

DEFENDING OR DEFRAUDING THE FAITH: A PRADIGMATIC COMPARISON OF THE "THEOLOGY OF RELIGIONS" OF HENDRIK KRAEMER & JOHN HICK

Enoch Wan

A paper presented at the 47th Annual Meeting of the ETS, November 16-18, 1995
Philadelphia Airport Radisson Hotel.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Importance of the Study of the "Theology of Religions"

The *theologia religionum* ("Theology of Religions," hereafter as "TOR") is one of the most important missiological tasks today. The importance of TOR is acknowledged by contemporary missiologists (Anderson 1993, Bavinck 1960, Bosch 1991, Conn 1990, Knitter 1985, Küng 1988, Newbigin 1989, Rommen & Netland 1995, Verkuyl 1978). For examples,

Theology of religions and missiology, both being branches of theology, also complement each other. If a theologian of religions lacks missionary motivation and perspective, he has actually traded in the real foundation of his discipline for something which provides no basis at all. On the other hand, if a missiologist both in his method and his conclusions fails to take theology of religions into account, he will be blind to what is actually transpiring among human beings and religions and thus tack only in thin air and grope about in a fog." (Verkuyl 1978:361-362)

No issue in missiology is more important more difficult, more controversial, or more divisive for the days ahead than the theology of religions...This is the theological issue for mission in the 1990s and into the twenty-first century. (Anderson 1993:200-201)

Contemporary evangelical Christians in North America are faced with an unprecedented challenge of other religions due to socio-cultural factors (e.g. demographic shift, popularity of pluralism, etc.) and theological shift from within, e.g. Pinnock (1991, 1992, 1994) in North America and others elsewhere: Bosch (1991) of South Africa, Neil (1961) and Newbigin (1988, 1989) of the United Kingdom.

1.2 The Purpose and Significance of this Study

Contemporary missiologists are aware of the problem that many different understandings and approaches to other religions bring confusion to the Christian Church and missionaries (Beyerhaus 1971, 1972, Fellows 1988,

Knitter 1985, Küng 1987, Gnanakan 1992, Scheid 1992). As a missiological task, it is necessary to clarify the content and nature of representative contemporary models of the TOR. The **purpose** of this study is to analyze and compare the views of Hendrik Kraemer and John Hick on the TOR. This study is **significant** because it will provide essential information regarding the mission strategy necessary to evangelize adherents of other religions.

1.3 The Methodology of "Paradigmatic Comparison"

The possible Christian attitudes to and preferred relationship with other religions have been proposed by different scholars. Hans Küng classifies "four basic positions" regarding this issue (Kung 1988, 230-237, see **Appendix I - Hans Kung's Classification of Positions on the TOR**). Klaus Nürnberger classifies the Christians' attitudes towards other religions into three major categories (Nürnberger 1970, 13-43). While both Küng and Nürnberger give philosophical classifications concerning the Christians' attitudes towards other religions, Ken Gnanakan, an Indian missiologist, uses practical terminology to classify this issue. In his book, The Pluralistic Predicament (1992), Gnanakan subdivides into three positions (see **Appendix II - Ken Gnanakan's Systematization of Various Positions**). Paul Knitter, a contemporary Catholic scholar, classifies the TOR into four models expressing Christians' various attitudes toward other religions. (See **Appendix III - Paul Knitter's Models of the TOR**). Harvie Conn, a professor of missions at Westminster Theological Seminary, gives a somewhat different direction to classifying paradigms. He identifies six contemporary models of encounter, of which five are very active in the missiological community (Conn 1990, 11-15). (See **Appendix IV - Harvie Conn's Analysis of Positions on the TOR**). David Bosch, late professor of missions at the University of South Africa, uses different terminologies (Bosch 1991, 478-483). He categorizes Christian *theologia religionum* into three paradigms. See **Appendix V - David Bosch's Categorization of the TOR**. **Figure 1** below is a summary of the various paradigms.

Figure 1 - Three Paradigms of the TOR

(Kim 1995, 35)

Issue	Exclusivism	Inclusivism	Pluralism
Christ's uniqueness	Constitutive uniqueness	Normative uniqueness	Relational uniqueness
Function of religion: for salvation	None: Religion is unbelief	Ways of salvation	Ways of salvation
Relationship between Revelation and Religions	No relationship; religion is human achievement	Religious phenomena are related to general revelation	Every religious phenomenon is valid revelational work
Major Supporting Group	Conservative evangelical	Roman Catholic	Diverse individuals
Continuum between Christianity and Religions	Discontinuity	Continuity: anonymous Christians	Continuity: Parallelism of all religions
Key Representative	H. Kraemer , Lausanne Covenant (1974)	K. Rahner , Vatican II (1962)	J. Hick

This essence of this study is derived from Y.J. Kim's (1995) dissertation for the Doctor of Missiology at the Reformed Theological Seminary, chaired by Enoch Wan who is the Director of the Doctoral Program at RTS.

This study is condensed from chapter five of the dissertation.

II. DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

2.1 "theology of religions, TOR"

"the discipline which deals with the Christian's approach to non-Christian religions."

2.2 "paradigm"

"conceptual, observational or instrumental model of reality and for this study applying to classification/categorization of Christian attitudes toward other religions" (Knitter 1985, Pinnock 1992)

2.3 "paradigmatic comparison"

"Comparative study with the use of 'paradigm' for the sake of conceptual clarity and analytical convenience."

III. PERSONS AND PUBLICATIONS OF HENDRIK KRAEMER & JOHN HICK

3.1 The Person and Publications of John Hick

John Hick (A.D. 1922-), an English Presbyterian minister, "is the most radical" and most controversial of the proponents of a contemporary model for Christian approaches to other faiths (Knitter 1985, 147). His opinion represents the model of pluralistic approach (Gnanakan 1992). He experienced a "Copernican revolution" in his Christian self-understanding, a revolution that he has been urging all of Christianity to launch since 1973 (Hick 1980, 1-5). Though he retains his personal commitment to Jesus as his Lord, he proposes a "new map for the universe of faith" (Knitter 1985). From his study of the major world religions, he thoroughly remodeled the TOR. He has expressed his opinion through his many books, including Faith and Knowledge (1961), The Existence of God (1964), Philosophy of Religion (1973), God and the Universe of Faiths (1973), Evil and the God of Love (1977), God Has Many Names (1980), Problem of Religious Pluralism (1985), and An Interpretation of Religion (1989).

According to Hick, Christianity is set "in a new and to some an alarming light in which there can no longer be any *a priori* assumption of overall superiority" (Hick and Knitter 1987, 23). For the Christian tradition is now seen as one of a plurality of contexts of salvation, contexts within which the transformation of human existence from self-centeredness to God-centered (or Reality-centeredness) is occurring. Accordingly, if it is now claimed that Christianity constitutes a more favorable setting for this transformation than the other traditions, this must be shown by historical evidence. Today we cannot help feeling that the question of superiority has to be posed as an empirical issue, to be settled (if indeed it can be settled) by examination of the facts (Hick and Knitter 1987, 23). Hick insists that all religious traditions, including that of Christianity, were constituted by our partial and fallible human ways of relating to the "Eternal One." Christianity was formulated with past "cultural

glories" and so functioned at times in the past when things seemed to "work." Therefore, "as vast complex totalities, the world traditions seem to be more or less on a par with each other," and none "can be singled out as manifestly superior," including the doctrines of Christian theology (Hick and Knitter 1987, 30). The central doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement, according to Hick, "eventually became established" and "pervade Christian theological and liturgical language," though "there was a period before" when these doctrines co-existed with different opinions on these theological subjects (Hick and Knitter 1987, 31-34).

H. J. Na, a Korean theologian, evaluated Hick as "an advocator of religious ecumenism" (Na 1991, 154). Hick's position, being heavily inclined toward the cooperation and co-existence of religions, finally expects religious ecumenism throughout the earth.

“What we are picturing here as a future possibility is not a single world religion, but a situation in which the different traditions no longer see themselves and each other as rival ideological communities. A single world religion is, Hick would think, never likely, and not a consummation to be desired. For so long as there is a variety of human types there will be a variety of kinds of worship and a variety of theological emphases and approaches.” (Hick and Hebblethwaite 1981, 189)

Evaluations of Hick's TOR are expressed from two perspectives, negative and positive. Ken Gnanakan criticized Hick for having no regard for the biblical doctrine of salvation by grace and for speaking on an empirical level (Gnanakan 1992, 103). As another negative response, Gavin D'Costa pointed to the weakness of Hick's argument, saying that his theo-centric propositionalism paid little attention to the importance of particularity concerning the revelation of God in Christ (Ford 1989, 280). Paul Knitter, however, as a positive evaluation, felt that Hick's approach held the greatest promise for the future of inter-religious dialogue and advocated the validity of his model (Knitter 1985, 167).

