

**PUBLIC DIALOGUE  
BETWEEN CHURCH AND OTHERS THROUGH  
A COMMUNICATIVE MODE OF MADANGGŬK  
: A PRACTICAL THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE**

By

**MIKYUNG CHRIS LEE**

Thesis

Submitted in fulfillment  
of the requirements  
for the degree of

**PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR**

in Practical Theology  
in the Faculty of Theology  
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

**SUPERVISOR: PROF JULIAN C. MÜLLER**

SEPTEMBER 2005

## DECLARATION

I the undersigned hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

Signature:

Date:

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A life without festival is only as good as a long journey without a place to sleep, said Democritus. Dreaming of a Christian community in which there is real dialogue and festival with others, I have devoted the last few years to a study of public dialogue. As a result, this thesis was written by one person but with many people's assistance.

First of all, I thank Professor J.C. Müller who is my current supervisor, as well as other academics at the University of Pretoria. I express my hearty thanks particularly to Professor Müller who taught me to shift to a thorough practical theological consciousness and way of thinking. In addition, I owe my concept of theory-praxis harmony to the black people I met at a mission in Potchefstroom, South Africa. The encounter and dialogue with them opened my eyes and enabled me to read reality.

I give thanks to all the professors at the Methodist Theological Seminary of Korea who taught me theology and Christian education. I thank especially Professors Kim J.U., Lee W.G. and Song S.J. who, during my studies toward this PhD, encouraged me and made me realize the fact that this study is the public responsibility of the Korean faith community, not merely a personal matter. And I wish to thank all members of the Shin-Sung Methodist Church in Korea, who attempted to fulfill "dialogic" Christian education with me and supported my studies with continuous prayer.

I am grateful to my family. I will never forget my mother's love and prayer. She worked as a missionary in Potchefstroom, South Africa, for 15 years. Although suffering a sudden serious illness, she put my studies before her health, and encouraged me to continue. I also thank my parents-in-law who have worked as pastors in the Methodist church. They allowed me to go abroad alone and supported me spiritually. I also express my deepest thanks to my husband who serves God as a pastor. Without his

positive support and understanding, this work could not have been accomplished. In addition, my son Joseph's fresh wisdom was always stimulating.

I wish to thank Ms Scheepers for her proofreading and editing of my somewhat complicated thesis. Finally, I appreciate the kindness and intellectual and spiritual dialogue of my friends in Korea and the Korean theological students at the University of Pretoria.

All those who are mentioned above became a haven for me. Now it is time to leave the nest and to soar on the wings of an eagle in dialogue with the other in another world.

I yield all glory and gratitude to God who has led me this far with endless grace.

## 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 madanggük studied in Chapter 4, it is revealed that madanggük 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, madanggük 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.

## KEY WORDS / PHRASES

Public Dialogue between Church and Others

Communication

Dialogic Praxis

Madang / Madanggük

Monologism

Privatization / Religious Individualism

Unfinalizability

Polyphony

Double-Voiced Discourse

Incarnational Public Dialogue

Critical Public Dialogue

Festival Public Dialogue

Madang Public Dialogue

Madang Christian Community

Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### ABSTRACT

### KEY WORDS / KEY PHRASES

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1	Theme and Motivation	1
1.2	Problem and Purpose	3
1.3	Methodology	7
1.4	Structure	9
1.5	Delimitation	11

## CHAPTER 2 PRESENT SOCIETY AND THE KOREAN CHURCH

2.1	Individualism	13
2.2	Religious Individualism: Privatization	16
2.3	The Korean Church and Church-Individualism	20
2.3.1	Religious Pluralism of the Korean Church	20
2.3.2	Church-Individualism and Church Growth	21
2.3.3	Church-Individualism and Church Decline	24
2.3.3.1	Materialism	24
2.3.3.2	Individual Salvation-Centered Faith	26
2.3.3.3	Exclusivism	28
2.3.3.4	Goal-Displacement and Church Decline	29
2.4	Diagnosis of the Korean Church and Suggestion	32
2.4.1	Primary Problem	32
2.4.2	Suggestion	36

### **CHAPTER 3**

## **PATTERNS OF PUBLIC DIALOGUE OF THE KOREAN CHURCH IN HISTORY**

3.1	The Period of Healthy Public Dialogue	40
3.1.1	Social Enlightenment Movement	41
3.1.2	National Movement Against Japanese regime	43
3.1.3	The Great Revival Movement	46
3.1.4	The March First Independent Movement	47
3.2	The Period of Unhealthy Public Dialogue	50
3.2.1	Realistic Enlightenment Movement	50
3.2.2	Transcendental Mysticism Faith Movement	51
3.2.3	Shinto-Shrine Worship of the Korean Church	52
3.2.4	The Split in the Korean Church after Liberation	53
3.3	The Period of Polarized Public Dialogue	55
3.3.1	National Evangelization Movement	56
3.3.2	Anti-Dictatorship Pro-Democracy Movement	57
3.3.2.1	Democratization Movement of the 1960s-1970s	57
3.3.2.2	The Democratization Movement in the 1980s	59
3.3.3	Social Reform Movement	61
3.4	Emergence of Cultural Public Dialogue: <i>Madanggŭk</i>	64
3.5	Limitation of Public Dialogue of the Korean Church and Suggestion	66

### **CHAPTER 4**

## **PRACTICES OF CULTURAL PUBLIC DIALOGUE: CENTERING ON *MADANGGŬK***

4.1	Korean Theology and Cultural Public Dialogue	73
4.1.1	Korean Theology and Reading Context	73
4.1.2	Minjung Theology and Minjung Cultural Movement	76
4.2	The Advent and Identity of <i>Madanggŭk</i>	80
4.2.1	Artistic and Social Background	80
4.2.2	Response to Context	83
4.2.2.1	Creative Inheritance of Traditional Performance	83
4.2.2.2	A Minjung Medium for Expression of Social Reality	85

4.2.3	Definition of <i>Madang</i> and Identity of <i>Madanggŭk</i>	87
4.3	Practices of Public Dialogue through <i>Madanggŭk</i> Performance	88
4.3.1	Involvement of Christianity in the <i>Madanggŭk</i> Movement	88
4.3.2	The First Performances for Public Dialogue	91
4.3.3	Practices of Public Dialogue through <i>Madanggŭk</i> in the 1970s	91
4.3.4	Practices of Public Dialogue through <i>Madanggŭk</i> in the 1980s	99
4.3.4.1	Proxy Assembly	99
4.3.4.2	Labor Drama	103
4.3.5	New Attempts for Cultural Public Dialogue	106
4.3.5.1	From <i>Madanggŭk</i> To <i>Madanggut</i>	107
4.3.5.2	Life Drama, Short Drama, and <i>Talnori</i> (Mask Play)	108
4.3.5.3	<i>Daedong Nori</i>	108
4.3.5.4	<i>Daedong Gut</i> and <i>Jipchyegŭk</i>	109
4.4	Interpretation on the Communicability of <i>Madanggŭk</i>	112
4.4.1	Rediscovery of the Populace (Minjung)	112
4.4.2	Re-Creation of Traditional Folk Culture	116
4.4.3	Their Own Story and Realism	122
4.4.4	Field Directivity Outside the Theatrical World	125
4.5	Meaning and Limitation of <i>Madanggŭk</i> Performance	129
4.5.1	Mutual Communication	129
4.5.2	Mediating Structure	131
4.5.3	New Reading Reality and New Field Recognition	132
4.5.4	The Problem of Dual Opposition	134

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE MADANG PUBLIC DIALOGUE: “THREE MODELS” OF DIALOGIC COMMUNICATION**

5.1	Why Live Theatre?	141
5.1.1	Three-cornered Feedback Effect	142
5.1.2	Immediacy and Concreteness	143
5.1.3	Presence and Present (Existence and Time)	143
5.1.4	Performative-Word (Action-Word)	145
5.2	From Monologism To Dialogism	146

5.3	The First Model: Incarnational Public Dialogue	154
5.3.1	Otherness and New Self-Image	155
5.3.1.1	General Features of the Audience	156
5.3.2.2	Surplus of Seeing and Mutual Answerable Being	157
5.3.2	The Change of Author, Performer and Audience Position	162
5.3.2.1	The Audience: An Infinite Interpretative, Dialogic Being	162
5.3.2.2	The Death of Author and the Return of Audience	164
5.3.3	Unfinalizability and Polyphony	168
5.3.3.1	Unfinalizability	168
5.3.3.2	Polyphony	170
5.3.4	Acceptance of Difference and Conflict	177
5.3.5	Dialogic Conflict in “ <i>The Gold-Crowned Jesus</i> ”	180
5.3.6	The Mission of Removal of the Monologic Gold Crown	184
5.4	The Second Model: Critical Public Dialogue	186
5.4.1	Cognition, Criticism, and Change of Reality	187
5.4.2	Temptation toward Monologic Communication of Fixed Messages	191
5.4.3	Expression of Ambivalence	193
5.4.3.1	Cognition and Expression	193
5.4.3.2	Ambivalence of Beauty and Ugliness	194
5.4.3.3	Ambivalence of Two Sides and Two Voices	195
5.4.3.4	Three Types of Double-Voiced Discourse	197
5.4.4	Self-Criticism: How to Communicate a Christian Story	199
5.4.5	Empathy and Critical Detachment	202
5.4.5.1	An Interpellated Subject and a Matter of Empathy	202
5.4.5.2	Estrangement Effect and Keeping Critical Distance	206
5.5	The First Model: Festival Public Dialogue	208
5.5.1	Play and Public Dialogue	210
5.5.1.1	Homo Ludens (Man the Player)	210
5.5.1.2	Dialogic Features in Play	212
5.5.2	Madang-Theatre as Play-Art	214
5.5.3	Rediscovery of Festivity for Madang Public Dialogue	216
5.5.4	Procedure of Festival Public Dialogue	218
5.5.5	Carnivalistic Festivity for Madang Public Dialogue	223
5.5.6	Dialogic Principles of Madang-Festival	225

5.5.6.1	The Spirit of Carnival Debasement	225
5.5.6.2	Everyone is a Participant	226
5.5.6.3	Dialogization of Differences	227
5.5.6.4	Criticism against Monologue and Privatization	229
5.5.6.5	Laughter and the Pathos of Change and Renewal	230
5.5.6.6	Dialogization of Past, Present and Future	231

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **MADANG CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY AND AN “INCARNATIONAL-DIALOGIC PARADIGM” OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION**

6.1	Toward a Dialogic Madang Christian Community	235
6.1.1	Three Phases for Reconstruction toward a Dialogic Madang Christian Community	236
6.1.1.1	Preparatory Procedures: <i>Training-Workshop-Rehearsal</i>	236
6.1.1.2	<i>Deconstruction—Transition—Reconstruction</i>	237
6.2	Six Stages of Dialogic Praxis in a Madang Christian Community	240
6.2.1	Opening Stage: The Focusing Activity	240
6.2.2	Dialogic Movement 1: Expressing and Sharing Present Voice/Story	241
6.2.3	Dialogic Movement 2: Critical Reflection on Present Voice/Story	242
6.2.4	Dialogic Movement 3: Making Accessible Christian Story/Vision	244
6.2.5	Dialogic Movement 4: Incarnational Dialogue between Christian Story/Vision and Participants' Stories/Visions	245
6.2.6	Dialogic Movement 5: Decision/Response for Madang Public Dialogue	247
6.3	The Praxis of Madang Public Dialogue	248
6.3.1	Street Parade	248
6.3.2	Singing and Dancing Together	248
6.3.3	Main Performance	249
6.3.4	Ending Play	249
6.4	Toward an Incarnational-Dialogic Paradigm of Christian Education	251

6.4.1	Purpose of Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education	252
6.4.2	Educator and Learner	253
6.4.3	Text and Content	254
6.4.4	Method and Curriculum	256
6.4.5	Place and Environment	259
6.4.6	Evaluation	262

## **CHAPTER 7 A CONCLUDING VISION**

7.1	Summary	265
7.1.1	On Analysis of the Present Society and Church	265
7.1.2	On Three Patterns of the Korean Church's Public Dialogue	266
7.1.3	On Practices of Cultural Public Dialogue	267
7.1.4	Toward an Alternative Madang Public Dialogue	268
7.1.5	Toward a Dialogic Christian Community	269
7.1.6	Toward Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education	271
7.2	Meaning and Suggestion	272
7.2.1	Meanings of Madang Public Dialogue	272
7.2.2	Suggestion and Further Study	273

<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>274</b>
---------------------	------------

# CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Theme and Motivation

The point of departure of this thesis is the need for “public dialogue” between church and others, or Christians and non-Christians. This theme, public dialogue as a faith-praxis, has been my main concern in the 16 years that I have served as a Christian education leader in various Korean churches. During the period, I was confronted with several problems and questions in the field of Christian education. These are a matter of “binary opposition” or “dichotomy,” that is, the separation of faith and praxis, knowing and doing, private sphere and public sphere, text and context and so on. As far as time is concerned, many people are Christians on Sunday, but non-Christians during the week. In the aspect of space, they are Christians in the church, but non-Christians at home, at school and in society. Many Christians fail to develop an image of God in themselves or to make “a creative, dialogic event” in or with the world. For them, God’s Word no longer seems to be activated as the “living” book. There is no doubt in my mind that these problems are not caused by the Scriptures.

“Knowledge” in Christianity cannot be separated from “doing” from a Christian perspective. The Hebrew verb *yada*, “to know,” means to encounter, to experience, to relate to and to share in an intimate way. In short, to “know” is to “do” in the Old Testament. This is clearly in accordance with the New Testament which teaches that “faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action, is dead” (cf. James 2:17 in the Scripture; Wilson 1989:185,288).

I began to realize that the source of the trouble lay in the attitude of Christian educators and leaders of the Korean church who had overlooked the integrative methodology with regards to the relationships of know-act, worship-work, and private-public. They were indeed only concerned with cramming knowledge of the Bible into Christians within the

church buildings, sticking to a “schooling-instructional paradigm” (Westerhoff III 1976:6). As a result, the Korean Christians and churches had no time to look outside the wall of the church. Facing the crisis of the binary opposition of faith-praxis, I attempted a paradigm shift within Christian education, by laying special emphasis on an “experiential teaching-learning way.” The experiential learning which I carried out as a method for the integration of faith and praxis was grounded in the conviction that the Truth is not what is thought, but what is “experienced.” As Heschel (1955:283) claims, faith requires “a leap of action” rather than “a leap of thought.”

On the basis of such “experiential learning,” I planned Christian education programs for children and teenagers and, at the same time, I put them into practice in some Korean churches over a period of several years. I also brought an awareness of the necessity of the experiential teaching-learning way and practical methods of those programs to teachers and leaders of Korean churches. In 1999, I had an opportunity to write one section of a textbook for *The Summer Bible School*, which is held for four days every summer vacation in Korea, using the experiential method.

However, the experiential learning programs were simply a first step towards faith-praxis. An expanded second step was needed as this first step had limitations in some respects. The experience programs were confined to the method of “teaching the Bible,” even though they helped provoke learners’ active interest and participation in the learning activities. These programs, moreover, had another limitation regarding place and time, in that they were planned only for Churches/Christians and used only on Sundays. In the process of the programs, I encountered a central problem. The root of a binary opposition of faith-praxis lies in an individual-church orientation and the exclusive attitude of the Korean church. In a closed home that has no relationship with its neighbors, it is not easy for children to grow into relational beings with the other so-called “being-in-the-world.” That is also true of the church. As long as the church remains within the wall without public dialogue with the others, Christians cannot grow into the integrated Christians of faith and praxis even though Christian educators



mobilize the right methodology.

This realization and reflection aroused my interest in “public dialogue” between the church and the other (society / non-Christian) outside the wall, which is the central theme of this research.

## **1.2 Problem and Purpose**

As Stephan Carter (1994) argues, modern times are characterized by the “culture of disbelief” in which God is pushed from public discourse into private parts of our lives. In the name of sacred-secular dichotomy, the church has isolated itself from society, and lost the power of influence on society or non-Christians (Osmer 1990:16-20, 21). As Peter Berger (1969:113) contends, contemporary religion became “a matter of the choice or preference of the individual.” This is the context of Christian education. In other words, the field of Christian education today is the world of fear and anxiety, and the ghettoized church “behind the wall” (Brueggemann 1989:3-34)<sup>1</sup> without any relationship with the world. We are indeed puzzled about how religion and Christian education will address the future.

In this view, the religious crisis seems to be closely connected with the loss of interaction between the two worlds of church and society. In short, the loss of any interaction means the loss of “public dialogue” between the two worlds. Indeed, the loss of dialogic interaction is not only the crisis of religion, but also the crisis of Christian education. Even in the context of teaching-learning, the phenomenon of the loss of dialogue has presented itself, by the following of one-way communication on the basis of a schooling-instructional pattern. The church has lost the power of dialogue with the other, and cannot exert an effect on society/non-Christians. Furthermore, even

---

<sup>1</sup> Using the terms “on the wall” and “behind the wall” of the faith community, Walter Brueggemann (1989:5-6) suggests that “Christian education must be bilingual”—“communal language” behind the wall and “public language” on the wall. In this thesis I prefer to use “outside the wall” instead of “on the wall.”

in a Christian community the lack of two-way dialogue has already occurred between Christians, leaders and believers, text and context, and learners and context.

Therefore, public dialogue between church and society, Christians and non-Christians, is an increasingly serious problem that the church will have to solve. The theme of this thesis, “public dialogue” is an attempt to overcome the crisis of the present church and Christian education.

Theologian Douglas Hall (1991) argues that there are three options in responding to anxiety about the future—*Denial, Despair, and Hope*. Considering them in the light of the dialogic relationship between the church and the other, on the one hand the Korean church has chosen *denial*, closing her eyes to the future and secluding herself from society and reality. On the other hand, the Korean church has shown the attitude of *despair*, giving up dialogic praxis with society, reality and the future. In my opinion, the central cause of this despair had its root in the fact that the Korean church did not know how to dialogue with the other. What the church needs is the third option of *hope* that empowers action. Hope cannot proceed in a vacuum without pain. Rather, as Jack Seymour (1997:16) states, “hope is only possible if we face pain directly.”

The church exists not for herself alone but to link the two worlds of church and society to each other. The dialogic relationship of church and society may be understood as the request for the Great Commission of Jesus: “<Go> into <all> the world and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them ... and teaching them” (Mark 16:15; Matthew 28:19-20). The “Go to All” is the reason for the existence of the church in this world. Here is the hope of the church. “Public dialogue” is to comply with the great commission of “go to all.”

To execute the great commission of “go-to-all” three actions are necessary: (1) to go outside the wall of the church, (2) to dialogue with the “all”, (3) to make disciples, baptize, and teach the all. How will the church dialogue with the other? In view of these

three actions, the public dialogue that is the theme of this thesis will be researched with three main purposes—(1) to prepare a place for public dialogue, (2) to formulate a new communicative pattern for public dialogue, and (3) to explore a medium for public dialogue.

The first purpose of this thesis is to find a “place or field” for public dialogue between church and others. This is a reply to the action of “going beyond the wall of the church,” according to the “go-to-all” commission. The field/place of Christian dialogue and Christian education has been studied focusing on the four fields of family, church, school and society. Nowadays there have been new attempts to include cyberspace and a global community in the field of Christian education, raising the problem of limited field understanding in arguments. The above fields for dialogue or Christian education, however, have been researched separately. This thesis will not be confined to any field among the field categories. Rather, it poses a question: “what is an alternative field in which the above fields can encounter each other?” Each field needs to open its own door and come out from behind the wall. Therefore, it is imperative to prepare an alternative expanded field, that is, *han-madang* (*han* means “one”, *madang* means “open place” such as street, park, public square) for them to gather into one place for public dialogue with each other.

The second purpose of this thesis is to formulate a “new communicative pattern” for public dialogue between church and others. The great commission of the church can be understood fundamentally as a communicative action, because the actions of “go-to-all” and “making disciples, baptizing, and teaching them” are possible through “communication / dialogue” with them. The problem here is what kind of dialogue it is. Jack Seymour (1997:9) indicates: “when we (the church and its leaders) talk about faith, it sounds artificial or forced. ... And, yet, it’s the dominant element in so many of our lives.” It is necessary, therefore, to reflect critically on whether the church takes a one-way dogmatic pattern of communication that makes genuine dialogue impossible, and to find an alternative pattern of communication that enables the church to dialogue with

the other effectively.

The third purpose of this thesis is to explore a “mediating medium” for public dialogue between church and society. As a cultural mediating medium I will take advantage of *Madanggŭk* (literally meaning: “theatre in an open space” in Korea) that was derived creatively from a Korean traditional mask dance, *t'alch'um*. Strictly speaking, this thesis will converge in the “communicability” of madanggŭk rather than a mode of madanggŭk itself. *Madanggŭk* is a compound noun: *madang* (open place) + *gŭk* (theatre). It presents three angles, which are related to the above three purposes of this thesis: (1) the first angle of madanggŭk is a concept of “field or place”; (2) the second angle is a mode of “drama or theatre”; (3) the third angle is “communicability” peculiar to the madanggŭk. In this view, the madanggŭk that has three angles is a cultural method with the possibility of contributing to the fulfillment of the three purposes mentioned above—(1) to find a “place / field” for public dialogue, (2) to formulate a “communicative pattern” for public dialogue, and (3) to explore a “mediating medium” for public dialogue between church and others.

However, an approach to madanggŭk for public dialogue is not an application that intends to establish it in the public dialogue. Rather, this research prefers a critical reflection approach. Therefore, a critical analysis of madaggŭk itself as well as the present society and church and the patterns of the Korean church’s public dialogue is presented first (the methodology of this thesis will be mentioned below in detail). Moreover, the above three areas of research—where (place), how (dialogic pattern), by what (means) for public dialogue—will be covered not separately but in synthesis.

The fourth purpose of this thesis is to propose an alternative model of public dialogue through madang-theatre, which will contribute to a change in the relationship between the church and the other, to the transformation of communicative pattern in a faith community and to the reconstruction of a dialogic paradigm of Christian education. For this purpose, I will attempt to produce “the whole procedure of public dialogue through

madang-theatre.” I will propose a plan for “the stages for dialogic praxis” which will be useful to the transformation of the church from a one-way dogmatic community to a dialogic community. These strategies will be designed to reconstruct not only a faith community but also Christian education, not only the relationships between church and society but also between Christians themselves.

