CHAPTER 6
MADANG CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY AND
AN "INCARNATIONAL-DIALOGIC PARADIGM" OF
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

While Chapter 5 dealt with the church's communication with others, proposing three alternative models of madang public dialogue, Chapter 6 will discuss how to activate the three dialogic models and principles, not only in the relationship between church and others but also in the church community that prepares madang public dialogue.

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part deals with the formation of a dialogic relationship among members of the Christian community preparing for madang public dialogue, and the transformation of the Christian community from a monologic to a dialogic one. The Christian community preparing madang-theatre will be called "*Madang Christian Community*"; the Christian members preparing madang-theatre will be described by the term "*participants.*" The second part of this chapter concerns the correlation between dialogic principles and Christian education, showing how Christian education can change if it follows the three dialogic models of madang public dialogue. In this section, an "*Incarnational-Dialogic Paradigm*" will be proposed as an alternative to "the schooling-instructional paradigm" in Christian education.

6.1 Toward a Dialogic Madang Christian Community

Only when the three models of madang public dialogue (Incarnational, Critical, and Festival Public Dialogue) and their principles are executed, first of all, in the madang Christian community, will madang public dialogue and a dialogic relationship be able to be fulfilled effectively between a madang Christian community and the audience. The aim of the madang Christian community is not to make "theatre for showing" (i.e. art for

art's sake), but to make "madang-theatre for dialogue." The dialogic principles of the three models apply not only to the audience but also to the church community itself. The principles should be fully realized in the madang Christian community before performing dialogic madang-theatre. Only after the Christian community preparing madang public dialogue is transformed into a "dialogic" community, it will effectively promote madang public dialogue with the audience. The core of madang public dialogue lies in the formation of a dialogic relationship and a dialogic community, rather than in the performance itself.

6.1.1 Three Phases for Reconstruction toward a Dialogic Madang Christian Community

6.1.1.1 Preparatory Procedures: *Training-Workshop-Rehearsal*

Most studies of theatre have concentrated on the show, not on the whole sequence of the theatre. However, Richard Schechner (1985:16) has been concerned about the whole process of drama, focusing particularly on the preparatory process before the performance. In his *Between Theatre and Anthropology*, he claims to see theatre in the whole "seven-part sequence": (1) training, (2) workshop, (3) rehearsal, (4) warm-up, (5) performance, (6) cool-down, and (7) aftermath.

Schechner enlarges the boundary of theatre by introducing anthropological points of view. He learned from an anthropologist Victor Turner that "theatre" is a pattern of human behavior that can be discovered in all human spaces. Therefore, according to Schechner (1988:169), there is no sense in the distinction between life and art, reality and theatre: theatre performance is not "less real" but "differently real" to what happens in everyday life. For him, the heart of performing art is not an imitation of reality. Rather, he understands theatre as an arena of transformation in which people experience, act and change through playing together (cf. Carson 1996:35).

6.1.1.2 *Deconstruction—Transition—Reconstruction*

Schechner (1985:113) believes that "the workshop-rehearsal process is the basic machine for the restoration of behavior." He (1985:111) thinks that "to restore behavior" is the basic function of both theatre and ritual. All performers and restored behaviors—in both rituals and theatrical performances—are "transitional." "While performing, a performer experiences his own self not directly but through the medium of experiencing the others. While performing, he no longer has a 'me' but has a 'not not me,' and this double negative relationship also shows how restored behavior is simultaneously private and social. A person performing recovers his own self only by going out of himself and meeting the others—by entering a social field. The way in which 'me' and 'not me,' the performer and the thing to be performed, are transformed into 'not me…not not me' is through the workshop-rehearsal/ritual process. This process takes place in a liminal time/space and in the subjunctive mood. The subjunctive character of the liminal time/space is reflected in the negative, antistructural frame around the whole process. This antistructure could be expressed algebraically: 'not (me…not me)'" (Schechner 1985:111-112).

The workshop-rehearsal process passes through the three phases of rite of passage suggested by Arnold van Gennep (1969:vii)—"separation, transition and incorporation"—in order to restore 'behavior' (Schechner 1985:113-115). The first phase is to separate or to break down the surroundings prevailing in the ordinary, in order to use new and special time/space. The second phase, initiation or transition, is to develop new behavior or to restore old behavior. In the third phase, reintegration or incorporation, the restored behavior is practiced until it becomes second nature. The final part of the third phase is public performance.

Training is the practice of transmitted skills. *Workshop* is a deconstruction process of the ready-mades of culture. Thus it is analogous to "the liminal-transitional phase of rituals." *Rehearsal* is a reconstruction process, where strips of restored behavior are

arranged. The conclusion of the two-phase—the deconstruction-reconstruction process, or the workshop-rehearsal process—is the *public performance*. Therefore, the main performance is analogous to what Van Gennep calls "reincorporation" and what Turner calls "reintegration" (Schechner 1985:99).

Madang public dialogue centers on the "*restoration of dialogue*" with the others, while Schechner focuses his attention on the "restoration of behavior" from an anthropological standpoint. In spite of the difference between his theatre and dialogic Madang-theatre, his whole seven-part sequence and the transforming process in workshop-rehearsal are valuable in practicing the shift from monologism to dialogism.

Madang Christian community preparing dialogic madang-theatre does not make a sharp distinction between training, workshop, and rehearsal. As Schechner (1985:100) indicates, "In many Asian forms training, workshop and rehearsals are one." Madang public dialogue does not in fact need the training process of learning the high degree of difficulty of theatrical skills. Madang-theatre is theatre not for show but for public dialogue. It has an unfinalized plot, and it is thus open to improvisation as a blank slate to activate dialogue with the audience during performance. Nevertheless, it calls for a preparatory process before the main-performance. The chief reason for this is that the dialogic principles of madang public dialogue must be incarnated in the madang Christian community for a long time. Strictly speaking, the workshop-rehearsal process before the main-performance is not a "preparatory" process in madang public dialogue. The process itself aims to embody a spirit of dialogue. Therefore, the preparatory process is indeed a "dialogic process" rather than a preparatory stage.