3.2 The Person and Publications of Hendrik Kraemer

Hendrik Kraemer (A.D. 1888-1965) was "a scholar of the first rank" whose opinion represents the model of the exclusivistic approach (Nicholson 1978, 9). As a Reformed missiologist, he was recognized by the

modern missionary leaders of the International Missionary Council that asked him to write a book on the TOR. The result of that request was his book (The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World) which became his *magnum opus* in missiology (Jathanna 1981, 68). He became known as the "leading conservative protagonist in the field of the theology of missions" (Nida 1990, xvii). His many books included Religion and Christian Faith (1956), The Communication of the Christian Faith (1957), World Culture and World Religions (1960), and Why Christianity of All Religions? (1962).

For Kraemer, "Christianity is to be distinguished from the other religions" and arises "out of the Revelation of God in the Person of Jesus Christ" (1962, 114). His TOR was applied in a practical manner as the motive for enthusiastic evangelism. The Christian Church has not only the right, according to Kraemer, but also the "duty to take conversion and evangelization as prime necessities for mankind" (1963, 295).

Kraemer insisted that "there is no natural religion," therefore he denied the scientific research of religions (1963, 112). To him, the non-Christian religions are merely human achievement (Conn 1990, 11). However, he did not deny, but stressed, the "point of contact" as the primary concern of the missionary. Man is, even in his fallen condition, God's creature, in whose heart God "has laid eternity." He knows about God; therefore he seeks God and at the same time in his seeking tries to run from Him. This tragic contradictory position is his deepest problem and testifies to his indestructible relatedness to God. The quest for God, even when man tries to surpass it in himself, is the perennially disturbing and central problem of man. Therefore, there is here undeniably a point of contact for the message of the Gospel. To deny it is virtually to deny the humanity of man. (1938, 130)

Evaluations of Kraemer's TOR are expressed from different perspectives. J. Verkuyl considered

Kraemer's idea of "Biblical realism" which emphasizes the unique character of the Bible's message, the topic which should continue to be studied. (Verkuyl 1978, 48)

Wilhelm Anderson determined that Kraemer's contribution to the understanding of the nature of revelation was opposed to that of Barthian theology (Anderson 1957). Antonio Gualtieri criticized Kraemer for ignoring the human element in Christian experience that can be found in the experiences of other religions (Gualtieri 1978).

According to Gualtieri, though Kraemer grouped empirical Christianity with other religions, he failed to see that the parallelism also extends to the revelational element in Christian experience (Gualtieri 1978, 290).

Eugene Nida, a linguist and missionary anthropologist, introduced Kraemer as the "leading conservative protagonist in the field of the theology of missions" (Nida 1990, xvii). Nida recognized the fact that Kraemer emphasized "the radical distinctiveness of Christianity in comparison with other religious systems" (Nida 1990, xvii).

Paul Knitter stated that Protestants' attitudes toward other religions were "championed and propagated by Hendrik Kraemer" during the 1940s and 1950s (Knitter 1985, 82). Edward Scheid set a high value on Kraemer's contribution, believing his theology of religions to have been laid as the foundation of the evangelical approaches toward other religions (Scheid 1992, 51).

Generally, Kraemer is blamed or criticized for placing too much emphasis on the exclusiveness of the Christian message (Hoedmaker 1989), and his TOR sometimes is criticized as Christo-centric with an abhorrence of syncretism (Jongeneel 1988). Interestingly, the Roman Catholic side (since Vatican II) has shown interest in Kraemer's work because it thinks there are common fundamental preoccupations in his theory and praxis (Frei

1988).

3.3 Reasons for the Choice of Hendrik Kraemer and John Hick

The perplexing diversity of the approaches and ongoing discussions of this discipline give an appearance that there is "no clear direction"(Bosch 1991, 478). From the brief review of the related literature, the following results are obvious: First, the TOR is of great concern to all Christians today, whether they have direct personal experience with other religions or not. Second, it is evident that it has become customary to classify models on the relation of Christianity to the other religions as "pluralism," "inclusivism," or "exclusivism." The positions of these three paradigms are summarized in **Figure 1**. The representative figures of these three positions are, respectively, **John Hick, Karl Rahner, and Hendrik Kraemer** (Newbigin 1989, 182; cf. Scheid 1992). Third, the position of inclusivism has an ambiguous character when compared with the other two models, exclusivism and pluralism. Furthermore, inclusivism is not of much concern to major Protestant scholars. Therefore, it is evident that contemporary discussions on the TOR in the Protestant community are wandering between two extremes, exclusivism and pluralism. In order to clearly grasp the scope of the contemporary TOR, it will be necessary to examine the representative figures of these two extremes in detail.

Hendrik Kraemer and John Hick are chosen to be representatives of the two poles (i.e the "exclusive" and the "pluralist" models) of the three paradigms of **Figure 1**.

IV. PARADIGMATIC COMPARISON OF HENDRIK KRAEMER & JOHN HICK

In order to examine or understand the religions or religious phenomena, Kraemer and Hick assert different starting points for epistemology: God or his revelation, and humankind and its existence.

For **Kraemer, God is the source of knowledge or its starting point**, since to him alone is known the truth and truth is "never in the first place an intellectually demonstrable proposition" (Kraemer 1962, 74). His concept of truth is definitely derived from the faith that God has revealed the Way and the Truth and the Life in Jesus Christ and wills this to be known through all the world (Kraemer 1938, 107). The revelation of God, "the divine initiative," cannot be identified with any ideas, concepts and experiences that are engendered in the course of history. To Kraemer any value judgment or truth-claim for religion can be carried out only by its adherence to the revelation of God.

The weakness of Kraemer's epistemology, as understood by rationalists, is that there may be a possibility that it may run into the danger of agnosticism. As a critic of Kraemer's view, C. J. Bleeker highlights this point (Bleeker 1965, 102-103). Nevertheless, Kraemer's understanding of the Bible, as the unique witness regarding the Person of Jesus Christ, can easily avoid this problem (Kraemer 1962, 20). Rather, his treatment of revelation, based neither on the empirical statement of men nor the phenomenology of religions, remains its strong point in regard to his epistemology of religions. Furthermore, the ontological consistency of the metaphysical world is a strong proposition of exclusivism (Stetson 1994, 115-116).

In contrast to Kraemer, Hick begins his epistemological inquiry with "human understanding." Hick goes on to distinguish his epistemology of religion from that of Kant.

Thus for Kant God is not experienced, but postulated. However I am exploring here the different and very non-Kantian hypothesis that God is experienced by human beings...(Hick 1980a, 142)

Thus, for **Hick, the "starting point"** of understanding of religious phenomena is the "**ultimate concern**"

of humanity (Hick 1989, 4). He defines religion as "human responses to the Transcendent" (Hick 1989).

Based on this epistemology, Hick criticizes the traditional conceptions of Christian doctrine, i.e., Trinity,

Incarnation, two natures of Christ, due to their "unintelligibility."

The problem with Hick's empirical epistemology is the inconsistency of the reality. In his Copernican TOR, one may find there are many realities in his "universe of religions." Ward J. Fellow points to this dilemma for Hick:

In Hick's pluralism there are many suns: the many images of and beliefs about the Godhead, around one of which each of the religions is organized...in operation each religion moves around its own little sun, not the one big SUN. The SUN is the basis of Hick's pluralism of religions as a group, precisely because it is both unknown and absolutely unrelated in any significant way to any specific religion. (Fellow 1988, 184-5)

To **Kraemer**, however, though **religions** are sincere human expressions directed toward Ultimate Reality, they **do not guarantee arrival at God**. Thus Frederick the Great's expression, "Ieder wordt op zijn manier zalig," may not be applicable to all appearances of religious phenomena (Kraemer 1962, 57,61-62). The appearances of religion--"the various ways which men have of believing, together with their consequent activities"--are not the legitimate criteria of reality; only God's revelation in Jesus is. It is

God's Self-disclosure, God's Self-communication in Jesus Christ, which reveals the truth and reveals that truth to be the criterion for every effort of ours to search out and determine where truth is to be found and where not...(Kraemer 1962, 77)

Therefore, **religion** is, to **Kraemer**, not a genuine path to God, but misguided human endeavor. Because of his pessimistic stance regarding the validity of human reason, Kraemer's view is vulnerable to the critical attack that its end would be skepticism or exclusivism. The ontological judgment of religious phenomena for these two paradigms is derived from and related to their ethical aspects. Kraemer's exclusive view, based on his insistence upon man's total depravity, may easily lead to the criticism that it posits a morally incorrect attitude and behavior.

