological fantasy or substitute for the warmer inter-personal relationships each villager apparently desires.

This mistrust seems to be in persons (but not in their function in their position in the hierarchal structure), which is reflected in the
basic principle governing social interaction 'Avoid face to face conflict.' (Phillips 1966:54).

Personal and Social Damage

Social relationships are often characterized by much laughter and giggling. These are mechanisms to avoid direct social interaction. Phillips (1966:67) calls this external politeness a "social cosmetic" to keep social relationships "smooth and uncomplicated." The psychic and social cost of such artificial social relationships is heavy as is illustrated by the following story of a villager called Dang:

Dang's story is a somewhat plaintive tale: how, because of his anxiety about revealing his true feelings to his father, uncle, and aunt (his social superiors) he lost a house, some land, and married a girl he "did not quite want to." Yet at all times he maintained courteous relationships with all concerned. What is most significant about Dang's case, however, is the position of psychic isolation to which politeness brought him. Basically, Dang substituted in his relationships with his relatives the form of politeness for the more enduring substance of love, loyalty, and obligation. Rather than trust to the strength of such sentiments to help resolve his difficulties (ask his father to save the family land for him; tell the aunt he did not want to marry the girl she had chosen—which he could have done had he felt secure about his relatives' love for him), he politely said nothing. The net result of all of this... was a deep sense of personal inadequacy and resentment that loved ones cannot be depended on. Further, Dang had begun to treat others as he felt others had treated him (Phillips 1966:67-68).

It is hard for an American to believe that people will go to such lengths at great inconvenience to themselves to avoid a shameful situation for one or both parties involved. Yet this is quite common in Thai village social life. Phillips (1966:67) recounts the story of two women who were
deeply disturbed by the fact that their husbands had taken second wives. But the wives did not ever mention the problem to their husbands. They said they were to embarrassed to do so.

Good friends will avoid telling each other distressing information even though it would be advantageous to know about it as soon as possible. The reason given is they would be embarrassed about making their friend unhappy, or they would just be embarrassed to mention it.

There is never any competition for the post of village headman because "the eventual headman would be embarrassed because the presence of a competitor would suggest doubt about his competence." (Phillips 1966: 71); and, of course, the loser would obviously be shamed.

Truth, then, is sacrificed in interpersonal relationships. Pleasant face-to-face relationships are far more important. It is difficult to reconcile the rather extreme emphasis on individualism, on the one hand, with the extreme emphasis on avoiding shame at all costs, on the other hand. Thais seem to have self-confidence and self-acceptance so their embarrassment in social relationships does not seem to be designed to cover up personal inadequacy; however, poor social relationships seems to create inadequacy. Thais seem to have been taught that smooth social relationships are proper social behavior so a good Thai acts this way.

In this paragraph I will make some judgments about the Thais based upon what I believe are scriptural and psychological and anthropological universals with the obvious risk of some ethnocentric judgments. Phillips (1966:76) talks about "rights, obligations and responsibilities that form the substance of enduring relationships" but that "their most conspicuous expressions tend to be negative in nature." In Thai society shame has
serious negative results. The lack of trust and love is deep. Honesty and openness are relatively absent. To me the damage done by this excessive concern for shame is immense. I am vividly reminded at this point of the story of the fall of Adam and Eve. Sin resulted in shame and a covering of self. Immediately relationships were characterized by diversionary tactics and avoidance of responsibility. A society built on this foundation would seem to me to result in a society much like the Thai. There may be a basic selfishness in Thai individualism which is threatened to be exposed in face-to-face relationships. By mutual agreement uncomfortable reality is ignored. Life is lived positionally in the hierarchy. Society can function in this manner, and persons are protected from painful exposure of what they really are.

The gospel needs to delicately expose the nature of the problem, but even more important create an atmosphere of love and trust so that an individual can be genuine. God is love and trust. God loves enemies. Christ's life is evidence—"He who believes in me will not be put to shame." Don Beyers (1965) believes that shame in the context of individualism and Buddhist principles results in a relativistic ethic. A positive aspect of Buddhist teaching is the emphasis on performing meritorious acts. Society benefits from the generosity, reciprocity, and cooperation involved in this religious practice. This helps counterbalance individualism.

The relativistic ethic also has negative results. If one can get away with evading taxes or cheating a merchant, this is considered commendable. But if the person is caught, shame comes to the fore. Apparently shame is not deeply internalized among the Thai, or possible there are two
levels of shame.

Beyers says that "inconvenience borders closely on the concept of sin." When a person is caught doing wrong, it is inconvenient to himself and others. The Thai avoid inconvenience and personal involvement like the plague. The most used phrase among the Thai is 'it doesn't matter.' Unless the issue is forced or crucial 'never mind.' Truth seems to be convenience; falsehood is inconvenience. If "lying" will keep the immediate face-to-face situation smooth and peaceful, if it will avoid shame, then lying is good according to Thai practice.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

OTHER CULTURES

This chapter will be given to brief comments about shame in a variety of cultures. Shame will not be examined in its larger cultural context as was done with Japan, China, and Thailand. So this data will need to be used with greater caution. In most cases, at least to my knowledge, the data are not as complete as in the case of the previous cultures studied. Hopefully, these observations will stimulate others who have lived in the following cultures to write on the role of shame in their cultures. I would appreciate receiving bibliographic information on shame in any culture.

Allow me to reiterate a caution stated earlier. Because of culture change, class differences, etc., all data cited should be rechecked if there is any question about its validity or applicability to a specific cultural situation.

Arab

The Arab cultures of the Middle East appear to have much in common as far as honor and shame are concerned. Richard Antoun (1968:671) in his article "On the Modesty of Women in Arab Muslim Villages" believes that the modesty code is a basic pattern of Middle East culture found both in Islamic law and village custom. George Harris (1958:300) stresses the extreme importance of personal relationships in all of Iraqi life. Iraq's traditionally have preferred oral contracts to written ones. Written contracts imply distrust—an insult to a person's honor.
Closely related to the concept of family solidarity is the emphasis placed on honor among all segments of the population. Shame or dishonor, which causes one's "face to become blackened," is a major disaster, and violation of an individual's honor, until avenged, brings discredit upon his entire family (Harris 1958:299-300).

One does not have to hunt for the ideas of honor and shame among the Arabs; they are so pervasive one cannot ignore them (Zeid 1966:245). Life revolves around honor and shame. The Arab cultures have much in common with the Old Testament ideas of honor and shame.

The modesty code of Arab villagers has three parts; covering of the physical body, bashfulness and humility, and the honor of the group reflected in areas such as, adultery, purity of women, superiority of men and inferiority of women (Antoun 1968:672). The modesty norms apply to both men and women, but with greater emphasis on the sexual identity of women. For older women some of the restrictions dealing with sexual shame, such as the covering of the face, are ignored. Village folklore supports the belief that women have an animalistic sex drive. Women must be protected against themselves by men in order to preserve the honor of both.

Several Arabic words are used to indicate modesty with these meanings: being chaste, virtuous, veiling or concealing the female genitalia, and being inviolable or sacred. Other related ideas are bashfulness, blushing, and respect. These words have a double reference. They begin with a strong sexual emphasis, but they also clearly refer to modesty in terms of broader ethical behavior. "Offenses that have nothing to do with modesty such as assault and murder . . . are . . . described in terms of the violation of modesty." (Antoun 1968:680).
The modesty required of a woman cannot be separated from the honor of the male:

The man preserves his honor, in great part, by protecting the modesty of his women. Among Arabs the man who does not do so is termed "cuckold"... "reviled one." (Antoun 1968:680).

One man, in describing his concern about his daughter being adequately clothed, commented: "A girl is an object of shame; she must be clothed; she must be protected." (Antoun 1968:680). After an offence which has violated the modesty code a man may say, "My honor is exposed." The symbolism, which expresses reality to the Arab, is that "honor is complete when fully dressed (and thus protected) and incomplete when exposed."

On one occasion three men from a neighboring village seduced a young girl. As a result the religious leader stressed the concepts of honor and shame in his Friday sermon. He quoted the Koran:

The woman is exposed to shame, for if she leaves her house, Satan seeks her out and gains possession of her honor.

Again:

And Ali, ... said, "Are you not ashamed—have you no jealousy, allowing a woman to depart and pass among men, she peering at them and they peering at her.

The speaker, in his application of the Koranic principles, stated:

... violation of honor is a barbarous crime—there be no one to perpetrate it except him who is stripped of religious faith; there be no one to commit it except him who is broke loose from shame and honor. For he is allied with the devil (Antoun 1968:686).

Among the Bedouins of Egypt (Zeid 1966) honor and shame revolve around kinship and livestock—the key values of Bedouin life. A man has certain
well defined obligations to his lineage. Failure to complete these responsibilities brings shame upon both the individual responsible and upon the lineage.

The tent (one or more) serves as the spatial focus for the extended family or lineage. Such a grouping of tents is to be regarded with great respect and awe by outsiders. No stranger may come near without permission. Any violation is regarded as a great threat to the honor and integrity of the group.

A criminal may seek temporary refuge from his enemies in such a tent complex. Until the dispute is settled the honor of the lineage protects the criminal. Sometimes a murderer will turn himself in to the lineage of his victim indicating a plea for mercy. This puts tremendous pressure on the honor of the lineage. Tribal custom dictates that the highest honor goes to the lineage that finds it possible to refrain from an eye-for-an-eye type of justice. Self-control and forgiveness are the highest virtues in such a situation. Failure to measure up to this supreme test of character brings great disgrace on the lineage.

The highest virtues must be pursued in moderation. Generosity and hospitality are greatly prized among Bedouins as is bravery in raiding hostile camps. But where these are carried to excess with the element of rashness, then the pursuit of these same virtues becomes a source of disgrace. Situations vary and the line between honor and shame in the pursuit of good virtues is sometimes a thin one, but the society knows how to evaluate the vain pursuit of honor.

The Kabyle of northern Algeria (Bourdieu 1966) also have a keen sense of honor which is delicately balanced, ideally among equals. This is mani-
fest in challenge and riposte (a quick retort), a common test of honor in a verbal duel. A person should be challenged only by a person who is his equal in honor. If a person challenges an opponent who is obviously inferior to him, he dishonors himself. To take unfair advantage of an opponent in order to crush him unmercifully, is also considered extremely dishonorable. To defeat an opponent is legitimate; to devastate an opponent is unforgiveable.

If a person violates the rules of riposte he is open to extreme humiliation in the presence of others. The other alternative is for one to "cover himself in shame." A proverb says 'Better that he strip himself than that I should strip him.'

The same principle governs fighting among individuals and wars between tribes. In fighting it was a disgrace for several men to gang up against one man. In war one normally did not "seek to kill or crush one's opponent." (Bourdieu 1966:201). Instead a proper ritual was followed. First, insults were freely given. Then some physical blows were exchanged. At this time mediators usually arrived to settle the dispute.

Honor demanded that a man or tribe carefully defend against all attacks on their honor. Among the Kabyle honor is constantly being tested. As we have indicated, honor also demanded that the utter defeat of the opponent be avoided. His honor must be preserved. Honor is greater than life itself, so the defeated must be protected against overwhelming shame. The victor would indeed be cruel to inflict such a loss.

The ideal man is one who guards his self-respect with the utmost discretion, who keeps his inner self veiled, who practices self-effacement, and who fulfills the code of modesty upheld by society. The man of honor
is faithful to himself. At the same time the moral code expects him to see himself through the eyes of others. He "has need of others for his existence, because the image of himself is indistinguishable from that presented to him by other people." (Bourdieu 1966:211). He has the courage to protect his honor against insult. Even the most worthless man is expected to have enough sense of shame to avenge himself of insult.

How is the man without shame, honor, or modesty described? Bourdieu (1966:210) states:

The man who, . . . grows impatient or angry, speaks at random or laughs without reason, . . . acts without thinking, . . . in short, abandons himself to his first impulse, such a man is unfaithful to himself, and falls short of the ideals of dignity and distinction.

In summary, for the Kabyle "existence and honour are one. He who has lost his honour no longer exists. He ceases to exist for other people, and at the same time he ceases to exist for himself." (Bourdieu 1966:212).

Africa

The Igbo of southeast Nigeria handle the shame concept differently than most cultures do. Usually shame oriented cultures emphasize concealment, covering, to avoid shame producing situations—essentially a negative approach. The Igbo take a positive approach by stressing transparent living. Victor Uchendu (1965:17), an Igbo, says that "secretive persons are held in contempt as not being properly socialized."

The Igbo do have a keen sense of status and honor. They believe in change and they strive to increase status. Status is thought to carry over into the world of the ancestors:
A person's social position is such an important thing that even on his deathbed the individual Igbo thinks more of his status in the hereafter than of his death. His most important injunctions to his heir and family are: Do not shame my spirit. Do not let my enemies see my corpse. Give me a good burial (Uchendu 1965:16).

It seems to go against human nature for a people to combine status striving and transparent living. But the Igbo "wash their dirty linen in public." A good leader is one who has "strong eyes" to see "hidden things" and the "mouth to expose them."

Constant exposure serves to pressure a person to refrain from doing anything that will result in loss of face. Leaders are under strong pressure to demonstrate their innocence and good faith. They are regularly required to go through a rite known as the affirmation of innocence.

If any personal acts, such as the borrowing or lending of money, might be used in a wrong way, the deal should be completed openly in the presence of witnesses. Before the coming of Western civilization teenage nudity was customary for both boys and girls. Nakedness, a symbol of transparency, indicated innocence and virginity; shades of Genesis 2:25!

The Igbo are not naive; they realize that not all persons will live up to their ideal. When things go wrong, the Igbo look first to those who tend to be secretive. They believe that "those who live a 'dark' life ... commit most crimes." (Uchendu 1965:18).

In some respects it appears that the Igbo are trying to counter the effects of the fall--man's tendency to cover himself--by constantly insisting that persons live open lives for all to see. The Igbo are the only people of which I am aware that actually stress transparent living as a practical ideal--with the possible exception of the small scale attempt of
the Israeli kibbutz. To a degree the Israeli kibbutz (commune) described by Melford Spiro (1956:98-100) is similar. There is very little privacy; candor, straightforwardness about one's own life as well as one's opinion of his fellowmen is encouraged. In fact, persons who are not open and straightforward are not trusted.

The Ashanti of Ghana are a proud people who are very sensitive to personal insult of any kind. To have a 'good name' is of great importance; it is the essence of a person's existence. To have a 'bad name' in the community makes life unbearable. Public ridicule is so traumatic that suicide is sometimes resorted to as a way out. Ridicule is dreaded much more than any physical punishment. It is the strongest deterrent to bad behavior. R.S. Rattray (1929:327) records:

The tale-bearer had his or her face smeared with charcoal, was compelled to hold a live fowl between the teeth, and to parade the town, beating a gong.

Children are taught to be careful about saying anything which will imply ridicule or disrespect of others. Ridicule is often used to discipline children. Williamson (1965:146) believes that the Akan (Ashanti are Akan) feel little sense of guilt for wrong acts. He asserts that life is so highly social that the individual conscience does not develop as Westerners conceive of it. Instead the stress is on social sensitivity to the norms and welfare of the group.

Walter Trobisch (1961a:201) declares "that African culture is not concerned with guilt but with shame." It is the external control of the social unit that governs African conduct. "One's guilt before God is not feared, but shame in the eyes of men surely is." I would not quarrel with the strong social dimension of shame in Africa, but I would suggest...
that researchers look for evidence that shame might also be internalized. If it is not internalized, it might be more effective for missionaries to attempt with the aid of the Holy Spirit to internalize shame rather than to introduce the foreign concept of guilt.

Some examples of shame situations follow. Most come from Trobisch's research on sex and marriage in West Africa.

1) illegitimate child (Trobisch 1961b:260) and (Lystad 1958:57).
2) premarital sex (Trobisch 1961b:260).
3) birth certificate on which is written 'father unknown,' a permanent public shame (Trobisch 1962:10).
4) impotent man: "greatest possible shame that can fall on an African and his family." (Trobisch 1962:11).
5) a youth not "knowing" about sex might be shamed by both boys and girls (Trobisch 1962:11).
6) loud proclamation in a village of wife's laziness in failing to prepare a husband's meal would prod her to action. An anthropologist's cook failed; she made a public issue of it. No more trouble after that. All her servants asked her not to make a public issue of problems again (Bowen 1954:67).
7) public disclosure of adultery (Lystad 1958:58).
8) childless couple (Lystad 1958:97).
9) few slackers in a cooperative work group because of a combination of pride and fear of shame (Ames 1958:232).
10) when the first Kirundi Bible was completed, the pastor quoted Ezekiel 16:60-61 which includes: "Then thou shalt remember thy ways, and be ashamed. . . ." Then he commented: "How ashamed
we must be when our ways do not conform to it. . . . Until
now we've only understood part of it, but now what shame will
be ours if we do not walk in the path God has shown us in His
covenant." (Cox 1968:16).