In the workshop-rehearsal process of madang-theatre, the madang Christian community needs to experience the three phases of "separation—transition—incorporation" in Van Gennep's terms, or the four phases of "breach—crisis—redressive action—reconciliation/reconstruction" in Victor Turner's terms (Turner 1974:37-41; 1982:11).

The first phase is to experience the separation or deconstruction of monologic communication. This is a breach process. The relationship between the author (the church) and the performers (Christians) in madang public dialogue has to be grounded in dialogic, transactional communication. They should recognize each other as subjects on an equal level, and an event signifying the death of the church's dogmatic attitude should take place here. All the church and Christians as performers therefore require the activity of critical reflection. In this process, a monologic world-view falls into crisis.

The deconstruction or separation enters into the second phase, the liminal-transitional phase of monologism and privatization. The deconstruction of the monologic tendency facilitates the breakdown of the Christians' passivity and the resurrection of subjects and intersubjective dialogue. In the phase of redressive-action, monologue should be transformed into dialogue.

In this process, the madang Christian community is reborn as a dialogic Christian community. This is the third phase, the reconstruction phase. So it becomes a festive community that celebrates the born-again experience of becoming a dialogic community. For madang public dialogue, Christians are not simply preparing the theatre for performance. They are in the process of re-discovering the self, understanding each other, and forming a dialogic relationship with the other. In this way, the preparatory process is the process of transformation into a dialogic being, beyond the process of preparing theatre.

After all, a dialogic being or a dialogic community has a tendency toward the consonance of criticism and festivity, reason and emotion. The dialogic being/community experiences the restoration of the image of God as an answerable being/community. The experience of restoration and transition is an essential condition for the madang Christian community to reach a dialogic encounter with the others and dialogic participation of the other in dialogic madang. Performance as the realization of public dialogue in madang is the conclusion of the restoration and reconstruction of a

239

dialogic and responsible being/community.

6.2 The Six Stages of Dialogic Praxis in a Christian Community

The stages of dialogic praxis must be set up so that the madang Christian community can be born again effectively to a dialogic community. The dialogic praxis stages will be projected, according to Thomas Groome's (1991:134-293; 1981:207-223) procedures of sharing praxis approach mentioned in Chapter 1.

6.2.1 Opening Stage: The Focusing Activity

The opening stage of dialogic praxis in a madang Christian community is "a focusing activity" in which all participants congregate to create madang-theatre for public dialogue. A focusing activity stage has two aims—one is "selecting a theme," the other is "creating a dialogic environment." What is important at this point is to facilitate active participation of members in selecting a theme for madang public dialogue. According to the models of incarnational and critical public dialogue, the madang-theatre for public dialogue is produced by all participants together. Therefore, an environment of "deep respect for all participants" should be prepared, which creates the sense that their being together is "holy ground" (Groome 1991:168). Groome (1991:168) calls it "intellectual hospitality." According to his description, "intellectual hospitality" invites participants into dialogue to grapple with and question their lives, their world and their faith tradition; to agree and disagree; to affirm and confront; to come to critical understanding, tested judgments and responsible decisions.

This environment of hospitality is a prerequisite for a dialogic community in which double-voiced discourse is possible. The following guidelines (cf. Groome 1998:199) will influence the creation of a dialogic environment, if they are read and followed whenever participants congregate. These include:

Be open to sharing your thoughts and, as far as you are comfortable, your feelings.

Recognize everyone as a resource and welcome others' voices and opinions.

Be willing to truly listen to people—more than just hearing them but listening

  "between the lines"—even if their perspective is very different from your own.

Try not to give advice or to dominate.

Try not to talk too much or to interrupt in the middle of others' speech.

Appreciate all contributions and let people know that they are being heard.

6.2.2 Dialogic Movement 1: Expressing and Sharing Present Voice/Story

Movement 1 of dialogic praxis is the stage in which participants express their own stories and voices on the theme of madang public dialogue that they selected in the beginning stage. The expressing method is "through a recognizable activity, in making and describing, in symbolizing, speaking, writing, gesturing, miming, dancing; that is, by any form of human expression" (Groome 1991:175). Dialogue here is used not simply to repeat de-historicized ideas or metaphysical concepts, but to express the existential truth. Thus "participants are to have their own say rather than saying what they are supposed to say" (Groome 1991:178).

In movement 1, different voices and stories that have been ignored will be accepted in polyphonic harmony. The difference between voices is the motivating power of dialogue, as indicated in the previous chapter. According to the principle of ambivalence or multi-valence, various expressions and viewpoints relative to the theme will be reflected in madang-theatre for public dialogue because it engages the audience's spontaneous participation and interpretation, by expressing not a single voice/story of the church but two or more voices/stories reflecting the others.

Expressing and sharing their own voices/stories requires and improves the capacity for "listening" to the others that is one of the essential conditions of dialogue. As Sofia Cavalletti (1983:49) remarks, listening is to open oneself to the other. It means, therefore, to take a receptive attitude toward the other's reality. A method of preventing

oneself from living in a monologic world is to develop the ability of "listening" in incarnational dialogue.

6.2.3 Dialogic Movement 2: Critical Reflection on Present Voice/Story

If Movement 1 of dialogic praxis focuses on expressing and sharing participants' own voices and stories, and accepting different voices/stories in polyphonic dialogue, Movement 2 is the stage of "critical reflection" and has three aspects: the first is critical self-reflection on the reason I insist on it, the background that has influenced me to take this voice and story. The second is critical reflection on the effect that my insistence and story exert in a social dimension. The third is critical reflection on the dialogue of the different voices/stories. A basic spirit of dialogue is to respect the freedom of the other, but "it is not a false liberalism or 'niceness' in which everyone passively accepts everyone else's reflection as if it were a final word" (Groome 1991:192). Therefore, it is necessary to prompt participants to critical consciousness of their voices and lives. Critical reflection on individual/social prejudices and ideologies is the process of "unveiling reality" (Freire 1985:102).