This sort of moral attack comes primarily from the pluralist camp with its humanistic perspective. Pluralists conceive of exclusivists as arrogant and imperialistic because they believe their religious doctrines to be ultimately true and others' ultimately untrue. John Hick denounces the errors he believes are propagated by exclusivism:

This conviction [exclusivism], with its baleful historical influence in validating centuries of anti-Semitism, the colonial exploitation by Christian Europe of what today we call the third world, and the subordination of women within a strongly patriarchal religious system, not only cause misgivings among many Christians but also alarms many of our non-Christian neighbors, creating invisible but powerful barriers within the human community. (Hick 1993a, viii)

This criticism, of course, from a representative of pluralism, is based on a humanistic understanding of human disposition: all men naturally possess innate goodness. But pluralism's morality is not guaranteed by its insistence upon a universal human morality. Rather, its embracing universalism--universal salvation of humanity--is problematic. Its non-theistic approaches to the "Real," shown in its soteriological perspective, ultimately leads to immorality. John Sanders powerfully criticizes it:

If the words "God will save" are to have any meaning, they must have a particular content. When Hick and Knitter claim that God will save all, do they have a Christian understanding of God and salvation in mind? If so, then they are not true pluralists: they are smuggling in a Christian conception and making it definitive. If not, then what exactly do they mean? If they are genuinely including Hinduism or Buddhism, then they are radically altering the Christian understanding of the assertion that "God will save," since these non-theistic Eastern religions posit a non-personal God who cannot do anything and a non-individualistic existence after death that is quite different from the Christian conception... Pluralists such as Hick remove the God of Christianity via the front door with much fanfare only to smuggle him quietly in the back door, and it is for this reason that they are not successful in completing the revolution from a Christo-centric to a theo-centric theology. (Sanders 1992, 120-121)

4.1 Comparison: The Two Basic Systems of Hendrik Kraemer and John Hick

Hick proposes a **definition of religion** as "an understanding of the universe," because it involves reference beyond the natural world to God (Hick 1973a, 133). Above those general illustrations about the function of religions, Hick tries to put his pluralistic reflection on this functional view of religion. Religion "works" as a means of God's revelation. In this regard, all religions function in their own distinct ways. This means that the

different world religions have each served as God's means of revelation to a different stream of human life. (Hick 1980a, 71)

If religion is "God's means of revelation" and a "way of salvation," then how is God to be known within various religions? To answer this question, it is necessary to examine Hick's understanding of revelation.

Hick does not use the term "**revelation**" exclusively, nor does he give a clear definition of it. However, he explains the nature and content of it from time to time. He advocates the possibility of many-faceted perceptions of revelation:

I have spoken of the ultimate divine reality as everywhere 'revealing' itself to human beings, this universal revelatory activity being differently perceived and responded to within the different cultural ways of being human. (Hick 1985, 97)

Kraemer expresses his understanding of **revelation**, which he likes to express as "**Biblical realism.**" He understands this to be God's Self-disclosure in the Person of Jesus Christ. It is the focal point of his revelational activity (Kraemer 1956, 237, 353, 363). Other modes of his revelatory works in nature, history or conscience, which scientific researchers argue are God's revelation in other religions, are of a different order. These modes, therefore, according to Kraemer, may not be called "revelation" or even "general revelation."

To **Hick**, the **Bible is not the "revelation of God,"** but a "record of the stream of revelatory events" (Hick 1973a, 50). Inspiration, which he refers to as the "faith of the biblical writer," makes the Bible differ from a secular historical record.

The uniqueness of the Bible is not due to any unique mode or quality of its writing but to the unique significance of the events of which it is original documentary expression, which became revelatory through the faith of the biblical writers. As such the Bible mediates the same revelation to subsequent generations and is thus itself revelatory in a secondary sense, calling in its own turn for a response of faith. (Hick 1973a, 51)

Because Hick clings to a non-propositional view of revelation, especially concerning the Bible, he denies the exclusive manifestation of God's revelation. To him, any religious tradition has the same degree of authenticity as others, and therefore, differences cannot support religious exclusivism (Hick 1985, 93). Furthermore, in his pluralistic point of view, all religious modes and ways are possibilities leading to the affirmation of the ultimate Reality (Hick 1985, 94). Therefore, for Hick, the revelation is that which in a wider sense does not necessarily entail divinely disclosed propositions or miraculous interventions in the course of human history, but in which is found all authentic religious awareness in a response to the presence and pressure of the divine Reality. (Hick 1985, 97-98)

The **difference in the epistemological presuppositions** of these two paradigms is advanced in their ontological understanding of religious phenomena: one statement -- the appearance of religious phenomena does not supply the guidance to God -- vs. the other -- all religious phenomena are legitimate and workable guides to the Reality. For Hick, all religions are ways to humanity's salvation. He insists "the great religions are all, at their experiential roots, in contact with the same ultimate divine reality" (Hick 1974, 151). In Hick's pluralistic schema, the different religious traditions, in their variegated doctrines and practices, actually center upon the same subject. This implies that all religions, or any kind of religious phenomena of humanity, are valid and valuable appearances.

These two paradigms on the TOR manifest in their philosophical presuppositions different beliefs.

Figure 7 clearly demonstrates their different presuppositions.

Figure 2 - Paradigmatic Comparison of the Basic Systems of Kraemer and Hick

(Kim 1995, 121)

Theme	H. Kraemer	J. Hick
Sources of Religious Knowledge	God and the Bible	The Bible and other religious literature
Starting Point of Religious Epistemology	God and his revelation	Humankind and their existence
Ontological Status of Religion	Religion is a human endeavor Religious phenomena - not guarantee guidance to God	Religion is the legitimate way to the Reality
Human Condition	Man's disposition is basically bad	Man's disposition - naturally good

4.2 Comparison: Christology

Kraemer's theo-centric understanding of Christ appears to reflect the situation of the mission field. Only an exclusive understanding of the Logos concept can make clear the message of the Christian gospel (cf. John 1:11). Kraemer insists that Jesus Christ is not only the "subjective" criterion of the truth, but also the "objective" criterion. On this point, he does not accept the existential view of faith, with its emphasis upon the subjectivity of faith and revelation (Kraemer 1962, 71-76). Methodologically, **Kraemer** prefers the "**Christology from Above**" view, though he did not mention it specifically. His Christology was, in its character, "theo-centric," emphasizing the divinity of Christ without ignoring Christ's human nature. He quoted biblical passages mostly from the Apostles John and Paul. **Hick**, however, in his methodology of Christology, prefers **the search for the historical Jesus**, concentrating largely on Jesus' humanity.

Hick criticizes traditional Christology as not being authorized by Jesus himself, believing the religious-cultural milieu of the early church as having provided its manner of expression, and asserting that the meaning of the dogma has never been shown to have any precise meaning (Hick 1993a, 49; cf. 1993b, 1-79). What, then, is the content of Hick's "revised" Christology? Following the lead of D. Baillie and G. Lampe, **Hick** introduces his "**inspiration**" **Christology** (Hick 1993a, 35ff). His "inspiration" Christology can be analyzed as follows:

First, Hick describes Christ as the highest degree or example of grace-inspired humanity. As a human being, Jesus, throughout his life, reflected God's grace. In other words, Hick insists that in Jesus, God's love, *agape*, was incarnated, and Jesus' spirit was inspired by God's grace (Hick 1993a, 54-55). Jesus is the fullest or most complete realization of human life as it is meant to be lived by the divine inspiration of God's spirit (Hick 1993a, 53).

Second, in Hick's Christology, Christ is understood in a functional rather than an ontological sense. Jesus is, according to Hick, a man of the Spirit who is a model of human response to God's principal activity. He exemplifies human life thoroughly lived in faith and freedom within the grace and inspiration of God (Hick 1993a, 54-55).

Third, the "inspiration" Christology implies that Jesus' exemplification might also be found and verified by observation and judgment in other religious traditions. Jesus' exemplification of divine inspiration does not lay *a priori* claim to the superiority of Christianity in relation to the other world religions. It allows for historical observation and evaluation to decide if this highest degree of inspired life represented in Jesus is also discovered and exemplified in other religious saviors or traditions (Hick 1977b, 46-65; 1993a, 52-56).