To conclude this brief glimpse of shame in African culture (the term
African is very imprecise for there are hundreds of different tribes), we
shall turn to Ruanda. According to Maquet (1954:183) Ruanda culture is
predominately shame oriented, but there is some evidence for what Maquet
calls guilt. He says there is a word for conscience which means something
internally felt; conscience is located in the heart. Maquet is obviously
using the traditional distinction of guilt being internal and shame ex­
ternal. Hopefully, some one will check and see if shame is related to
conscience also as is true in Japan.

American Indian

In a chapter on Hopi goals, Richard Brandt (1954:42) records his Hopi
informant's answers to the question: "what would you feel ashamed of?"
1) death of his children.
2) friction, lack of unity in the village.
3) being lazy.
4) stealing ripe crops.
5) being dirty.
6) not knowing how to weave.
7) getting caught doing something wrong.
8) helping the anthropologist as an informant!
The Hopi frequently talk of persons having "died of shame." They are
very sensitive to public opinion. Shame appears to function along with honor as an effective means of social control. Brandt (1954:70) indicates that the Hopi have numerous opportunities to be dishonest, but such behavior is rare. He found the Hopi to be very honest in their money transactions with him.

According to Abram Kardiner \(^2\) (1939:69) the Zuni use shame as their most powerful means of social control. Kardiner called this "nonrecognition." "The individual is cut off from response (loss of love), but nothing else." Because of a high degree of mutual dependency, the use of shame as a sanction is extremely effective. Zuni mothers use very little punishment, but concentrate on "building up a sense of shame in the child." (Kardiner 1939:112).

Navaho attitudes are difficult for whites to understand. Part of the reason is that the Navaho depend less on conscience or guilt to control behavior and more on the external control of shame. To whites, adult Navahos seem to be supersensitive to shame or ridicule. Anything that seems to infringe upon or invade the person's dignity to any degree is taken seriously.

Dorothea Leighton and Clyde Kluckhohn (1948:104) tell the story of a Navaho family that converted to Mormonism. As a result they gave up their coffee habit. For a month or so everything went well. Then they heard a rumor that the reason they no longer drank coffee was because they were too poor. This was such an insult to their dignity that they gave up Mormonism.

Navaho often manifest extreme embarrassment in the presence of whites. They hang their heads, say practically nothing, will pretend to
understand when they do not understand—all to avoid shame. "The Navahos are always talking about "shaming," "being ashamed," or "acting ashamed." (Leighton and Kluckhohn 1948:105). For the Navaho "shame is the agony of being found wanting and exposed to the disapproval of others, . . ." There is little privacy in the intense face-to-face relationships of Navaho life. This is an ideal social setting for shame to be most effective.3

Toba Indians

Among the Toba Indians of Argentina power is the key to spirituality. Power over spirits and power to heal were a basic part of the traditional animistic religion, and they continue to be integral aspects of Toba Christianity. In 1963 a Toba pastor unexpectedly resigned and completely severed his relationship with the church. Because he was sick Toba logic required that he resign; if he did not have enough power to keep himself well, how could he fulfill his responsibilities to the church.

Illness and death are considered to be evidence of the absence of power. Failure to maintain power brings shame. In the case of death this failure is so deep and obvious, that the family members often stay away from church for several months. "They return only after they have overcome their shame." (Loewen 1965a:269). The Toba generally refrain from going to the hospital, because this act is an open admission that they lack spiritual power.

It is very difficult for a shaman to renounce his practice of shamanism. If he does he loses his power and his personal prestige. One shaman did burn all of his equipment and profess to accept Christ. In a few weeks he returned to his old ways. "Fear and shame drove him
back into shamanism." (Loewen 1965a:271).

In the pre-Christian era one of the responsibilities of the shaman was to protect the tribe from illness and sorcery. "If he failed, all were embarrassed and humiliated." (Loewen 1965a:277). So deeply did the Toba feel such a failure that they would destroy their village and move to another area. Probably fear and shame were mixed motivations in such an experience.

Trobriand Islanders

The Trobriands live on an island off the east coast of New Guinea in the southwest Pacific. An unusual feature of Trobriand culture is that about twice as many yams are raised as are needed for food. A man takes great pride in the size of his yam crop. It is his most important means of gaining prestige. He gives about three-fourths of his harvest away to his village chief and to his matrilineal in-laws. In the total process of exchange normally he would receive yams from some one else.

There is no punishment for failing to grow and give away yams except shame. Yet a male Trobriand rarely fails to complete his duty even though it demands hard work. A Trobriander is ambitious and proud. Family pride is deep; matrilineal obligations are strong. "A man's sister is his nearest relative, and her honour, her position and her dignity, he identifies with his own." (Malinowski 1929:108). Thus if he fails to provide her family with yams he brings great shame upon both her and himself. "Scarcity of food, hunger, lack of superabundance are considered very shameful indeed." (Malinowski 1929:108).

Westerners would tend to judge some Trobriand sex practices as quite
immoral, especially in the area of premarital sex. But any discussion of the sex life of a married couple had to be handled with delicate care. A husband would be deeply offended at the slightest allusion to his own conjugal life.

Sex roles were clearly and carefully identified and distinguished from each other. A man who cooked was taunted and ridiculed. A Trobriander has an extreme fear of being laughed at or shamed, especially of "doing something which is intrinsically the attribute of another sex or social class." (Malinowski 1929:16). For example, women carry loads on their heads, but men carry them on their shoulders.

It would be with a real shudder, and a profound feeling of shame, that an individual would regard carrying anything in the manner proper to the opposite sex and nothing would induce a man to put any load on his head, even in fun (Malinowski 1929:16).

One time Malinowski was walking with a married couple. The wife had a sore foot and was limping badly. So Malinowski advised that the husband help her along. Both stared at the ground in great embarrassment at his suggestion which did not fit the Trobriand concept of proper sex role behavior.

For either a man or a woman to be openly aggressive in sex is shameful, because a person's worth lay in being desired by the opposite sex, not in seducing them. For a man to have intercourse with an ugly or old woman would reflect on his worth or dignity, and should such an act be known it would be a source of intense shame.

Trobrianders resort to magic to take away their appetite so that plenty of yams will remain in the storehouse, many of which will rot. It is a terrible insult to tell a man that he is hungry. A man will suffer
genuine hunger rather than "expose himself to the sarcastic question 'Is there no food in thy village?'" (Malinowski 1929:373).

Malinowski tells of numerous other instances of shame situations among the Trobriands. Shame is a powerful force for social control based, of course, on Trobriand values.

Spain

Julian Pitt-Rivers (1966:21) begins his discussion of honor and social status in Spain with this definition: "Honour is the value of a person in his own eyes, but also in the eyes of society." Honor and shame are used synonymously in many contexts. Once the quality of feeling of shame is lost it is irrecoverable. Such persons are classed with thieves and prostitutes--devoid of shame and honor. "A person of good repute is taken to have both, one of evil repute is credited with neither." (Pitt-Rivers 1966:42).

The code which establishes honor and shame for a person varies with sex, social status, and locality (village versus city). For example, when a woman loses her sexual purity, she is dishonored: when a man engages in sexual escapades he is proving his masculinity. Women are expected to blush easily and be timid, but a man doing the same things might be ridiculed.

Traditionally the upper classes inherited a social quality of honor. By contrast the lower classes entered life in a state of shame in the sense of inferiority. Because the upper class had, in a sense, a surplus of honor, they could, at times, engage in dishonorable conduct and get away with it. In some sense the upper class was beyond reproach.
Julio Caro Baroja (1966) discusses the Spanish concept of honor and shame based on his analysis of historical, legal, theological, and literary works. Baroja (1966:85) notes that "the loss of honour is equated with the loss of life," so that, at times, even the innocent person who is defamed loses his honor. For this reason the person guilty of destroying by slander the honor of another was severely punished. Sometimes the tongue was cut out or his life taken.

In modern times the rich upper classes seem to have lost the aura of honor they once had. In fact, among the Spanish masses the idea is widespread that a wealthy man is almost automatically evil because he must be an exploiter of the working class. Today, the place of honor goes to the hard working poor man. Money, its use and abuse, is now more apt to be the central concern of honor and shame than is sexual behavior.

According to Baroja (1966:122) honor and shame have been important concepts throughout the history of Spain. As society has changed the social values which defined the content of honor have been modified. For example, "pure blood" is no longer of much significance in determining honor. Each standard of honor tends to be corrupted over a period of time and is replaced by new values. Baroja (1966:124) states that each age had its honor focus: "lineage, physical strength, scorn of death, etc., all of which began to diminish in vitality precisely at the moment when society had become obsessed by them." Today, says Baroja, wealth is the dominant force (though tarnished) in Spanish society. But, if history repeats itself, wealth will soon be replaced by something else.

As face-to-face societies are disrupted by modern civilization, the
intense social aspect of shame usually declines. The Japanese represent an exception to this general rule. To a degree law replaces shame as a force of social control. But some social element of shame remains in modern societies. And there is always present in the individual, except among the shameless, some sense of honor and shame. This more personal portion of honor and shame may come more to the fore as the overwhelming social sense of shame recedes. The personal and social aspects of shame are always present in all societies. The degree and intensity of each will vary from historical period to historical period in any one culture, and from culture to culture.

Mexico

The Mexican, whether young or old, criollo or mestizo, general or laborer or lawyer, seems to me to be a person who shuts himself away to protect himself: his face is a mask and so is his smile. . . . everything serves him as a defense: silence and words, politeness and disdain, irony and resignation (Paz 1961:29).

Octavio Paz provides us with a very vivid description of the state of shame of the Mexican in his book The Labyrinth of Solitude. The defensive covering of the Mexican personality is very pronounced. People who open themselves up to others are thought to be weak. The strong person protects his privacy at all costs. A person might think that openness and honesty would lead to trust, but such is not the case in Mexico. If one does open himself up to another, he lives in fear that his confidence will be betrayed. Such exposure when misused brings dishonor. Here is Paz's (1961:31) description of manliness:

The Mexican macho—the male—is a hermetic being, closed up in himself, capable of guarding both
himself and whatever has been confided to him. Manliness is judged according to one's invulnerability. (Italics mine)

To guard himself from unwarranted exposure to others, the Mexican resorts to an extensive use of 1) ritualism or formalism in life, 2) dissimulation or lying, and 3) the explosive release of the fiesta. Ceremony, courtesy, and tradition allow the Mexican to handle life at arm's length.

Another defense for the Mexican is the widespread use of elaborate lying or dissimulation. Paz (1961:34) comments that "the liar lies to himself, because he is afraid of himself." Paz seems to feel that Mexicans engage in lying more extensively than most peoples, and that this phenomenon provides a clue to Mexican character.

Lying plays a decisive role in our daily lives, our politics, our love-affairs and our friendships, and since we attempt to deceive ourselves as well as others, our lies are brilliant and fertile, not like the gross inventions of other peoples. Lying is a tragic game in which we risk a part of our very selves (1961:40).

The liar is a master pretender; he lives the lie.

Every moment he must remake, re-create, modify the personage he is playing, until at last the moment arrives when reality and appearance, the lie and the truth, are one (1961:40).

In his discussion of lying, Paz makes rather extensive use of the concept of dissimulation which seems to get at the purpose for lying. Dissimulation means to hide one's feelings and motives through pretense and deception. The Mexican is afraid to be known as he really is so he lies so that the real self remains invisible to others. "He is afraid of others' looks and therefore he withdraws, contracts, becomes a shadow, a phantasm, an echo." (1961:42-43). Since lying is an act to protect one-
self, Paz says that "it is pointless to denounce it." His point is that unless what a Mexican is is changed, he has a compelling need to lie. Lying will never be controlled by focusing on the outward act of lying. Instead the person who lies must be changed. Listen to these tragic comments by Paz (1961:42-43):

The lie takes command of him and becomes the very foundation of his personality.

And:

We dissimulate so eagerly that we almost cease to exist.

Paz believes that this widespread practice of dissimulation may have originated in colonial times as a way of dealing with the conqueror. But even though the colonial world has disappeared the pattern of dissimulation based on fear and mistrust continues.

The third way the Mexican handles his fear of openness and exposure is to provide a socially approved opportunity for an explosive expression of the inner man— the *fiesta* (Paz 1961:47-64). "The solitary Mexican loves fiestas." In the fiesta the Mexican "opens out." The fiesta is much more than pleasant amusement. To the Mexican the fiesta is a rather frenzied and often violent opportunity to escape from himself, "to leap over the wall of solitude that confines him the rest of the year." Chaos and license reign. Everything important and sacred, the law, the army, the clergy, can be safely ridiculed. One temporarily escapes from oneself and the norms of society. Paz asserts that the "fiesta is a revolution. . . . society is dissolved."

But the fiesta is only a temporary escape from the prison of privacy, the sanctuary of solitude. The problem of the personality remains unre-
solved. So Paz (1961:64) asserts:

We oscillate between intimacy and withdrawal, between a shout and a silence, between a fiesta and a wake, without ever truly surrendering ourselves. (Italics mine)

Pentecostalism, with its emphasis on freedom and joy in the Holy Spirit, has been the most successful form of Christianity in the Mexican cultural setting. William Wonderly and Eugene Nida (1963:257) observe:

It is significant that the worship services of Pentecostal groups among the lower socio-economic classes frequently take the form, not of reserve and solemnity, but of freedom and a fiesta spirit. The people are sometimes reminded specifically that their worship is to take the form of a fiesta of joy and gladness. . . . an atmosphere is created in which the church fellowship becomes the place where people expect to "open up" in the presence of one another.

A major unanswered question is whether or not the Mexican experience is typical of Latin America as a whole.⁴ Joseph Spielberg (1968:206-207), in his discussion of a small village in Guatemala, makes similar observations to Paz's comments about the Mexican. In discussing manliness Spielberg states:

Presenting oneself in a dignified manner is a vital concern of most adult villagers. Public slips of the mask of reserve and social distance are a source of great anxiety and even physical illness.

This is true of the marriage relationship as well which is characterized by "mistrust and suspicion."

The villagers feel that the lifetime continuity of any conjugal union is highly doubtful. Conjugal bonds therefore--like all other interpersonal relations--are approached with reserve and caution.
PART IV

PREACHING THE GOSPEL
"I can be a Christian only by ceasing to be an African." (Williamson 1965:145).

What an utterly tragic statement! If he ceases to be an African, what shall he be? A man without a culture? A Westerner? Is Western culture more Christian than African culture?

"Do not be conformed to this world," Paul exhorts in Romans 12. The value systems of all cultures have been corrupted by sin. There are some aspects of every culture that stand in opposition to the gospel. Note H. Richard Niebuhr's statement:

Ancient spiritualists and modern materialists, pious Romans who charge Christianity with atheism, and nineteenth century atheists who condemn its theistic faith, nationalists and humanists, all seem to be offended by the same elements in the gospel and employ similar arguments in defending their culture against it. (1951:5).

While it is true that every culture comes under the judgment of God, it certainly is not true that one has to become a cultural drop-out in order to become a Christian. Why did our African friend not make this statement:

"If I become a Christian, I will become a better African."

Unfortunately, the above issue is not a dead one, even in the 1970's--though it ought to be. Western ethnocentrism (the attitude that our culture is superior, that anything different is inferior or even sinful) combined with a semi-legalistic guilt-oriented expression of the gospel have produced a deadly dual distortion of Christianity in non-Western
cultures. There are numerous exceptions, of course, but the problem still remains even though many people are now somewhat aware of it. It is deep and pervasive; a superficial acknowledgement of the problem does not resolve it.

Many missionaries have succeeded in building Westernisms of all kinds into the national church. These range from materialism to denominationalism to theological formulations. A few years ago in a group Bible study, I asked a Christian from the Congo how a certain portion of Scripture applied to the religion of his tribe. To my surprise he gave a 100 per cent Western reply. He had been thoroughly indoctrinated in Bible school.

In this section we shall attempt, one, to establish the need for a new framework for the evangelistic message,¹ and, two, through ideas for sermons make some positive suggestions. The first part of this section will be rather negative and critical in tone; the second part will be positive and constructive.

The Need

How would you structure an evangelistic message to reach a person whose life is deeply affected by shame and honor? Daniel K. Inouye (1968: 227), a senator from Hawaii, tells the following personal story; Daniel, who was going into the army, was talking with his Japanese father:

"You know what on means?"