This critical reflection, however, should be carried out in a form of "dialogue," moving beyond argument that aims at a single voice. The purpose of critical reflection here is to gain critical and not monologic consciousness. According to Groome (1991:199-207), critical reflection embodies three actions: (1) critical and social reasoning, (2) analytical and social remembering, and (3) creative and social imagination.

Critical and social reasoning enables participants to uncover the reasons for their present voices and monologic attitudes, and how these were influenced by their context in place and time. It includes both individual and social criticism as well as self-reflection and social reflection. It helps participants "to scrutinize the interests, assumptions, prejudices and ideologies," questioning what influences one to describe them as one does (Groome 1991:188,200).

242

Analytical and social remembering has two emphases: one is the analytical remembering of the participants' own biography that concerns how it shapes their personally initiated praxis; the other is the analytical remembering of social archaeology that concerns how this shapes their society's present praxis of the theme (Groome 1991:202). For example, when sharing the theme of "dialogic communication," participants reflect critically whether they communicate "dialogically" with family, friends, neighbors and strangers. They need to scrutinize why they have failed in dialogic communication with themselves and with others. In this process, participants become aware of personal and social factors that have shaped their present stories/voices. However, the aim of analytical and social remembering is not to adhere to the past, but to draw up a plan for the future—a dialogic community.

Creative and social imagination will be the acme of critical reflection. The imaginative activity also has two aspects: "creative imagination for person" and "creative imagination toward society" (Groome 1991:205). Imagination suggests engaging our voices and creativity for the vision of ourselves and others. Imagination based on the festival principle, therefore, constructs answerability/responsibility of the praxis of incarnational dialogue based on critical principles. In this way, through sharing the present story, critical reflection and imagination with an individual and society, participants who prepare madang public dialogue can enter into "doing" with a vision of dialogic praxis. This is a way of changing personal and social reality from a monologic to a dialogic worldview.

The critical and social imagination that promotes the responsibility for doing is constantly required in the whole procedure of dialogic praxis, from movement 1 to 5. Emphasizing critical reflection from both a social and a personal angle, Groome (1991:201) explains that "social analysis may at first appear complex and daunting for both educators and participants. If it is constantly neglected, however, critical reflection can readily become a narrow psychological analysis of ourselves or others that tends to 'blame the victims' in society."

6.2.4 Dialogic Movement 3: Making Accessible the Christian Story/Vision

The three procedures—the opening stage and the first two movements—in dialogic praxis have focused on mutual interaction between participant-environment, participant-theme, participant's story-the others' stories, and participant-society. Next, movement 3 makes Christian stories/visions of their faith community relating to the focused theme accessible to participants. As participants have expressed and shared their own stories/visions in movement 1, so Christian stories/visions will be expressed and shared during this stage. As participants have critically interpreted the text and context of their lives according to the three actions (critical reasoning, remembering and imagination) in movement 2, so the text and context of Christian stories/visions will be interpreted by participants in movement 3.

During this stage, therefore, the leader of madang public dialogue has the role of providing participants with scriptures and traditions that relate to the selected theme. However, what is important is that the leader should not provide Christian stories/visions as fixed messages, and help participants to search for the stories/visions for themselves. In a madang Christian community the leader and participants need to maintain a dialogic two-way relationship based on an incarnational attitude that means the return to dialogic communication through the death of a monologic worldview which prevails in the Christian world.

Making accessible the Christian story and vision should closely be connected with a matter of concern and a point of view commonly held today. And it needs to be related to the vision and realization of a dialogic community that recognizes a new heaven and a new earth. In this way, a madang Christian community enters into dialogue with tradition, reality and vision in the process of accessing the Scripture. Therefore, interpretation in movement 3 is not an action of passive reception or application, but rather a dialogic interpretation of the three dimensions of time.

For example, the story of Ezekiel seems appropriate to the madang Christian community preparing for dialogic madang-theatre, in that Ezekiel carried out theatrical performances as a prophetic action at God's request. The participants in the madang Christian community need to read the scripture verses and interpret the circumstances of those days, questioning why God requested Ezekiel to present performances—an action prophecy, what communication was like in those days, and in what respects his performances have a connection with "dialogic" communication and relationships. Ezekiel's performances include:

> Ezekiel 4-5: Performance symbolizing Siege of Jerusalem
>   to make a miniature clay tablet (4:1-3),
>   to lie on one side (4:4-6),
>   to tie up with rope (4:7-8), weigh out food (4:9-12),
>   to cut hair and shave beard (5:1-4).
> Ezekiel 12: Performance symbolizing the Exile
>   to go out like those who go into exile (12:1-7)
>   to tremble while eating food (12:17-19)
> Ezekiel 24: Performance symbolizing Attack
>   cooking pot (24:3-5), Ezekiel's wife dies (24:15-24)

Besides this, various verses of the Scripture or traditions relating to matters of communication and relationship based on public, two-way dialogue need to be presented to participants.

6.2.5 Dialogic Movement 4: Incarnational Dialogue between Christian Story/Vision and Participants' Stories/Visions

While movement 3 is concerned mainly with interpreting Christian stories and visions suitable to the selected theme, movement 4 engages participants in entering into "incarnational dialogue" between their stories/visions and Christian stories/visions. "Incarnational dialogue" means "participant's change" in the sense that a being or a community is born again—changed—through participation in a dialogic event. "Incarnational dialogue" thus requires four activities: "participating," "dialoguing" and

245

"changing," and ultimately "celebrating" a change-event.