Finally, the goal and direction of Hick's Christology are to correct the Christian faith by promoting both pluralistic spirit and vision, thereby renouncing the claim of its uniqueness. Hick suggests:

The alternative is a Christian faith which takes Jesus as our supreme (but not necessarily only) spiritual guide; as our personal and communal lord, leader, guru, exemplar, and teacher, but not as literally himself God; and which sees Christianity as one authentic context of salvation/liberation amongst others, not opposing but interacting in mutually creative ways with the other great paths. (Hick 1993b, 163)

The greater conflict between these two paradigms on the TOR is clearly manifested in their differing understandings of the divinity of Christ. For Kraemer, the divinity of Christ is the unshakable foundation and "the absolutely distinctive and peculiar and unique element" of Christianity (Kraemer 1962, 80). Kraemer and Hick, these two experts of religious study, reflect well prior centuries' theological debates in their respective TOR.

Figure 3 - Paradigmatic Comparison: Christology

(Kim 1995, 126)

CATEGORY	H. KRAEMER	J. HICK
LABEL	"Theo-centric Christology"	"Inspiration Christology"
POINT OF EMPHASIS	Christ's Divinity	Jesus' Humanity
THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST	Jesus Christ is totally human	Jesus Christ is totally human; Incarnation = a mythological concept
THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST	Jesus Christ himself is fully God	Jesus himself denied his deity; to assert it is "blasphemous"
CHRIST & RELIGIONS	Christ is the unique revelation of God (the only Way)	Jesus is a religious leader. He is a model/ideal religious man.
PREFERRED METHODOLOGY FOR CHRISTOLOGICAL STUDY	"Christology from Above"	"Search for the historical Jesus"

4.3 Comparison: Soteriology

The character of Kraemer's soteriology is exclusive because it demands an explicit belief in Jesus Christ alone as leading to salvation (Kraemer 1938, 211). This is why his thinking is labeled as "exclusivism" by many scholars (Newbigin 1989; Conn 1990; Scheid 1992).

Hick argues that the central tenet of Christianity as a "way of life" is its self-perception as a way of salvation. The teaching of Jesus is presented as "a Way" (Hick 1973a, 109). The Christian way is a practical way of life, but it is not simply an ethic as many modernists understand. The important element of this Way is "belief or faith" (Hick 1973a, 110), expressed in the activity of worship. But this expressive activity, according to Hick, has been changed in its form, organization or worship, according to the influence of its immediate environment. Nevertheless, there is the unchanging element that is to be found in the originating event. In this

event Christian faith sees God acting self-revealingly for the salvation of the world. It is the "Christ-event" (Hick 1973a, 111).

Both paradigms propose a decree of God in which is expressed his salvific will toward fallen humankind. But they differ in dealing with God's action in achieving his purpose. First, they disagree over the definition of the word "salvation." To **Kraemer**, **salvation** has legal implications, necessarily involving "restoration." For **Hick**, however, **it is a "transformation"** of human existence in which no judicial process is required or necessary.

Two different views of **the salvation of humanity** are based upon and derived from their understanding of human nature. For **Kraemer**, **humanity is fallen and corrupted**, having definitely lost its *sensus divinitatis*. It cannot save itself nor rightly recognize its problematic nature, being separated from God by personal sin. Humanity needs God's action and God's Mediator for salvation. God's loving intervention is the unique hope of humankind. But for **Hick**, **humans are autonomous beings**. There is no "original fall" or the like; hence human nature itself is basically good. It does not need any mediator nor God's action. Humankind can save itself by its own right response to the Reality.

Such contrasting interpretations of the nature of humanity require different provisions for salvation. For Kraemer, the "atonement" is inevitably necessary for the "restoration," in which God's initiative is involved. However, for Hick, there is no need of any redemptive work by a mediator nor for a mediator at all, inasmuch as humanity transforms itself by itself into the "likeness of God" (Hick 1993b, 130).

Another contrast between these two views of soteriology is their understanding of faith. For **Hick**,

Christians' faith in Christ, evidenced by serving him as God Incarnate, is very **subjective**. On this point, he basically agrees with the existential view of faith. Hick interprets the inspiration given to biblical authors as their faith in Jesus. Therefore, inspiration also is a very subjective response on the part of the biblical authors. In contrast to Hick, **Kraemer**, though not denying there is a subjective element in the character of faith, claims that **faith in Christ** also possesses **objectivity** (Kraemer 1962, 74-76).

As a final observation upon these differing soteriologies, the **subject of salvific operation** in these two paradigms on the TOR is evidently different. For Kraemer, God and God alone is the subject of salvation, inasmuch as only he can perform the "restoration" or *heil* of humankind. To him, the decisive factor in determining who is to be saved is the sovereign grace of God. On this point, Kraemer's soteriology, from a theological standpoint, corresponds well to the Calvinistic or Reformed perspective of soteriology. For Hick, however, since humanity has some sense of divinity in its nature, humankind itself controls the operation of salvation. Thus a Calvinistic doctrine such as predestination is, for Hick, merely a product of religious elitism and cannot "claim to represent the message of the great spiritual traditions" (Hick 1989, 207-208). **Figure 4** shows how greatly these two paradigms differ in their understanding of salvation and its operation.

Figure 4 - Paradigmatic Comparison: Soteriology

(Kim 1995, 129)

Theme	H. Kraemer	J. Hick
Nature of Man	Humanity is fallen and corrupted	Humans are autonomous beings; no "original sin"
Nature of Salvation	Salvation is the "restoration" of the lost normal, original divine order of life.	Salvation is full humanization. It is maximization of human nature's potentiality.
Provision for Salvation	"Atonement" which God initiates	Humanity's self-deification
Nature of Faith	Faith is both subjective and objective	Faith is subjective
Decisive Factor or Role in Salvation	God's sovereign grace	The individual's personal decision

4.4 Comparison: Ecclesiology

One of the important things in **Kraemer's ecclesiology** is his distinction between historical Christianity, which he generally expresses as "empirical Christianity," and the true invisible Church, which he sometimes refers to as "biblical revelation," "true Christianity," or "**biblical realism**" (Kraemer 1938, 368; 1956, 336-337; 1962, 110). The content of "empirical Christianity" is the "mixture of 'true' Christians and Christians in name" (Kraemer 1956, 336). The latter, nominal human expression of spiritual life can be brought into line with the other religions in some aspects like psychological, moral or mystical phenomena (Kraemer 1938, 285). Therefore, Kraemer does not deny the possibility that "the demonic aspect of religion" could appear within "empirical Christianity" (Kraemer 1956, 335, 337).

Nevertheless, **the Christian Church** is in a special position, differentiating it from non-Christian religions (Kraemer 1938, 145). The unique element of the Christian Church is "the fact of Jesus Christ," who invites humanity to genuine communion with God. Though the Christian Church itself is not the standard or criterion of truth - Christ is - it is constantly called and standing under the direct influence of God's revelation in Christ (Kraemer 1962, 76-80). The Church must keep its unique character, so that it does not lose its element of uniqueness in a multi-religious society. Though its mode of expression may at times be similar to other religious societies, its meaning differs radically.

The Christian Church, according to the conception of the New Testament, is a community *sui generis*. The unique character of the Christian Church is entirely misunderstood if it is conceived as a welfare or goodwill society on a religious basis. In its mode of expression, in its ministry, it may make in some respects the same impression as such societies, but in reality it is something quite different. (Kraemer 1938, 415-416)

The **unique character and position of the Church** definitively implies its missionary obligation. The Church is the center of missions. The Church, as an official institution, must be aware of its essential missionary

character because it exists for the sake of the Lord of the world and not for its own sake (Kraemer 1938, 34; 1962, 22).

The church is, rightly understood, the greatest agency for continual change and renewal of the world and its life, for it obeys a Lord who is the "hidden" Lord of the world, and who is bent upon the redemption and renewal of the world, of this world. (Kraemer 1965, 34)

For Kraemer, the primary interest of the Christian Church is its mission toward other religions.

According to **Hick**, though the **Christ-event** serves as the origin of Christianity, there is a fundamental problem in understanding it, inasmuch as it only happened once, and is not reconstructible, i.e., his physical appearance and actual words. Only the reports of the witnesses, the New Testament writers, remain. Because of the difficulty of historical reconstruction, according to Hick, different Christian circles have understood Jesus very differently (Hick 1973a, 113). Those with faith in the Christ-event interpreted it under the influence of the religious environment within their immediate community. They formed doctrines, intellectually fixed systems of beliefs and diverse terminologies. Their theological systems, as diversifications of the modes of Christian thought, developed through a complex interaction between religious and non-religious factors.