"Yes," I replied. On is at the very heart of Japanese culture. On requires that, when one man is aided by another, he incurs a debt that is never canceled, one that must be repaid at every opportunity. "The Inouyes have great on for America," my father said. "It has been good to us. And now
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it is you who must try to return the goodness. You are my first son, and you are very precious to your mother and me, but you must do what must be done. If it is necessary, you must be ready to . . . to . . ."

Unable to give voice to the dread word, he trailed off. "I know, Papa. I understand," I said.

"Do not bring dishonor on our name," he whispered urgently.

The thrust of this book is cross-cultural with attention directed primarily to non-Western cultures. In these cultures, by and large, shame is more predominant than guilt. Evangelism must reckon with this cultural fact if it is to be most effective. Effective cross-cultural evangelism must consider both the framework of the message from the sending culture and the cultural situation in the receiving countries. Western missions have encountered serious problems at both ends.

While recognizing the danger of piling all the weaknesses of Western missions onto an improper and overloaded use of a guilt framework in shame oriented cultures, I strongly feel that our preaching framework has contributed, to a significant degree, to superficial conversions and legalistic living. It is my contention that a sin-shame-Savior structure is more apt to probe the nature of sin deeper as well as contribute to a more personal and positive expression of Christianity. This is a rather broad claim so some time will be spent in an effort to demonstrate the deep need for changes in the preaching of the gospel.

Guilt: Inadequate Base For Morality

E. Mansell Pattison, a Christian psychiatrist, wrote an article on morality in which he demonstrates the inadequacy of a superego-guilt basis of morality. While the superego and guilt have a proper and necessary
place in morality, an overreliance on the superego-guilt approach
focuses too much on prohibitions and rules, and leads to a neurotic
legalism. This has too often been the basis of evangelistic preaching
and theology.

Morality, according to Pattison (1967:66) is not primarily "a
question of prohibitions, but rather the values and definitions of
appropriate behavior by which man governs his behavior." The key part
of the personality which contributes to a positive and personal standard
of morality is the ego ideal. Briefly, Pattison (1967:66-67) defines the
ego ideal as "that agency of the self which produces shame" and as the
"various aspects of the affirming, loving, or approving counterparts to
prohibitive superego functions." A failure to live up to the values of
the ego ideal results in shame. If wrong values are fed into the ego
ideal, then it can mislead one's moral behavior.

Pattison (1967:70) lists four types of guilt.

1) Civil guilt which "is arbitrary and impersonal. It is the
violation of objective rules. Such guilt may or may not be
related to morality."

2) Psychological subjective guilt feelings related to the superego.

3) Existential ego guilt which "is a violation of relationship be-
tween man and man. . . . Existential ego guilt is ultimately a
reflection of man's denial of his values and commitments. . . .
is not a feeling but is a situation." (Italics mine)

4) Ontological guilt which "may be understood in theological terms
as original sin, that is, man's basic responsibility for his
life and behavior. . . . a reflection of man's awareness of what
he is."
To me, what Pattison calls existential ego guilt is shame at its deepest level. Note that his primary emphasis is on violation of relationship rather than feeling. In one sense the state of shame (as contrasted to an experience of shame) may be related to or even based upon ontological guilt. See chapter five for the discussion of the fall.

Pattison (1967:70) observes that "psychotherapists have for the most part concerned themselves with reducing guilt feelings, but ignored the existential guilt situation." Too often evangelicals have also attempted to resolve existential ego guilt and ontological guilt in terms of guilt feelings related to disobedying the commandments. Sin is often presented in Old Testament terms—transgression of the law. Men are sinners because of something they have done. Get the acts of sin forgiven and everything is all right. This is part of the gospel, but not the core of the gospel. Too many disciples are enlisted under the banner of cheap grace. Sin is superficially faced and thus the conversion and subsequent morality is shallow. Fertile ground for an impersonal legalism has been prepared. Dietrich Bonhoeffer has given us a devastating critique of Western Christianity which I believe applies to much of the evangelical wing as well. Hear Bonhoeffer (1963:45-46):

Cheap grace is the deadly enemy of our church. . . . Cheap grace means grace as a doctrine, a principle, a system. . . . In such a church the world finds a cheap covering for its sins; no contrition is required, still less any real desire to be delivered from sin. Cheap grace therefore amounts to a denial of the Living Word of God, . . . Cheap grace means the justification of sin without the justification of the sinner. (Italics mine)

And on page 93 Bonhoeffer pleads:

We must not do violence to the Scriptures by interpreting them in terms of an abstract principle, even
if that principle be a doctrine of grace. Otherwise we shall end up in legalism. (Italics mine)

What a poor product to export to the mission field!

Pattison (1967:71) continues:

The resolution of guilt feelings does not change the basic violation of relationship which is existential guilt. Patients would quite willingly settle for pacification of their superego, but are reluctant to undergo the pain of changing their pattern of relationship so that they no longer need to feel guilty! . . . One needs to face up to one's existential guilt. . . . Only when one has come to grips with the sort of person that one is can one hope to be a responsible moral person, instead of merely evading or placating one's superego. (Italics mine)

Pattison indicates that forgiveness for psychological guilt feelings tends to fit a punishment model. What is really needed is a reconciliation model which is more closely related to existential guilt.

Theologically guilt is primarily a legal term connected to the Old Testament law. Justification by faith continues this legalistic framework. It is a correct and helpful way to express the gospel to a mind oriented in this direction. Thus Paul explained the gospel to the Jews in these terms. Reconciliation is an equally Biblical term which is more personal, stresses relationships, and fits the strong shame emphasis of the Bible better. For cultures without an understanding of Old Testament law, reconciliation is a much better emphasis than justification. At the very minimum reconciliation should be used at least as often as justification.

Personal salvation is a foundation stone of the gospel, but if the gospel is conceived of solely in these terms it may quickly degenerate into a selfish gospel—a self-orientation in which a person's standard of
morality is focused largely upon himself rather than his treatment of
others, one that stresses not breaking the commandments so that people
will think of him as a good person, and so that he will make it to
heaven.

While there are numerous exceptions to the restricted love of evan­
gelicals, the best empirical data that we have tend to confirm that the
majority of evangelical Christians have warped attitudes towards social
issues and relationships with other people. Pattison (1966:8) writes:

The data reveal that evangelical Christians tend
to (1) allege humanitarian ideals yet consistently
have low scores on scales measuring humanitarian
concern, while scoring high on scales of rejection
and hostility toward others; (2) claim superior
moral conduct, but in tests actually behave the
same as agnostic and atheist peers in situations
of moral choice; (3) proclaim an ethic of love,
but on measures of social behavior favor punitive
and retaliatory methods of social control; and (4)
in studies on personal conscience reveal that for
them morality is a matter of hostile demand instead
of positive affirmation.

A study of Mexican Protestant social attitudes reveals the same con­
stricted sense of morality. William Wonderly and Jorge Lara-Braud (1967)
have reported on a survey of Protestant and non-Protestant attitudes in
Mexico City. While Wonderly and Lara-Braud found some positive features,
they felt that the most significant finds were:

that the differences in basic moral and social
attitudes among Protestants as compared with non-
Protestants are not as sharp as the former have
generally assumed. . . . There is a tendency to
interpret the "new life" or salvation in negative
terms, and consequently to weaken both the internal
spiritual vitality of the church and its witness to
the non-Protestant world . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
a tendency among Protestants to emphasize the exter­
nal aspects of Christian conduct, without sufficient
regard for inward transformation and fundamental
Christian ethics (Wonderly and Lara-Braud 1967: 1, 9). (Italics mine except for basic)

For some reason, and there are many and varied reasons, the quality of the average Protestant's religious life is not as sharply different from the world as the gospel indicates it should be. And what success there has been seems to have been primarily in preventing members from doing bad things rather than in encouraging them to do good things.  

I believe that one important reason for the low quality of Christian life among evangelicals is their overuse of the guilt approach and their neglect of the shame dimension in the proclamation of the gospel. The guilt approach which is essentially negative does have some success in preventing sins of commission, but it has limited success in preventing sins of omission. Sins of omission are failures, not transgressions.

West African Examples

Victor Uchedu (1964:114), a Nigerian, declares: "The social cost of transforming this 'shame-oriented' culture into a 'guilt-oriented' one is a form of deculturation." Unfortunately in many cases Western missions have been more successful in deculturation than in regeneration.

Ironically, in some cultures the arrival of Westernized Christianity has contributed to an increase in immorality; those who professed to be Christians were more immoral than the so-called pagans. The decline of aspects of the old culture such as fear of the traditional gods and spirits plus the brand of Christianity introduced, brought about an increase of immorality among the Anang of Nigeria. John Messenger (1959:100-101) believes that Protestants and Catholics both have promoted, unintentionally, an easy forgiveness concept among the Anang. One need not worry too much
about punishment for sin; the Christian God forgives if you confess, reasoned the Anang. Protestant ministers stressed the sinfulness of man and justification by faith. Little was said about repentance, restitution, or the necessity of good works following conversion.

Much the same thing happened among the Christian Zulu of South Africa. Illegitimacies increased among the Christian girls. The traditional ways of teaching about sex were opposed; no successful substitute was achieved. The unintended result was ignorance coupled with a negativistic legalism which was not as successful as the traditional "pagan" ways (Vilakazi 1962:47-59).

Walter Trobisch (1961a), a sensitive Lutheran missionary to the Cameroun, has written extensively on sex and marriage problems in Africa. In an article entitled "Church Discipline in Africa," Trobisch asserts that a legalistic, non-Biblical approach to church discipline may be the first significant heresy to arise from African Christianity. He regards this as a very serious matter. Trobisch says that the African culture lends itself to a legalistic handling of sin because Africans take great pleasure in the endless arguments and counter-arguments of their trials. He appears to put the primary blame on African culture including its social shame orientation that something is wrong only if one gets caught.

A lesser but important reason, according to Trobisch, is the legalism of Western Christianity. This is most evident in the area of sex and marriage—the very area where most matters of church discipline occur. Approximately 95 per cent of church discipline decisions involve adultery. Trobisch (1961a:202) notes:

I am convinced that the preponderance of church discipline in Africa can be traced back to an
essential weakness in proclamation of the gospel. What Africa needs today is a positive message about marriage. . . . In no other area do missionaries and Africans so fail to communicate with one another as in the area of marriage. (Italics mine)

To obtain a full picture of Trobisch's excellent insights into the failures of the missionaries and the African church in the area of sex and marriage, and some excellent positive steps to remedy the situation, read the series of articles by him in Practical Anthropology (1961; 1961b, 1962, 1966a, 1966b). Trobisch (1962:13) states:

The contribution of Christianity to the premarietal sex problem is seen by the African youth as a matter of law. Instead of meeting Christ as their personal Redeemer, they meet the church as a spying, judging, and punishing authority. (Italics mine)

An African does not feel guilt when he commits sexual sins, according to Trobisch (1961b:260); he only feels shame. Trobisch implies that this is a serious lack, and that one could never establish a morality based on shame. However, it seems to me that it might be better to try to deepen the sense of shame, than to try to introduce the alien concept of guilt. The guilt centered approach tends to be interpreted in terms of law thus resulting in legalism more than grace. If Africans had a tendency to be legalistic, Western Christianity certainly re-enforced this weakness. A Biblical Christianity should have solved the problem.

Williamson (1965:141) states that the Akan have great difficulty understanding the concepts of sin and grace.

Christianity speaks of man's need, salvation from sin, and of God's redemptive acts. This evokes no significant response in the Akan, and among good Christians in the Church there is slight appreciation of these truths.
Even theological students find these ideas difficult to grasp. Possibly the Akan would understand the gospel better if it were expressed in terms of honor and shame, of sin in terms of disruption of social relationships and as an insult against God. Western theological formulations are not the only valid way to express the gospel, but such formulations, Biblical as they may be, have become so identified with the gospel that many Western Christians cannot think of Christianity in any other terms. There are other Biblical ways!

Traditional Akan society categorized wrong-doing in two ways; social wrongs and religious wrongs. Only religious wrongs, offences against ancestor spirits and gods, were labelled sin. The church did not reorient this religious concept of sin; instead the church treated it as superstition and tried to eradicate it. Then the church stressed social wrongs and defined these as sins against God. The important sins have been stated in terms of "the ethical requirements found relevant in western Christian society." (Williamson 1965:145).

Williamson (1965:150-151) continues:

The convert was touched at superficial levels, apprehending his new faith in terms of catechetical statements, and a certain number of obligatory practices, and too rarely appropriating it as the answer to his deepest spiritual needs.

Williamson (1965:171-172) summarizes:

What passes for Christianity, as so many understand it, is disbelief in gods and fetish, membership in the Church, payment of its dues, and obedience to its regulations. . . . Since this approach is largely negative, it follows that in times of personal crisis it is unlikely as a faith to support the Christian member tempted to relapse into traditional practices. . . . Their lives show the impact not so much of the Christian faith per se, as of an invading westernism.
which includes an association with the Church.
(Italics mine)

These highly disturbing comments represent the mature judgment of a missionary scholar who has wrestled with such problems for many years.

If the previous discussion is correct, then the restructuring of the evangelistic message is of the greatest importance. (Of course, the type of follow-up and fellowship in the church is of equal importance; this will be covered in the following chapters.) Shame demands transformation for a solution. Being cannot be forgiven; it can only be changed. Terms like repentance, which demands a basic change in attitude, and reconciliation, which insists on a basic change in the pattern of personal relationships, are deeper than terms like justification, which refers to what we have done in the sense that we are no longer guilty before God. All are involved in becoming a Christian, but what is needed is a change in emphasis to avoid expressing the gospel of grace in legalistic terms, or at least leaving this impression with the hearers.

Evangelistic Cautions

Avoid Implications of Deculturization

To become a genuine Christian a person must forsake the sinful values of the world. The evangelist should make this clear. Yet this point can be easily misunderstood and become a stumbling block to conversion.

The Japanese have not been very responsive to Christianity. It is estimated that only one-half of one per cent of the population are Christ-
ian in any sense of the word. Rev. Dominic S. Fukahori (1962:12) attempts to explain why:

Buddhism and Shintoism have virtually invaded every possible phase of Japanese culture. The Japanese must live according to these customs, or religiously, despite the fact that he has very few religious convictions of his own. . . . Any religion teaching ideas which are in opposition to Japanese culture are met with strong opposition. . . . There is great national pride among the Japanese for their customs and culture and any attempt to change them is regarded as an insult.

For a Japanese to turn against his culture would be an act of dishonor. Since the concept of honor is so strong, this traitorous act would bring a strong sense of shame to the individual. The evangelist will have to make it crystal clear that becoming a Christian will make a person a better Japanese. He will actually be a better citizen and a better father. Here one should be specific and list the things in the Japanese nation and family life that a Christian could support. Back this with examples of outstanding Japanese Christians who have contributed to Japanese development. Stress the characteristics of integrity and honesty. Use personal testimonies highlighting the differences, the improvements, after a family became Christians.

It is not the wisest procedure to attack another religion or culture. A missionary from a "superior" culture may unwittingly imply the inferiority of the national culture. Ignoring the national religion, especially when the majority of adherents only go through the forms of it without much personal commitment, may be the best approach. While the apostle Paul never compromised the gospel, his major thrust was always positive. Paul's sermon at Athens could serve as a model at
this point. He pointed out what was missing in Athenian religion, and where possible he quoted men from their culture to reinforce some of his main points. With the Japanese the evangelist will have to be supersensitive at this point. In a dozen different ways he will have to make it clear that he is not attempting to introduce a superior foreign religion to replace the "inferior" Japanese religion. The evangelist must communicate the fact that he is the humble representative of God to all men.

If the evangelist implies that deculturalization is necessary in order to become a Christian, then the principles of honor and shame will be working against him. If the evangelist primarily stresses the positive factors of Christianity, honor and shame will be working for him. The hearers will make their own comparisons, and if they are honest they will see that their life does not measure up to what it ought to be. Shame will push them towards the honorable values of Christianity.

Avoid Unnecessary Shame Situations in Conversions

It is true that Jesus Christ said that if a person is ashamed of Him before men, He will be ashamed of them in heaven. Sometimes this verse is applied to the decision making time at conversion. The primary impact of this verse is for the one who is already a Christian. One must avoid making it unnecessarily difficult for the sinner who does not yet have the grace of God in his life. Shy persons or even average persons who are seriously considering the claims of Christ upon their lives, may avoid making that decision because of the potential (possibly just
imagined) social shame involved. Why complicate the conversion decision by introducing unnecessary factors?