The incarnational dialogue is "a two-way hermeneutics" (Groome 1991:251) between stories/visions and the Story/Vision. Each participant judges the Christian Story/Vision from the point of view of his/her own reality, and the Story/Vision in turn judges the reality of the participants and of society in movement 4 of the dialogic praxis (Groome 1991:252). Just as there are differences and conflicts between participants' stories/visions, so there are differences and conflicts between the Christian Story/Vision and participants' stories/visions. The incarnational dialogue of movement 4 allows moments of affirming and cherishing, questioning or refusing, and "moving beyond" (Groome 1991:251). The church dogma and the Scripture, therefore, should have an authentic openness to critical reflection in incarnational double-voiced discourse between the two stories/visions. In the process, "people are not to repeat our (Christian) word but to speak their own; that may well be a 'new' word for Story and Vision" (Groome 1991:263). The dialogic two-way hermeneutics is an appropriate method for the critical encounter between the Story/Vision and participants' stories/visions. For this reason, Groome (1991:263) notes that "authentic openness is a journey of lifelong dialogue for every Christian educator."

The incarnational-dialogic hermeneutics of movement 4 poses three questions (Groome 1991:251): (1) What do we recognize as true and valuable in this symbol of Christian faith? (2) What do we find problematic, or perhaps refuse, in the version made accessible to us? (3) What do we need to reformulate in our understanding of this Story to live more faithfully according to the Vision of God's reign? Stated more obviously, how does this aspect of Christian faith affirm, question, and call us beyond present praxis?

Dialogic madang-theatre does not choose one of the two (Christian Story/Vision and participants' stories and vision), but expresses both according to the principle of ambivalence. Through the madang-theatre that contains both, and in the difference

between the two (or more), the audience will participate in dialogue between the audience's story/vision and the madang-theatre's story/vision. In fact, madang-theatre serves as a zone of dialogic encounter between "three" stories and visions: madang-performers' stories/visions, Christian Story/Vision, and the audience's story/vision. The most important thing in movement 4 is not finding the right answer but dialogizing various stories/visions.

6.2.6 Dialogic Movement 5:
Decision/Response for Madang Public Dialogue

The outcome of dialogic praxis through the five stages is not a state of stasis but a driving power to open "new horizons for choice, decision and action" (Groome 1991:252). Movement 5 is, therefore, not the end of dialogic praxis in a madang Christian community, but rather a new starting point for madang public dialogue. While the stages from the opening to movement 4 constitute dialogic praxis within a Christian community, movement 5 becomes a new dialogic praxis with the others—non-Christian and society and so forth.

Every decision in movement 5 of dialogic Christian praxis should be made by each participant as an agent-subject in intersubjectivity and dialogue (Groome 1991:270). Movement 5 activities—dialogic decision making and acting—help socialize each participant and community to the incarnational dialogic character (Groome 1991:271). The conclusion of dialogic praxis through the six stages is the reconstruction of a madang Christian community into an incarnational-dialogic community.

A madang Christian community encourages people who are planning a madang public dialogue to participate in dialogic praxis within a Christian community. And then incarnational polyphonic dialogue occurs between our stories/visions and the others' stories/visions, and between people's stories/visions and Christian Story/Vision. Through incarnational dialogue at each stage, a madang Christian community

experiences a born-again event, moving from a monologic to a dialogic being or community. After all, the born-again dialogic Christian community is characterized by festivity. In this stage, participants in a dialogic madang Christian community choose their roles in madang public dialogue, practice them, and make madang-theatre and finally enter into madang-performance.

6.3 The Praxis of Madang Public Dialogue

As described in Chapter 5, the procedure of madang public dialogue is as follows: 1. Street Parade 2. Singing and Dancing Together 3. Main Performance 4. Ending-Play

6.3.1 Street Parade

The performance of madang public dialogue starts with a street parade. The street parade in madang public dialogue has two meanings. One is a festival to celebrate being born again to a dialogic community, and the other is festivity that is expressed by the gesture (i.e. madang-theatre) of inviting others. In the dialogic community people can see the image of God in each other. The dialogic community does not remain isolated from society and others any longer. Coming out from behind the wall it begins to see the image of God in the features of the other, and to realize faith-praxis with the attitude of polyphonic dialogue of both/and, accepting even differences and conflicts.

6.3.2 Singing and Dancing Together

It is important to form a festive time/space when arriving at a venue for performing the dialogic madang-theatre. If a street parade allows an open mind, the next procedure is to elevate the communal spirit to a festive mood. During the procedure of singing and dancing together, it is helpful to exchange greetings with each other through patting people on the shoulder or by playing a simple game in twos or threes. The procedure of singing and dancing together is for a time when playing and laughing, which have been overwhelmed by work and over-seriousness, can be expressed or revealed

through familiar encounters with the other in an open madang space.

6.3.3 Main Performance

The third procedure is an interaction of stories. The main performance does not deal with only the Christian story any more. According to the principle of critical public dialogue, the madang Christian community contains two or more stories in madang-theatre; expresses the ambivalence of its own story in the form of self-criticism; assists the audience to keep a critical distance without merging into a single voice of the theatre. It makes a dialogic space while the performance is on and realizes the competence of the infinite interpretation of the audience.

The performer is, to use Schechner's term, "not me…not not me." The performer is the one who expresses rather than empathizes with the character, thus (s)he can criticize or mock his/her character in the performance. This no-fusion attitude of the performer leads the audience to see the theatre much more objectively, and to become a subject who takes part in the dialogue of madang-theatre, by telling his/her own story.