### 1.3 Methodology

In order to achieve the abovementioned purposes, two kinds of methodology, grounded particularly in Don Browning and Thomas Groome, are adopted: (1) *practical theology* on the basis of a *practice-theory-practice model*, and (2) a *critical reflection approach*. Public dialogue through madang-theatre, the theme of this study, is a “practical” attempt to shape a balanced faith-praxis Christian and community. Therefore, even in its research method this study will be situated in a perspective of practical theology.

Christian education is not “*applied theology*” but “practical theology.” Schleiermacher (1966) classified theology into three types: philosophical theology, historical theology and practical theology. Although he regarded practical theology as the crown of the three, it is in fact nothing other than applied theology that conveys theories of philosophical and historical theology to believers. This means that practical theology was restricted within a theory-to-practice, or *text-to-application* model (cf. Farley 1987; Browning 1991). The tendency of understanding practical theology as applied theology based on a theory-to-practice model was dominant all over the theological world of South Korea as well as Western Europe and America.

From the 1970s, however, the hierarchical structure of theology began to be modified. One of the most noteworthy attempts was David Tracy’s (1981) study, which was renowned for proposing a *revised correlational approach*. Dividing theology into fundamental theology, systematic theology and practical theology, he claimed that all three theologies headed toward “praxis” “in correlation” with one another, instead of

securing their superiority. This was an endeavour to overcome the theory-practice dichotomy. In this way, “praxis” became the centre of theological interest. Peter Hodgson (1994) reconstructed systematic theology as *constructive theology*, and tried to accept and deal with postmodern problems and subjects such as liberation, ecology and inter-religions’ dialogue in a constructive theology.

Don Browning made the best use of such a theological paradigm in his practical theological study, following Tracy’s critical correlational method (cf. Browning 1983; 1989). His efforts produced his representative book *Fundamental Practical Theology* (1991). For him, the term *fundamental* implies that every theology pursues praxis, by taking on a practical theological character; this was also Tracy’s advocacy.

Firstly, Browning’s practical theological method is adopted as a method for this research. His method is developed under four categories (Browning 1991): (1) a descriptive theology, (2) a historical theology, (3) a systematic theology, and (4) a strategic or fully practical theology. These categories are a practical theological method on the grounds of the context—text—context, i.e. practice—theory—practice model. This thesis starts from context (practice), moves to theory (text) and returns to context (practice), which is clearly different from an “application” methodology that starts from text in order to reach context.

Secondly, when developing this thesis according to the four categories, critical reflection is adopted as a central approach. In fact, a “critical approach” in practical theology has been a matter of significant concern to some practical theologians. And critical reflection may be considered as an approach of dialogic interpretation between context and text, practice and theory. James Fowler (1983:154) defines practical theology as “critical and constructive reflection on the praxis of the Christian community’s life and work in its various dimensions.” In other words, a practical theology requires critical reflection on the church’s task of practicing public dialogue between church-society, and between Christians. The critical reflection is fully realized

concretely in Thomas Groome's (1981; 1991) "shared praxis" approach. Groome understands his educational approach as a "dialectical conversation" between, on the one hand, participants' present praxis and their stories and, on the other hand, the Christian Story and participants' stories. At the same time, he suggests the hermeneutical conversation between praxis and theory, context and text to be enacted through critical reflection. According to the critical reflection approach, it is necessary to critique the Christian Story in the light of participants' stories and to critique participants' stories in the light of the Christian Story (Groome 1981:217).

Browning (1989:149) acknowledges the value of Groome's critical reflection approach as follows: "The possibility of critical reflection assumes that we can find a third perspective that constitutes a vantage point from which to test and evaluate both our own stories and the Christian story." The reason that this thesis follows a "critical approach" and "practical theological methodology" is expressed well in Browning's (1989:136) following statement.

If a revised correlational practical theology is to bridge the gap between citizenship and discipleship, it should be at the same time *critical*, *public*, and *centered in theological ethics*. By *critical* I mean that, although practical theology must begin with faith and discipleship as formed by a community of believers, it must go beyond an unreflective attitude and seek arguable reasons for supporting its practical action. It must be *public* in the sense that it should attempt to relate the Christian message not only to the inner life of the church but to the public world in all its pluralistic, secular, and rapidly changing character. To do this, of course, it must all the more respond to the challenge of expressing itself in both the evocative language of faith and the critical language of public discourse.

## 1.4 Structure

This thesis consists of seven chapters including the introduction (chapter 1) and

conclusion (chapter 7). Chapter 1 clearly defines the introductory matters: what do I want to research? (Theme), how did I come to this theme? (Motivation and Problem), what do I want to achieve with this research? (Purpose), which method do I adopt to achieve the purposes? (Methodology), how do I structure this thesis? (Structure) and finally, where am I going to erect my borders? (Delimitation)

Following a practical theological method and a critical approach, this thesis begins with an evocation of context. Chapter 2 engages in descriptive theology. It places the focus on description of the context of present society and the Korean church relating to the matter of public dialogue. It is concerned with the correlation between public dialogue and context, critically analyzing the internal and external crisis of the Korean church in relation to public dialogue between church and society.

Chapter 3 takes a historical theological approach. It examines how Korean Christianity has fulfilled public dialogue with the Korean nation and society in Korean history. In the process, I will explore the patterns of public dialogue that the Korean church has shown. Here, the advent of a new cultural pattern of public dialogue, *madanggŭk*, will be mentioned.

Chapter 4 takes, on the one hand, a historical theological, and on the other hand a constructive/systematic theological approach. It concentrates upon the “faith-praxis” of “cultural” public dialogue between church and others (society and non-Christians). In order to this, I will examine cultural faith-praxis in the two domains—the Korean theological world and the *madanggŭk* cultural movement. Here, I will explore and interpret the communicability of *madanggŭk*, introducing its communicative characteristics. In the process, the necessity and possibilities for a transformation to cultural public dialogue will be presented. However, this research will be done from a critical perspective; thus the limitations of *madanggŭk* will be revealed. This means that *madanggŭk* cannot be considered as an “application” model for the praxis of public dialogue. Rather, it requires “alteration” and “reconstruction” in order to become an



ideal mediating medium for public dialogue.

Chapter 5 is based on both a systematic theology and a strategic practical theology. In dialogue primarily with the dialogism of Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian literary theorist and philosopher, Chapter 5 will explore possibilities for a change to two-way dialogic communication, and ultimately attempt to create alternative models and principles for public dialogue.

Chapter 6 takes a strategic or fully practical theological approach. I attempt to offer practical strategies for constructing a faith-praxis community for public dialogue and effecting a paradigm shift to dialogic Christian education. Here, I will explain the whole procedure of public dialogue through madang-theatre. Only through the transformation and the rebuilding of a faith community and a Christian education paradigm, can the dialogic model and principles be successfully executed.

The concluding chapter will provide a summary of this study with its meanings, and offer some suggestions for further study.

## **1.5 Delimitation**

The scope of this research is confined to the church and Korean Christianity.

Firstly, the analysis of the decline in the power of the Korean church in society (Chapter 2) will be discussed as well as how this concerns the present times. The exploration of the patterns of public dialogue of Korean Christianity (Chapter 3) will cover the period from the beginning of Korean Protestantism (the end of the nineteenth century) to the 1980s.

Secondly, a means of public dialogue between the church and the other is limited particularly to a performing art, *madanggŭk*.

Thirdly, this study on “public dialogue through madang-theatre” lays emphasis on “communicability” of *madanggŭk* rather than the “mode” itself, on the assumption that

ideal communication enables true public dialogue between the church and the other, and facilitates a dialogic faith-praxis community and dialogic Christian education in which public dialogue is possible.

## **CHAPTER 2**

# **PRESENT SOCIETY AND THE KOREAN CHURCH**

Christianity that is based on the Creation and the Providence of God could overcome the dualism of the ancient Greek where ‘the matter’ is inferior to ‘the spirit.’ It implies that Christian thought affirms the two aspects—the physical world and human reason (or autonomy)—as products of God’s creation. The affirmation of the physical world makes it unnecessary to seclude society in order to reach God. This affirmation of human reason and autonomy led Protestants to resist the heteronomy of absolutism in the Middle Ages. Since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, as capitalistic economy expands all over the whole world, the ‘practical reason’ of the Age of Enlightenment has become ‘technical reasons.’ In the process, autonomy and individualism has been distorted, and religion has come under this distorted individualism as well. As a result, religion has lost not only its role in traditional social integration, but has also retreated from the public to the private realm. In this way, the crisis of religion is closely connected with modern distorted individualism.

This chapter will firstly examine individualism, and then determine how it affects religion, and what religious individualism or privatization means. As a next step, it will explore how the phenomenon of religious individualism or privatization appeared in the Korean church. In the process of the research into the Korean church, finally, the current problem of the church will be diagnosed.

### **2.1 Individualism**

Individualism is a commonly representative phenomenon of modern society. In the process of industrialization and the development of science and technology, modern society changed gradually from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft* (Tönnies 1957). It was a

change from a moral community to a rational society (Wilson 1982:153-161). In consequence, the moral order and the organic community became weaker, but conversely, the rational order and the contractual and individualistic character of the community grew stronger. Robert Nisbet (1970:372) calls this phase “individualization.” Robert Bellah (1985:142) also points out that individualism lies at the very core of culture in the world: “Our highest and noblest aspirations, not only for ourselves, but also for others, society and the world, are closely linked to our individualism.”

Modern individualism, according to Robert Bellah (1985:142,277), emerged out of the freedom from superstition and out of the struggle against monarchical and aristocratic authority of the tyrannical structures of the past. Therefore, it might be a natural consequence that individualism focuses mainly on searching for ‘the self’ and on pursuing the right of individuals’ freedom—the freedom to decide individually and to develop as an individual. Everything here revolves around the nurturing, exalting, and gratifying of one’s self. The individual’s success at the cost of all else, satisfaction of needs, standing up for his or her rights and autonomy—these are the expressions of a self-driven culture (Gorman 1993:28). In an industrial society, such individualism had a positive impact with regard to allowing the value of each personality, equalitarianism, freedom, autonomy and self-fulfillment.

However, in the process of the battle of such cultural and social contradictions, the nervous search for self began at the place of “independence of and detached from any cultural or social influence.” According to the explanation of Bellah (1985:144,150-151,286), the reason is that individuals have some fear of losing their independence and autonomy unless they stand against society. Hence, one’s primary task is viewed as finding oneself in autonomous self-reliance, existing independently, entirely ‘outside’ any tradition and community, and then choosing one (Bellah 1985:63).

Paul Wachtel (1983:61) indicates the result of an extreme emphasis on ‘the self’ of individualism in brief. Individualism makes the individual a “separated and isolated self,

not only vis-a-vis the present, with respect to their contemporaries (communities and institutions), but also vis-a-vis the past, with respect to their ancestors (tradition and obligation).” On the one hand, the isolating individualism thinks of obligation (commitment) and tradition negatively because it seems to limit the ability of independence, freedom, and self-gratification. On the other hand, it endangers community and traditional relationships, whether of friendship, group, church, marriage and so on. If a relationship and community do not fulfill us, they can easily be discarded. This is why individuals’ interest and self-preservation are most desirable.

Relationships in such “a throw-away world” finally become the “things” to be selected or rejected at our convenience (Gaede 1985:140; Gorman 1993:57-58). Yankelovich (1981:248) argues that the very “me-first, satisfy-all-my-desires attitude” leads to form relationships that are superficial, transitory, and ultimately unsatisfying. The statement by Robert Bellah (1985:152) provides more detail: The individualism involved in pursuing such “unencumbered self” tends to isolate one from one’s group and causes one to withdraw into the circle of fewer relations (family and friends), and at last generates withdrawal from the public world (Bellah 1985:112). What it comes down to is that the individual of today is caught between ideals of obligation and freedom, or community and self.

Such separating individualism makes the individual a “socially unsituated self” and “a fragmented being” who lose coherence with the whole (Bellah 1985:55). According to Robert Bellah (1985:279,281), television and the technological revolution has helped in this process of isolating individualism because the lifestyle delivered by television is an individual (private) lifestyle rather than a public (communal) one. Accordingly, the present period is characterized by “private-oriented culture” or “culture of separation” (Bellah 1985:277).

If so, what is the primary problem of isolating individualism? The answer is that individualism makes one live typically with a sense of imbalance and strain between

private life and public life. As examined above, although individualism implied much greater opportunities, it produced greater separateness. Overemphasis on the private realm of individualism spoils the unity with society. As Albert Borgmann (1992:3,6) points out, in the individualized society and separated culture, “we have no life to be shared in collaboration with together, ... we lost already common life.”

## **2.2 Religious Individualism: Privatization**

How is religion today under the influence of individualism and the culture of separation? In his book *A Teachable Spirit*, Richard Osmer (1990:16,20-21) states that the present church is undergoing a crisis of a decrease in church-membership and a decline in the power of influence, so to speak, “disestablishment.” He goes on to point out that a representative cause of the crisis of religion lies in individualism. Individualism affects the realm of faith. Neither religion nor society can transcend individualism.

If this is so, in which aspects would religion show the phenomenon of individualism? According to Robert Bellah (1985:226), religion of today is regarded as “something individual, prior to any organizational involvement.” This means that the individual is a controlling factor even in religion. This is contrary to the traditional pattern that assumes a certain priority of religious community over the individual. The relationship of the individual with God in the past was ultimately personal, but was mediated by the whole of community life (Bellah 1985:223). However, our thoughts about community and relationship became colored by the individual himself nowadays. The main cry here is “every man for himself, and God for us all!” (Kraus 1979:107). Facing the God of man occurs not through the mediation of the mother church, but through the separate and isolated individual. In the religious sphere as well as in the true frontier of individualism, individual gain becomes the primary motivator, and thus the church is always secondary to the individual (Gorman 1993:66-67).

Many sociologists, most prominently Peter Berger, Talcott Parsons, Tomas Luckmann, and Robert Bellah, have put forward the notion that religion has become increasingly “privatized” in the contemporary world. They commonly profess the privatization or individualization of religion and the diagnosis that individualism has become today’s essential characteristic of religion. Metz (1980:32-47) also observed that “a distorted religious individualism legitimates bourgeois, privatized religion.”

What is the privatization of religion? Peter Berger’s (1969:133) statement below clearly characterizes the privatization of religion: “Religion manifests itself in its peculiarly modern form, that is as a legitimating complex ‘voluntarily adopted’ by an un-coerced clientele. As such it is located in the private sphere of everyday social life, then becomes privatization. This means that privatized religion is a matter of the choice or preference of the individual or the nuclear family, ipso facto lacking in common, binding quality.”

Such privatization of religion was brought by secularization and pluralism in modern society (Berger 1969:133-153). In ancient society, religious establishments existed as monopolies in society. The religious system was an organization to regulate human activity and thought. It was not a matter of individual choice. “To step outside the religious world was to step into a chaotic darkness, into anomy, possibly into madness” (Berger 1969:135). In contemporary society, however, religious traditions have been demonopolized by secularization. This leads to deficiency in the allegiance of its client populations, and religion, which could previously have been authoritatively imposed, now has to be marketed competitively. In addition, as pluralism produces a “market situation” of marketing and offering various opportunities of choice, the individual has the right of choice to shop for the right religion or church according to individual religious taste, on the basis of “the dynamics of consumer preference” (Berger 1969:145). In this context, religious institutions become ‘marketing agencies’ and the religious traditions become ‘consumer commodities.’ Individual believers become ‘consumers of religion’ (Berger 1969:135-138; Bellah 1985:233). This means religion

has become “a matter of choice” for the individual.

Privatization is, as Meredith McGuire (1992:58) states, the process by which certain institutional/private spheres become removed from effective roles in the public sphere. In this process of the privatization of religion, traditional religious forms are no longer definitive for the society as a whole, but can be directed mainly at the lives of individuals or subgroups. Privatization diminishes the individual's control over public life, and undermines the influence of religion over the public sphere. A privatized religion is expected to provide a haven away from the public sphere and to compensate for what their members are deprived of in the public sphere (Luckmann 1967:106-114). It tends to have primary concern for the individual and to have lost much of its public relevance (Beyer 1994:70).

In this way, religion has been marginalized from the public life. In *The Culture of Disbelief*, Stephen Carter (1994:xv) argues that “in the public square, religion is too often trivialized, treated as an unimportant facet of human personality, one easily discarded, and one with which public-spirited citizens would not bother. It has nothing to do with the real public world. At its most extreme, religious belief cannot serve as the basis of policy; religious beliefs cannot even be debated in the forum of public dialogue: in the public life, one does not talk about one's faith and one does not follow the rules of one's faith. Religion became something quiet, private, and something trivial and not really a fit activity for the public sphere.” Carter (1994:22,29) describes that this attitude exerts pressure to treat “religion like building model airplanes,” and “God as a hobby.”

As society became individualized, the phenomenon of separation between public life and private life occurred. In other words, under the influence of individualism, religious individualism or privatization of religion arose. In addition, in the process of connection of religious individualism with secularization and the phenomenon of pluralism, the position and function of religion gradually changed from public religion to private religion. This change has eventually brought about a crisis of credibility in religion.



What is the change in the position and function of religion? If seen from a perspective of status, contemporary religion fell from a position of monopoly to one of competition (Berger 1969:138,151), because religious groups were transformed from monopolies to competitive marketing agencies by the logic of market economy in the consumer culture. The individual cannot really talk about religion any more in the public realm. On the other hand, if seen from a perspective of function, religion became a private affair only. Religion became a matter of private choice or preference of the individual or family.

The most important cause of such religious changes lies in the loss of the socially significance of religion in the public sphere. The reason is that religion as a private matter means the loss of its social sphere. Thomas Luckmann (1967) explains: "Religious issues are based on only the experience of private realm, mainly emotion and feeling, so it became a very subjective issue." Peter Berger (1969:152) also diagnoses: "Religion no longer refers to the cosmos or to history, but to individual existence or psychology."

In conclusion, this indicates what the basic problem of religious individualism or privatization is. That is, religion in modern society fulfills simply a psychological function in the private realm, but does not execute a social function which affects the whole society. In fact, the most serious crisis of today's religion, as Bryan Wilson (1966:14) mentions, "is not the decline of religion itself, but the decline in religion's ability to influence other spheres of life." The crisis of religion lies not in the fact that religion has been driven out of modern society, but that religion has not had an important function for the whole of society any more. That is because "religion is judged by its effects" (Wuthnow 1996:26). It is important how religious commitment affects 'the others' and the public sphere.

If this is the case, how can religion, especially Christianity, become a publicly influential religion? In the face of privatization of religion or religious individualism, the question is

how Christianity will overcome the segregation between public realm and private realm, and how it will form a connection with the world. This is the main concern of this dissertation. Before a solution can be found, it is necessary to examine the Korean church.

## **2.3 The Korean Church and Church-Individualism**

Where does the Korean church stand in the religious stream of individualization and privatization? Considering the fact that the Korean church is placed in a totally multi-religious context, the phenomenon of individualization or privatization would be expected to occur as in a competitive market situation. In particular, the privatization of the Korean church has emerged with a specific form of 'church-individualism' or 'each church centralism.' Therefore, a diagnosis of the Korean church will proceed with a focus on the representative phenomenon of 'church-individualism.'

First of all, there will be a study of the characteristics of church-individualism, and then research into the influence of church-individualism on the Korean church. Examining both positive and negative aspects will reveal the relation between church-individualism and the growth of the Korean church, and a correlation between church-individualism and the crisis in the Korean church. Finally, the basic cause of crisis will be diagnosed.

### **2.3.1 Religious Pluralism in the Korean Church**

The Korean church is placed in a context of pluralism. Korea is a society in which many kinds of religion, including Buddhism, Confucianism, Won-Buddhism, Cheondogyo, Catholic and Protestant, coexist. The number of surveyed 'new religions' is calculated as about 400. In addition, if one considers Folk belief, Korean society manifests religious pluralism most remarkably and can be called "an exhibition of religion" (Lee W.G. 1998:38; 1992:28).

Religious pluralism means that different religious groups coexist in a free competitive situation (Berger 1969:135). However, the Korean church has not taken the attitude of generosity and tolerance of other religions. On the contrary, it has shown an exclusive attitude of a religious crusade mentality with the motive of evangelism. Furthermore, the disunion, separation and struggles are represented even within the religion. Disintegration of Protestantism is most severe among the Korean religions, as it is divided into 113 denominations (1993 present. The Ministry of Culture and Gymnastics 1993:5; Lee W.G. 1998:69) and polarized in respect of faith to the conservative and to the liberal. This polarization of faith affects the attitudes of political-social participation. The Korean church needs public dialogue with other religions and also within denominations to create contact and harmony.

### **2.3.2 Church-Individualism and Church Growth**

In plural-religious and plural-denominational circumstances, “a competitive market-situation” as Peter Berger calls it, was developed in the Korean church. Concentrating all its energy on the solidarity and growth of an inner group in order to compete, the Korean church followed ‘church-individualism’ characteristics very strongly (Roh C.J. 1995:48, 50-51). Church-individualism is another form of individualism expanded into the church (Roh C.J. 1997:27). According to the description of Roh Chi Jun (1995:32), church-individualism means “an attitude or a policy that gives a priority to inner-issues of a local church, especially to the maintenance and the expansion of its own church, when the church sets up its purpose, practices its ministry, and uses human and material resources. The Korean church has formed and developed ‘independent church-individualism’ by accepting from the early mission period the Nevius doctrine for mission which emphasizes the three greatest principles (self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagandizing).

This chapter will research how church-individualism affects the Korean church. Both positive and negative aspects will be considered.

What is the positive influence of church-individualism on the Korean church? A competitive market-situation induced from multi-religious circumstance brought about a miraculous growth in the Korean church. As a result, especially after the 1960s, each local church and each denomination of the Korean church have positively executed a competitive “church-making-movement.” This movement, together with a great mission of Christendom-evangelism, contributed to an increase in the number of Christians (Lee W.G. 1992:250-251).

The Korean Tonghap Presbyterian Church enforced “the 5000 church-making-movement,” the Korean Hapdong Presbyterian Church “the 10,000 church movement,” the Korean Methodist Church “the 5,000 church and one million church member movement” and the Holiness Church “2,000 church movement” (Ju J.Y. 1983b:172; Lee W.G. 1994:185-192). In addition, the revival movement, the Holy Spirit movement, the body-healing movement, church members’ redoubling movement, and the evangelism movement helped the growth of the Korean church, combining with a quantitative expansionism of the church (Han W.S. 1982:165-232). The following table indicates a geometrical progression in the number of Korean Protestant members (Lee W.G. 1998:169; 2000:361).