Therefore, according to **Hick**, **Christian systems of beliefs, or theologies, are ever changing.**

Christian theology is part of the culturally and historically conditioned response to the Christ-event. Only the essence of Christianity, which is the way of life and salvation originating in the Christ-event, will continually exist as the Way (Hick 1973a, 119). Christianity is an open-ended history that has taken diverse forms in diverse circumstances as well as heralding the way of salvation. Hick himself confesses his faith in the uniqueness of the Christ-event.

I believed that God has made himself known to mankind with unique fullness and saving power in Christ, and has ordained that all men must come to him through Christ. (Hick 1973a, 122)

However, this way of Christianity is not the unique way of salvation. According to his "**Copernican revolution**" in the TOR, this kind of salvation can be found outside Christianity.

The position and role of the Christian Church is described differently in these two theological paradigms. For Kraemer, who accepted the traditional understanding of the nature of the Church, it is to be distinguished from the world, advancing its spiritual nature over the world. Thus the Church is "the apostolic body" (Kraemer 1956, 17) and is commissioned to proclaim the message of God (Kraemer 1956, 18). For Hick, however, while accepting the validity of Christianity's confession and faith (Hick 1973a, 111), there is a denial of its unique nature (1993a, 77-99). To him, the Church is a faith community such as other religious congregations. Therefore, according to Hick, the role or contribution of the Christian Church, from his pluralistic view, is partial and insufficient as a guide for the salvation of humankind.

The **priority of the functions for the Church** is different between the two paradigms, as well. For Kraemer, the supreme function of the Church is evangelism; for Hick, the humanistic service is the most important role of the Church. Actually, Hick denies the evangelistic task of the Church.

Their understanding of the Church's position in the pluralist society makes for a strong contrast. In Kraemer's view, the Church is the unique container of God's revelation. According to Hick's view, however, the Christian Church is merely one of many religious organizations in the world. This differing understanding of the Church's position is linked to the content of the message that the Church will deliver. According to Kraemer, the Church's message to the non-Christian religions is one of "conversion to Christ." For Hick, the Church must take off her exclusive truth-claim and cooperate with other religious organizations. Thus the Church needs to maintain an ecumenical spirit.

These two paradigms of the TOR present conflicting directions for the Christian Church. In **Kraemer's TOR**, it is demanded that the Christian Church be faithful to the revelation of God. That is what he suggests through his biblical realism (Kraemer 1938, 368; 1956, 336-337) and the Church must be obedient to the Word of God. In contrast, **Hick's** suggestion to the Christian Church is implied in the title of his "**Copernican revolution**:" that the Christian Church abandon traditional doctrines and its exclusive truth-claim. Christians must give up their prejudiced "ecclesio-centric" understanding of religions (Hick 1973a, 131). In other words, the Christian Church must radically change its attitude from one of absoluteness to one of relativeness in the face of religious pluralism (Hick 1985, 86; 1980, 38).

Figure 5 summarizes how significant the difference is between these two paradigms in their understandings of ecclesiology.

Figure 5 - Pradigmatic Comparison: Ecclesiology

(Kim 1995, 132)

Theme	H. Kraemer	J. Hick
Nature of the Church	The Church is the sole agency of God	The Church is a faith community that was influenced by Jesus' life
Role or Function of the Church	The Church is commissioned by God to proclaim his message	The Christian Church is one of many faith communities, a response to the divine Reality
The Church's Position among Other Religions	The Church is the unique container of divine revelation	The Church, as one of many religious organizations, needs cooperation & mutual acceptance with other religious/institutions.
The Church's Primary Task	Evangelism	Humanistic service
The Church's Message for Non-Christians	Conversion to Christ & regeneration	Charitable cooperation
Ideal Model of the Church	"Biblical Realism" - faithfulness to God's Revelation	"Copernican revolution" - abandonment of exclusive truth-claim

4.5 Comparison: Missiology

All religious phenomena, according to Hick, are encounters "with the one infinite reality" (Hick 1973a, 139). In other words, all religions are responding to the one God, the one Divine Reality or Absolute. Therefore, **for Hick, every religious expression is relative.** But this relativity neither means that every expression is true, nor that all is equal. Hick himself argues that religious phenomena can be graded (Hick 1985, 67-87). But this grading can be applied only to their religious phenomena. Grading of great world religions as totalities is impossible, because the human mind cannot weigh up and compare their merits as systems of salvation (Hick 1985, 86). In summary, Hick's "Copernican revolution" in the TOR implies that Christians must respect the ways and systems of other religions, rather than claim exclusive validity for their own way and system. Second, according to Hick, this Copernican revolution is required not only for the Christian, but also for the adherents of other great religions of the world (Hick 1973a, 132). In other words, every religion must take off its attitude of Ptolemaic thought which assumes that its own system is alone fully true and that all the others are more or less true according as they approximate to or diverge from it. (Hick 1973a, 132)

Hick insists that since this Ptolemaic thought normally originates wherever the believer happens to have been born, he is not provided with a sufficient basis for a conviction with which to assess all other convictions due to the contextual limitations of his birthplace. Each Ptolemaic theology of great religions tends to posit its center on the basis of the accidents of cultural geography (Hick 1973a, 132). Therefore, it must be aware of its historical relativity. Hick develops his argument based on this insistence: namely, that any conversion from one religion to another, including that of Christianity, could not have been successful in the past (Hick 1980a, 60-61).

What then is the valid theory to which this Copernican revolution points? It is **religious ecumenism**, which **Hick calls "the new map of the universe of faiths"** on the earth (Hick 1973a, 133-147; cf. Na 1991, 154). On this new map, the different religions will constitute a global religious life. The relationship between these religions will be like the appearance between the different denominations of Christianity today.

What, then, is the implication for Christian missions of this "Copernican revolution" in theology?

According to **Hick**, Christianity has the right to claim its distinctiveness, but it must be practiced under the **"pluralistic vision."**

For each of the great traditions has developed its own absolute claim which in principle relegates other relations and ways of salvation to a secondary status. To varying extent the kind of rethinking that is going on fairly vigorously within Christianity is also going on within the other major traditions; and the gradually emerging outcome will be a new pluralistic world consciousness. But the rethinking has to be done within each tradition, developing its own resources in the direction of the pluralistic vision. (Hick 1985, 101)

In other words, the mission of Christianity in a pluralistic society is, first, to abandon its claim of absoluteness, and second, to take off the ego-centric or exclusive understanding of salvation and recognize that its way is not the only way but one way of many ways (Hick 1985, 53,86; 1980a, 38-39).

Since Hick's TOR claims a pluralistic view of the religions, the inter-religious or inter-faith dialogue is an inevitable and important subject in the theological paradigm. According to Hick, theological dialogue comprises a spectrum ranging between two extremes: "confessional dialogue" and "truth-seeking dialogue" (Hick 1980, 117).

Hick introduces Hendrik Kraemer as the representative of the Christian "confessional" attitude. But this attitude, Hick argues, can only result either in conversion or in a hardening of differences (Hick 1980a, 121).

Ideal patterns of dialogue must be accompanied by the possibility of mutual change.

In order for dialogue to be mutually fruitful, lesser changes than total conversion must be possible and must be hoped for on both (or all) sides. (Hick 1980a, 122)

Hick argues that Christians may engage in dialogue with a changed attitude in which they perceive

themselves not "as adherents of historical Christianity but simply as adherents of Jesus" (Hick 1980a, 123). Of course, here, Jesus refers only to the human Jesus. **Hick suggests "ecumenical dialogue"** (Hick 1980a, 124-136), which can be analyzed as follows: First, Hick's ecumenical dialogue means an abandonment of the confessional faith of Christianity and its uniqueness. It is neither seeking for the point of evangelism nor witnessing to the gospel. Rather, **Hick** insists that Christianity must "turn out" its traditional doctrine or reconstruct it for effective truth-seeking dialogue. Second, in ecumenical dialogue the process of inter-religious dialogue involves formulating "**a global theology.**"

A global theology would consist of theories or hypotheses designed to interpret the religious experience of mankind as it occurs not only within Christianity but also within the other great streams of religious life. (Hick 1980a, 21)

Finally, the expected goal of this ecumenical dialogue is the **integration of world religions.**

The religious traditions are consciously interacting with each other in mutual observation and in inter-faith dialogue, it is possible that their future developments may be on gradually converging courses. For during the next few centuries they will no doubt each continue to change, and it may be that they will grow closer together, and even that one day such names as 'Christianity,' 'Buddhism,' 'Islam,' 'Hinduism', will no longer describe the then current configurations of man's religious experience and belief. (Hick 1974, 151)

For Kraemer, men like Gandhi, Tagor and Radhakrishnan, although expressing in their peculiar ways strong similarities to ideals and ideas derived from Christianity, were not Christians. The dissemination of Christian ideas, as well as other social services, cannot be the goal of Christian missions (Kraemer 1938, 291,295).