Madang-theatre can be satire or serious in content. But the comic is more suitable for the early works of madang public dialogue since it provides better access to the audience. Madang-theatre can deal with a serious theme, but it is desirable to include festive elements of laughter as well as critical factors. People need to recover their composure in seriousness and criticism through laughter. In order to reap the fruits of dialogue, a theme dealing with a matter of common interest seems more effective. And madang theatre for public dialogue usually does not reach a conclusion, but opens it all to the audience.

6.3.4 Ending-Play

It is important to create a pleasant, festive atmosphere for constant public dialogue. The festive atmosphere does not mean just play. The ending-play is a prepared time and space in which to dialogue or discuss the content of the main-performance.

Madang-theatre with unfinalized content and without conclusion provokes the audience to enter spontaneously into discussions for a solution and new ideas. The audience's discussion is indeed a conclusion of the performance. In this discussion, the whole audience should be subjects, that is, heroes of dialogue.

The leader of this discussion should take the polyphonic attitude of accepting various voices. Madang public dialogue devotes itself to encouraging dialogue even in the ending-play. Therefore, the leader is not an "answer person" but a "question poser" (Groome 1991:182) i.e. a facilitator of dialogue through questions. The leader, first of all, needs to be a dialogic being. To be dialogic is to accept the other as a dialogic subject, and to tolerate different opinions. The atmosphere of a warm welcome should be maintained from the preparatory process to the ending-play of madang public dialogue. A leader with a sense of humor is basic in producing a dialogic atmosphere when there is collision and conflict among different voices. The leader is a promoter who creates "a hospitable environment" (Groome 1991:178) in which the various voices can interact dialogically.

If social helping hands are necessary in connection with the theme and content of madang-theatre, madang public dialogue encourages the audience to make a plan of engagement for themselves and to organize a body for it through public dialogue. This discussion requires connecting with a festive mood in which participants can express themselves as celebrating, relational, and communal beings in the time/space of festive ending-play. However, the discussion may be progressed smoothly after madang-theatre is performed several times, and after a relationship of mutual trust between the madang Christian community and the audience has been created. Therefore, it is desirable that in the beginning madang public dialogue constitutes festivity.

In the process of madang public dialogue, the audience will gradually realize that the church does not consider non-Christians as simply objects for evangelism any longer, but treats them rather as subjects of dialogue. In this way, a Christian community can

help both itself and the other to shift toward becoming an answerable being on the basis of a helping relationship and dialogic communication through madang public dialogue.

Madang public dialogue serves as a driving force with which a "dialogic mode of communication" and an "incarnational relationship" are formed among the church, Christians, and non-Christians. The transformation of a relationship from monologic to dialogic between performers (the church) and audience (non-Christians/society), and the process of breech—crisis—redress action—reconciliation, that is, the process of deconstruction—transition—reconstruction takes a long time, particularly in the Korean church and society that were previously socialized into what Freire calls "the culture of silence" in which their own word was of no value, and they waited for instruction of an authority. Therefore, the praxis of madang public dialogue is an important issue in the Korean church and society, and there must be a continuous praxis.

6.4 Toward an Incarnational-Dialogic Paradigm of Christian Education

The three models and principles of madang public dialogue will be able to perform a significant role in transforming Christian education from a monologic "schooling-instructional paradigm" (Westerhoff Ⅲ 1976:6) to an incarnational-dialogic paradigm. How can Christian education be reconstructed in this way? It begins with critical reflection on a monologic schooling-instructional paradigm. Just as the Incarnation of Jesus means to *dialogue with*, to form a *relationship with* and to *participate in* the world of the others, so an incarnational education pattern suggested by this thesis will facilitate the activities of participating, dialoguing, changing and celebrating, as described above.

Harold Burgess (1975) offered six components for effective theory and praxis of

Christian education: purpose, content, educator, learner, environment, and evaluation. Considering the components as a frame, an alternative *Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education* will be suggested here. That includes: (1) purpose, (2) educator and learner, (3) text and content, (4) method and curriculum, (5) place and environment. (6) evaluation.

6.4.1 Purpose of Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education

In a broad sense, Christian education aims, according to James Michael Lee (1973), to shape "Christian life-style." James Fowler (1983:155) describes that shaping Christian lifestyle bears a relation to "building and changing personality," which is the purpose of practical theology. Christian lifestyle is formed through "two patterns of growth and change in faith" (Fowler 1991:91-95). Shaping Christian lifestyle is not a matter of choice (either/or) but a dialogic harmony in the tension of both—growth and change. Moreover, Christian lifestyle is a broader concept than the intellectual dimension, because it includes the dimensions of emotion and action. Thus, it is developed through dialogic harmony of "knowing, desiring and doing" (Groome 1998:304).

Therefore, the purpose of incarnational Christian education is "the realization of polyphonic dialogue for Christian lifestyle" which means a dialogue between binary opposition, conflict and collision. To shape Christian lifestyle means in effect the following:

1. to shape a "relational being" through incarnational dialogue between self and the other, and through encounter with strangers,
2. to build an "integrated being" through dialogic harmony between reason and emotion, criticism and festivity, growth and change, and through incarnational encounter between the tradition of the past, reality of the present, and hope of the future,
3. to form an "answerable/responsible being" through incarnational praxis of both

252

"discipleship and citizenship" (Coleman 1989), private life (church-life) and public life,

4. to become a "loving and loved being" through dialogic praxis of loving God and loving neighbors,

5. to be a "doing Christian" through dialogue between knowledge and practice, faith and praxis.

6.4.2 Educator and Learner

The Educator has generally performed a role of "conveying or transmitting" knowledge that learners ought to know. Thus the educator is not a questioner but a kind of machine providing answers. In this schooling-instruction oriented education, dialogue between educator and learner has frozen.