**Table 1**

Year	1950	1960	1970	1977	1985	1991	1994
The number of Christians	500,198	623,072	3,192,621	5,001,491	6489,282	8,037,464	8,146,556
Percentage of increase		24.6%	412.4%	56.7%	29.7%	23.9%	1.4%

(Data: Year 1950, 60, 70 statistics. Korean Religious society center, *Korean Religious Yearbook* (1993)  
 1977 Statistic. Cultural Information Center, *Religious Corporation & Community Situation* (1977)  
 1985 Statistic. *Population & Residential Census* (1985)  
 1991 Statistic. The Bureau of Statistics, *Social Index of Korea* (1992)  
 1994 Statistic. The Bureau of Statistics, *Social Index of Korea* (1995)

As far as the rate of growth is concerned, the number of Korean church members increased by 24.6% over the 10 years from 1950 to 1960. It shows a tremendously rapid growth of up to 412% for the 10 years from 1960 to 1970. Over the next seven

years, from 1970 to 1977, an increase of 56.7% occurred, and 29.7% over the eight years from 1977 to 1985, and 23.9% over the six years from 1985 to 1991. This rapid growth is grounded in the church-individualism of the Korean church.

Besides such competitive church-movements, there is another important factor strengthening church-individualism and affecting a consecutive growth in the size of the Korean church. This is known as the Korean political-economical context (Lee W.G. 1994:183-185).

Since 1960, Korean society has faced unstable situations—the oppressive military dictatorship, the industrialization through miraculously rapid economical growth policy, the failure of economic justice in distribution of wealth, the destruction of community owing to the drift of population to the cities, and the loss of identity generated from mechanical labor.

These circumstances meant that the people demanded another ‘new community’ for the future. The community needed by new citizens was a solution to psychological problems such as a compensation for anxiety, relative deprivation and loss of identity. It had characteristics of a secularized and privatized community, which tends to show indifference toward public issues outside the church and to focus mainly on the activities of one’s own local church. Through this, the individualized Korean church could achieve rapid growth, by compensating for psychological concerns under the deprived political-economical situation, and by focusing on a church-centered competitive church movement under religious pluralism and in a multi-denominational situation. Therefore, the growth of the Korean church resulted from dual factors—contextual and inner factors of the church.

### **2.3.3 Church Individualism and Church Decline**

Although it had a proper function in respect of the growth of the Korean church, ‘each

church-centralism' produced several problems.

One of the conclusions in the research conducted by the Modern Society Institute in Korea reveals clearly that a phenomenon of Korean church-individualism is as follows (Kim J.K. 1982:185): "Korean Protestant tends to have an attitude of the church sovereignty principle. Christian life of belief is oriented to the life of each individual church (not the secular), and all of church life converges on transcendentalism repeatedly. Furthermore, this church-centered attitude is connected with the tendency of church-individualism. As a result, it prevents organic integrity of a whole Protestant church."

It may be summarized that the church-individualism of the Korean church has three negative phases, namely, materialism of a church growth-centered policy, individualistic faith and privatization, and lastly, exclusivism or group-egoism.

### **2.3.3.1 Materialism**

According to Lee Won Gue (1998:54-55), a Korean sociologist of religion, the main factors of materialization of the Korean church are the capitalistic-economy system and the religious pluralistic circumstances of Korean society. Both factors characterize the nature of competition and expansion in triggering a situation of rivalry to attain the predominant position and giving rise to the market situation. In the process, the phenomenon of materialism appears in that each church competes against others for the collection of religious customers (increase of church members), financial increase and the expansion of church powers. Furthermore, according to the church-growth principle, there is a pandemic symptom of pursuing the large-sized church. This results in the expansion of the individualistic church (Kim B.S. 1995:66).

A measure of the success of the Korean church is the number of church members, the budget limit of church finance, and the size of church buildings. In addition, laymen's faith is estimated by the amount of offering and their socio-economical status. A luxurious style prevails in church buildings and furnishings. In this way, the Korean

church began to place much more emphasis on its numbers and external aspects rather than on its quality (Lee M.Y. 1981:185).

The research on “ the image-evaluation of some religions,” (Lee W.G. 2000:292-293; 1998:198-201) which is surveyed by non-religious people, reveals that Protestant has the highest rate of response of 76.0% (Catholic 35.1%, Buddhism 36.6%) on the question that “each religion is concerned with the expansion of its power rather than the pursuit of real truth.” The tendency to overemphasize the offering is also highest (70.8%) among Protestants. These present the phenomenon of materialism in the Korean church and a loss of its original purpose.

The response rate of the attitude of intolerance to unbelievers and the negative attitude toward the social role reflects the lack of public dialogue and praxis of the Korean church. The statistical data in Table 2 indicates the fact that the communion with mutual help and interdependence has been broken down and the Korean church is instead founded on selfish church-individualism, materialism, and escapism from history and society.

**Table 2. Image-Evaluation of Korean Religion** (unit:%)

	Protestant	Catholic	Buddhism
More concern for expansion of church power rather than real truth	76.0	35.1	36.6
Overemphasis on offering	70.8	28.7	33.6
Emphasis on its rules very rigorously	38.4	29.2	23.8
Solving individual or spiritual matters	18.0	19.0	20.5
Being intolerant of unbelievers	33.2	18.5	14.6
Playing its social role such as charity and social work	37.8	44.8	25.3

Data: Korean Gallup, *Korean Religion and Religious Consciousness*, 1998.

### 2.3.3.2 Individual-Salvation-Centered Faith

The Korean church has built a religious rampart and disconnected from society while

pursuing church individualism. The privatization of the Korean church has no relationship to the cosmos or history, but only to individual existence or psychology (Berger 1969:152). The Korean church represents the phenomenon in which faith recedes from the public realm to the private realm.

Based on this background of privatization and church-individualization, the church developed an individual salvation-centered faith. This faith, on one hand, caused the Korean church to adopt transcendental faith; on the other hand, it led to an ‘individualistic blessing-faith.’<sup>2</sup> When facing the prophetic responsibility as the transformer for social issues, the Korean church chose escapism and avoided the reality of this world. When facing materialism as a social evil, it chose to follow individualistic material-blessing faith based on secular materialism as well.

The research into “why they have their own religion” (Lee W.G. 2000:168) announces the degree of privatization of the Korean church. In addition, Table 3 shows a continuous increment in respondents who gave their reasons as based on “peace of mind,” namely, as psychological causes (1984:32.9%, 1989:43.4%, 1997:53.7%). This data reveals the reasons for religious life which was based more and more on personal need, and why the psychological functions of religion became much more important.

**Table3. The Reason of Having Religion – “peace of mind”** (unit:%)

	1984	1989	1997
Whole Believers	32.9	43.4	53.7
Protestant Believers	34.0	39.7	45.9

The survey on the “effort for faith-growth” (Lee W.G. 2000:296) also points to the privatization of the Korean Protestant church. As contrasted with Buddhists and Catholics, Protestants show distinguishably the tendency of individual faith or privatization: “to attend worship service faithfully (53.7%)”, “to be ardent to prayer

<sup>2</sup> It means “tree blessing” of Korean church: Peace of the Present, Physical health, and Success in the world (Lee W.G. 1998:54).



(46.2%)”, “to read the Bible diligently (45.4%)”, “to participate a discipline course (13.7%)” and “to be faithful for church work (24.7%).” From this point of view, Protestant Christians seem to be exemplary religious people with the inner faith that is confined within the wall of the church. They are immature in the praxis of public life outside the church (30.2%). Compared to other religions, the Korean church is the strongest in the religious life of the church, but is lowest in public social service.

**Table 4. Effort for Faith-Mature/Growth** (unit:%)

	Protestant	Buddhism	Catholic
To attend worship, or Buddhist temple faithfully	53.7	16.3	20.2
To be ardent in prayer or Zen meditation	46.2	22.7	39.4
To read the Bible or Buddhist scriptures	45.4	15.7	24.0
To participate in a disciplined course, Bible study, Buddhist scriptures study	13.7	3.0	9.6
To work faithfully for the church, Buddhist temple	24.7	3.7	22.1
To help people outside the church, Buddhist temple	30.2	43.3	42.3

Data: Korean Gallup, *Korean Religion and Religious Consciousness*, 1998.

All of the research above informs the phenomenon of privatization of the Korean church, namely, a church-centered tendency with the view of individualistic salvation, and a lack of public relationship outside the church. This means that the Korean church has given preference to the salvation of individuals rather than the salvation of society. Nevertheless, the answer about “the question of how religion solves their individual spiritual problems” (Lee W.G. 2000:292) is remarkably negative. It shows already in the survey of “Image-Evaluation of Religions” in Table 2. The three religions have very low rates of positive responses. Among them, Protestants are lowest (18%) compared to Catholics (19%) and Buddhists (20%). This means that even if it is privatized with individualistic-centered salvation, ironically, the Korean church does not give much satisfaction to Christians even in the private respect of individual spirituality that it emphasizes.

### 2.3.3.3 Exclusivism

The Korean church with its church-centralism has a tendency to exclusivism (Lee W.G. 1998:57-59, 97-134). In the survey of “religion leaders’ attitude toward other religions” (Lee W.G. 1998:123-124), the Protestant pastors were more exclusive than Catholic priests and Buddhist monks.

Table 5 reveals that the Korean Protestant church shows a deeper exclusivism than the Catholics and Buddhists. In the answer to the question that “other religion is regarded as a target which should be rejected,” 30.5% of Protestant pastors agreed. This is very different from the priests (0.0%) and the monks (3.0%) when answering the same question. Also, pastors (29.9%), priests (85.7%), and monks (81.7%) responded to the question of “Other religion is a companion to be coexisted with.” This clearly reveals Korean Protestant leaders’ exclusivism.

**Table 5. Attitudes on Other Religions and Religious Leaders** (unit:%)

	Exclusive	Competitive	Coexisted	Unconcern	Others	Total
Monk (Buddhism)	3.0	6.0	81.7	8.1	2.2	100.0 (134)
Pastor (Protestant)	30.5	10.7	29.9	16.4	12.5	100.0 (177)
Priest (Catholic)	0.0	3.0	85.7	6.6	4.7	100.0 (134)

Data: Modern Society Institute, *Research on Consciousness of Korean Religious Leaders*, 1990,

Table 2 on “the image-evaluation of some religions,” as mentioned above, disclosed that the attitude of exclusivism of the Korean church apparently occurred from individual church-centralism and finally led to “group-egoism.” The image of the Korean Protestant church, if compared with other religions, is one of over-concern towards the expansion of the church, a lack of social practical roles in the public sphere, and an exclusive attitude towards unbelievers (non-Christians). This brings one to the conclusion that the Korean church exists in exclusive isolationism without public

dialogue.

This negative image is reflected not only by non-Christians but also by Protestant Christians. An 11.7% of registered church members are nominal church members without any attendance. The first reason for their absence is that “they have no time.” However, there are more important reasons such as “church member is exclusive and selfish,” “church does not accomplish its essential role such as charity and public service, etc” (Lee W.G. 2000:295).

#### **2.3.3.4 Goal-Displacement and Church Decline**

In summary, while pursuing an external, quantitative growth in church-individualism, the Korean church fell into materialism, privatization and an individualistic inclination of faith without public praxis. In such confined conditions behind its own wall, the Korean church has finally developed a de-socialized air by adopting a tendency towards exclusivism. This is to say that the Korean church lost social participation based on a communal relationship and prophetic mission, and it gradually became more sensitive to the hierarchical system. By having as its purpose church maintenance and growth, the church fell into the group of “displacement of goal” or “loss of goal” with a reversed sense of value that the real aim of church could be thought of as external expansion itself (Roh C.J. 1995:55-56; Lee W.G. 1994:190).

In the process of church-individualism or individual church-centralism, which drove the use of most human or material resources to be concentrated only inward on the church for the aggrandizement of the church itself, the Korean church ignored the quality of maturity and social participation; after all, its social influence decreased distinguishably (Roh C.J. 1998:106-108; Lee W.G. 1994:191).

As the following Table 6 shows, there are only a few organized movements against the social irregularities and the infringement of human rights (Kim B.S. 1995:66). According

to this survey, only 4.4% of ministers and 6.1% of laypersons insist on positive participation in social matters. Most Christians, however, have a negative idea of social participation, and they urge such social participation of the Korean church to be restricted within their own church activities through kerygma and prayer. This is a result of the viewpoint of church-individualism that religious life should be performed inside each one's own church.

**Table 6. Attitude on Social Irregularity and Infringement of Human Rights**  
(unit: %, number)

	Pastor	Layman
To take social participation and organized movements	4.4	6.1
To denounce it through Kerygma	44.0	31.6
To have prayer meeting	32.8	43.4
To do it of Christians' own free will	17.1	12.9
Do not need direct participation in it By church	1.8	6.1
Total	100.00(328)	100.0(1,040)

Data: Modern Society Institute, *Research on Faith-Type and Growth of the Korean Church*, 1982.

According to Table 7, "the expenses of Korean church finance" surveyed by Rho Chi Jun (1995:270, cf.205-273), the Korean church acts completely on church-individualism. A total of 87% were used for church maintenance. On the other hand, only 15% were used for essential missions such as mission (5.35%) and social work (3.88). Most of the budget of the church was spent on church maintenance itself, and the finance for society was insufficient.

**Table 7. The Expenses of Korean Church Finance (1992)** (unit: %)

Finance for church maintenance: total 87%	Expenses for Management (12.70), Administration (13.33), Building (13.16), Worship (4.02), Education (7.41), Minister's Salary (27.28), The other (10.12)
Finance for society total 12%	Mission (5.35) Congratulations and Condolences (2.75) Social Work (3.88)

What is the result of this? The Korean church that achieved an amazing growth in

numbers in the 1990s finally encountered a crisis of slowing-growth together with its decline today. Church membership increased up to 1200% between the 1960s and 1990, as shown in Table 1. But compared with this period, the growth of the 1990s stopped and there began to appear the signs of stagnancy.

Of course, the decline in church-growth is a result of not only some inner factors of the Korean church caused by church-individualism, but also outside factors as well, namely, the context of the times (Lee W.G. 1998:204; 1994:186-193). Since 1990 Korea has been under the situation: political democratization, economical abundance and social welfare and the eradication of military dictatorship. Meanwhile, “alternative functions” or leisure industries—such as sports, TV, videos, Karaoke, hobbies, entertainment, Internet, etc.—started to appear in more developed forms. Consequently, so many people no longer seek their compensation for deprivation from the church, but rather from the democratizing politics, the developing economy, social welfare and leisure activities (Lee W.G. 1998:191-194; 1994:239-240,242). For whatever reason, they have departed from the church. In addition, the fall in population among the youth together with an increase in the population of the elderly, and an increased number of career women are other reasons for the Korean church experiencing a decline in church-growth (Lee W.G. 1998:189-190).

However, the inner factors of the church related to church-individualism have had a greater effect on the slowly-weakened growth of the Korean church, rather than the context of the times. This is because the contextual factor is somewhat inevitable, while church factors are chosen on its own initiative (Lee W.G. 1998:194). The greatest obstacle to church growth is the church itself. Compared with the affluent manpower, material resources and facilities of the church, as mentioned above, it is due to the fact that the praxis on social participation of the Korean church is largely deficient.

There is a survey that reflects the respondents’ desire for the reformation of the Korean church (Lee W.G. 1994:81-82, 274-277). Of the respondents, 54.3% answered that the

church does not play the role of salt and light for society; on the other hand, only 19.7% answered that it does well. A total of 42% of them answered that the most necessary function of church is social service; 25.3% mission, 25.6% education, 5.9% koinonia and 5.0% church maintenance. In addition, 45.9% of them replied that if the church has extra finance, this should be spent on social services rather than on other aspects; 20.3% said it should be spent on mission, 8.5% on education, 17.7% on church work, and 5.0% on church maintenance.

However, going against these demands, the Korean church was indifferent to its reformative responsibility in a capitalistic and individualistic society. Far from reforming social evils, it showed a greater tendency towards church-individualism and individualistic faith instead. Although church-individualism had the positive aspect of an increase in numbers, its negative aspects outweighed the positives. The Korean church, thus, became very weak in the public system of communication for society. As mentioned above, the system of church-individualism and privatized structure inclines the church to pursue religious and psychological satisfaction individually, disregarding social practices. Social participation as well as religion in the case of the Korean church became a matter of choice according to the decision of the church itself.

## **2.4 Diagnosis of the Korean Church and Suggestion**

### **2.4.1 Primary Problem of the Korean church**

The Korean church has been criticized as a representative hopeless group of group-egoism, and is called “an empty and broken shell” (Bellah 1970:168) even though it takes pride in so many church members. If so, what is the basic problem within the Korean church? What is the primary reason for the criticism leveled at the Korean church and its crisis of decline? In order to answer the question it is helpful, first of all, to summarize the common problems of materialism, individual-salvation-centered faith,

and exclusivism derived largely from the negative factors of each church-centralism.

At first, the materialism of the Korean church, concentrating on church-growth, reflected that the church had fallen into the survival ethos by taking advantages of the thought of the times rather than revising or reforming the present chronic evils of society, including the principle of economical growth-centralism and an acquisitive society. In the process of church-enlargement, the Korean church structure became so bureaucratic that it lost solidarity and personal relationships even within the church (Kim B.S. 1984:21-22). Moreover, materialism caused unbalance and disharmony among churches, and avoidance of socio-historical issues outside the church.

Secondly, the attitude of individual salvation-centered faith led the Korean church to adopt transcendental faith and material-blessing-centered faith, while ignoring the responsibility of social salvation. In other words, faith did not develop toward the praxis of public affairs, and focused primarily on private affairs and church boundaries. The privatized Korean church resulted in the loss of communal solidarity within churches, denominations, religions and society.

Thirdly, the exclusivism of the Korean church is based on group-egoism and mutual antagonism against the outer group (Lee W.G. 1998:59-60). It promotes the struggle and division among other churches and denominations, and lastly, the loss of relationships with other religion and society. As a result, Korean churches are moving away from their basic purpose of harmony and unity.

In conclusion, a common feature in materialism, individual-centered faith, and exclusivism is the absence of praxis on public affairs outside the church. As church-individualism restricts the concerns of church leaders and followers within the church, finally the value of their concern for society and history deteriorates. Rho Chi Jun (1997:26-27) describes this Korean church-individualism as another form of individualism expanded to make difficulties in cooperation among churches or

denominations. This deficiency in cooperation wasted resources and caused inefficiencies so that the Korean church could not play its social role effectively. Finally, the public influences over society have decreased. Thus, a common problem of the Korean church is the deficiency of praxis outside the church.

What is the main reason for this problem? It is actually based on the disconnection between “faith and praxis,” namely the disconnection of text-context, the discontinuity of theo/christo-praxis, and the spilt between faith and public life. This distorted form is the core problem of the Korean church. It means that the church did not perceive the context in which it was placed, the gospels did not answer the need of the times, and faith did not take the practical responsibilities in relation to public affairs.

Consequently, the present Korean church is confronted by a dual crisis—the internal crisis of identity and the external crisis of relevance. As the Korean church became church-individualized and privatized, it avoided the joint liability (or communal responsibility) to society. As a result, the Korean church is now encountering a decline in church growth or an identity crisis from inside the church, and the crisis of social persuasiveness and public confidence from outside the church. Therefore, it could be explained that the crisis of the Korean church came from the phenomenon that it looked inward and not outward. This is because the crisis of the non-true church (crisis of identity) occurred, when the church built an isolated castle and could not exist for others (the loss of public relationship). The lack of praxis or the loss of a relationship with society is a basic problem as well as an essential cause of the crisis in the Korean church.

One of the representative church historians, who researched the cause of church-crisis in historical contexts, is Walter Bulmann. In his book *The Coming of the Third Church* (1978), Bulmann explores the causes of church crisis, dividing it into 1<sup>st</sup> church, 2<sup>nd</sup> church, and 3<sup>rd</sup> church according to the historical stream.



The first church is the period of Orthodox Church up to the 11th century. It did not attempt any reformation. It avoided the responsibilities of its relationship with the world. As it deteriorated into anti-historical religion, the first church was faced with its crisis. The second church includes the Roman Catholic church from AD 1000 to 1500 and the Protestants of Europe and North America from 1500 to 1950. It explored new changes through the reformation of ecclesiastical authority by the second Vatican Council in 1963, and through the theology of "Missio Dei" by the W.C.C. in Uppsala, 1963. In spite of such renewals, the second church faced a serious crisis in institution, building, and organization, leaving the glory of Christendom behind.

The quickening of the third church, compared to "a rising sun on a new horizon" (Bulmann 1978:24), moved the location of the spiritual center to Africa, South America and Asia. This is because they formed dialectic relations with the historical question of painful life and answered that in resurrection-hope. Adding to this, Bulmann explains that they are the people experiencing suffering. They have spiritual energy with which to change in the hope of resurrection. In this, he points out a common reason of the worldwide decline of the church due to "enervation about history" and "dullness about innovation of the church."

This means that the church cannot continue to exist as long as it turns away from reality—history and society. A basic cause of crisis lies in the church's unconcern for praxis about socio-historical reality.

The current stream of church ministry generally takes the direction of emphasis on spirituality. An absence of social and public relationship is evident. David Schuller (1980:6-7) explains that three stages of change relate to the purpose of American church ministry. At first, church ministry put its purpose in individual counseling or pastoral care. The church ministry of the second stage focused on social change in order to cope with unexpected social revolution, the church transfigured as an agent for social change. The third stage is fairly new. It stresses a spiritual ministry, and it helps

one's spirituality and intensifies internal life.

How is the Korean church? The purpose of Korean church ministry also follows the process of the American church. The purpose and image of the Korean church changed constantly from pastor to revivalist, from revivalist to social change agent, and then from a manager of church growth to an awakener of spirituality. The overemphasis on spiritual ministry caused the Korean church to "escape from reality and society." The trouble lies in the accentuation of biased-spirituality that implies the disconnection of spirituality with history and society (Un J.K. 1999a:54-55).

As Farley (1976:151,169) insists, Christian spirituality in the true sense is born within the company and shared-praxis of God's people. The grace, forgiveness and love for others have all been emphasized inside the church. However, the faith community needs a clear redefinition of the church for others outside the church.

The praxis for public affairs outside the church starts with "turning onto the others" (Tracy 1990). It means the turning toward not only the others of the in-group, but also a comprehensive conversion for the others, including institutions of the out-group. This can be a real spirituality. Therefore, the restoration of true church community means regaining socio-historical responsibility with an eye of faith (spirituality), neither going to the mountain (transcendental faith) nor escaping into the fence of the church (individualistic faith or each-church-centralism).