During an evangelistic campaign in Taiwan the evangelist noted that there was little response. He was puzzled because through past experience he had found young Chinese soldiers fairly responsive. The evangelist asked questions and found out that the presence of officers on the platform was inhibiting the enlisted men. The enlisted men felt that they would lose face if they acknowledged that they were sinners in front of their officers. The evangelist arranged for the removal of the officers from the platform during subsequent meetings. Immediately more soldiers began to respond to the invitation to accept Jesus as their Savior. Such an approach is not an attempt to make it easy to become a Christian; it is an attempt to avoid making it unnecessarily hard.

High pressure evangelism may misuse the shame motivation resulting in spurious conversions. Loewen (1965b:15) writes of a situation in Columbia as follows:

Many of the people, who had responded to the missionary's altar call out of sheer politeness, had been seriously embarrassed by the premature commitment they had made. . . . Now their embarrassment prevented them from returning to the chapel.

Evangelists would be wise to be very clear about what an invitation to accept Christ involves. Billy Graham is very careful to tell his audience just exactly what is going to happen, even to the extent that whoever brought them will wait for them. By removing all possible extraneous fears of getting involved in some unknown situation which might prove to be very shameful, one can help the individual concentrate on
making a spiritual decision based on the real issues. Satan loves to confuse the issue by suggesting side issues, and especially that a person will somehow make a fool of himself.

Evangelists might also be wise to provide in a clear manner alternate human situations to accept Christ. Possibly hand out cards to make it easy to make a personal appointment with the evangelist. The evangelist should make it clear that he wants to help, not high pressure, because people shy away from high pressure situations due to the potential embarrassment involved.

After a person accepts Christ then shame and honor can work to help a person keep his commitment. Close fellowship with like Christians will build his sense of honor and loyalty. He knows that he will bring dishonor to himself, his Christian friends, and to Jesus Christ if he openly practices sin again.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

SERMON SUGGESTIONS

To give some positive follow-through to the previous criticism of evangelical preaching, I would like to suggest some sermon themes using the idea of shame in order to emphasize a more personal gospel. Only key Scriptures and basic ideas will be given; occasionally an illustration or quotation will be included, but by and large the reader will have to fill in and illustrate.

The Glory and Shame of the Cross

**Person of the cross**

Heb. 12:2 "Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, . . ."

Heb. 2:9 "Jesus, . . . crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for every one."

Jesus, the Person who transformed the cross from an instrument of punishment and shame to an instrument of love and glory, wishes to make the same dramatic transformation in your life.

**Purpose of the cross**

John 12:27-34 (context)

12:32 "And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself."
The shame of the cross involves what man did. Only self-centered rebels would kill an innocent man who loved them and revealed the power of God. The glory of the cross involves what God did. Only love would ask forgiveness for enemies while they were engaging in crucifixion. Love takes the initiative to reconcile; it will go to all necessary lengths, even to death.

The glory of the cross is completed when men respond to the offer of reconciliation and are transformed. To refuse such a gift bought at so great a price would be as shameful as having participated in the crucifixion. The glory and shame theme provides a sharp contrast and it vividly points up the great need for reconciliation.

John 17:1-5 is excellent background Scripture. A suggested hymn: "In the Cross of Christ I Glory" or "Beneath the Cross of Jesus" noting the following phrase 'My sinful self my only shame. My glory all the cross.' "The Old Rugged Cross" has two references to shame.

Freedom: Wine (spirits) versus Spirit

Eph. 5:18 "And do not get drunk with wine, ... but be filled with the Spirit."
Acts 2:4 "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit."
Acts 2:12,13 "And all were amazed and perplexed, saying to one another, "What does this mean?" But others mocking said, "They are filled with new wine."
Acts 2:15 "For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, ..."

Alcohol

A major reason why people drink is so that they can be released
from personal and social inhibitions, and express themselves freely. According to Harrison M. Trice (1966:vi) "emotional expressions are effusive and free. The ego is exposed, unprotected." (Italics mine) "Alcohol functions as a facilitator of social exchange." (1966:viii).

Alcohol does give the drinker a certain type of freedom. Some of these expressions are quite harmless. But alcohol also enables a person to do things he normally would be ashamed to do. For example, drinking creates the climate for much premarital and extramarital sexual activity. The unscrupulous male knows he is much more apt to get a girl to yield if she has been released by alcohol.

**Holy Spirit**

All men need to have times of freedom and expression. Psychologically, it is healthy to be in situations where we can expose our real selves. Life is meant to be open and joyous. One can really only be open and joyous with those he trusts. Since men really cannot trust each other in daily life they partially withdraw and become inhibited. The Holy Spirit can free man from himself. Spirit-intoxication is our need. We need to have the Spirit overwhelm us. Note the highly descriptive phrases used to describe the coming of the Holy Spirit into a person's life in the book of Acts. 1:5 baptize; 2:4 filled; 2:17, 18 pour out; 2:33 promise; 2:38 gift; 4:31 filled; the result was unusual boldness to witness; changed people, free, open and unafraid; 8:15-20 receive, gift, fallen, given, receive; 10:44-47 fell, gift, poured out, received; 19:1-6 receive, baptize, came on.

Alcohol gives temporary freedom without control. Result: shameful
acts committed under the influence of alcohol and the feeling of shame after it is all over. A temporary release from shame. The Spirit gives permanent freedom with control. Result: joy, acts of praise, love, with no later letdown. Man needs freedom. How shall he obtain it? A chemical counterfeit or a Spirit invasion.

Dead Idols versus Living God

Isa. 42:17 "They shall be turned back and utterly put to shame, who trust in graven images, who say to molten images, "You are our gods."

Ro. 9:33 "He who believes in him will not be put to shame." See also Isa. 44:1-24; 45:16, 17; 49:23; Jer. 3:24, 25; 10:1-16.

Weakness of idols

Jer. 10:5 "Their idols are like scarecrows in a cucumber field, and they cannot speak; they have to be carried, for they cannot walk. Be not afraid of them, for they cannot do evil, neither is it in them to do good."

Idols are the work of man. Idols cannot see, hear, or think. Why should a man bow down before an idol, a block of wood or stone he has made? What a disgrace! Use illustration of Elijah on Mt. Carmel to illustrate the difference between dead idols and the living God. False prophets trusted in Baal. No answer. Baal let them down, put them to shame.
Strength of the all-seeing God

Jer. 10:6  "There is none like thee, O Lord; thou art
great, and thy name is great in might."

Present the Creator God, all-knowing, all-powerful. Sees all,
everything you have done. Jer. 23:24 "Can a man hide himself in secret
places so that I cannot see him? says the Lord. Do I not fill heaven
and earth? says the Lord." You may think no one knows what you have
done in secret, because no man has caught you. God knows. God has
caught you. Some day you will stand before God. Everything you have
done will be brought before you. Will you be ashamed? A saying from
Ghana: "The balance of the weights of judgment knows no shame; it
strips naked in the light of the sun even the shy self of the mother-
in-law."

Use Heb. 4:12, 13 "... And before him no creature is hidden, but
all are open and laid bare to the eyes of him with whom we have to do."

We need to see ourselves as we really are. This is a function of shame
under the Holy Spirit and the Word of God. We are clearly exposed and
identified as sinners. A fat woman tells about her first exposure to a
TOPS meeting: "At that meeting I realized that what was so humiliating
to me was my size. The shock of seeing all that flesh in one small room
finally forced me to identify with fat women. For the first time I
really wanted to reduce. Suddenly I know that this time nothing could
stop me!" Lay stress upon the thought that God sees and knows all. This
is a crucial point because in many cultures you experience shame only if
you get caught. (I am not sure that this type of statement is entirely
correct; on the surface it seems to be so, at least to a Westerner.) The
Holy Spirit will reinforce this emphasis and men will feel conviction because they will realize that God knows the truth about them. End with a positive emphasis that if you trust God, obey God, that you will have no need to fear Him. His all-seeing eye will guide you. You will never be put to shame if you trust God.

From Sin and Shame to Trust and Love

Ro. 3:23 "All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God."

Mt. 22:37-39 "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. . . . You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

Sin

Here sin is pictured as a failure, a coming short of the mark which is the glory of God. Why did God create man? For fellowship and for man to praise and glorify God. Sin is telling God I do not need you. I want to run my own life. It is like doing something which brings disgrace to your father and mother. If it is serious you may be disowned. Out of this type of attitude flows acts of selfishness. Thus a person steals, lies, commits adultery. A person has done wrong when he has done these things, but not just because he has broken a law. The real wrong is that these acts hurt other persons. This may seem obvious, but too often sin is thought of in terms of some bad act a person does and the effects of that act upon him, rather than the effects of that act upon another person.
Repentance

This attitude is revealed in the way we seek forgiveness. Most Christians ask God for forgiveness for the act of sin. They seldom go to the party they have offended and ask their forgiveness. Preachers seldom talk about restitution. The first thing Zacchaeus, the cheating tax collector, did was to promise to restore fourfold to those he had defrauded. Here is genuine repentance. Here is concern for the person sinned against, not just our escape from the consequences of our sin. Restitution is painful; possibly this is why it is avoided. It is an open exposure of the way we have treated another person. Since we have to face the person we have sinned against, the shame factor will be allowed to do its full work. We will really think twice before committing that sin again. Personal restitution is not always possible due to time or geographical factors, but where possible it should be done.

Guilt focuses upon the act of sin done; shame focuses upon the personal relationship that has been disrupted. Usually the personal relationship factor involves both God and man; always God and almost always man. Man is created in the image of God. When a man sins against another man, he is insulting God the Creator as well as the other man. The essence of sin is missing the mark—failing to love, failing to trust, failing to respect other persons and God. The act of transgression is the outward manifestation of our attitude failure. The law was meant to be a mirror, to show us what we really are, but most people do not allow it to go that far. For most people the law contributes to a legalistic rather than a personal definition of sin. Harold Blake Walker (1968) has written:
If we do get around to considering ourselves we are inclined to skate around on the edges of our self-deception. A perceptive Roman Catholic priest described his experience listening to the confessions of nuns by saying, "It's like being stoned to death with popcorn." So we focus on the 'popcorn;' the little sins, while we miss the thunder of our own self-centeredness.

Restoration

Acknowledge what you are, and what you have done. You must repent—have a radical change of attitude about yourself, your sin and its effects on others, and your rebellious attitude towards God. You must humble yourself before God and man and admit your forlorn condition. This is not easy. It brings shame when we admit and expose what we are and what we have done. But there is no easy way, no short cut. God will forgive us and restore us again as His sons just as though we had never rebelled against Him. How great is the love of God!

Confusion of Face versus the Righteousness of God

Daniel 9:3-19, especially 3-8.

Relationship

Daniel prayed with "fasting and sackcloth and ashes" indicating seriousness, shame, and repentance. "O Lord, the great and terrible God, who keepest covenant and steadfast love with those who love him and keep his commandments, . . ." (Daniel 9:4). The emphasis is on trusting personal relationships based on love. The covenant relationship could be the theme of a sermon on the type of relationship that should exist between God and man with the history of Israel serving as an example of
both broken and kept covenant relationships. Shame could readily be worked into the pattern of broken relationships.

Rebellion

"We have sinned and done wrong and acted wickedly and rebelled, ..." (Daniel 9:5).

This is a clear cut confession. More was involved than just breaking the law. There was a personal rebellion against the "great and terrible God."

Result

"To thee, O Lord, belongs righteousness, but to us confusion of face, ... because of the treachery which they have committed against thee." (Daniel 9:7). Disorientation, shame, dishonor, disgrace are the results of recognizing and confessing the rebellion. Man cannot look God in the face when he has been disloyal. Just as a naughty child looks down at the floor--avoids eye contact--when he has done something wrong.

Request

"O Lord, cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary, which is desolate. O my God, incline thy ear and hear; open thy eyes and behold our desolations, ... we do not present our supplications before thee on the ground of our righteousness, but on the ground of thy great mercy. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; ..." (Daniel 9:17-19).

The rebel has no grounds for dictating the terms for reconciliation. He is at the mercy of the one who remained righteous. Forgiveness is a
gift given on the basis of love. The offer of forgiveness indicates that the desire for a restored relationship is greater than the offense which separated the parties. The condition is a genuine desire for the restored relationship (repentance) and an open confession (exposure of what a person is) of rebellion and the sins that followed. The shame connected with the full exposure of the seriousness of the rebellion is apt to act as a preventive measure to keep the same thing from happening again and again. For a powerful example of a group conversion see G.F. Vicedom's (1962) description of the conversion of a New Guinea tribe. Through vivid ceremonies repentance and turning to God were publicly demonstrated.

Prodigal Son and Reconciling Father

Luke 15:11-32

Prodigal son

Younger son was openly selfish; he thought he could find happiness in riotous living. A famine arose and with his money gone the prodigal son was poverty stricken. He was given the lowest of jobs—feeding swine. He was so hungry that he could have eaten the pods the swine were eating. This must have been an intensely humiliating experience. Often it takes a shattering experience of some kind before we honestly look at ourselves and see ourselves as we really are. This is the real purpose of shame—to force an exposure of ourselves. The prodigal said to himself that he would go and be his father's servant and say to his father, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you." Genuine
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repentance. He knew he had no grounds to try and come back as a son. He was at the mercy of his father. ¹

**Father**

His father still loved him as a person in spite of what he had done. Love prompted immediate forgiveness with a joyous reconciliation. In cultures where there is little sense of personal responsibility outside the family, lineage or clan, possibly one can by analogy create the concept of responsibility and honor to God as Father. God created man. Man rebelled. The death of God's Son on the cross was to pay the penalty of sin which is death. In a sense we are all responsible for the shame and suffering of Christ on the cross. The honorable thing to do would be to acknowledge to God what we have done and seek his forgiveness and reconciliation. If one does not do this when he dies and appears before God, God will have to turn His face away and exclude him from his heavenly family. You will lose more face then than you ever have lost here on earth. And you will have to live forever with similar shameful people. II Cor. 5:16-21 could be used with its emphasis on reconciliation.

**Elder Son**

One could use the resentment of the elder to illustrate that a legally-obedient son may be a "bad" sinner. The elder son was attitudinally selfish. True honor of one's father must come from inner love, not outward obedience only. Outward obedience may avoid most social experiences of shame. But someday some experience will come which will
expose your inner attitude to all. Even if this does not happen, God sees and knows your selfish attitudes.

Rebellion and Reconciliation

Gen. 2:15-17, 25; 3:1-13

See the chapter on the Scriptures and shame for an extended commentary on the role of shame in the fall of Adam and Eve.

Rebellion

The fall is not described in theological terms, but in common terms of persons and their relationships to each other. God tested Adam and Eve to see if they would be voluntarily obedient to Him. They failed the test, experienced shame, and then tried to hide from God. They were exposed as rebels, and thus they were separated from God. Fromm's insightful observation might be repeated here: "The awareness of human separation, without reunion by love, is the source of shame." And Lynd's comment that "a person who is unable to love cannot reveal himself." Since Adam and Eve men have been afraid to reveal themselves. Harold Blake Walker (1968) says:

Our private thoughts reveal us far more adequately than our public affirmations. Often we are unhappy with the private thoughts that expose ourselves to ourselves. The biographer of Jean-Jacques Rousseau notes that Rousseau could not "face himself with himself," and when anything threatened to bring him to the necessity of seeing himself "he quickly looked away."

We are pained by the necessity of viewing ourselves honestly. Dennis the Menace once looked at himself in the mirror as he tried on a new suit and remarked, "If it was anybody but me, I'd die laughing." When we see self-deception and pretense in others we are
inclined to laugh, but when we see them in ourselves we look the other way.

A pessimist once wrote "that instead of men aiming to advance in life with glory they should calculate how to retreat out of it without shame." (Lynd 1958:63). Or should they throw their values to the winds and become shameless persons. The real options of this life are not very pleasant when God is left out of the picture.

Selfishness breeds isolation. Sinners do have some fellowship with others sinners, but the real meaning of life is lacking. Selfishness is not a solid basis for fellowship. Even families, which provide the best opportunity for human love, are often torn with discord. See Lynd's (1958:69) comments about the pervasiveness of alienation, loneliness, and isolation in modern society. Lynd (1958:70) states:

Protection against isolation and the difficulty of communicating such experiences as shame may take the form of impersonalization and dehumanization. If I cannot communicate with others, then I will at least not risk openness. I will deny the possibility of openness; I will protect myself against it.