From the view of incarnational madang public dialogue, knowledge and meaning take place with the interaction of the two (or more) voices and consciousnesses. In other words, learners can acquire knowledge and meaning from incarnational-dialogic relations between educator-learner, learner-learner, learner-text, and learner-context. Lonergan (1972:57-73) called it "intersubjective communication of meaning." The intersubjectivity in teaching-learning action premises an incarnational dialogue between two subjects—a "leading learner" (Groome 1991:449) and a learner. While a schooling-instructional paradigm lays emphasis on the superiority of the teacher over pupils, an incarnational-dialogic paradigm stresses the partnership of educator-learner from the outset when educator and learner participate in an educational pilgrimage.

In an incarnational-dialogic paradigm both the educator and the learner are "beings-in-relation-with-others" (Aoki 1990:114). The learner is accepted as a participative subject with his own voice; the educator plays the role of helper or leading learner who is not any more dominant in the educational world. The educator and the learner meet each other as strangers for the first time. But according to the incarnational principles, they

253

open up to and accept one another with hospitality, and consequently become close friends who share their lives as well as planned educational activities. In an incarnational-dialogic paradigm of education, the educator therefore has to perceive the subjectivity of the learner, and should make an imaginative projection into the learner's context.

6.4.3 Text and Content

An incarnational approach to education begins with critical reflection on the monologic theory that the text contains all the answers. Incarnational-dialogic Christian education goes beyond text-orientation as well as educator-orientation. The incarnational approach exceeds the limits of Tillich's "correlation method" which comprehends that the context (and people) questions and the text (the Scripture) answers. But incarnational-dialogic Christian education promotes dialogue between text and context, text and learner. Thus the understanding of text in dialogic education verges on Tracy's critical correlation method. The text (the Scripture) does not always answer, but can continually pose questions to the human; the learner or context is not the one who only questions, but can provide answers to the questions of the text (the Scripture). In this way, dialogic Christian education recognizes text in dialogic relations to context and learner.

In a view of incarnational dialogism, text is a kind of communication in that it has a relationship with the learner. Text waits for the hermeneutical participation of the learner; so it is "unfinalizable." The unfinalizability of text is a basic condition for mutual communication between the learner and text. As described in the previous Chapter, Wolfgang Iser thus speaks of "blanks" or "spots of indeterminacy" as a condition of connecting text with the audience.

If depending on the incarnational and critical models of madang public dialogue, the content should contain critical reflection and dialogic praxis. Not only human

experience (the learner's story) but also Christian tradition (the Christian story) should be comprised in the content of an incarnational-dialogic education. As if strange others become closer friends in the principle of polyphonic and festive dialogue, so in teaching-learning actions, strange contents have encounters with familiar contents (cf. Huebner 1999:407-411), and the two enter into polyphonic dialogue.

The encounters of learner-text, strange-familiar contents, tradition-reality as well as learner-educator and a learner-the other learner inevitably cause conflicts or collisions between them. Trevor Cooling (1996:171) asserts: "Unless there is a collision between the student and the text, serious misreading could take place and an educational possibility be lost. … Reading the text without collision will leave us both ill-informed and stunted in personal development terms." In an incarnational-dialogic paradigm of Christian education, difference, conflict and collision are dealt with as contents of education. This is a polyphonic approach of incarnational dialogue.

Through the polyphonic dialogue of accepting the other's voice and standpoint, dialogic Christian education contributes to the broadening of the learner-subjects' horizons. Through a polyphonic encounter between tradition and reality, the student has a new vision for the future. The vision of a new heaven and a new earth results from the learner's hermeneutical activity with the educator, adopting a polyphonic attitude of dialogizing different voices and collisions.

The educator should not be a person who teaches *about* the content, but a partner who dialogues *with* the student *with* the text *in front of* the content. The polyphonic dialogue serves the learner to practice the content or subject matter. As Donald Hudson (1982:26) insists, "educators need quite properly to educate both about and in their subjects. Not only do they pass on a lot of information about mathematics, chemistry or history, but they also teach their pupils to think mathematically or historically: to 'do' these subjects, rather than just learn about them." In an incarnational education, the educator and the learner are participants in dialogic activity "with" the text and the

content. The content is always open to dialogue with the educator and the student.

In this way, the content contains both knowing and doing, faith and praxis, and requires "participation" by the learner and the educator. The three components of education—the educator, the learner and the content (the text)—have a dialogic relationship. From this view, James Loder's (1972:76-77) assertion that education is a matter of medium rather than a matter of text or content is true. It means education is, fundamentally, *a matter of dialogue*.

6.4.4 Method and Curriculum

Two curriculum worlds: In a Christian education that aims at the formation of Christian lifestyle, curriculum is understood as a course of "pilgrimage" (Kliebard 1975:84-85) in which various subjects (God, educator, student, text, context etc.) carry out the love of God and neighbors in intersubjective participation. An incarnational-dialogic paradigm of Christian education thus sees the Christian curriculum not as source materials but as the entire course of both the church's life and public life. The Christian curriculum for the formation of a Christian lifestyle in the two lives, therefore, should include a "curriculum-as-life-experience" as well as a "curriculum-as-plan" (Aoki 1986:8). Conflicting between and combining the two curriculum worlds, the educator should help the pupils to develop their creative capacity through creating tension between the two. Incarnational-dialogic Christian education inquires into curriculum in the structure of a communicative relationship of learner-educator, learner-other learners, learner-text (content), and learner-context. An authentic dialogic relationship and public discourse should be formed between education-subjects in a Christian education community.