#### **2.4.2 Suggestion**

It is obvious, however, that the church should not be evaluated only by its social praxis. If so, what is a desirable stance for the church and its ministry? It places a dialectical synthesis between spirituality and historicity, between transcendence and participation (Park B.B. 1989:249). The transcendence of religion must be maintained, but the transcendence should always be on the premise of public dialogue toward society. Also,

positive social participation of religion must always be insisted upon, but the participation should always be based on the transcendental character of religion. At this point, it is possible for the church to become both a spiritual community and a historical community (Un J.K.1999b:450-451).

Now is the time for the Korean church to wake from an illusion of church-growth, and to prepare for the coming history of post church-growth. For this, it is necessary, first of all, for the church to form a more self-critical and transformational relationship with society. Together with this, the church should recognize the phenomenon of its basic crisis of severance of the relations between faith and praxis, or between spirituality and public participation. According to Richard Osmer (1990:21-22), the reformative relevancy to society connotes a healthier tension relationship between Christianity and social context. By having an answering responsibility to the context of society and 'shared-praxis', the Korean church can be restored as a transformative community.

Perhaps a transformative community has two sides namely, a 'transformed community' which runs constantly, and a 'transforming community' which takes part in historical or social renovation. Taking negative aspects of church-individualism into consideration, a transformed community should solve the chronic troubles of the Korean church—the structures of each church-centered or church growth-oriented structure, and the attitude of individual salvation, privatization and exclusivism. A transforming community requires social responsibility and a history-directed attitude. The church should not lose its peculiar sphere; but, at the same time, it should be able to unite with others and participate in others' sufferings. On such reformative occasions, a responsible relationship of faith-praxis will be restored, and the church with an influential atmosphere is possible.

As Stephen Carter (1994) states, God is pushed from public discourse to the private parts of our life in contemporary society. At this time, the church should come out from its ghetto, end the separation of faith-praxis, and restore its social relevance. In order to

do this, the Korean church, first of all, must leave its wall, and start public dialogue. It is significant to facilitate the consciousness and abilities of public dialogue. In this context, Walter Brueggemann (1989:6,25) urges that church education must be in bilingual form: "the language behind the wall" for dialogue of the faith community and "the language on the wall" for public dialogue. It means that the dialogue behind the wall should not be restricted in its wall, but should come out to the front of the wall to participate in public dialogue.

What kind of dialogue will the Korean church practice in order to be born again as both a spiritual and historical community, in the midst of achieving 'unity with diversity' in polarized and pluralized situations? What is a practical public dialogue for the Korean church in order to be a socially participative and historically transformative community that answers the questions and needs of socio-historical reality, by overcoming church-individualism and its privatization? What kind of public dialogue will the Korean church engage in order to enter the public sphere again, and recover as a publicly influential religion?

Asking these questions related to public dialogue, the third chapter will study the patterns of public dialogue which the Korean church followed in Korean history. Has the Korean church taken a balanced posture of faith-praxis in the face of questions and the demands of the specific times in Korean history? Has the church played a proper role as both a spiritual and a transformative community? What are the types and characteristics of public dialogue in the Korean church historically? In this process of exploring the patterns of Korean church's public dialogue, the advent of *Madanggŭk* will be dealt with, which was a means used for cultural public dialogue of the Korean church in history, and will serve as a root of a study on alternative paradigm of public dialogue later in this thesis.

## **CHAPTER 3**

# **PATTERNS OF PUBLIC DIALOGUE OF THE KOREAN CHURCH IN HISTORY**

The Korean church of today, faced with the serious crisis of a “loss of social relevance,” as described in chapter 2, has to be fully aware of the necessity of “public dialogue” within society. In this chapter the patterns of the Korean church’s public dialogue will be sketched by exploring the practices and activities of public dialogue that the Korean church has undertaken in the Korean historical reality.

Korean Christianity cannot be understood without consideration of Korean circumstances, because it was formed through the Korean historical reality of suffering. This historical research about the practices of public dialogue within the Korean church is a preliminary work which suggests a direction and an alternative paradigm for new social participation required today. The historical understanding of public dialogue will help the Korean church to listen to the voice of society and to realize changes in the church to make it a responsive and transformative community.

The analysis of the public dialogue of Korean Christianity will be approached from the perspective of the social consciousness of Korean Christians in the history of the struggle for justice, human rights and independence, because it will emphasize a review of public dialogue in Korean church history. This will cover the period from the beginning of the Protestant mission to the 1980s, and this will be divided into three periods. Each period shows a distinctive pattern of public dialogue, and consequently public dialogue can be broadly classified into three patterns according to the three historical periods.

The first public dialogue of the Korean church occurs in the period from the beginning of the missions (1884) to the March First Independent Movement (1919). During this

period, the Korean church participated in and practiced external social activities based on faith in many ways. Therefore, this period is characterized by “healthy public dialogue.”<sup>3</sup> In the second period of public dialogue from 1920 to the April Nineteenth Revolution of 1960, the Korean church emphasized individual salvation and sanctification under the Japanese imperial oppression of Korea, and faith was not presented as external evidence. Eventually, the Korean church lost the relationship with society, so it was an age of “unhealthy” public dialogue. Since the 1960s the Korean church has clearly separated into two—a group with individual or privatized faith and a group for social practice. According to the trend of the times, the pattern of public dialogue was also polarized. In this polarized period, however, there was an attempt at a new public dialogue, namely the so-called *Madanggŭk* (drama on open area), in which the Korean people could express themselves and practice public dialogue beyond the limitations of the oppression of the times. Therefore, the third period is an age of polarized public dialogue and art-cultural public dialogue.

1. The first period of public dialogue: *Healthy Public Dialogue*  
1884-1919 (from the beginning of mission to the March First Movement)
2. The second period of public dialogue: *Unhealthy Public Dialogue*  
1920-1960 (from 1920 to the April Nineteenth Revolution of 1960)
3. The third period of public dialogue:  
*Polarized Public Dialogue and Art-Cultural Public Dialogue*  
(the latter period of the mission after the 1960s)

### 3.1 The Period of Healthy Public Dialogue

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Protestant mission was begun in earnest by Dr. Horace N.

---

<sup>3</sup> The words “healthy” and “unhealthy” here are rooted in Albert Outler’s (1971:284) interpretation. Outler, a Wesleyan theologian, interprets Wesley’s evangelism as “healthy” evangelism in the sense that faith is developed into social action, but he interprets the overemphasis on self-righteousness and individual salvation as “unhealthy” evangelism.

Allen,<sup>4</sup> a medical missionary of the Presbyterian Mission Board. This was an extremely complicated and uncertain time and a turning point in history. During this period Korea entered a critical phase both inside and outside the nation. Internally, traditional Korean society was undergoing great changes, moving from a closed feudal society based on Confucian values to a new, modern society. It was thus a time in which a new guiding ideology was required. Externally, the Koreans were suffering under the Japanese imperialistic invasion. Japanese imperialistic aggression against Korea was maintained with terrible oppression and exploitation until Japan left Korea after being completely defeated in the Second World War.

Therefore, Korea was faced with two tasks. One was to reform feudalism from inside, and the other was to maintain the land, free from imperialistic invasion. The preservation of civilization and independence became the national priority (Ju C.Y. 1983:76). Hence, Christianity in Korea, which had been accepted in the early years with the opening of ports to foreigners, would not have been able to exist if it had been indifferent to the socio-historical issues at that time, such as anti-feudalism and anti-Japanese imperialism (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a:292). American Christianity became contextualized in Korea (Ju C.Y. 1983:76) by communicating with historical reality. This is the foundation of the pattern of public dialogue of the Korean church in this period which can be considered as “healthy public dialogue.” In the light of this, this chapter will now examine practices of public dialogue in the Korean church in those days.

### **3.1.1 Social Enlightenment Movement**

The main policy of the missionary community in the first stage of missionary work was to concentrate on the indirect mission of philanthropic and educational work because

---

<sup>4</sup> He arrived in Korea in September 1884. On April 5, 1885, Rev. M.G.Underwood, a Presbyterian missionary, and Henry Appenzeler, a Methodist missionary and his wife joined him.

Christian evangelism was banned at that time.

Firstly, the mission began with work at hospitals and schools. The early hospitals were the Gwanghyewon (not the Severance Hospital) where Allen was active and the Jeongdong-Jeil hospital of the Methodist Church in 1885. About thirty hospitals were built by 1910 (Min K.B. 1987:95-98). Furthermore, in a situation of immediate need for universal education, Christian schools such as the Baejae founded by Appenzeller, the Gyeongsin founded by Underwood, the Ewha established by Merry Scranton and so on were established in 1886. In 1909, 17,656 students were being taught in 720 schools (Kim Y.S. 1971:383).<sup>5</sup>

By correcting the exclusive attitude of the Koreans to the West through the activities of hospitals and schools together with the roles of the YMCA established in 1903 and the YWCA in 1922, Korean Christianity could finally make an evangelical mission possible. At the same time, Korean Christianity encouraged the nation to become an enlightened, civilized and modernized society, and played the role of a 'standard bearer' for social change by challenging feudalistic thoughts and promoting the spread of a new sense of values and critical principles through philanthropism, the protection of human rights, sexual equality and a democratic system (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a:196,198-199).

Secondly, the translation of the Bible into the Korean language, *Hangul*,<sup>6</sup> which was used by "*minjung*" (the populace or common people) is another representative factor of social enlightenment and transformation of Korean Christianity. Besides a crusade against illiteracy and the propagation of the Bible, the significance of the translation of the Bible lies in the fact that it created a major language-event by introducing a

---

<sup>5</sup> Compared with the 60 general schools with 10,914 students at that time, Christian schools were given more weight (Kim Y.S. 1971:383).

<sup>6</sup> The New Testament was published by the British and foreign Bible societies in 1887. In Japan Lee Su Jung translated the Gospel of Mark into Korean in 1884 and the Gospel of Luke in 1885. By 1900 the Bible was translated into the Korean vernacular language.



messianic language to the common people of Korea. These people had been oppressed and exploited and suffered under social chaos and foreign threat. The historical language of the Bible became the historical language of the Korean people.<sup>7</sup> The story exerted its strong spiritual power when it was told in the light of the historical situation of the time. For the Korean Christians, the Exodus was not merely that of the church but of the whole people of Korea.

Thirdly, aspirations to read and study the Bible, which resulted from the translation of the Bible into *Hangul*, led naturally to the organization of "Sakyunghoe" (the Bible examining meeting) that became open universal religious communities for the people excluded from Confucian and Buddhist communities. Sakyunghoe was a space where the Korean could acquire "communicative competence in socio-ethical discourse" (Habermas 1987) through those communities (Park J.C. 1998:18). Later, these fundamental communities played a crucial role in the nationwide organization and movement of the Koreans against the Japanese imperialism (Park J.C. 1998:19).

### **3.1.2 National Movement against Japanese Regime**

Under the political fate of Japanese aggression and rule, public dialogue in Korean Christianity assumed the form of a national movement for independence and sovereignty. The reason this national movement as a form of public dialogue was possible is that the Korean people had already been enlightened and had acquired national consciousness and communicative competence for social dialogue through the social enlightenment movements.

During the Chinese-Japanese War (1984-85) and foreign aggression, Korean Christianity expressed national faith, by organizing the Independent Association

---

<sup>7</sup> The story of Moses and the Exodus was so vividly related to the national destiny of the Korean people and was told and retold to raise the national and political consciousness of the hearers for liberation (Suh K.S. 1983:22).

(Tongnip Hyophoe) under Seo Chae Pil on July 2, 1896, publishing the Independent Newspaper (Tongnip Sinmun), and constructing the Independent Gate. The activities of the Independence Association and the Independent Newspaper focused on two aspects: the national independent movement and the civil rights movement (Kang M.G. 1984:224).<sup>8</sup> The Independent Newspaper served as a vehicle for the Western liberal ideas championed by the new intellectuals. At the same time, the daily “Hwangsong Sinmun” (Capital Gazette) served as a forum for Confucian reform elements within the Independent Association. The Korean press also played a prominent role in fighting Japanese aggression.

Despite these efforts, and despite having won recognition from Russia, England and America in 1905, Japan moved immediately to establish a protectorate over Korea. The Protectorate Treaty of 1905 gave full authority over Korea’s relations with foreign countries to the Japanese foreign office. This meant that Korea was deprived of diplomatic rights and the Japanese invasion of Korea became evident. In the context of 1905, the Korean church held “the One Week Prayer Meeting” for the nation all over the country. This prayer meeting, in which not only Christians but also non-Christians participated, inspired the Korean people with the national spirit and consciousness (Lee & Cho 1997:121). The event of the Protectorate Treaty of 1905 shifted the attention of the Korean people from internal contradictions to external contradictions, from issues of internal reforms to the issues of national sovereignty and independence (Kim Y.B. 1983:89).

In 1907, “the Sinminhoe” (the New People’s Association) against Japanese rule was secretly formed mainly by Protestant Christians, including Ahn Chang Ho, Lee Tong

---

<sup>8</sup> The activities of the Independence Association were directed toward three principal goals. Firstly, the aim was to safeguard the nation’s independence in the face of external aggression. Secondly, the association sought to promote a self-strengthening movement, and thus sought principally to establish modern schools in every village, to build textile and paper mills, and ironworks as well, and to develop a modern national defense capability—all under the slogan of “Korea for the Koreans!” Thirdly and most importantly, the Association initiated a democratic people’s rights movement in order to increase popular participation in the political process.

Hwi, Yang Ki Tak, Lee Sung Hun, and Lee Kap. This made more positive resistance. Sinminhoe promoted not only the development of modern industry and education by founding factories and schools, but also the preparation for armed operations for Korean independence outside the country.

August 29, 1910 was the day when Korea was formally annexed to Japan. The Koreans lost their country and became enslaved as subjects to the Japanese military rule. Under the circumstances of national humiliation, the Korean church led a revival movement called “the Million Souls for Christians” with the slogan “Leading one million people into Christ.” This was in direct conflict with the Japanese authorities.

There were anti-Japanese movements in the economic sphere as well as in the political sphere. The Koreans lost their livelihood as a result of Japanese economic dispossession and the domination of Korea traders, compulsory seizure of Korean farmland, and the revision and enforcement of unreasonable tax laws. Under these sufferings, the campaign to boycott Japanese products, the resistance movement against tax, and the movement for redemption of the national debt (Kukchae Posang Undong)<sup>9</sup> arose as pan-national movements during the Protectorate period.

Obviously the existence of the Christian community was a formidable problem for the Japanese military regime in Korea. Thus, Japan hatched a plot to crack down on the Christian nationalist forces. This was “the Korean Conspiracy Case” or “the 105 People Event.” In October 1911, 123 people were prosecuted, and 105 among them were convicted on the grounds that the arrested had plotted to assassinate Terauchi, the governor general, on his way to the opening ceremony of Abrok river bridge. Of the 123

---

<sup>9</sup> In 1907, the Association for Redemption of the National Debt was organized to conduct a campaign to repay the immense debts artfully forced upon the Korean government by Japan. The existence of these debts threatened the nation’s independence, and so the idea that the national debt might be repaid through the united efforts of the Korean people gained immediate support throughout the country. Toward this common end, men donated the money they saved by giving up smoking, while women and girls responded by selling their ornamental hairpins and rings.

prosecuted, 93 were Christians (including 2 Catholics) (Yoon K.R. 1995:181). As a result of the Korean Conspiracy Case, Christianity and national education met with great difficulties (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a:327-328).<sup>10</sup> In fact, the number of students in Christian schools and Christians attendant at the Sunday service or religious assemblies decreased (Yoon K.R. 1995:192).<sup>11</sup> At the same time, the activities of Sinminhoe, a secret nationalist association against Japan, were brought to a halt, for the majority of the organization's directors were arrested in connection with the Korean Conspiracy Case (Yoon K.R. 1995:202). The 105 people event reveals the great pressure exerted by Japan on the national movements and the great persecution of the Korean church by the Japanese regime (Yoon K.R. 1995:174). After the incident, Korean Christianity became a vicarious symbol of the Cross for the entire Korean people (Kim Y.B. 1983:100).

### **3.1.3 The Great Revival Movement**

Korean Christianity practiced public dialogue in the religious sphere itself as well as in the social sphere. The Great Revival Movement by Gil Sun Ju in 1907 represents the first major stage in the internalization of the Christian message in the Christian community in Korea. Through the revival movement, the people who had accepted the Christian faith with personal or patriotic motives began to experience being born again as true Christians, and Korean Christianity was born again as a religion with a religious dimension.

In addition, in the process of the nationwide revival movement, the early-morning prayer, the collective audible prayer and the all-night prayer were very clearly established as features of the Korean church. Likewise, the movement embodied the ecumenical spirit, and led to the quantitative growth and spiritual strength of the Korean

---

<sup>10</sup> The Japanese regime suppressed Christian schools. Proclaiming an educational policy of "the Japanization of the Koreans," Japan forced Koreans to use the Japanese language and kept the management under close observation.

<sup>11</sup> In Suncheon province, the number of Christians decreased from 3000 to 300.

church (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a:274-275).<sup>12</sup> In this way, the Korean church with its internal maturity in spirituality could develop into a church with national faith, and could then perform its duties as a national church responding to historical contexts during the Japanese domination.

### **3.1.4 The March First Independent Movement of 1919**

After the Treaty of Protectorate (1905) and the Annexation of Korea (1910) the Korean people suffered severe political oppression, economical exploitation, cultural obliteration, social discrimination and religious suppression at hands of the coercive Japanese regime. These historical sufferings changed the form of public dialogue of the Korean church from enlightenment and national movements to more positive resistance, namely, a more strongly organized independence movement against Japanese rule. The peak was “the March First Independent Movement” in 1919.

Thirty-three persons in all, sixteen of whom were Christians, fifteen Chondoists, and two Buddhists, were elected as the representatives (Kim Y.J. 2002:172), determining to carry out “the Independence *Manse* Movement” on March 1, 1919 with three principles—to popularize, to unify and to be nonviolent. Right after reading “the Declaration of Independence,” the widespread peaceful demonstrators started shouting “Taehan tongnip manse” (“long live an independent Korea”) parading through the streets. Over a million people from all levels of society participated in the demonstrations in all but seven of Korea’s 218 counties, in spite of Japanese disturbances by force (Eckert 1990:279).<sup>13</sup> It was a unified demonstration and a national outcry that went beyond all differences of faith and denomination (Lee H.J.

---

<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, “the great revival movement” and “the one million souls to Christ movement” were encountered criticism because those pursued extremes of the other world, moral repentance, personal salvation rather than of this world, reality of national society, so reduced the consciousness against Japanese imperialism and made the Korean church an anti-historical church.

<sup>13</sup> Estimates of casualties range from the official Japanese count of 553 killed, 1,409 injured, and 12,522 arrested between March and December to a Korean nationalist estimate of over 7,500 deaths, roughly 15,000 injured, and some 45,000 arrested.

1983:178; Kim I.S. 2002:217).

Kim Yong Ok describes the March First Movement as a peak of public dialogue of the Korean church as follows:

Christian community had the Bible as a basic language, which determined a style and way to participate in the March First Movement. The biblical language was not a political-neutral language taught by American missionaries. It was a language orienting to the kingdom of the Messiah and directing to religious depth of the March First Movement together with other religious language—Buddhism of Han Yong Woon and Chondoism of Son Byeong Hee (Byun S.H. 1993:400).

The reason it could play a leading role in the March First Movement was that it had an already equipped nationwide organization network through the religious communities all over the country, with which it could contact and communicate systematically, and could thus mobilize the Korean people.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the March First Movement could spread throughout the country and lasted for a long time.

Even though it failed to depose the Japanese and to secure independence, the March First Movement strengthened the Korean people's sense of national identity and patriotism, and let the Japanese authorities and the world know the strong desire for independence of Korean nation. Such practical participation in public dialogue served as a momentum for the people to take the initiative in socio-historical reform. As a result, the public dialogue in the March First movement produced a new conception that Christianity was not a foreign religion but the most patriotic religion in Korea. That is, as fulfilling the spirit of the love for the nation that was fostered by education and evangelism, Christianity secured its place as a public religion sharing its destiny with a

---

<sup>14</sup> For that reason, the damage to the Christian church was more severe than to other religions and organizations. Many church leaders and laypersons were killed, injured and arrested, and many church buildings and Christian schools were burnt.

nation (Kim S.T. 1994:305-306).

In conclusion, as researched above, Korean Christianity of the early days of the mission showed healthy public dialogue with the idea that faith and social participation are one. The public dialogue in this period was fulfilled in various forms. It began with the enlightenment of the people's consciousness, and then went through the form of an anti-Japanese national movement, finally reaching the direct form of independence movement. In fact, for the Korean people Christianity was more than a religion. By providing monotheism and universal community for Korean society that had been based on polytheism, pantheism, and particularistic community, Korean Christianity helped the Korean people to develop critical principles.

The Korean church could become a transformative community by developing the ability to communicate with society through the Bible (Kim K.J. 1996:273-274). For the Korean people, the biblical language was also more than the language of Christian community. The biblical language set up its foundation at the first stage of the translation and spread of the Bible, and went to the second stage of internalization through the experience of the Holy Spirit and the collective repentance movement, finally reaching the practical stage of participation in the emancipation of the Koreans from suffering.

The application of the biblical language to the historical experiences of the Korean people meant historicization or secularization of the Christian language and Korean Christianity beyond the boundaries of the Christian church. The biblical language and faith of the Korean found a way of expression in actions as it did in the March First Independence movement and other subsequent events (Kim Y.B. 1983:117-118). Even if there was some vulnerability and limitations, Korean Christianity showed the dignity as an avant-garde of healthy public dialogue by serving as a social-transformative community as well as a spiritual community in meeting the needs of the times.

## **3.2 The Period of Unhealthy Public Dialogue**

Korean Christianity was not always responsive to the context, but sometimes lost its true identity in Korean history. In the atmosphere of coercive rule of Japan after the March 1st Movement, the Korean Church took, as a whole, a passive attitude toward national issues, concentrating on internal piety centered on individual salvation under the distorted influence of the Great Revival Movement. Nevertheless, some practices of public dialogue of the Korean church continued through realistic enlightenment movements.

### **3.2.1 Realistic Enlightenment Movement**

After the March First Movement Korean Christianity chose the enlightening form for public dialogue, instead of positive struggles against Japan, with the object of motivating national consciousness and developing national independence, because it diagnosed that the failure of the movement resulted from an insufficient capacity for national independence. Educational, cultural and social enlightenment movements were thus promoted from the viewpoint of “a theory of national reconstruction” (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989b:41) the aim of which was to reconstruct a nation with Christian thoughts.