Reconciliation

Since this theme has been discussed some in other sermon suggestions, it will not be elaborated upon here. God so earnestly wanted the fellowship of His creation that He immediately started planning a way to reconcile man back to Himself. Use II Cor. 5:16-21 in explaining the death of Christ on the cross. Use Rev. 21:1-5 and 22-27 to present the restored harmony in heaven. An eternity of love and loyalty with God our Creator through Jesus Christ the Lamb.
Success versus Failure

By using examples from the Scriptures plus illustrations from life, portray God's standards for success and failure. Possibly compare Judas, who had every opportunity for success, but ended up betraying Christ, and then in shame and remorse committed suicide, with Paul, who started out life a zealous failure persecuting the church, but later became an outstanding success as a leader in the church. To be honest note that this success included persecution along with love and joy.

Shame-Guilt Theme

Use Ezra 9:6-7 which ties sin, shame, and guilt together. One might use both shame and guilt in the same message putting a greater emphasis upon one or the other depending upon the cultural situation. Additional information on the shame-guilt theme can be found in Tournier's book Guilt and Grace. The following two quotations are from Guilt and Grace; others can be found on pages 10, 11, 12, and 40.

By resolutely multiplying opportunities for minor guilt, we try to make ourselves sufficiently familiar with the emotion in order to be less subject to it in major cases, in which we are really ashamed because our true nature is then compromised (Tournier 1962:29). (Italics mine)

Thus money is the source of innumerable feelings of guilt and contradictory guilts at that. We feel shame because we lack money, we also feel shame at possessing it, at earning it. Many doctors have confessed to me that they cannot send off bills without a feeling of guilt (1962:34).

Evangelistic Message for Japanese

Ro. 10:11 "No one who believes in him will be put to shame."
**Person of Christ**

Before the Japanese would put their trust in Christ they would need to know something about Him as a Person—His teaching, His power, as seen in healing, casting out demons, and His control over nature. (The Japanese are strongly nature-oriented.) After they know something about Jesus Christ as the most unique Person who ever lived upon this earth, tie Him to a theistic concept of God as Creator. Then urge the Japanese to follow Him. Jesus said to His disciples, "Follow me." No complicated theological jargon; just a personal invitation to follow Christ.

**Work of Christ**

Then tell something more about why Jesus Christ came. Go back to the creation; it was good, perfect. Man had fellowship with God His Creator. No shame! Then the test of loyalty, love, and obedience. Man disobeyed. Elaborate on the concept of sin here based on the story of the fall. Illustrate by referring to the Emperor and the loyalty and relationship of the Japanese people to him. This would have validity as a historical illustration even if the Emperor has been downgraded today. Illustrate also by referring to Japanese loyalty to groups to which they belong and the shame of disloyalty.

Such disloyal behavior is very disgraceful; it dishonors God who created us. It breaks the close relationship man had with God. Now a barrier exists between God and man just as a barrier exists between a son and his father when a son brings disgrace upon his father or the family. Ruth Benedict (1946:222-223) comments:

In a culture where shame is a major sanction, people
feel chagrined about acts which Americans expect people to feel guilty about. This chagrin can be very intense and it cannot be relieved, as guilt can be, by confession and atonement.

Thus we need to talk about transformation, restored relationships, and regeneration. The world is now torn by such shameful behavior. Wars are fought for selfish gain. Sin has ruined God's perfect creation. What a tragedy! What can be done? **God has done something** to bring man back to Himself. Elaborate upon the role of the cross, noting the place of shame and glory, in making it possible for man to be restored to fellowship with God.

The Japanese are shame oriented so stress personal relationships in spite of Buddhist philosophy. Attempt to communicate the gospel in personal terms; do not use the religious terms of Shinto and Buddhism very much since their meanings are so different from those of Christianity. Instead of a frontal theological attack take the side door of personal relationships. Another emphasis might be to attempt to relate the shame-honor concept to God the Father-Creator, and indicate that the Japanese can get rid of the paralyzing fear of excessive concern for shame and can develop an open relationship with God based on honor. "No one who believes in him will be put to shame."
PART V

LIVING IN FELLOWSHIP
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UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

In the previous section the relationship between preaching and shame was explored. The intended function of shame was shown to be that of exposure and openness to the truth about oneself, his relationship to others, and to God. To become a Christian one must openly confess his need of God and as proof of his repentance he should where possible practice restitution. For the Christian life to be fruitful this same type of open life should be continued and developed, but unfortunately such a life seems to be the exception rather than the rule. In this section the relationship of Christian fellowship and shame will be investigated.

Education

The academic community is concerned with the factors involved in effective education. If education is considered to be more than just the accumulation of facts, then the role of values needs to be given high priority. David C. Epperson stresses the type of personal relationship situation which should exist if real learning is to occur. Epperson (no date:4) asserts that love is crucial which he defines as a "context of relationships in which each self does not feel the exclusive need to defend or serve the self and is free to discover the other person."

Epperson continues:

Education then becomes the process in which indi-
Individuals join together in a relationship that permits them to attend to that which really is. . . . Education differs from study in that it involves dialogue. Education then is social. Instruction as it is generally experienced in our educational system often becomes a monologue; it is not a genuine partnership in which curious individuals join together in the process of perceiving, considering, and deciding.

Finally, Epperson (pp. 12, 13) concludes:

When the dialogue occurs in the social context of a classroom, the risks are great and the stakes are high for the student to truly reveal himself by dropping his defences and being himself. My conception of education demands that the defences be dropped before a dialogue can occur.

John W. Gardner (1964:14) exhorts us to have the "courage to fail."

One of the reasons why mature people are apt to learn less is that they are willing to risk less. Learning is risky business, and they do not like failure. In infancy, when the child is learning at a truly phenomenal rate . . . he is also experiencing a shattering number of failures.

According to Epperson, then, open personal relationships are essential for genuine learning. Epperson emphasizes the crucial role of the teacher since he has more status and to a large degree can control the classroom situation. If the teacher is afraid to reveal himself in dialogue, then both students and teacher will handle truth at arm's length.

Psychiatry

Paul Tournier also stresses the crucial role of the psychiatrist in creating the right atmosphere for the patient. Tournier (1966:221) writes:

But these people who need your help are very shy. They are all afraid. Perhaps you too are afraid that conversion may go too deep, and you try to keep it in conventional channels. In order to become a confessor it
is above all necessary to maintain one's own contact with God through practicing confession oneself. I was the recipient of many confidences, but I heard few confessions until I myself had started along the road of complete confession. We practice confession ourselves, not only so as to be forgiven, but also so as to be ready to hear other people's confessions without feeling uneasy. For when the confession we are hearing calls to our minds the thought of a sin we have not confessed, we start thinking about ourselves, instead of devoting our whole-hearted attention to the person who is confessing. . . . one ought to choose one's confessor from among a thousand, or even ten thousand.

In his book The Person Reborn, Tournier reveals his own painful struggle of self-examination in grappling with his pride of being a champion of the truth rather than a lover of men. Once one of Tournier's patients wrote to him, "It is terribly hard to reveal to one's doctor the things that really lie at the roots of one's trouble, even when one knows what they are." (Tournier 1966:219). Tournier added that "the slightest breath of criticism on our part stops a person in his progress towards liberation."

Pastoral Ministry

If the teacher and the psychiatrist need to create with care the climate for effective relationships, certainly the minister needs to do no less. According to Tournier (1962:102) ministers as a whole tend to judge people too quickly; they do not allow people enough non-judgmental freedom to unburden themselves fully. Thus many persons prefer to go to a psychiatrist for help. Tournier (1962:124-125) suggests that one important reason for ministerial failure in counseling is the tendency to be moralistic. He notes that there is a widespread human
tendency, too often found in the church also, to focus on what he calls a guilt of doing rather than a guilt of being. The guilt of doing is quantitative, an objective measurement of guilt. The guilt of being is qualitative; it is all-embracing and stresses "the common awareness of human weakness which brings men together in a common repentance."

When the guilt of being predominates no longer do men sit in judgment of one another—the plane of legalistic moralism. But Tournier believes that most people read the Bible from the perspective of moralism. If such people had been present when the woman was caught in adultery and brought before Christ, they would have joined the self-righteous Pharisees in condemning her rather than forgiving her and looking at their own equal sin.

Tournier (1966:121-122) declares:

The drift of the Sermon on the Mount is not that of a recipe for freedom from guilt by meritorious conduct. Just the opposite—it is the shattering word which convicts of murder a man who has done no killing, of adultery the man who has not committed the act... of hypocrisy the man who was noted for his piety.

According to Tournier, the church at its best does proclaim the grace of God in a way that brings genuine release to men. This is especially true during the periodic revivals in church history. But in between these revivals the church gradually moves from grace to conformity to a standard. Tournier (1966:125) insists:

Judgment appears. Anyone who does not subscribe to certain standards is suspected of infidelity and hypocrisy... everyone... seeks to appear better than he is and begins to hide his faults instead of confessing them... Moralism has returned and with it the breath of the Holy Spirit is stifled. (Italics mine)
Tournier believes that this tendency to moralism is related to the painfulness of shame. He says that no one can bear to live with exposed guilt unresolved. So if men do not maintain open fellowship between one another and God, they move towards a diversionary and superficial approach to sin, a moralistic, legalistic concern with outward acts.

In order to have a healthy Christian fellowship, the church must put first priority on creating and maintaining situations which promote openness and honesty in daily Christian living. It must avoid like the plague and/or take radical steps to eliminate institutional, moralistic Christianity. Ministers must guard against handling the Scriptures primarily on a truth basis. Focusing on objective truth will overemphasize preaching (as contrasted to fellowship) and moralism (as contrasted to a love-personal relationship morality). We are not against the proclamation of Scriptural truth. Properly handled the truth sets us free. But the truth must be person oriented, not just abstract intellectual statements.

The institutional church lends itself to an impersonal Christianity. We are learning that such a church is no more effective than the big university is in personalized teaching. In both the lecture--monologue--approach to truth is primary. The minister to be most effective must engage in dialogue with his members. Genuine dialogue demands an openness on the part of both participants. They must present an honest image of themselves. They must discipline themselves to receive as well as give. According to Reuel Howe (1963:73):

Too many teachers reveal a need to be right, a need that keeps them from hearing what their fel-
low says, which in many instances may be the truth they really need to hear. Laymen often state that their ministers do not like to be questioned or challenged and that for this reason they do not feel free to enter into dialogue with them.

Missions

It is only through open relationships that we really get to know each other. Knowing is a full exposure of oneself to another—a personal sharing in full trust. Such openness has a risk involved for if such a relationship is not governed by love it can be brutal. Thus the marriage relationship can be either a heaven or hell on earth. The Biblical expression for sexual intercourse is "to know." Leslie Newbigin (1966:79) says the Biblical idea of knowledge in this sense is very personal—"the total mutual self-revelation and surrender of persons to one another in love." At this point it is tragic to discover that the greatest weakness of Christian missionaries in Africa is their "failure to love."

David Barrett, according to Reyburn (1970), engaged in a massive study of African independent or schismatic churches and found two key elements behind the rise of these independent churches, a very widespread phenomenon in Africa. One reason was Bible translation, and two, the failure to love—at least in terms meaningful to Africans. As the African was able to read the Bible in his own language, he often noticed a vast difference between Western Christianity and Biblical Christianity. So in large numbers Christian Africans divorced themselves from mission churches and started their own movements.

Western ethnocentrism and racism muffled the expression of love.
Love had motivated missionaries to go to Africa, often at great personal sacrifice, but many missionaries failed to practice adequately brotherly love which Barrett describes as the ability "to forgive and make allowances, to share and sympathize." There was a lack of "sensitive understanding in depth between equals, . . . no dialogue."

The truth may have been proclaimed in love, but it was not adequately lived in love. Of course, there were many exceptions to this general negative statement.

Among the Lengua Indians we find again a massive misunderstanding and thus failure on the part of missionaries. Jacob Loewen wrote an article entitled "Lengua Indians and Their Innermost" in which he probes deeply into the psychic nature of the Lengua of the Paraguayan Chaco. To me it seems that the Lengua culture was uniquely built upon personal worth as related to honor and shame. Loewen believes that some of the Lengua ideals for the innermost are "in harmony with the highest New Testament ideals on Christian character and godly living." Briefly, Loewen (1966:272) summarizes four similarities between Lengua culture and the New Testament.

1. . . emphasis on intent as primary over deed, . . .
2. . . respect for the "self" of others . . . "to love one's neighbor as oneself. . . ."
3. . . avoidance of force, argument and personal advantage. . .
4. . . interesting "koinonia" concepts and practices.
   . . . unlimited sharing of the necessities of life:
   . . . the submission to group discipline.

It would seem that the peace loving Mennonites who emphasized many of the same ideals in their interpretation of Christianity would have found close fellowship with the Christian Lengua. Instead friction and misunderstanding were common. When the Lengua attempted to practice
their ideals they were often accused of lying. Mennonites who had lived among the Lengua for thirty years still misunderstood them. One Mennonite said:

They are just plain ignorant and basically dishonest, . . . You can't trust these Indians nohow, not even the converted ones. Their heathen lying habit is so deeply ingrained in their nature that they cannot possibly tell the truth (Loewen 1966:252).

The Lengua, on the other hand, confided that it was very difficult to live with the Mennonites because of their unstable innermosts. "You can tell them a lie to try and keep them calm, but they get angry. So the next time you tell the truth, but they still get angry. They even get angry when you are quiet and don't say anything (Loewen 1966:261).

Mennonite morality was truth centered whereas Lengua morality was person centered. Mennonites were highly disturbed by what they interpreted as lying, but the Lengua were greatly disturbed by anger since it reflected on the worth of persons. Compared to Lengua morality Mennonite morality tended to be legalistic—related to a catalogue of sins.

The heart of the Lengua idea of the innermost is that . . . a good person will have a stable innermost and he will exercise great respect for the innermost of his fellows. He will not talk or act when his own innermost is "wavy" (unsettled). Negatively stated, he will avoid those things in speech and action that will disturb his neighbor's innermost. Positively stated, he will say or do those things that keep it calm (1966:258).

Whenever the innermost of a person is not respected, hurt results. There are four main causes of hurt: gossip, embarrassment, disapproval of behavior by others, and disregard of person. Loewen (1966:262) says
that the Mennonite version of Christianity "has helped increase both
the incidence of gossip and the potential for hurt." The list of
specific sins has served "as a ready yardstick to measure short-coming
and provide gossip material on the behavior of one's fellows." Embarr­
rassment greatly hurt the innermost; this is closely related to honor
for

... parents, embarrassed by some negative
behavior on the part of their children, have
disappeared from the community.... In the
case of marital infidelity, it was generally
the 'innocent' partner that was embarrassed
and who at once left the community.

Disapproved behavior was normally handled in a public manner. A
person confessed some one else's wrong behavior, not his own; for ex­
ample, a husband would mention the behavior of his wife. Loewen (1966:
265) comments:

Because of the mutual respect for the inner­
most, parents and children, husband and wife,
and relatives seldom air their differences in
a face to face encounter. If a problem is
brought into the open, it is almost always in
a public setting.

Sometimes the guilty party, the innocent party, and the one who
made the public announcement will all leave the community for a time.
When a church disciplines one of its members he will usually leave the
community for three to six months.

The fourth hurt was the disregard of person. For example, when
hired for work Lengua Indians expected to be treated and paid equally.
Differential treatment according to Western standards was considered
to be an insult to a person's worth.

The Lengua-Mennonite mission situation highlights the need for
more than a common sense well-intentioned approach to missions. The comparative legalism of the Mennonites plus the cross-cultural problems of communication prevented them from sensing and building upon the superior Lengua approach to morality.

If the Lengua and the Mennonites had met together in weekly small group experiences, they probably would have gotten to know each other as persons and cleared away many of their misunderstandings.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

THE SMALL GROUP

We all need small group relationships in which we can develop . . . honesty . . . so often there's the big leader out front, minister and laymen are far apart, and the leader feels the loneliness the worst of all. The church needs to break out of its bigness and come back together in honest, vital, loving groups (Milliken 1968:119).

The Church as Small Group

The New Testament church was more of a fellowship and a movement than an institution. Believers met for fellowship and worship in small groups in homes. They did not experience the negative effect of meeting in a separate church building with its resulting institutionalism. They did have church leaders of various kinds, but apparently not the professionalization of the clergy which tends to separate the clergy and laity today.

So in essence the early church was an informal small group movement saturated with warm personal fellowship engaged in effective personal witnessing. Much of what we today assume is essential to the church is unnecessary and probably detrimental for it takes much time and energy away from the real task of the church. When the Holy Spirit revives a congregation much of the new spiritual energy that is released is absorbed within the organized church.

