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ABSTRACT

This thesis is initiated by the need for public dialogue between the church and the other. As a faith-praxis, public dialogue between the church and the other is a response to “binary opposition” or “dichotomy,” that is, the separation of faith and praxis, knowing and doing, private sphere and public sphere, Christian and non-Christian, text and context, educator and learner. As explored in Chapter 2, religion is presently characterized by privatization and does not provide an answer to the culture of separation in today’s society. Consequently, the ghettoized church behind the wall is confronted by a dual crisis—an internal crisis of identity and an external crisis of relevance. Therefore, to shape a dialogic relationship through public dialogue is an essential task of the public church, the so-called “go-to-all” church.

To execute “public dialogue” as the commitment to “go-to-all” three actions are necessary: (1) going outside the wall of the church, (2) entering into dialogue with the “all,” and (3) making disciples, baptizing, and teaching the all. How will the church dialogue with the other? In view of these three actions, this thesis researches three main elements of public dialogue—(1) preparing a place/field for public dialogue, (2) formulating a new communicative pattern for public dialogue, and (3) exploring a medium for public dialogue.

In order to achieve these elements of public dialogue, the patterns of public dialogue toward faith-praxis that the Korean church has shown historically in the public sphere were explored in Chapter 3. This thesis concerns an art-cultural pattern of public dialogue, particularly madanggŭk. Madanggŭk is a compound noun: madang (open place) + gŭk (theatre). Madanggŭk contains the three elements for public dialogue—(1) “field or place” for public dialogue; (2) a mode of theatre as a medium for public dialogue; and (3) the “communicability” peculiar to the madanggŭk.
Through the practices of cultural public dialogue in the Korean theological domain and the minjung cultural movement centering on madangguk studied in Chapter 4, it is revealed that madangguk showed the four characteristics of mutual communication which are essential in formulating an alternative pattern of public dialogue: (1) rediscovery of the audience, (2) re-creation of traditional culture founded on festivity and a communal spirit, (3) their own stories and reality-reading, and (4) activity outside the theatrical world in order to meet the audience. However, madangguk also had the limitation of a binary opposition of social-directivity and artistic-directivity, tending toward social drama. Therefore, an alternative form of public dialogue to overcome this binary opposition was required.

As an alternative with the purpose of shifting from monologism to dialogism, this thesis suggests “Trinity Madang Public Dialogue,” i.e. three models of madang public dialogue—Incarnational Public Dialogue, Critical Public Dialogue, and Festival Public Dialogue. The first model, Incarnational Public Dialogue, explores how to accept the other and the difference under the principles of otherness, unfinalizability and polyphony, proposing the culture of participative dialogue. The second model, Critical Public Dialogue, explores practical strategies for recognizing and criticizing the distorted communication and relationship of monologism, and for developing the audience’s competencies of understanding and criticism without merging into an authorial single voice, proposing the culture of criticism and transformation. The third model, Festival Public Dialogue, is suggested as a time-space for fulfilling both incarnational and critical principles and for the harmony of a rational and a sensuous nature, proposing the culture of laughter, play and the imagination.

The principles of the three models should be fully realized in the Christian community before performing dialogic madang-theatre. When the Christian community preparing for this type of public dialogue is transformed into a “dialogic” community, it will 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. Therefore, in Chapter 6, The “Six Stages of Dialogic Praxis” through which the madang Christian community can be recreated effectively to form a dialogic community is projected. And, an “Incarnational-Dialogic Paradigm” is suggested as an alternative to a schooling-instructional paradigm of Christian education.
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