First of all, there was the publishing movement, that is, nationalistic journalism such as Donga Ilbo (Donga daily newspaper), Chosun Ilbo (Chosun daily newspaper) and a great variety of magazines. Korean Christianity also published forty-one journals including “the Christianity News” which carried not only the Christian news but also the news items of independence movement and the other general political social news for enlightenment and conscientization of Koreans (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989b:41).

Furthermore, Christian social associations such as Singanhoe (the New Korea Society),



Geunwoohoe (the Diligent Christian Women's Fellowship), Christian Sinwoohoe (the Christ-believers' Fellowship), the Positive Faith-activity Corps were formed to creatively solve the problems of church and society, faith and people.

Social enlightenment movements such as the promotion of Korean production movement,<sup>15</sup> the rural enlightenment campaign and the temperance movement arose against Japanese colonial economic policy. It heightened mass awareness of economic issues, and it altered, at least temporarily, Korean consumption habits. Besides this, there were evening classes at the church, social work, the social equality movement to emancipate the lowest classes, the Korean history acknowledging movement by Nam Gung Eok and so on.

The concern of the public dialogue of Christianity toward social reality was assembled into "Sahoedinjo" (the Social Creed) in 1932.<sup>16</sup> But social participation movements of this period were limited by not getting over the form of enlightenment.

### **3.2.2 Transcendental Mysticism Faith Movement**

The failure of national independence created an atmosphere of defeatism and nihilism in Korea, and the Japanese governor suppressed public dialogue even more severely. Thus, the Korean church gradually focused on individual sanctification and internal piety and lost its interest in society. At that time, an enthusiastic revival movement together with miracles and wonders was generated with Gil Sun Ju and Kim Ik Doo as leaders, and later it continued to the revival movement of Lee Yong Do.

---

<sup>15</sup> In December 1922, all Koreans, rich and poor, were called upon to support exclusively native products by patronizing Korean stores whenever possible and using Korean-produced clothing, foodstuffs, and other daily necessities. As its height in the summer of 1923, the Korean Production Movement had become the most successful mass mobilization of Koreans since the March First Movement.

<sup>16</sup> The Korean National Council of Churches, that is the ecumenical movement organization of Prebyterian and Methodist churches, made it. It contains the will of the church to solve the social problems of the times in the perspective of Christianity. It dealt with human equality, sexual equality, advancement of women's rights, the holiness of marriage and chastity, respect of children's personality, prohibition of prostitution, labor problems, legislation of the law of guarantee for minimum wages, tenancy law, and social compensation law (Lee & Cho 1997:146-147).

Originally, such a revival movement gave new religious courage to hopeless Christians, and aimed at internal reform of the institutional church (Park J.C. 1998:65). From the beginning of the 1930s, however, the revival movement gradually changed into eschatological faith and the second advent of Christ, and finally, belief in the hereafter, and escapism from reality (The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a:41). While neglecting the shadowy colonial situation of the nation and falling into mystic individual faith, the Korean church became the target of public censure. As a result, many people who had crowded into the church in the days of the March 1<sup>st</sup> Movement in 1919 now left the Korean church (Lee & Cho 1997:134-135; Ju C.Y. 1983: 231-232).

### **3.2.3 Shinto-Shrine Worship of the Korean Church**

In the context of the Korean church internalizing mystic and transcendental faith and becoming a ghetto, or isolated from society during this period, Christian intellectuals who had played important roles as national leaders fled from both faith and historical responsibility by apostatizing to the pro-Japanese the Japanese religious suppression.

From 1935, Japan enforced a policy that compelled the Koreans to attend Shinto ceremonies and to worship and bow to the Shinto shrine of the Japanese Emperor or spirits of Japanese warriors. The Korean Church suffered most from this policy, for the policy ran counter to the doctrine “Don’t worship idols.” Many Christians closed their schools and churches rather than accede to the order. Some foreign missionaries were expelled and several thousand clergymen were arrested between 1935 and 1938, as a large portion of the Korean Christian community continued to resist.<sup>17</sup> However, all the institutional churches yielded to worship at the Shinto Shrine in 1938 owing to the menace and conciliation offered by Japan. This meant Korean Christianity’s loss of self-identity and enslavement to Japanese gods. Shintoism split the Korean Christian

---

<sup>17</sup> The Christians who protested it, keeping consciousness of faith and self-esteem amounted to about two thousand, and fifty Christians were martyred in prison (among them, a representative martyr is Rev. Choo Ki-chul). At that time the number of churches to be locked out was over two hundred, and almost all Christian schools were closed (Lee & Cho 1997: 152-153).

church.

This treachery of the Korean Christian community was repeated in 1938, when the Japanese authorities began to mobilize all Korean human and material resources for a war, proclaiming the Law for National Total Mobilization, and again in 1939 when Japan exercised the conscription system in Korea and dragged Korean youths to the battle line of the Japanese army.<sup>18</sup> At this time, pro-Japanese Christian leaders of the Korean church unfortunately presented an attitude of anti-nation and anti-faith, by holding a Christian meeting to exhort the conscription system.

### **3.2.4 The Split in the Korean Church after the Liberation**

August 15, 1945<sup>19</sup> was a day of liberation from Japanese rule in Korea, but this joy was short-lived. Ideological conflict broke out between democracy and communism, and Korea was divided into two—North Korea and South Korea. On May 10, 1948, general elections were held in the South alone, and on August 15, the “Daehanminguk” (the Republic of Korea) was officially established with Seoul as its capital and Lee Syung Man as president.<sup>20</sup>

The three years of war from June 25, 1950 to 1953, when North Korea launched a full-scale invasion of the South, devastated the entire land and wrecked the economy. Millions of people were left homeless and separated from their families. Furthermore, this war in which Koreans fought against Koreans hardened the division between the North and South and left scars which still last today.

After the war, the country obviously faced many problems. The first Lee Syung Man

---

<sup>18</sup> Approximately 450,000 Koreans were drafted at this time.

<sup>19</sup> On the day, Japan surrendered unconditionally to the Allied Powers shortly after atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. As a result, Korea was finally liberated, and regained its independence after thirty-five years of colonial rule.

<sup>20</sup> Almost concurrently, a Communist regime was established in the North with Kim Il-sung as the ruler with virtually absolute power. On September 9, 1948, the “Joseon Minjujuui Immin Gonghwaguk,” or the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), was officially established in the North with Pyongyang as its capital.

Government of South Korea failed in a cleanup of the vestiges of Japanese imperialism after the liberation. Instead, he joined the anti-national group to his political power. Furthermore, he became increasingly autocratic, dominated Korean politics depending on the United States, and tried the long-term seizure of power through improper amendments of the constitution and a rigged election. At last, on April 19, 1960, the student-led popular uprising later known as “the Sailgu (April 19) Revolution” broke out, and it forced Lee to step down.

In this situation, Korean Christianity was anti-democratic and anti-national, and supported the corrupt despotic government (Lee W.G. 1998:34-35). In addition, the phenomenon of the split occurred even in the history of Korean Christianity during the period (Lee & Cho 1997:181). Korean Christianity should have introspected and repented thoroughly for the deviated faith, anti-national attitude and distorted history that most Korean Christian leaders showed. However, far from repenting their faults, they became owners of the church and seized ecclesiastic authority. Then, some conscientious Christians who had suffered and been driven out at the time of Japanese rule demanded repentance and reflection from anti-national people, heading the church reconstruction movement.

The reconstruction movement, however, was not absorbed into the general religious campaign or movement of Korean Christianity (Lee & Cho 1997:163-168). Eventually, the issue of ‘who worshipped at the Shinto-shrine or not’ caused a split in the Korean church. This was particularly the case in the Presbyterian denomination, the greatest religious body of Korean Christianity, which was divided at that time. Another division of the Korean church occurred due to the conflict between progressive and conservative theological thoughts, and as a result of it there are now 168 denominations exist in the Korean Protestant church.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Kijang denomination was dismembered from the Presbyterian Church because of theological argument between the liberal and conservative group. And then the Presbyterian Church was split once into Hapdong and Tonghap denominations because of ideological problems based on their different opinion about W.C.C. (Lee W.G. 2000:211).

In conclusion, as positive social movements by Christians were banned by Japanese oppressive rule during the period of post-March First movement, eschatological faith and individual salvation-centered faith were widespread in Korean Christianity. After the Liberation of August 15, the Korean Church did not liquidate the history of distortion and apostasy. On the contrary, internally the Korean church was divided, and externally it showed the attitude of supporting the dictatorial government in collusion of politics and religion.

In the process, Korean Christianity lost the ability and human resources for public dialogue towards social change. As Song Kun Ho (1981:87; Lee & Cho 1997:232) indicated, “Christianity disappeared from the stage of history.” Accordingly, it is “a dark and depressed age” (Lee W.G. 2000:207-212) losing the ethos of public dialogue. Thus the public dialogue of this period can be said to be “unhealthy public dialogue.”

### **3.3 The Period of Polarized Public Dialogue**

Public dialogue since the 1960s has shown two directions. One is the national evangelization movement; the other is the social reform movement. While the conservative groups turned inwards toward the church, the progressive group took part in social reform activities with more direct and positive form of public dialogue. This reflects the polarization of the Korean church. In those times, what is worthy of close attention is the advent of new public dialogue that assumed a cultural pattern, that is, the so-called “*Madanggŭk*” (drama on open ground or outdoors). The *Madanggŭk* has an important position in public dialogue in that it was created and performed under unfavorable conditions for public dialogue—the condition of political dictatorship of Korea as well as the polarization of the Korean church.

#### **3.3.1 National Evangelization Movement**

The movement for national evangelization started with a positive aim to give a hope for the future to the people through preaching the Gospel in a situation of socio-political anomie as a result of the April 19 Revolution and the May 16 Coup D'etat (Lee & Cho. 1997:259).

Proclaiming 1965 as the year of “the National Evangelization Movement,” the Korean church started a nationwide movement for evangelization with the slogan of “thirty million people to Christ.”<sup>22</sup> It developed into a series of revival movements such as the National Christian Assembly (1965), Billy Graham’s Korean Evangelism Assembly (1973), the Explosion of Holy Sprit 74 (1974), the National Evangelization Holy Meeting (1977), the World Evangelization Holy Assembly (1980, 1988), and the 100<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Mission Assembly (1984) (Kim Y.J. 2002:324-328).

The Korean Church accomplished a truly remarkable rapid growth in numbers through these movements. In addition, the national evangelization movement was a significant event that embodied ecumenicalism, because it rose above the religious denomination, and Christians were united to participate in it on their own initiative. However, as observed in chapter 2, in pursuit of church-centered growth and big churches, the evangelization movement finally presented negative aspects by turning from the church’s social responsibility to remedy and reform Korean society (Lee & Cho 1997:303).

### **3.3.2 Anti-Dictatorship Pro-Democracy Movement**

It was after the April Revolution of 1960 that Korean Christianity started public dialogue again. Having been criticized as an anti-social group supporting the corrupt despotic government, the Korean Church began to repent for its lack of interest in social justice and to recognize its social responsibility. At this very moment, the signs of practicing

---

<sup>22</sup>This evangelization movement made record of 2,013 assemblies, about 2,300,000 participants, and 8.333 new believers in one year of 1965 (Lee & Cho 1997:302).

public dialogue began to appear in the Korean church.

### **3.3.2.1 Democratization Movement of the 1960s-1970s**

The April Revolution destroyed the corrupt despotic government of Lee Syung Man, but on May 16, 1961, a military coup led by General Park Chung Hee took control of the government. Korea was faced again with the undemocratic situation of long-term military dictatorship.

On June 22, 1965, Park Chung Hee's military government promoted humiliating diplomacy in the government's proposed normalization treaty with Japan. The Korean church once again began to practice public dialogue for social change. The Korean National Council of Churches (KNCC) issued a statement in 1962 urging the military government to hand over its political power to civilians, and objected to the treaty of Korean-Japan of 1965. In the same year, 240 Korean Christian leaders held a meeting to make a statement<sup>23</sup> against the treaty, and the Korean church organized a nationwide movement against the treaty through street demonstrations and prayer meetings for national salvation. The mass media of the times noted "it was the first event concerning the nation's destiny that the whole Korean Christian community had participated in since the March First movement of 1919" (Lee & Cho 1997:261-262).

When Park promoted the Amendment of the Constitution in 1969 to re-elect the president for a third term and seeking long-term seizure of political power, KNCC conducted a movement against the amendment of the constitution. On the other hand, 242 persons with a conservative faith censured political participation by the church, and proclaimed their attitude in support of this constitutional revision with the title of "the declaration about constitution amendment and consciousness freedom." This is an extreme instance of polarization within the Korean church (Lee & Cho 1997:266; Kim

---

<sup>23</sup> At the end of the statement, it said: "We resist all forms of dictatorship, injustice, irregularities, and corruption. We reject the impure influence of foreign powers on all aspects of economics, culture, ethics, and politics. We resolve to make a contribution to the historical development of our country with prayer and service led by the Holy Spirit" (Ju C.Y. 1983:78-79).

Y.J. 2002:277). The bill for amending the constitution for the third term was approved irregularly on September 14, 1969 in spite of opposition to it. This amendment paved the way for grasping political power in the long term, which led to the Yushin (Revitalizing Reforms) regime in 1972.

The Korean Christian Declaration of 1973 by clergymen leading the Korean church clearly reflected the awakening of the Korean church to public dialogue. Besides, the Korean Student Christian Federation (KSCF) held a “prayer meeting for the people” on October 11, 1974, and adopted “the KSCF Declaration of the Cross,” strengthening their will to anti-dictatorship and pro-democracy struggles (Lee & Cho 1997:277).

On November 18, 1974, the Korean Church announced the Theological Statement of Korean Christians signed by sixty-six leaders from the church and theological seminaries, presupposing that Christ did not come to the institutional church but into the midst of history and the world. The statement provided the Korean church with a theological patron for public dialogue and practical activity.

When the Commemorative Mass of the March First Movement was held at the Myeong-dong Catholic Church on March 1, 1976, the Catholic Church and the Protestant Church were united and announced “the Declaration for the Restoration of Democracy.” This declaration that was called the “Myeon-dong event” or “March First event” became a milestone of the democratization movement, and served as momentum for the solidarity between Catholicism and Protestantism, and between the Korean church and the church of the world (Lee & Cho 1997:288).

The Ecumenical Youth of Council (EYC)<sup>24</sup> announced “the Declaration of Youth Movement for the Denomination Unification” and “the Declaration of the Good

---

<sup>24</sup> Christian youth movement that had been restricted within few progressive churches developed an ecumenical movement for denominational unity. At the result, 70 young Christian representatives from six denominations, which had joined the N.C.C., announced the declaration of ecumenical youth movement on January 29, 1976, so E.Y.C. (Ecumenical Youth of Council) was established.



Samaritan Movement,” proclaimed to actualize “sharing practice” and social responsibility of young Christians. Thereafter, EYC dedicated itself to the struggle to accomplish democratization, to ensure the popular right to live, to defend human rights, and to realize national unification as well as church unity.

### **3.3.2.2 The Democratization Movement in the 1980s**

**The May 18 Democratization Movement of Kwangju Citizens:** When Park Chung Hee was assassinated on October 29, 1979, Prime Minister Choi Kyu Hah became acting president. But his rule was extremely brief. On December 12, General Chun Doo Hwan came to power in a coup-like military revolt. On May 17, acting through the Choi government, Chun proclaimed Martial Law Decree No. 10, which extended the already existing martial law even to Cheju Island, dissolved the National Assembly, closed down all colleges and universities, banned labor strikes, and prohibited all political discussion and activity.

On May 18, 1980, there arose a pro-democracy uprising demanding an end to martial law in the southwestern city of Gwangju, which later became known as “the Gwangju Democratization Movement.” The army troops sent into the city to suppress it began indiscriminately clubbing and bayoneting both demonstrators and spectators with a brutality that shocked and outraged Gwangju’s citizens. The Gwangju democratization movement was an event in which the brutality of the new military authority and the anti-national or anti-democratic character of Chun’s military dictatorship were exposed to the world (The History Institute 2001:367).<sup>25</sup>

The new military authority made a comment, distorting the truth, to the effect that the tragic affair at Gwangju was due to the destruction, provocation and agitation of the

---

<sup>25</sup> When it was all over, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Gwangju citizens were dead. The official number was about 200. Witnesses to the tragedy, however, claimed a much higher number, usually around 2,000 and a 1986 Asia Watch report noted that the city’s death statistics for May 1980 were 2,300 over the monthly average.

communists. Thereupon, the Korean church set out in its movements to disclose the truth of the Gwangju. On May 25, Christians in Mokpo district held an emergency prayer meeting for national salvation and made a declaration claiming that the resistance of Gwangju's citizens was an intentional and organized massacre of innocent people. On May 30, 1980, Kim Eui Ki, a youth from the Brother Methodist Church in Seoul, disclosed the truth of Gwangju by throwing himself off the Christian Hall. Pastor Im Ki Yun of the Cheil Church in Pusan city was tortured to death at Pusan branch office of Counter-Intelligence Corps (Lee S.G. 1993:279). In this way, the movements to reveal the truth about Gwangju event proceeded miserably.

**Democratization National Convention of June 10, 1987:** Chun Doo Hwan, who seized political power by force by bringing under his control the Gwangju Democratization Movement of 1980, established the Fifth Republic similar to Park's Yushin system. Chun strengthened control over society to consolidate his power. He banned political activity by politicians who could challenge his regime and also suppressed social movements and freedom of speech, by making "a special law on political atmosphere renovation," "the prohibition law on assembly and demonstration" and "the prohibition law of the third person" and so on. Under these undemocratic circumstances, on June 1987 the June Resistance began as a great march for national peace and democratization.

The intense aspiration toward democratization of a whole people who had been oppressed by authorities for about forty years was expressed in "the June 10 Democratization National Convention," and developed into the movements of "A Day of Tear Bomb Banishment" on June 18, and then "A Day of the Great March for Peace" on June 26. In this way, the Korean church held prayer meetings for the nation, and guided practice in public dialogue by organizing "the Public Movement Headquarters for Obtaining Democratic Constitution." Not only progressive churches, but also conservative churches that had often taken a cool attitude on social participation, took part in this democratization movement (Lee S.G. 1993:296-297).

### 3.3.3 Social Reform Movement

It was after the 1960s that the Korean church started positive social reform movements with missionary concern to improve living conditions of laborers, farmers and low-income urban people under industrialization. Park Chung Hee's military authority accomplished rapid economic growth called "a Miracle of Han-river" through a series of "the 5 Years Economic Development Plans" from 1962. However, the plan caused impoverishment of rural society and a rural exodus, an increase of urban poor people, poor working conditions, escalating foreign debt, and excessive dependence on foreign countries, because it chose export-oriented economic growth and labor-intensive industries based on the policy of a low wage and a low grain price. As a natural consequence the problems of labor, urban poor people and peasants deepened (Kwon T.H. 1981; Lee W.G. 2000:213,216).

At that time, there was a flame that lit public dialogue on social issues. This was the event of the suicide of Chun Tae Il, a teacher at a Sunday school of the Changhyun Church and a cloth-cutter and an assistant of sewing at the Pyunghwa Market in Seoul (Lee & Cho 1997:301). The other side of the coin of the rapid growth in the economy by ten percent each year was the grim reality of labor, where a worker who had been at a sewing factory for five years suffered from tuberculosis of the lungs in the end, but in spite of this illness, was compelled to work for about fourteen hours a day to earn his or her family's living. So Chun Tae Il decided to sacrifice himself for the improvement of human rights and working conditions, and he burned himself on November 13, 1970, holding the book of the Labor Standard Law and calling out the slogan, "Observe the Labor Standard Law!" His flames became a symbolic event that urged people to reconsider the meaning of high economic growth. Faced with the reality of the common people through his death, popular movements for laborers, farmers, and the urban poor began to develop systematically (Lee & Cho 1997:301; The History Institute 2001:349). The popular movement of the Korean church during this period was accelerated by

activities of the Urban-Industrial Mission.<sup>26</sup> On September 28, 1971, the Christian Industrial Mission, the Korean Student Christian Federation (KSCF), the Christian Academy, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association of Korea (KYMCA) and the Young Women's Christian Association of Korea (KYWCA) in combination with the Jeunesse Ouvriere Chretienne (JOC: Catholic Young Laborers Association) organized "the Council of the Korean Industry Problem" (An annual project report of Christian Social Activity Committee in 1972. Lee S.R. 2000:57).<sup>27</sup>

**Human Rights Movement:** As the movements against the military dictatorship regime spread all over the country, Park Chung Hee proclaimed "the Yushin Restoration Constitution" of the anti-democratic political system and placed a gag on free speech. As a result of this, Parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of association were denied, and human rights were cruelly infringed upon while the Yushin regime physically repressed those persons or groups against authority and put them (mainly progressive clergymen, students and workers) into prison.

Under these cruel circumstances, on November 23-24, 1973, the Faith and Human Rights Committee announced in the Declaration for Human Rights that "human rights is a value given from God," and on April 11, 1977, KNCC organized the Human Rights Committee which came into action formally. The activities paved the way for human rights movements in the institutional dimension (Lee & Cho 1997:310-312).

**Labor Movement:** In the face of the violence of monopolistic capitalism and the governing power, workers realized gradually that labor movements could not be

---

<sup>26</sup> The Urban Industrial Mission began at Incheon in 1961 and awakened social consciousness in the church about labor problems. After the 1970s the mission group enlarged the range of the public dialogue from the human rights rehabilitation movement and from the social justice practice movement to the democratization movement (Cho S.H. 1978:268-278).

<sup>27</sup> The object is as follows: "The problem of weak, poor and oppressed people, namely workers, poor people, peasants, is, in most cases, caused by not personal matters such as incompetence but by social and political problems. Hence our action organization for mission emphasizes not only "missionary activity" of the church but also "expression of action" for social reform of church mission."

separated from political movements. Thus, college or university students who had shown solidarity indirectly in public statements or by supporting struggles of the early 1970s began awakening labor political and social consciousness more directly by entering labor's world and organizing evening classes for laborers from the mid-1970s. Christian organizations such as the Urban-Industrial Mission and the Christian Academy contributed much to the struggles for labor.