Early Methodism, probably the most vigorous spiritual movement since New Testament times, was also based on small groups. John Wesley organized his new converts in societies. These societies were loosely formed
and voluntary; they were not a denomination. The societies were broken down into class meetings, which were small groups of not more than twelve, formed for spiritual fellowship, discipline, and mutual helpfulness. The small group was the core of early Methodism. Two high points of the history of the Christian church were built on the small group dynamic under the power of the Holy Spirit.

In modern American society, both inside and outside the organized church, the small group is being resurrected, sometimes with the blessing of the church, sometimes opposed by the church. But by and large the organized institutional church at best regards the small group as marginal to main ministry of the church. The more formal professional preaching centered morning worship service is still given first place.

Permanent Social Problems Ministries

In the society at large the small group under lay leadership has tackled some of our toughest social problems with success. Outstanding among such groups is Alcoholics Anonymous. AA does not allow professionals to run the organization. Yet almost any objective observer will admit that AA is far more successful than the professionals are in helping alcoholics. In fact, many professionals shun the alcoholic as hopeless.

Synanon, a more intensive 24 hour live-in version of AA, is one of the most successful groups in the rehabilitation of hard-core drug addicts. It is lay run and small group oriented. Within the context of trust and love, Synanon literally runs on truth and honesty. "We have to be honest to stay clean." (Yablonsky 1965:13). Everything is exposed. Attack therapy
sessions and extensive ridicule of drug oriented behavior are key elements of their rehabilitation process.² Information about a person is not kept secret; it is common property of the Synanon group. Many women addicts enter Synanon with fear that their inner world will be exposed. They appear hard and tough. After extended therapy often "a deep and sensitive person" is revealed with "unusual capacity for compassion and love."

John W. Drakeford (1969) has analyzed seven different lay organized small groups each of which deals with a social problem with the exception of Yokefellows. They are:

1) TOPS: for overweight people.
2) Recovery, Inc. for mental or emotional illness.
3) Yokefellows: for religious improvement.
4) Alcoholics Anonymous: for alcoholics.
5) Seven Steppers: for ex-convicts.
6) Daytop and Synanon: for drug addicts.
7) Integrity Therapy: for marriage problems.

Drakeford has summarized the underlying principles which these groups have in common. Briefly, these are listed as: "responsibility, high standards, slogans, lay leadership, confession, activity, modelling, and failure in success." (Drakeford 1969:118). Drakeford's book Farewell to the Lonely Crowd is an excellent introduction to the dynamics of lay oriented group therapy.³

Temporary Encounter Groups

Another aspect of the small group movement is the temporary encounter
group. Such groups may meet weekly for several months or for a long period of time such as a whole day or for a weekend.

The following description is based upon the book *Carl Rogers On Encounter Groups* by Carl Rogers (1970), a pioneer and veteran of the encounter group movement. The vocabulary of the book is obviously related to the concept of shame. Such words as the following are widely used: mask, reveal, expose, vulnerable, open, trust, risk, painful, and hurt.

At first participants are cautious in revealing themselves to the other members of the group. Slowly real feelings begin to emerge. Often the first feelings are quite negative. Rogers (1970:19) believes that deeply positive feelings are much more difficult and dangerous to express than negative ones. If I say I love you, I am vulnerable and open to the most awful rejection. If I say I hate you, I am at best liable to attack, against which I can defend.

As the group progresses and trust and love deepen, it becomes safer to reveal more and more of oneself. Participants often say that they reveal themselves more fully in the encounter group than they ever have in their own family setting. One person, in describing the closed life he lived, stated: "Nothing gets in to hurt me but nothing gets out." (1970:15). Another said, "this private self can feel worthless." (1970:15). Before long group members begin to realize that the more they reveal of their true self, the more accepted they become. Their fears of non-acceptance prove to be unfounded.

But the process of self-revelation is not easy. "The journey to the center of self" is often a very painful one (1970:20). One of the most
common statements is: "It hurts to talk about it." (1970:21). In this connection Rogers (1970:107-108) talks about the loneliness of man which is accentuated by the impersonality of today's culture. But Rogers claims that there is an even deeper loneliness:

>a person is most lonely when he has dropped something of his outer shell . . . and feels sure that no one can understand, accept, or care for the part of his inner self that lies revealed.

If such an exposed person does not find someone who responds in love, he may give himself over to despair. Life is meaningless, he feels. This is why some psychologists warn against a person becoming too open and vulnerable. But all of life is a risk. Playing it safe, remaining in one's shell, is not a good option. Many persons find that a small group designed for exposure and healing is a safe place to be open and vulnerable.

A common question is: does it last? Yes and No. Some lives are dramatically changed and the results carryover. Others seem to revert back to their old patterns of living rather quickly even when they desire to continue being an open person. Personally, I feel that it is rather unrealistic to believe that one intensive encounter group experience will forever resolve a person's inner problems. Life is dynamic, not static. We need new refreshing experiences. Even such a powerful experience as Christian conversion is not adequate to sustain a vibrant Christian life. Each week Christians are exhorted to gather together in the fellowship of the church for praise and encouragement.

Need for Self-Disclosure

Any good thing can be carried to an extreme. In some circles it is
now the in thing to have everything "out front." Exposure, honesty is it.

William Hulme (1965) notes that modern literature often features complete exposure of the negative elements in a character's life. This, of course, is supposed to reflect what real life is like. Hulme (1965:84) declares:

Frankly we needed this expose. Our examples of goodness were often phoney. We tended to sacrifice honesty for appearance. We defended a system more than truth. But like many reforms this drive for honesty has reached distorted extremes.

Because some people are overdoing honesty, does not mean we have to shy away from its tremendous benefits. It simply means that we have to use a little common sense in our handling of the issue.

Man needs to be exposed as the first step towards transformation and then continued fellowship. But there will always be tension between the need to conceal and the need to reveal ourselves. By far the greater danger is involved in concealment. For an extreme case, let us look at one explanation of schizophrenia cited by O. Hobart Mowrer (1961). An anonymous author, whom Mowrer calls Tim Wilkins, wrote the following based both on his own experience, his mother's four confinements in a mental hospital, and academic study. Traditionally schizophrenia has been called a break with reality. Wilkins (Mowrer 1961:86-87) says "schizophrenia psychoses originate in a break with sincerity." Wilkins continues:

Schizophrenia is the cultivation of a lie. . . . The real truth is that the schizophrenic is responsibly guilty for some crucial misdeeds. . . . His unethical defense mechanisms cause him deep shame and fear of loss of others' esteem. In addition,
the primary deeds—whose exposure and punish-
ment are avoided by the disease—are shame-
ful. . .

While most attempts at concealment are not this disastrous, self-
alienation in varying degrees is a common experience of man. Sidney
Horney believes that a person who is self-alienated has a diminish-
ed capacity for conscious experience, shows less concern for the needs
of the body, and a lessened capacity for experiencing feeling. The result
is that a person's "relation to himself has become impersonal." Jourard
continues his discussion of Horney's ideas. Self-alienation results in
an impairment in the ability to assume respon-
sibility for the self. The self-alienated per-
son is lacking in plain, simple honesty about
himself and his life.

Jourard (1963:158-159) then discusses various attempts to resolve
self-alienation through what he calls "pride-direction, conscience-
direction, authority-direction, other-direction, impulse-direction, and
finally, real-self-direction." Jourard asserts that only real-self-
direction is fully adequate. This requires voluntary self-disclosure
in a dialogue situation. "As he reveals himself to another, he is also
revealing himself to himself," says Jourard (1963:161). The most thor-
ough and honest introspection occurs as one dialogues with another person
who gives him honest feedback.

Voluntary self-disclosure is better than a spontaneous shame experience.
One usually reacts negatively to a shame experience which catches one off
guard. Voluntary self-disclosure is positive in purpose, picks the ap-
propriate time and persons, and thus reduces the pain of the shame involved.
One is more willing to undergo pain if one knows that there will likely
be positive benefits gained from the experience.

John Gardner, who is deeply interested in how to achieve self-renewal, points out the damage of self-concealment to the individual.

Human beings have always employed an enormous variety of clever devices for running away from themselves, ... More often than not we don't want to know ourselves, don't want to depend on ourselves, don't want to live with ourselves. By middle life most of us are accomplished fugitives from ourselves (1964:13).

Spiritually speaking, Francis Schaeffer (1968:129) also notes man's need for exposure. If a person does not voluntarily admit what and who he is, it becomes the Christian's responsibility, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to expose that person's bankrupt condition.

The Christian, lovingly and with true tears, must remove the shelter and allow the truth of the external world and of what man is to beat upon him. When the roof is off, each man must stand naked and wounded before the truth of what is.

Hopefully, such an exposed person will respond to the invitation to become whole in Christ. If he refuses, he will probably retreat further into his shell. There is a great need for exposure to be done in love, for as Jourard (1964:30) says, "love provides the optimum conditions under which man will disclose or expose, his naked, quivering self to our gaze."

Jourard (1964:43-44) discusses creative writing and declares that writing at its best is an act of love, especially when it flows freely from a person. The writer then "makes himself naked, recording his nakedness in the written word." Jourard declares that the open individual is the most creative writer. Disclosure, then, makes for the best psychological and spiritual health and the greatest productivity.
and creativity.

Disclosure Cautions

Small group fellowships in which participants reveal their needs to each other do not automatically achieve positive results. There must be a controlling objective purpose to keep such groups from degenerating into gossip sessions, cliques, or holier-than-thou clubs. Pure fellowship alone is too subjective; it may be alright for a short period of time, but it should soon be tied in to some objective goals and service of others. The East Harlem Protestant Parish found that small fellowship groups were most beneficial when personal sharing was combined with Bible study, prayer, and worship (Webber 1964:122). Bible study with a personal application has a dual function: it exposes the real issues of life in an objective way, and it presents Jesus Christ as a Person who can fulfill those needs and who can lead a person into authentic relationships with others.

Small group fellowships of the kind Keith Miller promotes achieve such openness, intimacy and acceptance so similar to that of the marriage relationship that precautions need to be observed to avoid possible sexual intimacies. Miller (1967:99) warns:

Any time a man or woman sets up a continuing relationship with a member of the opposite sex in an unstructured situation in which they are together privately, the chances of some kind of sexual involvement not taking place would appear to be small.

Thus individuals of the opposite sex should avoid further private fellowship outside the group no matter how spiritual their motivations. Better to have an ounce of prevention than a pound of tragedy.
Tournier (1966:222) says the same thing as Miller—that there is danger in the intimate situation of the confessor-confessee relationship. An improper love relationship may develop because it is so refreshing to find some one you can completely trust and to whom you can open your life. This is, of course, the very thing the confessee has been lacking in his or her life.

Another problem that arises in situations of open confession and fellowship is how much a person should say about sex problems. According to Norman Grubb (no date:35) this has been somewhat of a problem among some of the younger African churches. But Grubb indicates that the church leaders control such excesses that do occur by stopping the testimony and asking the speaker to use general descriptive terms, by giving general instructions on this point in church meetings, and by a quiet personal word of instruction at an appropriate time. Wise leadership can handle the problem of unwise public statements about sex matters without hampering public confession of sin and testimony of victory. Grubb feels that God is less shocked about such confessions than are some overly pious Christians.

Since there is increasing concern about nudity in our society, and since a few encounter groups include nudity (less than one per cent according to Carl Rogers), a few comments about nudity may be in order.

There is the seductive and exhibitionist side of nudity, but not all the modern emphasis falls in this category. Some seem to be trying to reverse the effects of the fall, and find the Garden of Eden innocence. One naked young man at the Woodstock festival explained, "I'm free this way. I've lost my ego." In man's desperate search for identity in this
confused age, many youth realize that the "wearing the mask" approach to life is not where it is at. So many are attempting to live the open life which for a small number includes nudity and for some hippies free sex.

For the serious searcher for meaning in life nudity is primarily symbolic; it is a physical expression of a psychological search for the honest open life. In some cases it might be a step towards further psychological openness. In other cases nudity may give a false sense of openness. Nudity is not essential to psychological or spiritual unmasking. In any case exposure alone, physical and/or psychological, is not enough; it is only a first step. Change, transformation, healing are necessary to change what we are.

Since nudity in itself does not resolve man's real problems, and since it is bound to be highly controversial and cause division, the church should not get involved in any such programs. Neither should it get too uptight about encounter groups that believe that clothing is a part of the mask that we wear, so that if we get rid of clothing we help people understand themselves better.

Do not let any side issues sidetrack the real benefits self-disclosure.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

POSITIVE RESULTS FROM SELF-EXPOSURE

A former colleague suggests that a counselor, in order to be helpful to a groping college student, must realize that the typical student goes through a cynical stage in which he is ashamed of some of the ideas that he previously held. He now regards these ideas as invalid. Being somewhat confused and disillusioned the student is wary of committing himself to anyone for fear of being disillusioned again. To be effective the counselor must humble himself, expose himself, before the student. He must bring himself down to the level of the student and reveal some of his own struggles and how he solved them.

Voluntary Self-Exposure: A Catalyst

Jacob Loewen has written an article whose title graphically illustrates the above point; it is entitled "Self-Exposure: Bridge to Fellowship." Loewen (1965c:49-50) tells of an example of unconfessed adultery by a leader of the Choco church. Weeks had gone by and the church had taken no action. The missionaries felt that something should be done for the sake of the church, but no opportunity had arisen. Finally, circumstances provided an opportunity to call a prayer meeting with three Choco Christians. Loewen (1965c:49-50) recalls:

At this prayer meeting the missionaries opened their own hearts and lives. They revealed to the Indian brethren that they undergo sex tension when they are away from their families for the summer. . . . Then they asked the Choco brethren whether Indians had this kind of problem in their lives, too. Before much else could be said, the leader under suspicion burst out, "I got involved
with one of my former wives."

As they decided to ask God for forgiveness, the other two Choco Christians voluntarily confessed some of their marital tensions. Then they collectively sought God's forgiveness and help.

Loewen's excellent article is filled with vivid illustrations which reveal how men wear masks to cover their real identity, and how a person can take the initiative to open avenues of fellowship by voluntarily sharing his life with others. Loewen (1965c:56) tells about a personal experience in which he had confessed his own problems in maintaining a consecrated life on the mission field. As a result a young man, who had just outwardly dedicated his life to God, grabbed Loewen and said, "You seemed a little less holy and so I thought I could talk to you about my sin."

In connection with his emphasis on self-exposure, Loewen (1965c:56) asserts:

Values are always best taught in the drama of life, not in preaching. . . . We can become like sympathetic priests. It will prevent us from casting the first stone at the person caught in shortcoming, because we will already be kneeling at the cross in repentance for our own weaknesses.

Loewen (1965c:50) concisely summarizes his key thoughts on self-exposure as follows:

1. That just as there is a gulf between God and man, so also there are barriers, gulfs, and walls of separation between man and his fellows.
2. That all men by nature as partakers of human culture are trained to wear a variety of masks to cover their true identity.
3. That missionaries, like other men, have learned to live with masks which will stand as a barrier between them and the nationals whom they want to serve.
4. That God in the incarnation of Christ has dem-
constrated that man needs a "human" sympathetic priest, one who has experienced and is willing to admit the pull of temptation and the limitations of the human flesh and nature.

5. That effective witness to others, especially to people in a different culture, will require an honest differentiation between the reality in one's daily life and in the ideal of one's profession.

6. That the honest facing and admission of the reality in one's life can often serve as a catalyst for a redemptive response in the life of one's brother.

Not many people have the courage, insight, or personal security to expose themselves deliberately to other people. But we do desperately need a few people who are willing to take the risk of being voluntary catalysts. Frank Buchman's approach was similar to Loewen's. Buchman called it "sharing for witness." Buchman states:

You don't know what to do with your sins. I use them. I drive them like a team of horses. They are my entry into the hearts of other people. Telling them how good I have been, and how well I have done, never impressed them much. Telling them honestly where I have failed often helps them to be honest about themselves. . . . That doesn't mean telling all about yourself all the time, in private or in public. That is wrong. Dead wrong. But you must learn to live free from the pride that is not ready to tell anybody anything about yourself if, in guidance, you see it will help him. Never tell anything to somebody else which involves a third party (Drakeford 1969: 10-11).

Confession

Compared cross-culturally, Americans are obsessed with privacy. But strangely enough, in some ways we are known as an unusually frank people. Our affluent homes provide luxurious privacy. The same zeal for privacy includes private confession—to the priest and the psychiatrist. Mowrer
(1964) believes that there are good reasons for using more public confession. He asserts that during the first four hundred years of the Christian church confession was commonly made in public. In the fifth century the practice of private confession began. Mowrer regards this development as a disaster for the church. He scorns secret confession to specialists. Instead he insists that confession must be made to the "significant others" in our lives. We must admit the "exact nature of our wrongs--and then get about the business of correcting them." (Mowrer 1967:106). Far more therapy occurs when a person confesses to significant others rather than to specialists.