A disclosure method through a *presentation* and *indirect communication*:
A monologue mode and a dialogue mode in teaching-learning can be named, in Ian Ramsey's (1964) terms, a closure mode and a disclosure mode. A disclosure mode is

256

more suggestive than definitive, opening things up and inviting people to think for themselves, while a closure mode tries to say it all and definitively, telling people what to think and how to think it, delivering rather than revealing. In order to practice the disclosure mode, the method of a dialogic "presentation" that is suggested by Thomas Groome (1998:201-202) will be necessary. He proposes that the educator prepares dialogue through "a disclosure presentation" rather than pronouncements "from on high" such as direct lecturing and instruction when they introduce the content of teaching. The style of presentation is employed to engage learners in the heart of educational action, by encouraging them to express their thoughts and reflections in dialogue with other learners. In the process, learners "usually experience such a presentational event as a kind of conversation" (Groome 1998:202). In the method of disclosure presentation, the educator talks not *to* but *with* the learners by engaging them as active participants.

Another method is related to "questioning." The educator who follows an incarnational-dialogic paradigm of education will focus on "questioning" rather than "answering" in teaching. As Maria Harris (1987:15) insists, to put questions is the core of teaching. It is therefore necessary for educators to develop effective questions according to the dialogic principles of incarnational and critical public dialogue: for example, questions to engage in dialogue, questions to invite learners to express their voices, questions to reflect on tradition and reality critically, questions for decision and choice toward praxis (cf. Groome 1998:309-313).

When the "life" of the learner is contained in the content and curriculum, education-subjects cannot avoid confronting various voices, differences and collisions. Therefore a method of dealing with life and difference is necessary. Madang public dialogue takes as the method "a story-telling through a communicative mode of theatre," in which the others' stories and voices are reflected, avoiding a form of direct transmission. As Mary Moore (1991:141) notes, "story is a form of indirect communication that conveys truths that cannot be communicated directly."

257

The idea of indirect communication was developed by Søren Kierkegaard (1960). James Whitehill (1974:79-93) analyzes Kierkegaard's indirect communication in the four aspects: intention, content, method and a relationship of transmitter-receiver (educator-learner) (cf. Harris 1987:96-107). While direct communication is to convey the content in a form of fact or information, indirect communication is to awaken the learners' capacity for freedom and choice, and to help learners to know the truth in the process of their active participation in education. In indirect communication the educator and the learner enter into the relationship of co-creation in a dialogic event of education.

In indirect communication, there are as many contents as there are subjects, on account of accepting every participant's life as the content. Therefore, various methods are needed in an incarnational-dialogic Christian education based on indirect communication. The methods are connected with all kinds of indirect communication forms that the learners have confronted and used in their lives. These include drama, film, all kinds of artistic means, silence, prayer and introspection (Little 1983:61; Palmer 1983:117,124), irony and humor (Kierkegaard 1960:446-448), using mask, a by-talk (Whitehill 1974:83), soft-focus, indirect narration and paralogical assertion (Harris 1987:102). In addition, as Eisner (1994:17) stresses, the various patterns of expression through the five senses, i.e. smelling, tasting, touching, hearing and seeing, can be used in an educational action.

Humor, Irony and Laughter: An incarnational-dialogic paradigm considers that communication of meaning is possible through the forms of art, symbol and emotion as well as through language. According to the festival principle of madang public dialogue, *irony* and *humor* in particular should be adopted as methods to deal with difference and contradiction of reality. Kierkegaard (1960:446-448) sought to develop the theory of humor and irony, searching for the comic dimension in the human contradiction (cf. Harris 1987:141-142). For him, *irony* serves as a means for living with the tension between possibility and necessity, by which human beings make the transition from

258

aesthetic to ethical awareness. *Humor* offers a means for answering or responding to contradiction and suffering, and by using it human beings can make the transition from ethical to religious awareness (Kierkegaard 1960:448). In addition, humor and irony produce laughter/smiling. Bernard Lonergan (1972:60) speaks of the "smile" as a representative intersubjective communication. The reason is that when a person smiles at us, we smile in response. For him, smile has a meaning; its meaning has diversity (heterogeneity or polyphony to use Bakhtin's expression) while meaning conveyed through language has singleness (homogeneity).

After all, humor, irony and laughter/smiling premise "plural" in the sense that they can be developed through intersubjective interaction between two (or more) people and their voices. They are thus grounded in dialogic polyphony, avoiding the dominance of a single voice based on monologism of a schooling-instructional paradigm. In an incarnational-dialogic paradigm of education, the methods of humour, irony and laughter are important avenues for the Christian lifestyle of forming a dialogic relationship with the Other and the others. This is not only because they are a means for communicating something of the human condition that cannot be communicated adequately in other ways, but also because they serve as a zone of a familiar encounter for incarnational dialogue with strangers and strange things, accepting difference in polyphonic harmony. This is educational wisdom derived from the festival principles of madang public dialogue.

6.4.5 Place and Environment

Where can incarnational dialogue take place? A place of incarnational dialogue is somewhere in which people can encounter and experience the love of God and the love of others. The "betweenness" (Sherill 1959:59) of encounter and response can become an educational place. Therefore, Christian educational places should be enlarged beyond the church and the church-school to any place in which people can encounter and response to God, other people and the world. Going beyond the wall of

the church, an incarnational-dialogic Christian education thus obtains educational places such as the home, the school and society. However, madang Christian community suggests expanding a dialogic place of incarnational Christian education to the "madang" (a public space) in which public dialogue and public praxis are possible.

What is a Christian educational place? Stressing that "embedment in the world is the seed and fruit of Christian education," David and Margaret Steward (1978:88,97) claim to shift the focus of the educational process from *content* to *place*. For them (1978:88), *place* means "our embedment in a world within which we are connected in a multitude of ways." The understanding of "place" generally recognizes two places: one is a physical place such as a particular building or geographical region. The other is a psychological place such as an ethos, mental state, or natural and social relations. People locate within the two embedments or places. According to these authors (1978:88), the Christian has a third place/embedment that is a spiritual place/embedment. "It is within God's love that we 'live and move and have our being.'"