The labor problem in those days was perceived not only as a problem between capital and labor but as a problem of structure and the regime itself. Hence, connecting with human rights movement for workers, intellectuals and churches, the labor movement began to turn the individual struggle of labor into a collective and organized combined movement, and also the economic struggle for the rights to live into a political struggle against a dictatorship (cf. The History Institute 2001:349,351,384-385; Kim S.G. 1984-1985; Lee W.G. 2000:217-218).

**Agrarian Movement:** According to the industrially directed economic development plan promoted in the 1960s and 1970s, the country was backward in the field of agriculture. Moreover, the policy based on low grain prices drove farmers into poverty. In response to this situation, the Korean Catholic Farmers Meeting was founded for agrarians' rights and interests, and an educational course for farmers was prepared in the Christian Academy in 1976. This helped the agrarian movement to progress actively (The History Institute 2001:351). Beginning with organization of the Chunnam Christian Farmers Association in 1978, the Christian Farmers Association became established throughout the country. In addition, the foundation of the League of Christian Farmers Association of 1982 played a decisive role in the higher agrarian movement.<sup>28</sup>

In opposition to bureaucratic domination over farmers of the Yushin system the

---

<sup>28</sup> The Christian Farmers Association was organized for the purpose of promoting economic, social, political status of farmers under the light of the gospel of Christ, and creating a farmers' self reliance culture to succeed national tradition, and realizing a just and free society through democratization (Lee & Cho 1997:327).

agrarian movement focused on a law-abiding labor struggle and a struggle to claim damages: for instance, a struggle against the low grain price policy, a struggle against excessive water tax and farmland tax, and a struggle for democratization. The movement of this period was led by a small number of progressive activists, and was limited to the agrarian movement centering on the church (The History Institute 2001:351-352).

### **3.4 Emergence of Cultural Public Dialogue: *Madanggŭk***

The demand of the people for anti-dictatorship, anti-foreign power and unification was expressed in the April 19 Revolution, but was distorted through the May 16 Coup, and finally was denied substantially through a series of subordinate processes, for instance, the ratification of the agreement between Korea and Japan. In such processes, nationalistic awakening was linked to the interest in a return to tradition, so that from the 1960s a far-reaching restoration of folk art that had almost been lost under the Japanese colonial rule began to progress.

The first public dialogue with a cultural form appeared in the process of the struggle against the Korean-Japanese treaty of 1965, in the social performance of “*Hyangtouiishick Chohongut*” or “*Minjokchok Minjuui* (Nationalistic Democracy) *Funeral Ceremony*,” using Korean traditional ritual on May 20, 1965. This performance was a struggle against President Park’s military dictatorship in the form of traditional culture (Jung I.D. 1985:21; Kang W.D. 1990:268). After the Society of Folk Mask Drama Studies was founded at the Seoul National University in Korea in 1971, folk drama meetings or mask dance clubs were organized at nearly all colleges or universities throughout the whole country, and then madanggŭk emerged as a new form, succeeding the traditional mask dance creatively in a modern style.

As the public dialogue through social movements was strongly suppressed by Park

Chung Hee's emergency measures, progressive intellectuals and students attempted to act out social participation within underground circles of the school and the church (The History Institute 2001:353). When student assemblies could not be maintained with political slogans in this repressive situation, cultural performance played a leading part in their assemblies (Lim J.T. 1990:134).

The mask dance and the madanggŭk movement as a creative renaissance of tradition were not limited to a cultural pattern but incorporated political and social issues (Lim J.T. 1990:22). This madanggŭk movement was spread to all levels of society including the workers on the front line in farm villages or factories, not to mention university (college) students and intellectuals of the country, and extended its field of activities from universities and the church to labor sites or farm areas, and from metropolitan areas to medium and small cities. The Korean church and Christian organizations participating in those days in social activities, such as the YMCA and the Urban Industrial Mission, joined and executed the madanggŭk movement.

In this way, the madanggŭk progressed actively, cutting its way through the suppression, and it accomplished "the unification of artistry and social-movement directivity" (Kang W.D. 1990:272). The madanggŭk was an important form of self-expression of the majority under the circumstances of a loss of freedom of expression (Lim J.T. 1990:69). Through the madanggŭk, the populace could throw their ability and energy into public dialogue for democratization and reform of the reality (Lim J.T. 1990:23) and fulfill a critical function of ideology (Kang W.D. 1990:272-273) in the vanguard of the social reform movement. Therefore, it seems a valid description that the madanggŭk was "an artistic victory over social consciousness of the popular community" (Lim J.T. 1990:83).

### **3.5 Limitation of Public Dialogue of the Korean Church and**

## Suggestion

The Korean church, as pointed out in the previous chapter, has a feature of the third church of Bulmann, in that it reflects “spirituality in suffering” in Korean history (Un J.K. 1999b:33). The suffering of the Korean church means “an experience of historical suffering” because it is political, economic and social suffering that the Korean people have experienced for several thousand years, while the spirituality of the Korean church means “the relationship with God” met through a response to society in the face of historical suffering. Therefore, the spirituality of Korean Christians is “spirituality in suffering.”

Korean Christianity has developed the spirituality of suffering in reply to historical and social reality. As researched above, Korean Christianity exercised socio-historical responsibility in the early days of mission. As the trend of indifference toward society had been dominant since the 1920s, Korean Christianity lost the healthy public dialogue of the early days of the mission. Instead of actualizing faith in the reality of life, most of the Korean church focused on individual faith movements. But even if so, there were cries for a response to the historical question by a few pioneers from time to time. After the 1960s, the Korean Church began to reflect on its faults in history and started public dialogue all over again, taking part in socio-historical reality with the progressive camp as the leader.

The patterns of public dialogue of the Korean church can thus be classified according to the current of Korean Christian history. In the early period of the mission it expressed healthy public dialogue, as the balance of faith-practice, namely the balance between a spiritual community and a transformative community was accomplished in general. When examining the public dialogue of this period, one sees not only an indirect form of social enlightenment but also a direct form of the resistance to Japan in the moment of crisis in the country. After the March First independence movement, a dark age with unhealthy public dialogue followed, because the Korean church was distorted in



respect of spiritual community and hardly exhibited the example of transformative community. After the 1960s, public dialogue continued actively, assuming a direct form of resistance or opposition as well as an indirect form under undemocratic or despotic circumstances. In addition, at the very time when freedom of speech, assembly and association was suppressed, and public dialogue was polarized, a new pattern of public dialogue came into being. This was the madanggük as a public dialogue in an art-cultural pattern. The Korean church found a way of expression through the madanggük, and attempted to fulfill its social responsibility. But a few progressive churches led the movement while the Korean church was polarized in the matter of choice of participation in public dialogue.

In this point, the limitations of public dialogue in Korean church history are revealed. This can be arranged into two parts.

The first limitation is that a mere minority progressive church, except the age of the early mission, has led the public dialogue of participation in society, transforming history. That is, public dialogue is not a general current in the whole church in Korea. Even if the practice of public dialogue has continued through Korean Christianity history, the greater part of the Korean church kept silence or assumed the attitude of an onlooker when faced with political despotism and authoritarianism and the infringement of human rights.

Rather, most of the Korean church placed more importance on rapid church growth and in the motto “Growth First” of church individualism after 1960. The privatized church of Korea achieved quantitative growth, but on the other hand it remained unconcerned about society and history, and finally lost the dialectical relationship of spirituality in suffering and socio-historical participation.

Korean Christianity had realized the dream of a new national and spiritual community at the beginning of the Protestant mission, but at present retreats into the

transcendental world, remaining content within the wall of the church, and tainted with modern material civilization. The Korean church has been criticized for going counter to the essentials of the church while losing the critical spirit and evading its responsibility to society (Kim K.J. 1996:283-284). Eventually, the loss of the relation of church and society brought about the double crises in the Korean church—a crisis of identity and a crisis of relevance.

The second limitation lies in the form of public dialogue. The public dialogue of the Korean church has been fulfilled broadly in two forms. One is an indirect form of enlightenment; the other is a direct form of resistance. These forms were to meet the demand of the times. However, times have changed. Today freedom of speech and assembly and direct participation by the people are allowed. Nowadays there is neither Japanese colonial period nor dictatorship. A new age by definition needs a new form in public dialogue.

Then what about the Korean church of today, no longer under non-democratic and oppressive circumstances? The public dialogue of social participation is almost halted. Present-day Korean society, however, has problems to be solved: for instance, urgent environmental pollution, exhaustion of natural resources and unification of North and South Korea together with problems from each sphere of politics, economy, society, education and religion. Furthermore, there is the other question of the missing reality of lives of God such as the starvation of brothers and sisters in North Korea and the misery of the reckless war.

The Korean church cannot disregard those questions any more. Now is the time for the Korean church to contribute to the restoration of life, peace and humanity with its participation in society. At this moment a question of what form or pattern of public dialogue is effective and necessary has been raised to recover its relevance to the world of today.

The public dialogue of the future seems to need not a form of resistance but a pattern

contributing to the creation of “the language of dialogue” and “the culture of dialogue.” It should be a new public dialogue that leads the church to be not a resistance force but a companion or a participant in the face of the present social problems and conflicts. It should not be confined only to social service but should aspire to transformative activities of mutual communicative cooperation and participation.

It is through the madanggŭk in the art-cultural dimension that a new paradigm of public dialogue will be explored. A desirable religion, as pointed out in chapter 2, lies in the dialectical synthesis of transcendence and participation; that is, the church should be both a spiritual community and a participative community in society. If described in terms of language, it means the church has to have both the language inside the church and the language outside the church.

If expressed in cultural language, Christianity has to contain both religious culture and action culture. Religious culture is referred to as value culture, designating the value of the Gospel in Christianity. Action culture, which is the culture of life, denotes the sphere of life taking part in the historical reality including politics, the economy and society. If this is the case, the implication that the present Korean church has spirituality but escapes from reality without social practices can be construed differently as follows: the Korean church has religious culture but lacks action culture relating to and participating in the value of the Gospel in the field of socio-political life.

The problem of the loss of the relation of the Gospel to society signifies that the Korean church has failed to connect the value culture of Christianity to action culture in the reality. Therefore, the reason why the Korean church of today has lost its influence on Korean society, despite its external growth, lies in the fact that the value of Christianity did not appear in the action or the life culture.

This dissertation concerns the role of art culture (expressive culture), especially the madanggŭk, in exploring a mediating structure for public dialogue that can be a point of

contact between religious culture and action culture. Basically Christian culture is a comprehensive concept of three cultures, namely, religious culture, action culture and art culture (expressive culture). In what respects is the madanggük performance suggestive in keeping the balance of faith-praxis and the balance between religious (value) culture and action (life) culture? The answer to the question will be investigated in following chapters.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRACTICES OF CULTURAL PUBLIC DIALOGUE: CENTERING ON *MADANGGŬK*

Public dialogue is communication through a relationship with the world. Therefore, it presents “context-reading” as a premise. Korean theologies and the *madanggŭk* movement began with the question of “who is the owner or the subject of society and culture?” The answer is “*minjung*” (the populace) in a Korean term which designates the ruled, namely, laborers, peasants and the poor. Generally speaking, *minjung* refers to the whole alienated class of the politically suppressed, economically deprived, culturally ignored, religiously removed, and ideologically anti-subjectivized (Song K.D. 1990:70-71).

The concern for these alienated people has a special meaning in Korean society, because, as Ahn Byung Mu (1982:19) points out, “In our history, there is only a nation, but no *minjung*. ... *Minjung* who has formed the nation is in a state of being neglected and suffering under the cloak for the good of the nation.” It means that Korea is, therefore, a nation that has lost *minjung*. The church, theology and cultural movements that attempted to “dialogue with the other” could therefore not avoid “context-reading,” that is, “reading *minjung* reality.” Public dialogue is thus closely connected with the concept of “*minjung*.” Therefore, the Korean term “*minjung*” will be used in this chapter without translating it to its English equivalent “the populace or the common people.”

The concept “*minjung*” came to the fore at the beginning of the 1970s. This was, so to speak, the flowering of *minjung*. As indicated in Chapter 3, under the policy of “rapid modernization” and “the high degree of foreign dependence” that got into its stride in the 1970s, *minjung* was increasingly sacrificed, the social contradictions were revealed more clearly, and the *minjung* movement for the right to live was established. Stimulated by serious *minjung* matters, both the theological world and the *minjung* movement began to concern itself with public dialogue with *minjung* and society. In

particular, the immolation of a Christian youth “Chun Tae Il” in November 1970 served as momentum for Korean theologians and intellectuals to participate in the alienated and oppressed minjung reality (Hwang Y.Y. 1998:125-126).

Where can we read reality/context? Suh Nam Dong (1982:256-276) suggests that reality can be found in the minjung stories—(1) firstly in the history of the Korean minjung movement, (2) secondly in the history of the Korean church, (3) thirdly in the traditional Korean religion, and (4) lastly in the folk tale, *t'alch'um* (Korean mask dance), *p'ansori* (a Korean style of opera) and Korean popular songs (minjung songs). What is significant here is the fact that the scope of reading reality is widened from Korean history to encompass Korean traditional culture.

Chapter 3 dealt with the history of Korean Christianity and the Korean minjung movement in connection with “public dialogue,” which are the first two stories among the four suggested by Suh. The stories showed the process through which the populace was freed and made the subject who determined their destiny by themselves. Although the practical faith of the Korean church was distorted by the privatization of faith, there have nonetheless been practices for public dialogue with society, history and others. Chapter 4 will explore the attempts of public dialogue in relation to the other two stories— traditional Korean religion/culture and Korean minjung reality.

Therefore, this chapter, focusing on practices of “cultural” public dialogue, consists largely of two parts. One is related to cultural public dialogue in the theological domain, especially Korean theologies which have paid attention to “culture” and have influenced minjung cultural movements as a foundation of ideology, directly or indirectly. Here the central theological idea and practices of cultural public dialogue are discussed. The second part concerns the practices of public dialogue through performing art called “*madanggŭk*” (theatre in an open public area) that is representative among minjung cultural movements.

This study is carried out by asking the following questions: the first is “what is the

historical background of the madanggük?” Here both artistic and social aspects are addressed. The second question is “what are the practices of the cultural public dialogue through madanggük?” The practices and the trends of public dialogue through madanggük are dealt with, centering on performed representative madanggük works of the 1970s and 1980s. The third question is “what are the central thoughts and the general characteristics of public dialogue in madanggük performance?” The fourth question is “what is the meaning of madanggük as a means of communication and what are the basic problems and limitations of madanggük as a kind of communication?” This research into the meaning and limitations of madanggük’s communicability aims to contribute to the formation of an alternative public dialogue based on mutual communication, which is the ultimate purpose of this thesis.

## **4.1 Korean Theology and Cultural Public Dialogue**

### **4.1.1 Korean Theology and Reading Context**

The representative theologies that attempted to fulfill public dialogue are the “Indigenization theology” that emerged in the 1960s and the “*Minjung* theology” that developed in the 1970s. Under the impact of the socio-participation theology of the W.C.C., Secularization theology, Liberation theology, Asian theology, and Third World theology, Korean theologies became interested in context-reading, which caused Korean Christianity to take part in practices of public dialogue with society. Meanwhile, the influence of Paul Tillich’s “theology of culture” caused Korean Christianity to have a positive effect on culture, especially traditional culture (Huh B.S. 1987:180). In this process, Indigenization Theology and *Minjung* theology began to engage in public dialogue with the other, using Korean traditional culture as a mechanism for public dialogue. For this reason, the two theologies are named “*Korean theology*” or “*Korean cultural theology*” (Kim J.C. 1993:160). In addition, the Korean theologies gained another name, the so-called “contextualization theology” in the sense that they

developed from “context-reading.”

The main focus of the Korean theologies is to define “what do the Korean people believe about Jesus in the present context” (Kim K.S. 1993:91). To answer this question, Indigenization theology tried to understand the Korean reality in the midst of traditional Korean religious culture, and Minjung theology focused on the common people’s reality in the Korean political-economic situation. The former took a religious cultural approach to communicating with traditional Korean religious culture, while the latter took minjung cultural approach to praxis for the isolated populace.

The cultural approach of Korean theologies aimed in common to re-establish “Korean” Christianity on the ground in Korean culture. For this purpose, Indigenization theology emerged in the 1960s and focused on reflecting that the reckless adaptation of Western theology without proper criticism had resulted in the loss of Korean tradition. Indigenization theology pursued the de-westernization of the Gospel, and the establishment of “Korean” theology based on the Korean religious mind and traditional culture (Kim J.C. 1993:160). With an interest in so-called “our things” (traditional Korean culture) it tried to form a relationship between Christianity and traditional religion and culture.

One religion has not been replaced by another in Korea; rather, several religions coexist in a state of religious accumulation. Kim Yong Bock (1993:122-123) explains it thus, “Korean minjung has experienced pluralism and accumulated religion in the life. In other words, minjung has experienced the representative religious culture of Korea such as Shamanism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism not separately but simultaneously and pluralistically.” The religious cultures of Korea can be understood separately in the aspect of analysis, but not in the dimension of experience.

In this respect, the main concern of Indigenization theology was how to deal with the existence of this religious pluralism and with the loss of religious culture. As a response



to this religious cultural situation, it attempted to create a religious discussion with other traditional Korean religions beyond the accomplishment of evangelism. These attempts resulted in Yun Sung Bum's (1976) theology of *Sung* (Faithfulness); the study of Shamanism by Ryu Dong Sik (1975); the study of Buddhism by Byun Sun Hwan (1982) which tried to connect Korean religious culture and Christianity; Rhyu Dong Sik's (1988) theology of *Pungryu* (Wind and Flow); the study of Korean cultural theology by Kim Kyung Jae (1983) and Kim Kwang Sik (1987) among others. As researched above, Indigenization theology has made every effort to bring about religious integration in the religious pluralistic situation. On the question of hermeneutics, it has contributed to the "indigenization" of Korean Christianity through traditional Korean culture.

While in traditional Korean religious culture Indigenization theology finds out "our things" and reads the popular reality, Minjung theology focuses on the problems of the reality regarding minjung as the subject of the nation. Minjung theology finds out "our things" (traditional Korean culture) in the Korean social reality—the political, economic and social context.

From the beginning of the 1970s, issues related to autocracy, socio-economic inequality, the alienated and the oppressed minjung began to come to the surface of society. The concern with the reality of minjung was often expressed through labor movements, agricultural movements and movements for the urban poor. Christianity has shown such concern through the mission for minjung and the Minjung theology that the so-called minjung theologians in general regard the event of Chun Tae Il as a symbolic event. Minjung theology itself resulted from "*minjung events*" (Hwang Y.Y. 1998:125-126) in the 1970s. For this reason, Ahn Byung Mu (1991:28-34) calls Minjung theology "*Event theology*." According to his explanation, event theology understands the current minjung events (affairs) as God's intervention in history. Therefore, its task is to discover God who works actively in the historical events, as well as to interpret and testify the Christ events by participating in minjung events. God exists in the events, and theology testifies the facts. Event theology is thus "the theology of testimony." In

this way, Minjung theology can be conceptualized in the words “event” and “testimony.” Therefore, Suh Nam Dong (1982:237-276), one of the representative minjung theologians, suggests the necessity of “the confluence of minjung story (minjung tradition) in Christianity and minjung story (minjung tradition) in Korea” and “the interpretation of this confluence process.”

Minjung theology is a theology that is accelerated by Christian praxis discovering and participating in Korean minjung’s suffering and resistance. Strictly speaking, Minjung theology did not conscientize minjung; rather, it became conscientized by the minjung. Nonetheless, as Kang Won Don (1990b:88-89) indicates, the discovery of the minjung reality of Minjung theology has a significant meaning in that “it led a revolutionary shift of the hermeneutical concept from the *above* to the *under* in perceiving history and reality.”

In conclusion, while Indigenization theology concerns religious culture from a philosophical standpoint, Minjung theology concerns minjung culture from a practical standpoint. While Indigenization theology insists on the liberation of theology advocating cosmological Christology, Minjung theology persists in the liberation of minjung claiming the theory of “*minjung-Jesus*.” Even though they are different from each other from the point of emphasis, these Korean theologies, as Park Jong Chun (1991:98-99) notes, have something in common in their conviction that the de-westernization and the liberation of theology can be accomplished by the praxis for minjung liberation. They all pursue “praxis” and see “our things” (traditional culture) as a medium for that praxis.

#### **4.1.2 Minjung Theology and the Minjung Cultural Movement**

If Minjung theology was established in the theological realm, the *minjung cultural movement* emerged from the realm of culture in the 1960s in a response to minjung reality. The concern with minjung gave birth to *minjung sociology*, *minjung literature* and

*minjung art*. Together with these, the minjung movement developed the enlightenment movement, the conscientization movement and the resistance movement. In this process, the minjung cultural movement engaged in dialogue with the oppressed minjung through a diverse cultural or artistic mechanism.

The central purpose of Minjung theology and the minjung cultural movement lies in the liberation of minjung, by acknowledging it as the subject of art and the nation. Here they ask some questions concerning minjung. The first is “what is the salvation (liberation) of minjung?” The answer is the liberation or exodus from the dehumanization, i.e. freedom from the ruling class and the realization of humanization by overcoming alienation. In order to meet and understand the needs of the populace, they started by reading minjung reality.

This led to the next question: “how is the salvation of minjung realized?” For this, Kim Yong Bock (1983b:56) proposes the “narratives of minjung themselves” as a method for reading reality and liberating minjung. Through story telling they willingly speak about their experiences of suffering, and we can understand them. He called the minjung narrative “the social biography of Korean minjung” (Suh K.S. 1990:52)<sup>29</sup> which contains three narratives: first, a story of ‘*Han*’ (a bitter feeling or agony) of minjung fatigued under the governor’s regime; second, a story of ‘*Dan*’ (decision or resolution for cutting) a struggle to overcome the vicious circle of the ruler, the exploitation and the oppression; and third, a story of the vision and hope of the minjung to be the subject of history. These narratives of the so-called social biography of minjung provide a clue for methodology, or the means for their liberation. Minjung liberation cannot be achieved through resistance and violence. Rather, warning against the vicious circle of

---

<sup>29</sup> Many stories about the poor are included in his article “*A Study of the Poor Women in Korea*” as examples of the socio-biography of Korean minjung: “*The Chun Tae-il’s Diary*” that tells how he burnt himself to death in order to make known the laborer’s agony in a clothing factory in the early part of 1970s, Song Hyo Soon’s “*The Way to Seoul*” describing her story of labor in the capital Seoul where she grew up as a teenager, and Lee Dong Chul’s “*The Ggobang Village People*”, etc. The socio-biography is composed by words and writings of minjung themselves (Christian Research Institute 1983). Huh Byung Sub also presented an article “*A Study of Minjung Reality*” with the premise that theology must recognize minjung reality.

struggle and violence, Suh Nam Dong and Ahn Byung Mu suggest “the dialectic of *Han* and *Dan*” as a method for liberation (Song K.D. 1990:80). It is not revenge but ‘*Dan*’ which cuts the vicious circle of revenge and the struggle for power. Liberation of the populace means humanization by the dialectic of ‘*Han*’ and ‘*Dan*’ which ultimately leads to the third story of vision and hope.