Mowrer has had extensive experience in group therapy for mental patients. When a person in such a group makes an honest self-disclosure, "There is no attempt to condemn or forgive him. Instead, the emphasis is upon what the person is doing, here and now, by way of trying to become more honest and authentic." (Mowrer 1967:110). The focus is on the present development of the honest person rather than on the past history of the bad act. It is redemptive rather than legalistic. Somehow I feel that this idea gets to the heart of Jesus' approach to the woman caught in adultery. This person centered approach is of the greatest importance. I hope that Mowrer's comments help to clarify the issue.

A short sighted criticism of public confession is that people may gossip and criticize. Mowrer (1967:111) boldly declares that this is good for "if we have been behaving badly, one of the strongest incentives for change is to have the eyes of others upon us." As a by product of public confession, Mowrer notes that "persons who have become deeply open with a group find that their 'willpower' is mysteriously strengthened."
(Italics mine) Probably our past approach to willpower has been too individualistic as has been our approach to confession. The great weakness of American culture is excessive individualism whose tentacles reach into a vast range of behavior.

Finally, Mowrer concludes that talking is not enough. Restitution and action to change one's behavior must be a part of a total healthy approach to confession. Mowrer (1961:191) approvingly quotes from Life Together by Deitrich Bonhoeffer:

"Confess your faults one to another" (Jas. 5:16). He who is alone with his sin is utterly alone. It may be that Christians, notwithstanding corporate worship, common prayer, and all their fellowship in service, may still be left to their loneliness. The final break-through to fellowship does not occur, because, though they have fellowship with one another as believers and as devout people, they do not have fellowship as the undevout, as sinners. The pious fellowship permits no one to be a sinner. So everybody must conceal his sin from himself and from the fellowship. . . . In confession the break-through to community takes place. Sin demands to have a man by himself. It withdraws him from the community. . . . In confession the light of the Gospel breaks into the darkness and seclusion of the heart. The sin must be brought into the light. The unexpressed must be openly spoken and acknowledged.

Jacob Loewen has written extensively on the subject of confession. In his article "Confession, Catharsis, and Healing" Loewen (1969a) discusses the practice of confession in a wide variety of cultural settings. Then Loewen (1969b) analyzes the role of "Confession in the Indigenous Church." In a third article Loewen (1970) elaborates on "The Social Context of Guilt and Forgiveness." Loewen (1969b:117) quotes from Irving Hallowell regarding the Salteaux Indian attitude toward confession:

In our society, it is assumed that what is exposed will be held in absolute confidence, but among these
Indians the notion is held that the very secrecy of the transgressions is one of the things that makes them particularly bad.

Nationals of tribal cultures are often used to being frank and open, at least when compared to Americans. American missionaries are often shocked at the open confession of national Christians, and national Christians are surprised at the missionary's fear of such honesty. An African once commented: "How can I open my 'box' when the missionary's 'box' is not only closed, but has a lock on it." (Loewen 1969b:121).

The closed life is unhealthy psychologically and spiritually. The church, especially small groups within the church, should provide the atmosphere of trust and love where it is safe and healthy to engage in confession. If the church does not provide such opportunities, it may be guilty of producing some of the most psychologically and spiritually unhealthy people on the face of the earth. If the church holds up a high standard of conduct for its members, but does not provide a channel for handling failures, it pushes its members into hypocrisy and legalism. Legalism has a devastating effect on the sensitive personality. There may be some dangers of excess in confession (Loewen 1970:89-90), but these are insignificant when compared to the dangers of concealment.

Revival Through Openness

Keith Miller has written a religious best seller on the topic of self-exposure and open fellowship in small groups entitled *The Taste of New Wine*. The fact that this type of book became a best seller indicates the widespread hunger for such spiritual reality on the part of American Christians. Out of his own personal inner struggle Miller learned the
necessity of utter honesty in order to have a joyful Christian life. He noticed that this type of transparent honesty was rarely in evidence in most church activities. Instead most Christians were yielding to the social pressures of outward conformity. They were wearing pious masks hoping to impress people in the proper manner.

Miller decided to experiment with a small group to see if open confession and honest discussion of real needs could not enhance their relationships with Jesus Christ. Miller (1965:71) recalls the effect of that first small group experience:

As those eight weeks grew into two years, as we studied the Bible and shared our real lives, we found that we had never really known each other at all before the group started. We found that we had not been able to communicate because we were basically afraid of each other somehow and did not know how to reveal our true selves without being embarrassed.

Out of the intensely personal times of Christian fellowship Miller found a new dimension of Christian living, a new freedom in Christ, and a much more authentic relationship with fellow Christians. People are hungry for this type of spiritual fellowship, but most churches spend most of their time in a more formal handling of the truth. What a tragic reversal of priorities!

In the early 1950's Norman Grubb (no date) wrote an account of the continuous revival that had been going on in East Central Africa for sixteen years. Grubb indicates that he used to believe that revival could only come through sovereign outpourings of the Holy Spirit. All that man could do was pray. Now Grubb realizes that God is always ready to pour out His Spirit. The key to revival is man's willingness to allow a horizontal moving of the Spirit from his life to others. Grubb (pp. 15-16)
declares that an attitude of brokenness towards both God and man is a key to revival:

Continued revival is continued brokenness, but brokenness is two-way, and that means walls kept down as well as roof off. But man's most deep rooted and subtle sin is the primal sin of pride: self-esteem and self-respect; and without hardly realizing it, while we are careful to keep the roof off between ourselves and God through repentance and faith, we soon let those walls of respectability creep up again between ourselves and our brethren.

Grubb insists that a person has a more vivid sense of shame about sin when that sin is confessed before fellow Christians than when it is confessed only before God. When the Christian confesses and also tells of the victory God now gives him, the Holy Spirit uses this to expose sin in the hearts of others. Shame moves them to confess and seek victory. Thus public confession and testimony of deliverance can, under the Holy Spirit, have a catalytic effect upon others.

Grubb (pp. 38-39) declares that the early church was first and foremost a fellowship. ... We have now replaced fellowship by preaching in modern church life, and the reason is not hard to find. Fellowshipping necessitates a real flow of life in the fellowship, for each has to be ready to contribute their share of what the Lord is really saying to them: preaching is an easy way out for a not-too-living fellowship.

The early Methodists had an excellent balance between preaching and fellowship, says Grubb.

A more recent account of revival in East Africa is given by missionary Dorothy Smoker (1967). She tells of some of the strains of missionary living. Note in the following account how the Holy Spirit used shame connected with a specific act of sin to expose her as a selfish person.
Smoker (1967:1) says:

God began to break through to me one day when I became angry with an elderly African man who brought us milk. When I looked around at those who were watching my performance, I suddenly saw what God saw. . . . As soon as I could get on my face before Him God showed me much much more: the pride, hatred, jealousy, impurity, and the basic self-centeredness of my whole life. All my defenses were breached so that I had to acknowledge myself to be full of sin and then almost at once I knew for the first time the exhilaration of the blood of Jesus at work. Love came. . . . (Italics mine)

Unfortunately this glorious victory turned out to be only a temporary experience. This is all too common in the Christian life. Later Dorothy Smoker and her husband learned from African Christians how to keep victory on a continuous basis.

In Uganda they found that God could do a work that not only continued bright and fresh in isolated Christians, but which drew whole groups of people together in a sort of corporate sharing of joy and spontaneous sharing. . . . Among them we saw a sort of transparency and matter-of-fact honesty about sin and dealing with it that shocked us. They were going back to pay debts and return stolen things beyond anything we had ever seen.

As a result of being in such a live spiritual atmosphere, both Mr. and Mrs. Smoker began to see things in their own lives that were hindering their marriage relationship.

One night we both collapsed. God gave us the grace of repentance and helped us bare everything before each other in the presence of God. It was a stripping indeed. I think now we know a little bit of what the Lord meant when He said Adam and Eve, "They were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." What a honeymoon began then; I no longer had a shadow husband but a real person, and we felt safe with each other. (Italics mine)

I wrote Mrs. Smoker about her article and asked her to comment about
the relative roles of guilt and shame in her experience. She replied:

No doubt both are involved in our separation from God. This is the first time I've thought about it this way, but I am wondering if the first major encounter I had with God at the age of fifteen was not a dealing with guilt. That knowledge of freedom from judgment was a great thing but not to be compared with the release that came later in Africa—His dealing with shame. Could it be that guilt is dealt with once for all normally, but that honesty exposing oneself to yourself, to God, and to others, has to be repeated often in order to keep spiritually fresh?1
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

LOVE AND SHAME

Genuine love, in the last analysis, means a willingness to be entirely exposed to the person to whom we are talking (Schaeffer 1968:120). (Italics mine)

Most of us are afraid to love deeply because genuine love requires full exposure. Many married couples are plagued with this fear. Paul Tournier (1967) again and again has found that the major problem of married couples is a lack of "complete frankness" and "mutual openness."

Many partners are essentially strangers to each other. Part of the problem may be a misunderstanding of what real love is. Francis Schaeffer (1968:120), in discussing what type of love it will take to reach twentieth-century man, states:

Love is not an easy thing; it is not just an emotional urge, but an attempt to move over and sit in the other person's place and see how his problems look to him. . . . This kind of communication is not cheap. . . . It is tiring; it will open you to temptations and pressures.

A Young Life director gave a talk about going the second mile which he defined as "sticking your neck out in love." He said that the most painful experiences in his life have been when he has, over a period of time, spent considerable time with teenagers and really loved them. And then they have finally told him to get lost. They did not want to see any more of him.

Marriage is supposed to be a relationship of love. But one psychiatrist has estimated that only two out of twelve marriages develop and maintain an ongoing love relationship. Why this high "failure" rate?
Tournier suggests that there are three phases or stages in many marriages. The early years of marriage make up the honeymoon stage when there is understanding and openness. The first flush of love helps each partner to minimize and overlook the other's faults. During the second stage each partner begins to realize that the other partner's faults are still there. And those "insignificant" faults now seem to be much more obvious, persistent, and irritating. Each partner often begins a campaign to pressure the other to get rid of their faults. If love fails to subdue this critical spirit, then the marriage moves on to the third stage. This may be continuous arguing or badgering; the dominant partner may subdue the submissive one; or there may be a mutual peaceful withdrawal from the heart of each other's lives even though they continue to live together as husband and wife.

Tournier (1967:16) states that "the discovery of the real person is never easy," and that "a deep encounter rarely takes place in a few moments." And then Tournier (1967:19-19) declares:

This affirmation will doubtless astonish many readers who imagine that we can open ourselves to others quite easily. Up to a certain point, yes we can, but not completely. Some jovial and sociable people flatter themselves that they are able easily to open up, but the truth is, it is but a superficial opening up. Actually, beneath their flow of words their deepest thoughts and feelings lie hidden, just as withdrawn people hide theirs by silence. A complete unveiling of one's inner thoughts, an absolute necessity for real and deep understanding, demands a great deal of courage.

The major barrier to such openness, according to Tournier, is that we know that if we are completely honest with our partner, we will have to talk about those things about which we are ashamed. And the big question
is, will our partner sympathetically understand or will he/she use the opportunity to reproach me? Judgment by our closest friends hurts most. So many couples play hide-and-go-seek with each other.

They fear that conversation, by becoming more real, will open wounds to which they are most sensitive, wounds made all the more painful because they are inflicted by one's closest partner (Tournier 1967:20).

From his extensive counseling, Tournier has found that people are much more sensitive than they appear to be, including men. Even in marriage "deep sharing is overwhelming, and very rare."

How desperately love is needed in human relationships! How risky, how daring it is to love deeply! How distorted, how partial are most attempts to love!

Octavio Paz (1961:41-42) discusses love in the Mexican cultural context. Paz notes that love involves opening ourselves up to another and revealing our inner feelings. In doing so, a great risk is taken. Popular Mexican songs and sayings about love often treat love so "false-hood and betrayal." Paz asserts:

Love is an attempt to penetrate another being, but it can only be realized if the surrender is mutual. It is always difficult to give oneself up; few persons anywhere ever succeed in doing so, . . . (1961:42).

But because all men everywhere need some sense of love, even if it is distorted, they seek for it in confused and often selfish ways. The Mexican tends to think of love in terms of "combat and conquest." Thus love which is designed to be penetration through voluntary surrender becomes violation through deceitful conquest. Paz (1961:197) concludes that for most people "love is an almost inaccessible experience."
are ambivalent about love. One part of our being craves for it; the other part is afraid of love.

But when real love does take place it is a glorious transforming experience for Mexican women who are imprisoned in the image that a masculine society has imposed upon them. In order to love, the Mexican woman must make a radical choice equivalent to a jail break. "Lovers say that 'love has transformed her, it has made her a different person.' . . . Love changes a woman completely." Kurt Riezler (1943:461-462) beautifully expresses the positive relationship of love and shame.

Mutual love banishes shame. . . . Shame decreases with increasing love, increases with decreasing love. It takes leave when love reaches its peak and reappears when love takes its leave. Shame protects love in sex against sex without love.

I John 2:29 indicates that if we are in Christ, if we have a love relationship with Him, "we may be confident and unashamed at his coming." Perfect love not only casts out fear; it casts out shame as well.

A love relationship requires giving and receiving on the part of two persons. In order to receive love one must be willing to open his life and let the other person invade his life. In order to give love one must do the same. In its deepest sense love is the giving or receiving of a person. Both giving and receiving must be expressed by both persons in order to have a full dynamic relationship. One way giving or receiving is not healthy for either the giver or the receiver over the long run. Temporarily one may be primarily a giver or receiver until a mature relationship is established.

One person must be willing to take the risk of initiating a love relationship. Receiving another person into your life, may be just as
effective as giving yourself to them. Possibly there is not as much
difference between giving and receiving as we usually think. Openness
is the key to both. By receiving a person into your life you are giv­
ing him love. "Love God with all your heart, soul, and mind and your
neighbor as yourself:" "Mutual love banishes shame." "He who believes
in him will not be put to shame."
NOTES AND REFERENCES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1. There are three other less precise types of shame which might be mentioned:
   1) sympathy shame
      when someone else has a shame experience in your presence, you feel deeply for him and may even blush with him.
   2) compliment shame
      a person may blush with embarrassment when he is given a deserved compliment. One lady described her reaction to a compliment as "blushing with pleasure."
   3) shared shame
      a. "Let us, then, go to him outside the camp and share his shame." (Heb. 13:13 Good News For Modern Man). In the RSV "bearing abuse for him."
      b. the quotation from Bonhoeffer at the end of chapter one exhorted Christians to share willingly the shame of the lowly sinner in order to exhibit the mercy of Christ.
      c. My nephew and I were in a juggling act together. He said the shame would have been less for him, if we had goofed, since I would have shared the shame with him.

CHAPTER 2. HONOR AND EXPOSURE

1. See Julian Pitt-Rivers (1966:42-43) for an excellent discussion of honor and shame. He includes sex-related differences as to what is honorable and shameful behavior plus the situations when honor and shame have no ethical implications.

2. Embarrassment is often a part of a shame experience, especially at the beginning stages of the experience. Some embarrassing experiences would become full-fledged shame experiences if they were allowed to run their full course. Shame is primarily a matter of dishonor or disgrace whereas "to embarrass is to cause to feel ill at ease so as to result in a loss of composure." Embarrassment especially fits the area of social blunder. Most Western people tend to think of shame and embarrassment as being roughly synonymous. Since there is some overlap between embarrassment and shame, the reader might find it instructive to read the following articles: 1) "Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements" by Edward Gross and Gregory Stone (1964:1-15) in The
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In addition Goffman has written two books: The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959); and Stigma (1963).


4. Fortunately On Shame and the Search for Identity is available in paperback. Not all of the book deals directly with shame. Two chapters are devoted primarily to the study of personality. I found this book to be the single most helpful book to me.

5. At this point a note of caution should be raised to avoid misunderstanding. Not all shame is ethical in the sense that a person is always personally responsible for his state of shame. We will stress in a later chapter that society may cause a person to fail. In addition we also may "inherit" (biologically and socially) things or states which we and/or society judge to be shameful. Arnold Isenberg (1949:10) states:

Shame is the feeling that comes with consciousness of faults, weaknesses, disadvantages—that is, qualities deemed undesirable. . . . To be ignorant, awkward, poor, impotent or undersized or bald, . . . member of a disgraced family or an oppressed race—.

While the above are not the result of a person's sin, they do illustrate that the essence of shame is a falling short, failure to measure up, less than perfection.