David and Margaret Steward (1978:89-90) go on to claim that when the three embedments are joined, *place* becomes a mystery—grace. In other words, when becoming the place of a physical space, a socio-psychological relationship or spiritual experience, it can be an educational place that changes us and is changed by us. The three places are indeed associated with the human's body, mind and beliefs. For we encounter and experience God, other people and knowledge with the whole of our being (i.e. body, mind and belief) in a "place" of our location or in a particular physical space, in a dialogic relationship and a spiritual place.

Compassion and 3Rs—Respect, Responsibility and Reverence: The problem is finding the environment for the integration of the three places—a physical space, a dialogic relationship and a spiritual experience. How can the educator create an environment that educates people as spiritual beings who engage in the world through a dialogic communication and relationship with the Other or the Subject, as

well as with the others or the subjects in a place of this world? The answer will be based on the suggestions of Groome (1998:305-308, 354-356). Incarnational Christian education requires an educational environment with the pathos of "compassion" and "3Rs (Respect, Responsibility, Reverence)" in which a Christian lifestyle can be shaped, as proposed by Groome.

Respect means showing regard for the worth of someone or something. It takes three major forms: respect for oneself, respect for other people, and respect for all creation. According to Maria Harris (1987:106), in a respect-environment it is acceptable for learners to refuse manipulation and intervention.

Responsibility is "an extension of respect" and the active side of morality and spirituality. It is a dimension of praxis, so it includes taking care of self and others, alleviating suffering, and building a better world.

Compassion is, for Groome, feeling at one with someone. It is a deep crossing over into the sufferings and needs of others, acting with love and mercy. Thus "it can permeate 'respect' and 'responsibility' with a spirit of largess and generosity. It promotes one to 'go the extra miles'" (Groome 1998:307).

Reverence moves beyond the above three (respect, responsibility, and compassion). Groome (1998:356) describes: "The etymological root of *reverence* means to recognize the deepest truth about something and then to take a second look—*re*—to see the plenitude beyond the obvious and immediate. … Surely to reverence oneself and others means first to recognize the dignity of human beings and then to 'look again' and recognize their Creator. And the same is true of reverencing creation." Under the reverence-environment the formation of a participant relationship is possible: learner and educator, learner-learner, learner-text, learner-context, text-context can enter a partnership of co-creation through incarnational dialogue.

Therefore, only in an environment with the four pathoses (respect, responsibility, reverence and compassion) can the dialogic principles of incarnation, criticism and festivity on which a dialogic education is grounded produce the fruits of morality and spirituality.

6.4.6 Evaluation

The criteria of evaluating teaching-learning comply with the principles of the three models of madang public dialogue.

(1) According to the Incarnation Principles, the criteria of evaluation are as follows:
• Whether Christian education renders public dialogue between church and others,
• Whether an educational action is dialogic or monologic,
• Whether the dialogue in an educational action is individual or public,
• Whether or not the teaching-learning action accepts strangers as participative subjects, receives strange things—difference and collision—in polyphonic harmony,
• Whether or not the educator and the text (including tradition) try to overcome monologism, i.e. a direct schooling-instructional pattern, and follow a dialogic disclosure mode of education,
• Whether or not the Christian education promotes the incarnational interaction of the educator, the learner, the text, the context, and the time/place; that is, the extent to which the educator encourages dialogism among educator, learner, text, context and time/space.

(2) Depending on Critical Principles:
• Does Christian education stress the recognition and criticism of tradition, reality and vision, rather than representation and imitation of action?
• To what extent is it open to self-criticism?
• Does it contribute to the formation of an authentic subject of dialogic education?
• Does it develop learners' competences of understanding and overstanding/criticism?

- Does it help learners to form an attitude of critical distance, instead of empathy, with which they can see a single voice of an almighty educator or text objectively and criticize it?

(3) On the Basis of Festival Principles:

- Does Christian education accept a spirit of play/festivity and a spirit of madang with openness for public dialogue?
- Does it make the best use of an expanded educational place, "madang" with festivity and openness?
- Does it affirm an expanded, integrated human who is *homo ludens*, *homo festivus* and *homo fantasia* as well as *homo sapiens* and *homo faber*?
- In what respect does it carry out the dialogic principles of festival?

In conclusion, an incarnational-dialogic paradigm of Christian education is summarized according to the principles of the three dialogic models.

Firstly, incarnational-dialogic Christian education begins with recognition of both the self and the other. A human being is in need of the other, and self-realization and self-extendedness are possible through a dialogic relationship with the other. Accepting the different voices of the other is the principle of surplus that enriches the human being in a relationship with the other.

Secondly, in incarnational-dialogic teaching-learning the learner is accepted as a subject with the competence of participation, interpretation and spontaneity. Any text and action of teaching-learning, thus, is not finalized, but rather in the process of becoming through the incarnational engagement of the learner and the educator with them.

Thirdly, the incarnational-dialogic Christian education facilitates polyphonic dialogue between differences: between criticism and festivity, soul and body, reason and

emotion, continuity and change, church and society, faith and doing, theory and practice, and between past, present and future and all kinds of collisions. The difference and conflict can be adopted as the contents of Christian education.

Fourthly, an incarnational-dialogic paradigm reflects critically on a hierarchical relationship and monologic communication rooted in a schooling-instructional paradigm. Rather, it pursues incarnational dialogue among educator, learner, text and context.

Finally, on the basis of incarnational dialogism, the Christian community of madang public dialogue tends ultimately toward a festival community with pleasure, play, imagination, irony, humor and laughter, celebrating the past, the present and the future.

A dialogic community is a praxis community, and incarnational-dialogic Christian education is praxis Christian education. The reason is that they aim for *praxis* in the sense that they fulfill the great commission of "go-to-all" in dialogic communication. Dialogue is not theory but praxis. Madang public dialogue serves to construct a dialogic community and dialogic Christian education, by demonstrating the principles of incarnation, critical reflection and festivity.