The history (or story) of the suffering of the oppressed Korean minjung required the hermeneutics of the Gospel from the perspective of minjung. Suh Nam Dong (1982:271) advocated “the conflux of two stories,” insisting that “the minjung story of Christendom and the minjung story of Korea should join together in the action of the *Missio Dei* of the Korean church.” In fact, it is possible to participate in action and interpretation in the confluence of the minjung story of the Bible and the present minjung story of Korea. In the process of the conflux and story telling of the minjung, minjung becomes the subject; theology becomes their hermeneutics by listening and interpreting and then telling their story again in connection with God’s story. Therefore, the popular cultural movement is a popular artistic expression of the two stories.

Some theologians search for the possibility of theological humanization in the Korean minjung culture such as Korean folk tales, *t’alch’um* (mask dance) and *p’ansori* (a Korean style of opera), in which the popular consciousness is contained. Suh Nam Dong (1982:265) considers *p’ansori* and *t’alch’um* as “a kind of religious ritual for the liberation of the oppressed minjung.” Hyun Young Hak (1982a:16), insisting that “Christianity must be incarnate into the populace and must learn the wisdom and the justice within minjung,” proposes turning our attention toward popular culture.<sup>30</sup> This means that traditional art is acknowledged as a starting point for theological epistemology and praxis for public dialogue of Christianity (cf. Suh K.S. 1986; Huh B.S. 1986).

---

<sup>30</sup> Hyun Young Hak is one of the representative theologians who led the methodological concern about public dialogue with the world to the notice of “minjung culture.” In the process of his study of mask dance, Hyun (1982b:384) looks for “religious transcendence with criticism” in humour, critical consciousness, vulgarism, and struggle peculiar to the performing folk art.

The Korean theologies influenced the popular cultural movement in the sphere of ideology. However, this was not direct. Strictly speaking, t'alch'um and madanggük, which were forerunners among the cultural movements for cultural public dialogue, did not originate from Christianity. Rather, with interest in the revival of tradition, some intellectuals and college/university students from the theatrical circle and the t'alch'um circle started the madanggük and the t'alch'um movement. Meanwhile, the theological discussion about the "culture" is inadequate and no longer developed. Huh Byung Sub (1987:181) refers to this point as follows: "While in the domain of general studies, the study of the popular cultural movement in the dimensions of theory and practice has steadily been done to some extent, Korean Christianity has no study group and practical group for the popular culture. Hyun Young Hak is the only one who attempted the interpretation of t'alch'um in theological perspective, but it was limited to a small article. In fact, there are few books related to the Christian interpretation and theory of the popular culture."

Despite the lack of research into the cultural movement, the practices that Korean Christianity fulfilled in the popular cultural movement are worthy of close attention. Some progressive churches and Christians took a positive part in the madanggük movement that was inherited from t'alch'um in a modern style. With a Christian identity, they began to criticize the reality of the alienated minjung through the performing art-cultural medium of madanggük. Some church buildings were used as places to prepare and perform the madanggük. Strictly speaking, therefore, the popular cultural movement was generated not from Minjung theology; rather, the two had a mutual relationship. Minjung theology provides a theological ideology for the popular movement; on the other hand, theologians accepted an art-cultural dimension through the madanggük or t'alch'um movement as a new method for praxis of public dialogue. Korean Christianity thus gained an opportunity to convert the resisting pattern of public dialogue into an artistic and cultural pattern.

#### **4.2 The Advent and Identity of *Madanggük***

Considering the fact that public dialogue begins with the reading context, it is no wonder that madanggük as an artistic communication emerged in close connection with the context of the times. In addition, considering the fact that madanggük is a product of a response to reality, surveying the background of the advent of madanggük is crucial. Madanggük arose from the t'alch'um revival movement<sup>31</sup> in the 1960s. The madanggük movement, including the t'alch'um revival movement, is valued as a great cultural event. There are two main aspects in the historical background of the advent of madanggük as public dialogue. One is artistic in that madanggük is a drama; the other is social in that it is a public dialogue with society. In other words, madanggük has a cultural or artistic dimension in the artistic context of the annihilation of traditional Korean culture, and a social dimension in the context of dictatorship.

#### **4.2.1 Artistic and Social Background**

The artistic background is largely connected to three historical events. The first event was Japanese colonial policy to annihilate Korean national culture from the 1900s. As a result, the national cultural heritage of Korea such as t'alch'um, which is a representative Korean traditional performance art, and *p'ansori*, puppet drama, began to disappear (Huh E. 1999:175). A representative case was "the Korean market survey" enforced by the Japanese empire from 1913 to 1917. The purpose of this survey was not only to occupy the Korean market but also to forbid the Korean people from gathering together in the market place. On the pretext of abolishing superstitions, Japan prohibited village festivals that had served to strengthen the solidarity of the Korean people. In those days, the market place functioned as a place of public dialogue, social gathering, recreation, assembly and festival as well as goods-exchange for the Korean people (Korean Folklore Academy 1994:68-69). Therefore,

---

<sup>31</sup> In November 1969, the Traditional Folk Study Society was organized at Pusan University, and in following year, the Folk Mask Dance Drama Society at Seoul National University. T'alch'um societies were soon formed in almost all colleges and universities all over the nation. In this way, the t'alch'um movement became a characteristic of college culture in the 1970s. This trend is called the "t'alch'um revival movement."

the Korean market survey by Japan meant the loss of a spontaneous space for culture and communication as well as the loss of economic infra-structure.

The second event occurred when Japan forced the Korean people to accept the Japanese *shinp'a* (new wave) drama and modern Western-style drama, instead of traditional Korean performing art. In order to get rid of the will for national subjectivity and independence, Japanese imperialism encouraged the Korean people regard the national Korean heritage as a vulgar and backwardly inferior culture. Instead of Korean culture, Japan transplanted the Japanese *shinp'a* drama into the Korean lower classes, and infused modern Western-style drama into the upper class intellectuals. The problem was that these new dramas, copied from Japanese *shinp'a* drama and Western modern drama, belonged mainly to the category of sentimental melodrama (Lee G.R. 1995:21).

After Korea's liberation, the Japanese *shinp'a* drama lost its prestige in Korea, but Western and American melodrama became more influential, with no recovery of the lost traditional Korean culture. This is not merely a matter of nationality. One of the most important points is the fact that indiscriminate import and imitation of Western drama promoted colonial consciousness, i.e. cultural colonialism among the Korean people, instead of the progressive spirit that characterized original Western drama in its own countries.

As a result of the indiscriminate import and imitation of Western drama in Korea, firstly, Korean drama showed a tendency towards translated drama based on the ambiguous and obscure Western high drama. Secondly, evaluation of drama was based in a perspective of Western modernism such as theatre of the absurd, experimental drama, and the avant-garde theatre (Ahn J.K. 1983:165-169). Thirdly, Korean drama began to be polluted by commercialism and purism (Oh J.W. 1980:302). The problem of commercialism was raised in that without due consideration Korean drama followed the phenomenon of the commercialization of Broadway in America, which balanced the

budget by drawing the upper classes and intellectuals into a type of spectator of drama. On the other hand, under the influence of art purism, the clarity of Korean traditional drama was regarded as what should be abandoned and replaced by the pattern of Western modernist drama with ambiguity, alienation, obscurity and high level of refinement. The problem of purism is, as Ahn Jong Kwan (1983:171) indicates, that it made even cognitive faculties about the world, history and objects ambiguous.

This tendency prevented traditional performing art that had been enjoyed by the common people or lower classes from becoming a popular art form for the public. After that time in Korea, performing art related only to the minority of the intellectuals; the common people were excluded from art and culture. In this respect, the prevailing purism, commercialism and the indiscriminate imitation of Western culture revealed in the end the nature of “inhumanity and non-popularity” (Ahn J.K. 1983:163,175; Lee Y.M. 1997a:29-30).

The third event which helps to form an artistic background to madanggŭk is related to the revival of the Korean cultural tradition under the military regime of Park Chung Hee after the liberation of Korea in 1950. Although the government-initiated cultural policy helped to rediscover traditional folk art and give it heightened interest,<sup>32</sup> it soon became clear that the government was more inclined toward the importation of foreign culture, denouncing traditional culture as a feudal legacy and thus a hindrance to the modernization process. A cultural heritage law was exploited by placing all items and genres of culture under its strict control. Culture was to be evaluated and transformed for political purposes, i.e. as a way of maintaining a dictatorship. In addition, the government-initiated cultural policy was confined to a preservation of the original forms, classifying and commenting on terms and notions. This was the so-called “taxidermization” of traditional art and culture, detaching itself from the life of the common people, i.e. defacing minjung-oriented and field-oriented features (Kim K.O.

---

<sup>32</sup> The Korean Folklore Academy was established in 1954 and the Society for Korean Mask Drama Preservation in 1959, and so the Folk mask drama was appointed as an important and inviolate cultural asset.



1997; Chae H.W. 1982:206). In this situation, the loss of tradition meant the loss of realism, which helped to bring about the failure of the development of a voluntary and spontaneous participative drama.

The social context as well as the artistic context effected the advent of the madanggük. The political situation at that point was under oppressive dictatorship: the undemocratic regime of President Lee Seung Man in the 1950s, and the despotic regime of President Park Chung Hee after the May 16 military coup in 1961. Moreover, the growth in the economy made the society rotten with the problems of social inequality, extreme antagonism among classes, and alienation of workers, farmers, and the urban poor. Under the military dictatorship, freedom of expression and freedom of speech or the press were suppressed, and the students' associations of all high schools, colleges and universities were broken up by force. This situation persisted into the 1980s. Therefore, the national desire for democratic government, economic independence, social equality, and cultural subjectivity deepened more and more. Above all, a new medium for expressing the truth about the distorted events and social contradictions was needed.

## **4.2.2 Response to Context**

### **4.2.2.1 Creative Inheritance of Traditional Performance**

Madanggük as an art movement and an expressive action emerged as a new alternative to the criticism and opposition to the extorted existing performance world (Seo Y.H. 1997:15). The Minjung cultural movement began with a reflection of the extinction of traditional culture, the reckless import and imitation of Western drama, the prevalence of purism and commercialism, and the political manipulation of traditional culture by the government. In the process of this response to the artistic situation, madanggük was created.

In reaction to a series of drastic cultural changes, a group of young intellectuals and

college students, most of whom attended Seoul National University, began in the early 1960s to think about a traditional cultural genre. In a narrow sense, the loss of traditional Korean culture meant the closure of a cultural gateway for public dialogue within an oppressive situation; in a broader sense it meant the loss of national identity under the motto of “Westernization is Modernization.” Therefore, those who regarded the whole situation as a threat began to organize a movement whose aim was the study of “traditional” culture. The name they chose for the movement was the “science of national culture” (*Gukhak*). In the process of searching for “our things” indigenous to Korea, the new performance pattern, “madanggük,” came spontaneously into being.

The “college theatrical group” and the “folk drama study group” of Seoul National University, which are the matrix of madanggük, were confronted by two immediate tasks of an artistic nature. One was a creative inheritance of traditional culture; the other was a critical adoption of foreign culture. When most other college theatrical groups as well as the established theatrical world in those days leaned towards “translated drama,” the college theatrical group of Seoul University leant on the one hand to “creative drama,” and on the other performed the classical drama works such as *Yangbanjyun*, *Hojil*, *Husaengjyun* in the form of folk drama. Meanwhile, “the mask dance group” organized by students of Seoul National University in 1965 focused on discovering and learning about “minjung” culture through various study groups. They concentrated on mask-dance theatre (*kamyongük*), mask dance (*t'alch'um*), folk songs (*minyo*), performances of farmers' music (*p'ungmul nori*) and dance (*ch'um*), all of which had been regarded as the cultural genres of the uncultivated peasants or humble folk. Under the influence of the t'alch'um revival movement, many college students developed an overwhelming interest in t'alch'um. Consequently, t'alch'um study groups were organized in almost all colleges throughout the country, and even in middle and high schools, churches, cultural and social organizations, including factories and farm villages (Chae H.W. 1982:206-209; Moon H.Y. 1985:56). The t'alch'um group played a role in the spread of madanggük as a creative inheritance of t'alch'um.

The theatrical group and the t'alch'um group joined forces in order to invent a new

genre of performing art, synthesizing many elements of the traditional peasant culture such as *t'alch'um*, *p'ansori*, folk song and dance, and the traditional operetta and shamanistic rituals. This is the madanggük, the only true indigenous performance style in Korean contemporary theatrical history. Madanggük is, therefore, the creative fruit of a process of integration between critical realism directivity (the theatrical group) and the inheritance of creative tradition (the *t'alch'um* group). They are not merely “students” learning traditional culture, but true “creators” of a new cultural mediating structure for public dialogue.

If this is the case, why did they direct their attention to folk performance art including *t'alch'um*? The reason is that the ideological foundation of *t'alch'um* is *minjung* orientation. The folk drama based its principle on the struggle and critical consciousness of the reality of *minjung* (Cho D.I. 1988:221). The *t'alch'um* mode, which has the function of reading reality from the perspective of the populace and the will to solve *minjung* problems, coincides with the *minjung* cultural consciousness and action ideology of the cultural groups of the colleges/universities. As a result, from the end of 1960 the *t'alch'um* and the madanggük movements were developed in such domains as the college, the village, work fields and religion.

#### **4.2.2.2 A Minjung Medium for Expression of Social Reality**

Madanggük entered a developmental stage early in the 1970s. If the madanggük of the 1960s was “an artistic response” to the historical context by searching for a creative national power from within the traditional culture, that of the 1970s could not help operating as “a social response” to the political situation, in an effort to find a new gateway to expression in the form of a traditional culture. Under the newly introduced National Security Law and *Yushin* Restoration Constitution, any direct criticism against the regime meant prosecution as a procommunist and an antinational reaction. Therefore, it was necessary to seek a new medium in order to describe, interpret and express socio-cultural experiences. As Victor Turner (1974:10) indicates, this new way

is often expressed in “art and religion,” and the criticism against the government was expressed in “metaphorical” ways through art or religion. Some liberal theologians and church leaders were fighting for human rights and democracy, and in order to do so, some student groups invented a new cultural mechanism, namely, the *madanggŭk*.

Madanggŭk was one of the most effective cultural mechanisms through which the people could express feelings and opinions which could not be conveyed anywhere else. So Lee Gang Ryul (1995:25) regarded madanggŭk as “a minjung medium for communication.”<sup>33</sup> Madanggŭk, as a positive medium for expression, dealt aggressively with the social issues of the time, such as the undemocratic political system (*Yushin* regime), farming community matters and labor problems, government suppression of the media and the economic invasion by Japan. In the disguise of performance art, the people were able to engage in political discourse. That is why, when a military dictatorship ruled the country, madanggŭk won the positive support of the public and grew dramatically. In this way, madanggŭk has the features of a social movement beyond an art category.

Madanggŭk was performed in the practical sphere of the social movement beyond the sphere of theatrical art, and accordingly, it came to take on the characteristics of “progressive drama” manifesting the practical will of reality (Lee Y.M. 1997a:59-60). According to Lim Jin Taek’s statement on the future of madanggŭk, “madanggŭk is a practical work of art giving shape to social reality truly. ... New drama should be ‘a drama with the realities of life’ and ‘a drama as praxis toward free and equal society’” (Lee Y.M. 1997a:43).<sup>34</sup> The madanggŭk as a public dialogue of the practical dimension carried the characteristics of a kind of “political proxy assembly” (Lee Y.M. 1993:91), so that the idea of “madanggŭk is becoming generally accepted as ‘the political

---

<sup>33</sup> There are vigorous studies of Korean traditional performances; *P’ansori* (a Korean style of opera or a Korean traditional narrative song), folk song, puppet drama, especially mask dance (Lee G.R. 1995:25,40-41).

<sup>34</sup> For this reason, Lee Young Mi (1997a:43) insists that it has to be evaluated as an important part of Korean theatrical history despite the fact that it is not a performance within the theatrical world.

performance” (Kim B.O. 1995:234; Lee Y.M. 2001:71).

#### 4.2.3 Definition of *Madang* and Identity of *Madanggŭk*

Madanggŭk performances are held in a round open area (*wonhyongp’an*).<sup>35</sup> The literal definition of “*madanggŭk*” is “a drama performed in *madang*” or “a drama to be seen in *madang*.” The word “*madang*” indicates “an open area” like “garden” or “plain.” At the same time, “*madang*” implies “situation and time” indicating “on this occasion” or “in this atmosphere.” Therefore, the word *madang* contains two concepts: one is “a space of open ground,” the other is “time related to a situation.” Here *madang* becomes “a space of life,” i.e. a place for life planning, a space for play, a place to express the joy, anger, sorrow, and pleasure of the community (Sim W.S. 1988:581-582; Lim J.T. 1990:18-19).

The space of “*madang*” here is not limited only to the meaning of “outdoor.” Physical conditions, for example, whether the performance is held indoors or outdoors, whether the area is circular or square, do not determine whether the performance is a madanggŭk or not. The outdoor circular performance area is only a representation of the form taken by the original madanggŭk. In other words, the madanggŭk is a drama portraying the populace’s concrete reality in “the *madang* of life” (the centre of reality), not making a sharp distinction between outdoors and indoors. This is the first and most important condition for “madanggŭk.”

Therefore, not all drama that deals with social reality is madanggŭk. And all drama performed in “*madang*” space cannot be madanggŭk either. Madanggŭk goes beyond the limits of drama art performed in an open area *madang*, and advances toward the concern of minjung’s life space and social participation.

Thus, in a word “*madanggŭk*” comprises both aspects of a mode and a value of drama,

---

<sup>35</sup> The reason that the term “circular stage” is not used is because the word “stage” has the connotation of a special place set well above the ground. Madanggŭk used a regular wooden floor for indoor performances, or simply the open area for outdoor performances. The centre of the performance area is a round circle around which the audience gathers.

both concepts of space and time, and both spheres of performance art and a social movement directivity.<sup>36</sup> Madanggük is a drama pursuing a synthesis between artistry and social participation. Therefore, the madanggük movement, as discussed above, could be completed by carrying out the two functions, i.e. the artistic function of the creative inheritance of traditional performance and the social function of practical participation. Here the shift from artistic to social communication took place not in stages but in a synthesis of the two. That is why madanggük is expressed rather as “the spirit” of drama that provides a practical value in the social change movement, than as “a mode” of drama.

### **4.3 Practices of Public Dialogue through Madanggük Performance**

The practices of public dialogue through madanggük show various features depending on the era. In the 1960s these practices were characterized by “nationalism” in achieving two art-cultural tasks—the creative heritage of traditional culture and the critical adoption of foreign culture. In the 1970s, however, they showed the minjung-oriented and social movement-oriented features more evidently as a mechanism of public dialogue against the dictatorship and contradictions of social structure in a new form of performance art. In the 1980s, it became widely popular and firmly established its status as “a progressive drama,” playing an important role as a social or cultural movement, resisting the existing governing ideology.

#### **4.3.1 Involvement of Christianity in the Madanggük Movement**

The development of the madanggük movement as a practice of public dialogue has to be understood from the perspective of practical background as well as the artistic and

---

<sup>36</sup> The term “madanggük” became an official name to indicate a certain form of drama in Lim Jin Taek’s essay “For a New Drama” (included in Lim 1990) in which madanggük was used to refer to a new style of dramas, i.e., minjung and national dramas such as ‘*Chinogwi*,’ ‘*Sori Gut Agu*’ created in the 1970s. After 1987, “national drama” was established as the word to represent a progressive theatre (Lee Y.M. 1997a:42-43).

political background. Practices of public dialogue and social participation through madanggŭk were possible through the participation of practical leaders and large organizations such as the World Council of Churches (W.C.C.) and the Korean National Council of Churches (K.N.C.C.), which followed the line of social participation.

The first aspect of the practical background is the Christian youth movements' active participation in the public dialogue. Christian youth started to criticize the privatized established churches that were biased toward individual salvation, ignorant of the social context. Soon the Korean Student Christian Federation (K.S.C.F.) was organized in 1969 by delegates of 69 colleges from all over the country. They got together in support of the K.N.C.C. and the W.C.C. By joining a mine, a factory, a wharf, a labor union during school holidays, they experienced the reality of minjung. As a result of the experience and by reading the context from a realistic and a practical standpoint, they joined the anti-dictatorship movement, the campus liberalization movement, the labor movement and the movement for the poor, despite the government's suppression. In 1976, the youth of six denominations were admitted to the K.N.C.C. and joined hands to form the Ecumenical Youth Council (E.Y.C). From the beginning, the E.Y.C. took an active part in the movement for minjung by setting its goal as minjung directivity. The E.Y.C. cultural sub-committee served as a stimulus for the indigenization of Korean Christianity by destroying the Western frame in pursuit of their heritage and the development of minjung culture (Lee D.S. 1984:87).

The second aspect of the practical background is the Urban Industrial Mission. In the early 1960s, Industrial Mission groups were organized primarily for the purpose of industrial evangelism. However, the somatic incarnational experience of the industrial missionaries who were involved in the lives of the workers changed the goal of the Industrial Mission from evangelism to "finding the body of Jesus Christ among the workers themselves." Toward the end of the 1960s, Urban Industrial Mission groups were formed in the Seoul metropolitan area. From the beginning, the basic concern of the Urban Industrial Mission was to develop a powerful system at grassroots level in

order to enable the urban poor to recover their rights and protect their interests. For this purpose, it would provide the urban poor with an education for conscientization, which would help laborers to realize that self-knowledge was a starting point for the recognition of their power and a means of asserting themselves and obtaining their rights and meeting their needs. The Student Development Service Corps (S.D.S.C) organized by the Korean Student Christian Federation (K.S.C.F) was especially physically involved in the situation of workers, farmers, and the urban poor by working in factories and joining in the community organizations. This experience stimulated them to fight for justice and social change; this action became a dynamic thrust not only for the S.D.S.C. but also for Korean Christian student movements as a whole. The experience of the S.D.S.C. also influenced the secular student movements. Afterwards, they came to follow the S.D.S.C. action model for social justice (Suh K.S. 1983:38-43).