CHAPTER 3. SHAME AS FAILURE

1. See Peristiany (1966) for references connecting shame and failure in Greek and Arab cultures; pages 149-150, 175, 203, 207, 211, 245, 252, and 255.

2. See a reprint entitled "Low Self-Esteem Means Friction and Trouble," from the evangelical periodical dealing with race and poverty, The Other Side, Box 158, Savannah, Ohio 44874.

3. For a more detailed analysis of our schools see Glasser's Schools Without Failure.

CHAPTER 4. SHAME AND GUILT

1. E. Mansell Pattison (1967:69) believes that we can list social values in the following manner:
1) Idiosyncratic values—held by only one person in the group under consideration, i.e., personal preferences.
2) Group values—which are distinctive of some plurality of individuals, whether this be family, clique, association, tribe, nation, or civilization.
3) Personal values—a private form of group values.
4) Operational absolutes—values held by members of a group to be absolute in their application for them.
5) Tentative absolutes—those operational absolutes found to exist in all societies.
6) Permanent absolutes—assumptions that may be asserted but unknowable in any scientific sense.

Anthropologists no longer hold to the radical cultural relativism of a quarter century ago. Rather, there is growing consensus that tentative absolutes do exist—interestingly, a rough parallel to the Mosaic Decalogue. However, those absolutes must be defined and translated into appropriate behavior by each group. In other words, absolute values must be translated into operational and group values which are to be taken as the moral norms of behavior. Briefly, absolutes must be reduced to relative values, and these relative values must assume absolute functions. For example, a tentative absolute is the right of personal property or, negatively stated, stealing is immoral. However, the behavior to be labeled as stealing varies with each group; yet, that group definition must be a fairly inviolable norm for that group.

2. Kurt Riezler (1943:495) notes another social aspect of shame: When someone is openly put to shame, we suffer even as mere observers with the person involved. We cannot help feeling his shame.

3. Hsu (1971:24-26) describes what he calls a psychosociogram of man. There are eight layers beginning with layer 7, the unconscious, and layer 6, the pre-conscious; these make up the Freudian psyche. Next is layer 5, the unexpressed conscious. Layer 4, the expressible conscious, and layer 3, the intimate society and culture, represent the jen (personage). Layer 2 is the operative society and culture; layer 1 is the wider society and culture, and layer 0 is the outer world. Hsu says that layers 7, 6, and 5 are "not communicated to his fellow human beings because:
   (a) he is afraid to do so . . .
   (b) the materials are to private . . .
   (c) he is ashamed to do so . . .

4. For a detailed discussion of guilt from the standpoint of Western psychology, see chapter two "The Universality of Guilt," in Man in Triumph: An Integration of Psychology and Biblical Faith by Harold Darling (1969). Darling discusses in detail the theories of Freud, Jung, Rank, Horney, Fromm, Frankl, May and to a limited degree Mowrer and Tournier. Darling (1969:54) notes that "guilt is a manageable phenomenon, localized, and specific; while anxiety is general-
ized, diffused, unrecognizable and unmanageable." In some respects, I believe that shame is something like anxiety, rather diffuse; therefore, it is more difficult to study and analyze than is guilt. Any discipline that wishes to be "scientific" is likely to gravitate towards more manageable and specific phenomenon, and neglect areas like shame. We have already mentioned Tournier's Guilt and Grace, a fine investigation with a Christian perspective. Another recent book from the Western perspective worthy of note is Guilt: Theory and Therapy by Edward V. Stein (1968).

CHAPTER 5. SIN AND SHAME

1. The 21st edition of Young's Analytical Concordance of the Bible is the source for the KJV word count.

2. According to the Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible under the article entitled "Sin, Sinners,"] generally the Hebrews did not distinguish between sin and its resultant guilt. Thus, as we have seen, all the leading words for 'sin' also express 'guilt.' The OT has, however, a special word for 'guilt' . . . Such a comment serves to warn one against drawing dogmatic conclusions from a compilation of the number of times a word occurs. It takes a linguistic expert familiar with all the subtleties of semantics in a specific language to ascertain which idea is more prominent. Both guilt and shame are important Scriptural ideas; shame has been neglected so this study concentrates on shame. An either-or emphasis is misleading.

P. Wooley (1962:1169) in an article on "Shame," in the New Bible Dictionary states in regard to the words for shame in the Bible:

These occurrences are translations of original forms representing at least ten different Hebrew and seven different Greek roots and a considerably larger number of individual Hebrew and Greek words.

There is great need and opportunity for an exhaustive study of shame based on the original Hebrew and Greek.

3. It is true that in the fallen state of man nakedness takes on a different meaning. Stephen Smallman (1969:7) indicates that "originally it meant openness and freedom; now it meant shame."

4. Helen Lynd (1958:262-263) in a footnote refers to Max Scheler's ideas about the essence of shame:

Max Scheler, for example, finds the essential characteristic of shame to be conflict between man's spiritual powers and his servitude to his body. He speaks of a bridge or passage between these two orders of being that is essential for man in order for him to be human. This is shame rooted in the nature of man, not in a particular culture. (Italics mine)
In the same footnote Lynd projects Arnold Isenberg's view: that shame is best understood in its relation to pride, that shame is related to feelings of weakness or inferiority and that, although the disfavor of others usually enters into feelings of shame, there is some evidence for the existence of sources of shame independent of society. (Italics mine)

5. It might be argued that sin is a part of this story. If pride is the essence of sin, and this story represents pride rather than just social blunder, then the attitude of sin is present. In fact, it might be argued that the reason any social blunder bothers us so much is because our pride is hurt. Why are we so protective of ourselves?

CHAPTER 6. GLORY, REPENTANCE, AND TRUST


2. Keith Miller in Habitation of Dragons (1970:20-24) tells a personal story of how he inadvertently "let down" a nine year old boy while he was a teenage counselor at a camp. Miller still had occasional bad dreams about the incident. He had become very close friends with nine year old Mortey. In the process Miller learned Mortey's faults as well as his good points. Miller was put in the predicament of having to choose between Mortey and another boy for junior honor camper. Miller chose the other boy. He tried to explain to Mortey, but Mortey felt that Miller had betrayed him. Mortey had completely trusted and loved Miller. Miller describes Mortey's reaction:
   He just stood there and stared at me in disbelief. After his dad had let him down by leaving his mother, he had trusted me. I had the chance to give him all he had ever wanted, . . . He covered his face with his hands and ran toward the bus.

CHAPTER 8. JAPAN

1. This news item is from the December 14, 1970 issue of the U.S. News and World Report. Japan now has a new status as a nation. Its leading citizens are very conscious of the shame, the loss of honor, that is felt when the nation fails to live up to its new status. This sense of shame motivated them to action to regain their lost honor among nations.

2. A.L. Kroeber (1948:612) notes the effect of a person's own cultural
perspective on his interpretation of sin (guilt) and shame in other cultures and in his own culture:

Of late years, with conscious effort to define the ethos of cultures, a whole array of observers have made a similar finding on culture after culture. They encounter plenty of shame, but little sense of sin. . . . This has been remarked equally for non-literate tribes and for literate nationalities. The Chinese are guided by "face saving"; the Japanese lack the sense of "contrast of real and ideal" and "do not grapple with the problem of evil."

But the findings about the importance of shame as a social force are a bit too consistent. They leave little explicit sin sense to any culture but our own Occidental one: and within that largely to its Protestant portion, in fact outstandingly its Calvinistically influenced sector. . . . It looks therefore as if the reputedly independent and separate verdicts of Anglo-Saxon anthropologists on Asiatic, Oceanic, native American, and African cultures, that shame is a far more influential motivation in them than a sense of sin, does not really specifically characterize these cultures nearly so much as its opposite—conscious sinfulness—characterizes Anglo-Saxon and Protestant cultures. Shame as a deterrent factor and a social force is probably operative in nearly all cultures.

Kroeber does not deny the reality of shame cultures in the above remarks, but he highlights the fact that American culture is the exception to the rule. Few cultures are as guilt or sin conscious as ours. Observers from our culture quickly note the contrast and some may try to find guilt where it does not exist. Shame can be related to conscience (Japan) and sin (Old Testament). Many Western observers seem to feel that only guilt can be internalized and related significantly to sin and conscience. This is a very ethnocentric view of sin!

3. The following are sources of illustrations of shame in Japanese culture:

From Vogel (1963):
1) desire respect for country, pp. 93-94.
2) family finance, p. 111.
3) joint husband-wife activities, pp. 112-113.
4) relationship to superior, pp. 126-127.
5) group control, pp. 138-141.
6) loyalty to group, p. 147.
7) firing a person in authority, p. 150.
8) husband doing housework, p. 183.
9) children's behavior, p. 242.
10) discipline of children, p. 249.
11) identification with relatives, p. 274.
12) research interviews, p. 278.

From Norbeck (1954):
1) illiteracy, p. 116.
2) mistake by expert, p. 115.
3) overuse of cosmetics, pp. 117-118.

From Embree (1939):
1) exposed love affairs, p. 172.
2) go-betweens, p. 173.
3) pre-marital sex, p. 173.
4) unexpected visitor, p. 173.

From Smith (1961):
1) reputation of village, pp. 523, 530.

Benedict (1946) has a wide variety of illustrations. The two books I would recommend for an understanding of shame in the context of Japanese culture are:

1) Vogel's *Japan's New Middle Class* is recent, easy reading, authoritative, stresses basic values and relationships in real life situations such as family and work.

2) Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* is quite readable, gives a historical perspective, and presents enduring values. Changes have taken place since she wrote her classic on Japan, but I received the impression from reading Vogel that with some modification the basic values discussed by Benedict still endure.

Also I would recommend a recent article by Haring (1967) entitled "Japanese Character in the Twentieth Century."

CHAPTER 9. CHINA

1. From the *Oregonian*, Tuesday, November 29, 1966, p. 10.

2. The following are brief comments about the best sources of information on the Chinese concept of shame. Probably the best single source of information is Hu Hsien-chin's article "The Chinese Concept of Face." An extensive discussion with numerous illustrations. Available in the *American Anthropologist* and it has been reprinted in Haring's *Personal Character and Cultural Milieu*. A second excellent source for an understanding of the cultural context in which shame operates in a pre-World War II Confucian family is the *Daughter of Confucius* by Wong and Cressy (1952). Wong Su-Ling tells the intimate story of her family with the aid of missionary Cressy. Wolfram Eberhard's book *Guilt and Sin in Traditional China* gives a somewhat different perspective than do the two above sources, but it is needed to obtain a balanced perspective.

CHAPTER 10. THAILAND

1. For an excellent description of Thai personality and social relationships, see Herbert Phillips (1966) *Thai Peasant Personality: The Patterning of Interpersonal Behavior in the Village of Bang Chan*. The
description of Thai society sounds strikingly similar to Laos culture. See *Laos, Its People, Its Society, Its Culture* (LeBar and Suddard 1960:97-100). Robbins Burling (1965:97) states that the "villages of Thailand, Burma, Laos, and Cambodia are similar in so many ways that a description of one country can often stand as well for the others."

CHAPTER 11. OTHER CULTURES

1. The major ideas for this section on the Arabs come from Antoun (1968), Zeid (1966), and Bourdieu (1966). See these men's works for numerous illustrations of honor and shame in a wide variety of life settings. Zeid and Bourdieu have written along with five other authors in *Honour and Shame: Values of Mediterranean Society*.

2. Kardiner (1939) has other references to shame in the Trobriand, Kwakitl, and Marquesan cultures. See pages 69, 74, 82, 99, 112, 114, 117, 120, 243.

3. Other references to shame in *Children of the People* by Leighton and Kluckhohn are found on pages 42, 52, 106-107, 170-171.

4. The periodical *Human Organization* devoted approximately one-half of the Fall 1968 issue to a discussion of atomistic type societies in which interpersonal relationships are usually characterized by suspicion and distrust. This appears to be a very widespread phenomenon in the peasant societies of the world. In part these societies seem to be dominated by a defensive concept of male honor which is sensitive to any type of insult or invasion of privacy. Thus Russell Langworthy (1968:216) states that "the machismo and philotimo codifications of masculine honor reported for Latin America and Greece resemble the Italian concept of maschio."

CHAPTER 12. EVANGELISM

1. There are many other factors involved in effective communication. Eugene Nida (1960) in *Message and Mission: The Communication of the Christian Faith* discusses the psychological, sociological, anthropological, theological, and linguistic aspects of effective religious communication.

2. We are not trying to re-establish the old rigid shame versus guilt label for cultures. A strict either-or approach is misleading. When we use the word predominant we do not mean totally. So our basic conclusion is that more cultures are predominately shame oriented than are guilt oriented. I am tempted to claim that every culture, including our United States culture (though we do not recognize it), is more shame oriented than guilt oriented; but to be
on the safe side, I will simply state that 1) shame is a cultural universal, and 2) in most cultures it is dominant.

3. Alfred Kinsey did find that religiously devout persons participate less in all socially disapproved forms of sexual behavior (Christensen 1966:63).

CHAPTER 13. SERMON SUGGESTIONS

1. Not all sons are as flagrantly prodigal as the younger son in this story. A more common theme is disrespect of father as a person. The following illustration comes from a friend:

   My definition of shame is a feeling of emptiness within oneself because of one's actions.

   The moment I felt most ashamed was the time I treated my father disrespectfully. I have always considered the relationship I have with my father one of the closest any person can experience with their father. It is probably a normal feeling but there is no other man dead or alive equal to my dad. We both have always been interested in short wave radios. Since he worked for GMC he did not have the time or opportunity to work with a person who deals with and repairs short wave radios as I did. When I was about seventeen I learned a lot about the radios. After I had worked for a dealer for about six months, I felt I had learned enough about the radios to talk intelligently about them. I thought that I knew everything there was to know! One day the man I worked for came over and started talking with my dad and I about the radios. Dad kept interrupting him and asking him questions. I, of course, thought I knew the answers already so after he had asked about six questions, I said, "Just be quiet and listen, Dad." Before the words had come from my mouth, I wanted to die. I had never even thought of saying anything like that to my father! Dad just went over and sat down in his chair and started to read his book. I don't remember when my boss left as I was too busy trying to convince Dad that I did not mean what I had said. He knew all along what had happened but I could not imagine him ever forgiving me. I knew that I had hurt him, but whatever I did I could not convince myself that he understood. My whole body felt limp and lifeless, and it seemed like all my blood had left my body. At that moment my life was completely empty. My father finally sat down with me and explained that everything was all right. It took a long time for me to forgive myself for speaking that way to him. Even now when I think about it I feel like I should call him up and tell him I'm sorry!
CHAPTER 15. THE SMALL GROUP

1. I highly recommend Lawrence Richard's book *A New Face For The Church*. In my opinion, Richards (1970) is the most thoughtful, balanced, and comprehensive evangelical writer on church renewal today. His book contains six fine chapters on the nature of the church in the Scriptures. This section is followed by a series of six chapters on the church today, its problems and the way to bring about change. Contains a solid emphasis on the role of the small group.

2. For additional insight into the dynamics of shame, ridicule, and exposure see the following pages in Synanon: 139-140, 148, 251, 261, 312, 320, 328-330, 349, 354, 367, 380, 384, and 393.

3. Roger W. Birkman has written a fine article entitled "Evangelism Through Small Groups." (June 1968 issue of *Pastoral Psychology*.) Contains an excellent summary of the need for small groups, discusses Wesley's class meetings, the psychological principles involved, gives fine illustrations, and reasons for success. See also the February, 1968 issue of *HIS* magazine for the InterVarsity emphasis on small groups.

4. In his article entitled "Sexual Modesty, Social Meanings, and the Nudist Camp," Martin Weinberg comments that the average person expects "breakdowns in clothing modesty to result in rampant sexual interest, promiscuity, embarrassment, jealousy, and shame." However, such is not the case among most members of most nudist camps. Weinberg (1968:220) concludes that:

> Covering the body through the use of clothes is not a necessary condition for a pattern of modesty to exist, ... Sexual interests are very adequately controlled in nudist camps; in fact, those who have visited nudist camps agree that sexual interests are controlled to a much greater extent than they are on the outside.

CHAPTER 16. POSITIVE RESULTS FROM SELF-EXPOSURE

1. I asked Mrs. Smoker to comment further on her reference to the nakedness of Adam and Eve and their spiritual victory. She replied:

> About the nakedness of Adam and Eve, I had a primary reference to spiritual life, as we both have found that this is the key to a good marital relationship. But the spiritual and psychological openness pay real dividends in the physical relationship as well. And a patently happy home life out of which to testify to others is no small item in evangelism.
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