The valid motive and purpose of missions is "to call men and peoples to confront themselves with God's act of revelation and salvation" as taught in the Bible and to build up a community of those who have surrendered themselves to faith in and loving service of Jesus. (Kraemer 1938, 292)

Therefore, "evangelism, proselytism and conversion" are the core of the missionary enterprise (Kraemer 1938, 296). For this reason, someone has called Kraemer's attitude towards religions an "evangelistic approach" (Jathanna 1981, 110, 144).

Kraemer warned the Christian Church that the contemporary inter-religious dialogue movement may be used as a counteragency to the world mission of Christianity. As the agency of God, the Christian Church should first and foremost set her own house in order, because the greatest service she can render to the world, the West and the Eastern world, is by being resolutely the Church of Jesus Christ. (Kraemer 1960, 376)

The two paradigms exhibit **a difference in the purpose for religious studies**. In Kraemer's theology of religions, the concern is not with a comparison of the empirical phenomenon of Christianity as a religion with other religions, but with the relation of the gospel to the world of religions. In other words, he has respect for the relation of the Christian gospel to the universal religious consciousness of humanity and its various manifestations in the religious forms (Jathanna 1981, 102). Thus Kraemer's main purpose is to develop an effective mission theory or strategy for the evangelization of the adherents of world religions. But in Hick's TOR, the major concern is the comparison of religious phenomena. The goal of Hick's endeavor is to build religious ecumenism through the comparative study of religions, while Kraemer wished to proselyte the adherents of non-Christian religions.

Kraemer's radical exclusive opinion concerning the revelation of God supports the view that there is no continuity between Christianity and other religions. Therefore, Kraemer did not view the scientific comparative research of religions (a preference of Hick's) to be a logically acceptable method for supporting mission strategy. To him, only a power-encounter style of evangelistic approach, using the missionary as "the point of contact," was the most effective mission strategy.

Figure 6 displays the great contrasts between these two paradigms in their suggested directions for Christian missions.

Figure 6 - Paradigmatic Comparison: Missiology

(Kim 1995, 134)

Theme	H. Kraemer	J. Hick
Purpose of Rel. Studies	For the evangelistic task & strategy	Comparison of religious phenomena
Method of Mission	Spiritual Power encounter: Evangelistic approach	Humanistic approach and cooperation
Goal of Mission	Proselytism & conversion	Religious ecumenism
Point of Contact	Missionaries themselves	Commonalities of religions based on scientific research of religions
Continuity/Discontinuity: Xnty. & other Religions	Discontinuity	Continuity
Inter-Religious Dialogue	Dialogue is basically impossible so far as the missionary claims his faith in Christ	"Ecumenical dialogue" is inevitable for building the integration of world religions and for formulating a "global theology"

V. CONCLUSION: AN EVANGELICAL EVALUATION

5.1 Defending the Christian Faith: Hendrik Kraemer

Kraemer is a proponent of an exclusive model of the TOR, rejecting all approaches--whether speaking of fulfillment, continuity, or even a radical break-- that see the encounter between religions and an affair taking place within the realm of human religious self-expression. He has been influential among contemporary evangelical theologians such as Lesslie Newbigin and John Stott.

Kraemer's TOR declares: Jesus Christ, the self-disclosure of God, is the criterion of all truth and value, and, therefore, no criterion from outside can be used to judge him; the world religions cannot be paths of salvation because only through an explicit link with the gospel of Christ can true salvation be found; Christianity is radically discontinuous with the rest of the world and the religions; the Christian gospel is the message of truth; an explicit relation with Christ is required; the Christian Church's primary task is evangelism; Messianic salvation cannot be identified with development, earthly progress, or social change.

Kraemer's legacy has been succeeded well in evangelical Christian movements. The "Frankfurt Declaration"(1970) and "Lausanne Covenant" (1974) are examples of the exclusivistic approach tied to Kraemer. John Stott, a speaker at the Lausanne Congress (1974), praises Kraemer's rejection of the notion of Christ as the fulfillment of non-Christian religious tendencies and his call for "persuasive and winning" proclamation of the Christian gospel (Anderson and Stransky 1981, 167-8; cf. Anderson and Stransky 1975, 241ff). This legacy of Kraemer continued through the Lausanne II meetings in Manila 1989. "The Manila Manifesto," an official paper of the meeting states:

We affirm that the Jesus of history and the Christ of glory are the same person, and that this Jesus Christ is absolutely unique, for he alone is God incarnate, our sinbearer, the conqueror of death, and the coming judge... We affirm that other religions and ideologies are not alternative paths to God, and that human spirituality, if unredeemed by Christ, leads not to God but to judgment, for Christ is the only way. (LCWE 1989)

Kraemer's TOR, with its strong biblical foundation, is a good example of how Christian theology approaches Scripture as the normative expression of the Christian faith. His academic tasks illustrate, in one way, how every dimension of theology is to serve the written Word of God in a changing world. The missiological conduct that he formulated and advocated through his theology of religions gives the Christian Church a fine example of the tasks of Christian theology: Christian theology and theological task must reckon with the uniqueness and decisiveness of Jesus Christ in relation to the religions of the world.

Kraemer's recognition as a great missiologist is deserved since he focused on the distinct identity of the Christian mission in an age of uncertainty and opened many eyes to the possibility of a truly worldwide evangelism through his contribution on the theology of religions.

5.2 Defrauding the Christian Faith: John Hick

Hick, having been brought up and trained in English Presbyterianism and having taught in many universities in both the United States and England, presents a serious challenge to the exclusivistic Christian theology of religions. His approach, generally denominated as a "**pluralistic position**," denies the possibility of one definitive and normative savior for all people, and treats the major world religions as legitimate paths to human salvation or liberation.

Hick's TOR is summarized by his call for a "**Copernican revolution**." This revolution means the abandonment of the exclusive truth-claims of Christian doctrines, such as the Divine Incarnation or Trinity, and understanding the Bible or Jesus as one set of religious symbols in the diverse manifestations of "Ultimate Reality." For Hick, Jesus is neither God nor the Lord of the world, but merely a man divinely inspired who opened his followers to the moral demands of conversion from self-centeredness to "Reality-centeredness." Hick's revolution requires the suspension of the traditional Christian teaching proclaiming Christ as the unique savior of the world.

Hick's view also asserts that **Scripture** is regarded as a religious book containing a limited story of the Divine. The Bible cannot convey absolute truth about the nature of God, and all religious literature is assumed to bear witness to some functional or partial truth about how human beings are to relate to the Divine. For Hick, Scripture must be interpreted mythologically. The resurrection story of Jesus is an example of such mythic language, relating the subjective experience of grace that the encounter with Jesus of Nazareth meant to his followers.

According to **Hick's** understanding, **salvation** is the liberation of humankind, which is understood to be the common ground to which all the religions of the world can contribute through inter-religious dialogue and

collaboration. The nature or disposition of humankind is not necessarily sinful, rather it contains the sense of deity by which all humankind can make a proper response to "the Reality" through religious practices.

In **Hick's pluralistic formulation**, the **Christian Church** must attempt to dialogue with the great world religions and have its theology formulated by the reflection of these dialogical activities. Hick's perspective presents serious problems. It is based on human philosophies, denies the particularity of the Bible, and destroys the foundational doctrines of Christianity. It distorts the role of the Christian Church, thereby hindering Christian missions (cf. Hick 1980a, 132). Denying the lordship and divinity of Jesus Christ, it is questionable whether it can be the theology of a Christian.

5.3 Conclusion

A comparison of two paradigms on the TOR, represented by Kraemer and Hick, demonstrates the great differences in their approaches.

Philosophically, Kraemer's model defines religion as a human endeavor, while Hick's values it as a legitimate way to the Reality.

In Christology, Hick's position sees Jesus as a human religious leader, while Kraemer's insists upon the lordship and divinity of Jesus Christ.

Soteriologically, Hick's system supports universal salvation, while Kraemer's emphasizes the particularity

of the redemptive atonement of Jesus Christ.

In ecclesiology, Hick's formulation denies the particularity of the Christian Church's position, while Kraemer's sees it as God's unique agency for salvation.

The two paradigms of Kraemer and Hick present contrasting directions for Christian missions. For Kraemer, the supreme mission of the Christian Church is the proclamation of the message of God and the evangelization of unreached peoples, while Hick understands it to be merely a service agency, thereby denying its evangelistic task. The paradigms of the TOR of Kraemer and Hick can be shown in comparison and contrast in **Figure 7** and **Figure 8** below:

Figure 7 - A Simplified Paradigmatic Comparison: Systematic Theology

TOPIC	H. KRAEMER	J. HICK
Bibliology	Bible = the Unique Witness	Bible = one of the many sacred books
Christology	Christ = the Unique Revelation of God	Christ = one of the many human religious leaders
Soteriology	salvation: Christ = the only Way	salvation: many ways in various religions
Ecclesiology	Church = the sole agency of God	church = one of the many forms of religious institutions
Eschatology	Christ's 2nd coming: separation of Xns. & non-Christians	Christ's 2nd coming: universal salvation of humankind

Figure 8 - A Simplified Paradigmatic Comparison: "Theology of Religions"

ISSUE	H. KRAEMER	J. HICK
Presupposition	epistemologically based on God's Revelation in the Bible	Epistemologically based on human understanding
Proposed Methodology	"Biblical Realism"	"Copernican Revolution"
Parallelism of All Religions/ Uniqueness of Xnty.	uniqueness of Christianity	parallelism of all religions; non-absoluteness of Xty.
Preferred Relationships between Religions	evangelistic claim & conversion to Christ	dialogue/religious ecumenism
Practical Guidelines	spiritual power encounter evangelism by	humanistic & humanitarian co-existence &

Relating to Other Religions	words & deeds	co-operation
------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

REFERENCE LIST

- Allen, E. L. 1960. Christianity among the religions. Boston: Beacon.
- Anderson, G. H., and T. F. Stransky, eds. 1975. Mission trends No. 1: Critical issues in mission today. New York: Paulist.
- _____, eds. 1975. Mission trends No. 2: Evangelization. New York: Paulist.
- _____, eds. 1981. Mission trends No. 5: Faith meets faith. New York: Paulist.
- _____, eds. 1981. Christ's Lordship and religious pluralism. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Anderson, J. N. D. 1984. Christianity and world religions: The challenge of pluralism. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.
- _____, ed. 1976. The world religions. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Anderson, Wilhelm. 1957. Dr. Kraemer's contribution to the understanding of the nature of revelation. International Review of Mission 46: 361-371.
- Barth, Karl. 1956. Church dogmatics. Vols 1,2. Translated by G. T. Thomas and H. Knight. Edinburgh: Clark.
- _____. 1957. Kirchliche Dogmatik: Ausgewählt und eingeleitet von Helmut Gollwitzer. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bucherei.
- _____. 1959. Dogmatics in outline. Translated by G. T. Thomas. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bavinck, J. H. 1960. An introduction to the science of mission. Translated by D. H. Freeman. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.
- _____. 1981. The Church between Temple and Mosque. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Benz, Ernst, and Minoru Nambara, eds. 1960. Das Christendom und die Nicht-Christlichen Hochreligionen. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Berkhof, Louis. 1941. Systematic theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Beyerhaus, Peter. 1971. Missions: Which way? Humanization or redemption. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- _____. 1972. Shaken foundations: Theological foundations for mission. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bleeker, C. J. 1965. Christ in modern Athens. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Bosch, David J. 1991. Transforming mission. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Braaten, C. E. 1977. The flaming center: A theology of the Christian mission. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Brunner, Emil. 1946. Revelation and reason: The Christian doctrine of faith and knowledge. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- _____. 1958. The philosophy of religion. London: James Clarke.
- Bühlman, Walbert. 1977. The coming of the third church. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- _____. 1983. God's chosen peoples. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Calvin, John. 1989. Institutes of the Christian religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Camps, Arnulf. 1983. Partners in dialogue: Christianity and other world religions. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

- Cobb, John, Jr. 1982. Beyond dialogue: Toward a mutual transformation of Christianity and Buddhism. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Conn, Harvie. 1990. The missionary encounter with world religions. Recorded lecture. Grand Rapids: Outreach, Inc.
- Cragg, Kenneth. 1986. The Christ and the faiths. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Davis, Charles. 1971. Christ and the world religions. New York: Herder and Herder.
- D'Costa, Gavin, ed. 1990. Christian uniqueness reconsidered. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Denziger, H. 1960. Enchiridion symbolorum, definitivum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum. Rome. Quoted in Hans Küng. 1988. Theology for the third millennium. New York: Doubleday.
- Erickson, Millard J. 1985. Christian theology. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Fellow, Ward J. 1988. The dilemma of universalism and particularism in four Christian theological views of the relation of Christianity to other religions. Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary.
- Fernando, Ajith. 1987. The Christian's attitude toward world religions. Wheaton: Tyndale.
- Ford, David, ed. 1989. The Modern theologian. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Frei, Fritz. 1988. *Die Katholische Stellung zu Hendrik Kraemer Werk* [The Catholic attitude toward Hendrik Kraemer's work]. Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 42 (4): 288-306.
- Glasser, Arthur F., ed. 1971. Crossroads in missions. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Glasser, Arthur F., and D. A. McGavran. 1983. Contemporary theologies of mission. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Gnanakan, Ken. 1992. The Pluralistic predicament. Bangalore, India: Theological Book Trust.
- Gualtieri, Antonio R. 1978. The failure of dialectic in Hendrik Kraemer's evaluation of non-Christian faith. Journal of Ecumenical Studies 15(2): 274-290.
- Gunawan, Yusuf. 1994. The Myth of an inspiration christology: An analytical investigation and critique of the christology of John Hick. Th.M. thesis, Reformed Theological Seminary.
- Hallencreutz, Carl F. 1966. Kraemer towards Tambaram: A study in Hendrik Kraemer's missionary approach. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- _____. 1969. New approaches to men of other faiths. Geneva: World Council of Churches.
- Hankook Kidokkyo Hakhoi* (Korean Christian Institute), ed. 1991. Gospel and culture (Korean). Seoul: *Tai-han Kidokkyo Suhoi*.
- _____, ed. 1991. Religious pluralism and theological task (Korean). Seoul: *Tai-han Kidokkyo Suhoi*.
- Hesselgrave, David J., ed. 1978. Theology and mission. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Hick, John, and Michael Goulder. 1983. Why believe in God? London: SCM Press.
- Hick, John, and Brian Hebblethwaite, eds. 1981. Christianity and other religions: Selected readings. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Hick, John, and Paul L. Knitter, eds. 1987. The myth of Christian uniqueness. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Hick, John, and Arthur C. McGill, eds. 1967. The Many-faced argument. New York: Macmillan

- Hick, John. 1957. Faith and knowledge: A modern introduction to the problem of religious knowledge. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1964. The existence of God. New York: McMillan.
- _____. 1973a. God and the universe of faiths. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- _____. 1973b. Philosophy of religion. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- _____, ed. 1974. Truth and dialogue in world religions: Conflicting truth-claims. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- _____. 1977a. Evil and the God of love. Cleveland: Collins + World.
- _____, ed. 1977b. The myth of God incarnate. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- _____. 1980a. God has many names. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- _____. 1980b. Toward a philosophy of religious pluralism. Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religions Philosophie 22: 131-149.
- _____. 1983. The Center of Christianity. London: SCM Press.
- _____. 1984. Christian's understanding of suffering. TMs [photocopy]. Special Collections, Yale Divinity School Library, Yale University, New Haven.
- _____. 1985. Problem of religious pluralism. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- _____. 1989. An interpretation of religion. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1993a. Disputed questions in theology and the philosophy of religion. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1993b. The metaphor of God incarnate. Louisville: John Knox Press.
- Hoedemaker, Bert. 1989. Kraemer reassessed. The Ecumenical Review 41: 41-49.
- Hoedemaker, L. A. 1980. The legacy of Hendrik Kraemer. Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research 4: 60-64.
- Hogg, Alfred G. 1938. Towards clarifying my reactions to Dr. Kraemer's book. Madras: Diocesan Press.
- Holsten, Walter. 1932. Christentum und nicht-christliche Religion nach Auffassung Luthers. [Christianity and non-Christian religion by Luther's interpretation]. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann.
- Houwert, F. 1988. Hendrik Kraemer en het rveil in de Hervormde Kerk [Hendrik Kraemer and the awakening in the Reformed Church]: 1937-1947. Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 42:276-287
- Jathanna, O. V. 1981. The decisiveness of the Christ-event and the universality of Christianity in a world of religious plurality. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Jongeneel, J. A. B. 1988. Kraemer und Samartha. Zeitschrift für Mission 14 (4): 197-205
- Judd, Charles, Eliot Smith, and Louise Kidder. 1991. Research methods in social relations. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College.
- Kim, Myung H. 1987. Trends of contemporary churches: Focus on theology of mission (Korean). Seoul, Korea: Sung Kwang.

- Kim, Yun Jin. An analysis and comparison of the view of Hendrik Kraemer and John Hick on the theology of religions. Doctor of Missiology dissertation, Reformed Theological Seminary.
- Knitter, Paul L. 1974. Towards a protestant theology of religions. Marburg, Germany: N. G. Elwert.
- _____. 1985. No other name? Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- _____, ed. 1991. Pluralism and oppression. New York: University Press of America.
- Kraemer, Hendrik. 1938. The Christian message in a non-Christian world. London: The Edinburgh House Press.
- _____. 1943. The riddle of history: Thought on Romans IX- XI. International Review of Missions 31: 78-87.
- _____. 1954. Syncretism as a religious and a missionary problem. International Review of Missions 43: 253-273.
- _____. 1956. Religion and the Christian faith. London: Lutterworth.
- _____. 1957. The communication of the Christian faith. London: Lutterworth.
- _____. 1958. A theology of laity. London: Lutterworth.
- _____. 1960. Islamic culture and missionary adequacy. Muslim World 50: 244-251.
- _____. 1960. World culture and world religions: The coming dialogue. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- _____. 1961. Permanent renewal or temporary revivals? Foundations 4: 144-153.
- _____. 1961. The meaning of renewal for America and American Baptists. Foundations 4: 56-64.
- _____. 1962. Why Christianity of all religions?. Translated by Hubert Hoskins. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- _____. 1965. The Bible and social ethics. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Küng, Hans. 1976. The challenge of the world religions. In On being a Christian. New York: Doubleday.
- _____. 1986. Christianity and the world religions. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.
- _____. 1988. Theology of the third millenium. New York: Doubleday.
- Larkin, William J. 1994. Luke's contribution to a biblical theology of religions. TMs [photocopy]. A paper to the 1994 EMS Annual Meeting, EMS.
- Lindsell, Harold. 1968. Missionary imperative. In Protestant Crosscurrents in Mission, ed. Norman Horner, 35-128. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Machen, J. Gresham. 1923. Christianity and liberalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- McIntosh, John. 1994. Biblical exclusivism: Towards a reformed approach to the uniqueness of Christ. Reformed Theological Review 53: 13-27.
- Na, Hak J. 1991. Christianity in multi-religious context. Ministry and Theology (Korean) 26(8): 134-157.
- Neill, Stephen. 1984. Christian faith and other faiths. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Neuner, Joshep, ed. 1967. Christian revelation and world religions. London: Burns and Oares.

- Newbigin, Lesslie. 1989. The Gospel in a pluralist society. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. 1969. The Finality of Christ. London: SCM Press.
- Nicholson, Wayne Issac. 1978. Toward a theology of comparative religion. Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1990. Message and mission. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Nürnbergger, Klaus. 1970. *Systematisch-theologische Lösungsversuche zum problem der anderen Religionen und ihre missionmethodischen Konsequenzen*. Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie 12: 13-43.
- Oxtoby, Willard. 1983. The Meaning of other faiths. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Packer, James I. 1973. Are non-Christian faiths ways of salvation? Bibliotheca Sacra 130: 110-116.
- PCUSA. 1986. The Minutes of 198th General Assembly, Part I: Journal. New York: PCUSA
- Pinnock, Clark H. 1990. Toward an evangelical theology of religions. Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 33: 359-368.
- _____. 1992. A Wideness in God's mercy: The finality of Christ in a world of religions. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Presbyterian Layman. 1984. January/February.
- _____. 1987. March/April.
- Presbyterian Outlook. 1987. 16 March.
- Quinn, Philip. 1994. Religious pluralism and religious relativism. The Scottish Journal of Religious Studies 15.2: 69-84.
- Race, Alan. 1983. Christians and religious pluralism: Patterns in the Christian theology of religions. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Rahner, Karl. 1957. Schriften zur Theologie. Zurich: Benzinger.
- _____. 1966. Christianity and the non-Christian religions. Theological Investigations 5: 115-34.
- _____. 1974. Anonymous Christianity and the missionary task of the church. Theological Investigations 12: 161-178.
- Richards, Glyn, ed. 1989. Towards a theology of religions. London: Routledge.
- Rommen, Edward, and Harold Netland. 1995 Christianity and the religions: A biblical theology of world religions. Pasadena, CA: William Carey.
- Sanders, John E. 1992. No other name: An investigation in the destiny of the unevangelized. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Scheid, Edward G. 1992. Scripture and theology of the religions: On the theological interpretation of sacred Scripture in Christian attitudes toward world religions. Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University.
- Schlette, H. R. 1966. Toward a theology of religions. London: Burns and Oates.
- Scott, Waldron. 1978. Karl Barth's theology of mission. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Sharma, Arvind, ed. 1993. God, truth and reality: Essays in honour of John Hick. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Song, C. S. 1993. Jesus and reign of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Stetson, Brad. 1994. Pluralism and particularity in religious belief. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Tillich, Paul. 1957. Dynamic of faith. New York: Harper & Brothers.

_____. 1963. Christianity and the encounter of the world religions. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1968. Systematic theology. London: Lisbet.

_____. 1969. What is religion?. New York: Harper & Row.

Thomas, Owen C., ed. 1986. Attitudes toward other religions. New York: University Press of America.

Toynbee, Arnold Joseph. 1956. An historian's approach to religion: Based on Gifford lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh in the years 1952 and 1953. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1957. Christianity among the religions of the world. New York: Scribner.

Troeltsch, Ernst. 1971. The absoluteness of Christianity and the history of religions. Richmond: John Knox Press.

Trotti, John B. 1980. Christian faith amidst religious pluralism: An introductory bibliography. Richmond: The Library, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia.

UPCUSA. 1962. The Minutes of 174th General Assembly, Part I: Journal. Philadelphia: UPCUSA

Verkuyl, J. 1978. Contemporary missiology: An introduction. Translated and edited by D. Cooper. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Whitson, Robley E. 1971. The coming convergence of world religions. Westminster: Newman.

Appendix I - Hans Kung's Classification of Positions on the "Theology of Religions"

(Kim 1995, 16)

Position	Viewpoint	Representative
Atheistic Position	All religions are equally untrue	F. Nietzsche
Traditional Catholic Position	Only one single religion is true. All other religions are untrue	4th Lutheran Council (1215)
Relativistic Position	All religions are equally true	Contemporary pluralists
Inclusivistic Position	Only one religion is true. All religions have a share in the truth of the one religion.	K. Rahner

Appendix II - Ken Gnanakan 's Systematization of Various Positions

(Kim 1995, 19)

Position	Viewpoint	Representative
Exclusivism	There is no salvation outside of Jesus Christ	Lausanne Covenant (1974) and H. Kraemer
Inclusivism	All religions are under the redemptive influence of Jesus Christ	Vatican II (1962-1965), K. Rahner, M. Thomas, & R. Panniker
Pluralism	Every religion has an independent validity for salvation	P. Knitter, J. Hick

Appendix III - Paul Knitter's Models of the "Theology of Religions"

(Kim 1995, 21)

Model	Viewpoint	Representative
Conserv. Evangel.	Christianity is the true religion	H. Kraemer, K. Barth
Mainline Prostant.	All religions play a part in salvation history, but it is not the way of salvation	P. Athaus, E. Brunner, P. Tillich, & L. Newbigin
Catholic	All religions are many channels of God's grace	K. Rahner, H. Kung
Theo-centric	Religions are the many ways to the Center	J. Hick, R. Panikkar

Appendix IV - Harvie Conn's Analysis of Positions on the "Theology of Religions"
(Kim 1995, 22)

Model	Viewpoint	Representative
Exclusivism	Christ-against-religions: Christianity is the true religion	K. Barth, H. Kraemer
Inclusivism	Christ-of-religions: All religions working for salvation	K. Rahner, P. Knitter
Pluralism	Christ-alongside-religions: Every religion has a saving power	K. Cragg, J. Hick
Accommodation	Christ-above-and-in-religions: Religions are preparation for evangelism	T. Aquinas, M. Ricci, & Vatican II
<i>Possessio</i>	Christ-transforms-religions: all religions need transformation	J. Bavinck

Appendix V - David Bosch's Categorization of the "Theology of Religion"
(Kim 1995, 23)

Paradigm	Viewpoint	Representative
Exclusivism	Religion is a concern of godless human beings	K. Barth
Fulfillment	Christianity is the fulfillment of other religions	W. Hocking, K. Rahner
Relativism	All religions are different human answers to the one divine Reality	J. Hick, R. Panikkar

Published in the July issue of www.globalmissiology.org.

Presented at the 47th Annual Meeting of the ETS, November 16-18, 1995 Philadelphia Airport Radisson Hotel