The Christian youth and the progressive churches played an important role in the development of public dialogue through madanggük. From the early 1970s, some progressive Korean churches, such as the Seoul Cheil Church, the Saemunan Church and the Kyongdong Church, formed a relationship with cultural public dialogue through madanggük, participating positively in madanggük performances such as *Gold-crowned Jesus*, *Chinogwi* (Soothing Dead Soul), and *Sori Gut Agu* (Shamanistic Ritual in Voice for Hungry Ghost), *Doingil Banjik Munje Haekyulhara* (Solve the Problem of the Doingil Textile Factory). The Christian youth took part in theatre, and church building and various Christian organizations buildings were used for rehearsal and performance places of the theatre as well. The Korean church together with the activists of the cultural movement performed madanggük works at prayer meetings for imprisoned and democratic individuals, or in farming areas, joining in the social service activities of the farming village. In addition, the encounter of Christianity and laborers was a chance to keep close contact with the labor union. The Urban Industrial Mission presented a course on cultural labor education, teaching traditional culture such as *t'alch'um*, *madanggük*, *p'ungmul* (performance of farmer's music) and a short drama. In this way, the Korean church and the madanggük were closely related in the practice of



public dialogue. The madanggŭk and t'alch'um movement of Korean Christianity was a means to the development of cultural public dialogue in society, and served as a stepping-stone for the field-directivity of cultural public dialogue (Park I.B. 1985:437).

#### **4.3.2 The First Performances for Public Dialogue**

Cultural public dialogue started collectively in the early 1960s with a view to overcoming the cultural reality of anti-nation and anti-minjung. It was an artistic response to a national situation. When the disgraceful policy of restoring diplomatic relations between Korea and Japan of the Park Chung Hee regime in the early 1960s was confronted with countrywide opposition because it encouraged an unrestricted influx of Japanese culture, a student group from Seoul National University, including some progressive intellectuals, performed the "Shamanistic Ritual to Revive the Spirit of Countryside" (*Hyangto Uishik Chohon Gut*, 1963. 11), which is regarded as the origin of madanggŭk. This performance was presented in the form of traditional peasant's mask-dance theatre. In the following year, about 1,500 college students participated in a performance called "Funeral Ritual of Nationalistic Democracy" (*Minjokchok Mminjujuui Janryesik*, 1964. 5. 22) which was a production with the purpose of opposing the Nationalistic Democracy that the Park Chung Hee regime invented in order to legitimize its dictatorial rule, based on patriarchal authority. The performance is not merely a simple theatrical performance, but rather "active agencies of change, representing the eye by which culture sees itself and draws more efficient or interesting 'designs for living'" (Turner 1986:24). This style of performance, as a struggle, was a distinctive form recreating the atmosphere of 1960s.

#### **4.3.3 Practices of Public Dialogue through Madanggŭk in the 1970s**

In the mid-1960s, the madanggŭk as a creative drama arose from people's interest in the traditional folk theatre, and the madanggŭk works aimed to deal with the social reality. During the 1970s, under an oppressive dictatorship and the excessive labor-

intensive industries, the social situation was so uneasy that many unprecedented cases occurred. Responding to such situations, madanggük began to develop a new theatre form through collective and practical experimentation. In a word, the *artistic* madanggük that was re-created from t'alch'um came to enlarge its domain, moving into *social* madanggük, which is a kind of social drama (Lee Y.M. 2001:53).

The majority of madanggük works of the 1970s showed a tendency towards criticism of the unreasonable reality of society which shaped the difficulties and sufferings of minjung. The works dealt with matters falsely reported in the news under the suppression of the press and expression. Here the madanggük functioned as an agency of public dialogue announcing the truth of events, as a substitute for an organ of public opinion when the press was stifled.

With the passage of time, the concept of "*minjung-gŭk*" (minjung theatre) was created, which was a more ideological and practical concept than the creative drama. The *minjung-gŭk* was proposed as an alternative measure for reading reality by dealing with the concrete life and the struggle for the right to live of the minjung. The works in focus are as follows:

*Napoleon Cognac* satirizing the life of the wealthy classes,

*Gold-crowned Jesus* embodying the ideal human being that Christianity pursues,

*Coppered Lee Soon Shin*, the story of a poor taffy seller in 1972,

*A Burning Flame* performed by college students from the Seoul Cheil Church in the winter of 1972, which dealt with labor problems and cherished the memory of the self-immolation event of Chun Tae Il.

*Winter Trees* dealt with the joys and sorrows as well as the reality of homeless people, who had their houses demolished and were forcedly expelled from their hometown and driven to the City of Syungnam. This was presented together with the college student department of the Saemunan Church early in 1973.

Although these were once-off performances, they led Christian youth to become

voluntarily more involved in cultural activities.<sup>37</sup> Later on, the t'alch'um revival movement tried the modern and creative tradition inheritance, and this linked with the critical realism of a college theatrical group to form "madanggük" as a creative style. The products of these creative efforts were *Chinogwi* (1973), also called *Chyongsan Byulgog*, and *Sori Gut Agu* (1974).

*Chinogwi* was aimed at change in form, known as an *enlightening theatre* designed to conquer the difficulties of the farming population who suffered from natural disasters and oppression by the landowners and governing classes. It revealed a practical will toward minjung with an extrovert mood and performed in an open area, and with the bold expression of traditional folk performance (Lee Y.M. 2001:47). In order to perform in an agricultural area, it was designed to be performed in the full *madang pan* (open place) excluding all stage factors such as stage setting, stage lights, make-up, and plot division of act and scene. Therefore, *Chinogwi* is acknowledged as the first representative madanggük because, portraying "national pattern" it strove to solve the question of "minjung-oriented form" that previous *minjung theatres* could not solve (Lim J.T. 1990:132; Lee G.R. 1995:32).

With *Chinogwi* as a starting point, the madanggük, satirizing the reality in the form of traditional drama, continued onto *Sori Gut Agu* (Shamanistic Ritual in Voice for Hungry Ghost, 1974).<sup>38</sup> *Sori Gut Agu* depicted the continuation of the politico-economic exploitation of Korea by Japan during the time of Japanese colonial rule, and called for the building of a relationship between the two countries based on equality.

The early works of madanggük focused on revealing the truth of matters by dealing with the actual (non-fictional) events. They revealed the direct, field-centered, and

---

<sup>37</sup> These works were confined within a stage style, even though the *minjung* was directive in content and theme. Therefore, the common people could not approach and accept them intimately (Lim J.T. 1990:130).

<sup>38</sup> *Sori Gut Agu* shows a transient form of change from the original t'alch'um to creative t'alch'um and madanggük by dealing with the reality of today according to the patterns of traditional performance and by using various expression techniques (Park I.B. 1985:430-431).

immediate characteristics. After the mid-1970s, madanggük as cultural public dialogue visited and performed in the labor field of the common people, making its way through the suppression. Madanggük was not created as a mere drama. Rather, it took on the features of a political movement, and pointed to the field-centered cultural movement. In this way, the madanggük movement began to develop.

In 1974, the anti-*Yushin* movement swept over all university and college campuses to rescind the *Yushin* (Revitalizing Reforms) system of Park Chung Hee and to demand the resignation of the dictatorial Park regime. The organs of public opinion, beginning with the *Tonga-ilbo* (*Tonga (East Asia) Daily News*), set forward the Practical Movement for the Freedom of the Press. In November of the same year, the National Council for Democracy Restoration was established, and the anti-*Yushin* movement spread all over the country. At that time, ta'Ich'um and theatrical groups at colleges gave wings to their imagination by dealing with the political issues through performing art, in spite of a police round-up of students during these political activities.

Madanggük as public dialogue responded to the critical situation of minjung's desires for democratization, the growth of their consciousness, the *Yushin* system and its emergency measures. The pertinent madanggük performances are as follows:

*Kim Sang Jin's Funeral*<sup>39</sup> was performed as the funeral of Kim Sang Jin who committed suicide after reading the declaration of anti-*Yushin*.

*Chin Tonga Gut* (Shamanistic Ritual for East Asia, 1975) dealt with a press corps of the *Tonga-ilbo* (*East Asia Daily Newspaper*) who were dismissed because they demanded freedom of speech. These were examples showing that political activity could not be separated from the cultural movement (Park I.B. 1985:432).

Regarding the national resistance against the *Yushin* regime, the government planned to manipulate the votes. Hence, on 12 February 1975, plebiscite day, the organization

---

<sup>39</sup> He was a student from the National Seoul University. The government cremated his remains without giving him a funeral; thereupon the students went ahead with his funeral and a demonstration of indignation, in November 1974.

for protection of civil rights and churches, including the National Council for Democracy Restoration, planned to hold a movement against the harsh oppression and violence of dictatorship. The activists of madanggük also planned to express their veto by performing madanggük plays throughout the day, in the Myung-dong Catholic Church. But, in the middle of their preparations, they were taken to a police station by the government that had got wind of their plan beforehand. Nevertheless, it set a precedent for coping effectively with political questions through cultural means (Park I.B. 1985:432).

Meanwhile, the government put pressure on colleges by implementing emergency measure no. 9 in 1975 as a precaution against the demonstrations that could occur where performances were taking place. The government insisted on only the original form of t'alch'um and indoor performance instead of an open area called *madang*. At this time, public dialogue through madanggük began to take place in practices outside colleges, consequently the field-oriented activities aiming to reach the minjung increased. The madanggük movement of the 1970s concentrated particularly on the united activity with the labor unions. From the 1970s, the number of laborers formed an overwhelming majority of 50 percent of the working population, increasing from 48 hundred thousand in 1970 to 77 hundred thousand laborers in 1977. There was a high growth in the economy; nonetheless, the working conditions of laborers grew steadily worse. Furthermore, under the influence of a worldwide economic depression, huge delays in payment by Korean enterprises, based on the high degree of foreign dependence, was the order of the day. Under these conditions, the laborers and the labor union members joined with the churches linked to the Urban Industrial Mission to deal with this crisis. At that time, the madanggük activists connected with the church t'alch'um movement met them to practice public dialogue through madanggük. From the autumn of 1977, the Incheon Urban Industrial Mission began to teach t'alch'um or madanggük to the laborers of Dongil textile factory and others. The representative works in the field of labor and peasantry are as follows:

“*Dongil Banjik Munje Haekyulhara!*”<sup>40</sup> (Solve the Problem of the Dongil Textile Factory, 1978) dealing with the case of the labor union members of Dongil Textile Factory who were violently dismissed by the government and had excrement poured over them,

*Tucksan-kol Story* of 1978 revealing the truth regarding the murder of a person who was working for the removal of shacks under Park Hong Suk, which was misrepresented in the news.

*Hamp'young Koguma* (Sweet Potatoes of Hamp'young County, 1978) portraying the case of the farmers' disputes regarding the purchase of sweet potatoes in Hampyong, i.e. a fight by peasants who produced sweet potatoes based on the local government's promise to purchase them, but who were betrayed after all.

*Kongjang-ui pulbit*<sup>41</sup> (Lights from Factory) of 1979 handling the problems of factory workers exploited by capitalists, mainly through songs and dances.

*Hamp'young Koguma* was produced especially by the peasants of Hamp'young by themselves; *Dongil Banjik Munje Haekyulhara* was also a dramatic work through which the workers of Dongil Banjik factory re-enacted their experiences realistically. Consequently, these madanggŭk works aroused great interest among spectators, to such an extent that no division between drama and reality existed. After the performance of “*Chin Tonga Gut*,” there were a report meeting and a prompt fund-raising campaign. In the case of *Dongil Banjik Munje Haekyulhara*, all performers and some spectators were hauled to the police station because of an unexpected demonstration at the very end of the performance. *Hamp'young Koguma* could create “a communal mood” worthy of madanggŭk as it was presented in the atmosphere of celebrating a triumph of a struggle at a farmers' meeting place in Hamp'young province (cf. Chae & Lim 1982:73-83; Lee Y.M. 2001:48-49).

---

<sup>40</sup> It has a significant meaning in that the discharged employees of Dongil Textile participated in its production and cast it by themselves (Lee Y.M. 2001:49).

<sup>41</sup> It was a style of song-*gut* recorded on cassette with the support of the Association of Social Mission of the Korean Church, and it influenced the succeeding song movement and dance form afterwards (Lim J.T. 1990:27; Lee Y.M. 2001:52).

While the madanggük works mentioned above dealt with actual cases, there are works that selected fictional material to give shape to a society or an individual at that time. The works were adapted from the plays that did not belong to a madanggük pattern, and were rewritten into the madanggük mode and performed in the style of madanggük. The fictional works dealing with the minjung reality are as follows:

*Toeji kkum* (A Dream of Pig, 1977) was adapted from Hwang Suk Young's novel. *Dong Myung* (Eastern Brightness), *Massgame* (1978) and *Nobimunseo* (Slave Documentary, 1979) were adapted from the original by Yoon Dae Sung.

*Toeji kkum* portrayed rag pickers' miserable stories of a day in the form of a combatant group dance and a march to express their iron will, rather than desperation.

*Nobimunseo* dramatized the reality of the ruler's deception and oppression of the ruled people with a story about the reality of a slave at the end of the Korean dynasty. It is the story about the promised emancipation of slaves which was not fulfilled; the slaves then resisted desperately against the government force and died a heroic death. This performance continued into another demonstration as a follow-up program where the audience joined in spontaneously (Lim J.T. 1990:28). These are acknowledged as ambitious pieces of work as they carried a strong social criticism and minjung consciousness. They also attempted to establish the unique principle of madanggük style through new styles and techniques (Lee Y.M. 2001:50).

*Miyal* (1979) modernized the character "*Miyal*" who was a representative woman image in t'alch'um, as a stereotype of the lower class of minjung women of today, who left the farmland and was employed in the factory but was dismissed as a result of a fight against the vicious enterprise. At last she met a tragic end by becoming a prostitute.

*Yesu'ui Sang-ae* (Life of Jesus, 1977) and *Yesu-cheon* (Biography of Jesus, 1978) were written as scripts for a meeting of A Youth Christians United Association. These were dramatic works that carried out public dialogue for minjung by the confluence of

the Jesus story with the present Korean minjung story.<sup>42</sup> Other Christian works of the confluence are *Yeun* (Prophecy, 1976) dealing with the theme of the temptation in the desert and performed at the place of a Christian youths united meeting, *Aesooni* (1975) dealing with Esther's life, *Minjung Haebang Nori* (National Liberation Play, 1975) addressing the theme of Exodus and national liberation, and *Minjung-ui Yesu* (Jesus of Minjung, 1980) and *Chukunja Kaundaeso Ilunara* (Rise from among the Dead, 1981).

In the practicing process, the form of expression became diverse. The madanggük of those times was a work revealing the truth about minjung matters in public; consequently, it was performed in narrative style with realistic description. In addition, it gradually took on a strong field-centered and politico-social character, because it was co-operatively written by the people concerned and was performed by them. Therefore, it was characterized as an open drama to give rise to active participation of the the audience. On the other hand, madanggük positively adopted the principles of traditional t'alch'um such as the episodic structure and setting, the participative method of conveying the line, the practical use of space and time, the operation of *madang pan* and so on. The integration of realistic narrative techniques and principles of traditional t'alch'um led to the creation of the unique principle of madanggük.

In spite of the oppressive situation, the public dialogue through madanggük solidified its peculiar cultural footing, joining with socially participative churches and the influential organizations of the minjung movement and of the democracy movement as well as with activities in colleges. At this time, night schools for workers tried a short drama and role-play, and the Christian Academy presented cultural trials in educational courses for peasants and workers. These cultural efforts of minjung influenced the activities of public dialogue through madanggük of the 1980s.

---

<sup>42</sup> Because of its features of the mask dance, it was called "a creative mask dance" (Lee Y.M. 2001:50).



#### **4.3.4 Practices of Public Dialogue through *Madanggŭk* in the 1980s**

In the spring of 1980, cultural public dialogue entered a new phase through a flood of madanggŭk performances. After the collapse of Park Chung Hee's Yushin dictatorship in 10, 26, 1979, political activity by students grew, and the scope of the cultural movement began to extend into the fine arts, movies, and *p'ungmul* (traditional Korean peasant music) movement as well as the t'alch'um or madanggŭk movement. The Minjung Cultural Movement Association was established in 1984, covering wide spheres such as freedom of speech and the press, women, religion and education including art (Choe S.W. 1988:63). The minjung cultural movement spread to the common people and increased in size leading the "demonstration-culture" in the 1980s, to such an extent that it was called the "madanggŭk age."

What is the reason for the popularity of madanggŭk or creative t'alch'um? Between 1980 and 1987, the dictatorship of Chun Doo Hwan, achieved through his military coup, provoked large scale resistance and a great many demonstrations. Under such circumstances, a long-term popular assembly for thousands or tens of thousands of people was required, and such an assembly could not be maintained only by political slogans. An assembly-culture different from that of the 1970s was needed in the 1980s. Consequently, the cultural performances took the lead in public dialogue of those assemblies (Lee Y.M. 2001:53; 1997a:14).

##### **4.3.4.1 Proxy Assembly**

From the start, madanggŭk took the lead in the student political activities and assemblies of colleges in the 1980s (Lee Y.M. 1997a:15). After ideological circles in the social sciences were forcibly broken up, the cultural or theatrical circles undertook public dialogue through madanggŭk or creative t'alch'um. The students, who could not open the political rally under the oppressive regime, discovered a new channel for expression through the medium of cultural performance. A great many college

campuses, including Seoul National University, held the so-called “*madang pan*” every week. In the open places where almost all college or university students got together, madanggük was performed, depicting the political reality in a creative t'alch'um or madanggük style. This meant that madanggük was a kind of “proxy assembly,” which is why it was often followed by a demonstration. Even if the quality of madanggük works was below standard, madanggük performance was an effective means of public dialogue, arousing the collective sympathies of college students.

During this period, the works of the 1970s, such as *Chin Tonga Gut*, “*Kim Sang Jin's Funeral*” and *Dongil Bangjik Munje Haekyulhara!*, were performed again. On the other hand, new plays were created in 1980:

*Nocktu Kott* (Green Gram Flower), *Nodong'ui Hoetpul* (the Torch of the Labor) dealing with labor disputes,

*Doohwan Chu'm* (Doohwan dance) criticizing Chun Doo-Hwan's *coup d'etat* and the behind-the-scenes immoral collaboration with and endorsement of foreign powers, especially the U.S.A.,

*Kangjaengi Darijaengi* (River Monger and Bridge Monger) also dealing with a satirical criticism of Chun Doo Hwan, concerning the power of the elite's privatization of public policy and their distortion of history at the expense of innocent people.

*Kwanak Gut* and *Sawiyul Gut* are memorial festivals of the April 19 Revolution of 1960, while *Hatnim-kwa Dalnim* (the Sun and the Moon) and *Namsae Gut Nori* (A Play for Shamanistic Ritual of Smell) address social issues.

The madanggük movement introduced a new dimension of subversion into the dominant group. Experiencing subversion with regard to the theme and structure of the dramas provides the performers with an opportunity to transform its art into a cultural mechanism for political discourse, through which people can build a new vision of community through political discourse. Because of this, the player and the audience have become, actively or passively, stigmatized in the establishment's view, as both producer and consumer of a new political discourse. For these reasons, madanggük

became the target of official pressure.

The madanggük in the early 1980s was performed in the field of labor and on the peasant front as well as in college students' rallies. During this period, the activities of the labor unions of Dongil-bangjik, Bando, Wonpung-mobang were strengthened, and the peasants' movement was developed through peasant organizations including the Jeunesse Ouvriere Chretienne (J.O.C: Catholic Young Laborers Association). The t'alch'um circles organized there were at the centre of cultural public dialogue. Since anti-governmental criticism and the challenge to state authority were not permitted, people had to seek a disguised form of resistance. Under these circumstances, madanggük provided a major space for political and social discourse. Through the performance art of madanggük, old issues were revived in order to seek new interpretations in a public space. To use metaphorical language, they raised political questions on current issues of human rights and social justice.

Cultural public dialogue in the field of labor and agriculture, summoning up labor's courage and self-confidence, helped people to manage the so-called "*Nodongja Noripan*" (the worker's play centre) by themselves by filling madanggük with their real experiences of life. One of the famous works of the "worker's play centre" is *Yangbangua Maltuki-ui Tae'rib* (Antagonism between the Aristocratic and his Servant *Maltuki*) created by members of the labor union of the Wonpung woollen textile factory in Daerim-dong, Seoul, and performed at the commemorative ceremony of Labor Day in March 1980. Adapted from a *Maltuki* episode of t'alch'um, it attacked a company manager, satirized a vicious entrepreneur, and made the antagonism between the laborers and the president of the company a main point in the dispute. Evaluated as a drama work, this greatly enhanced the sense of reality and context (Lim J.T. 1990:137-138).

The madanggük works for laborers and farmers in the early and mid-1980s are as follows:

“*Toeji p’uri*” (Pig’s Shamanistic Ritual) portraying the pig market crisis at the end of the 1970s that epitomized the current issue of rural economic instability, and which was performed at Kwangju YMCA and farm villages in March 1980,

*Pungnyun Pungnyun Ttongpungnyun* (Bumper Year, Bumper Year, A Dung Bumper Year) showing the optimistic view of farmers in fighting against an increase in the government purchase price of rice,

*Nomo-gane* (Pass Over) describing the laborers’ suffering as a result of being dismissed for fighting for improved working conditions,

*Jang p’uri* (Shamanistic Ritual for a Market) describing a struggle for the right to live by merchants of Osige local market in Donglae in Pusan province,

*Nong p’uri* (Shamanistic Ritual for Agricultural Village) performed on the subject of peasants’ problems in farming villages in Jinju province,

*Uridry Tasi Iryosunun Nal* (Our Re-standing Day) which was a cooperative composition by union members of the Chungje clothing factory and their stories,

*Chamminjok Haebang-ul uihan Korri-Gut* (Shamanistic Ritual for True National Liberation) warning against national survival being dependent on powerful countries,

*Kaksuri Mo’ydyun Nal* (A beggar’s Meeting Day) performed by a group of oppressed people at a unity festival in Bogumzari village,

*Somorital gut* (Shamanistic Ritual with a Cow Mask) in which the cows indigenous to Korea as well as farmers appeared on stage in order to object against the import of agricultural and stockbreeding products including imported beef,

*Oh Han-sub gut* (Shamanistic Ritual for Oh Han Sub) which is a story of an heir to farming, Oh Han Sub, who committed suicide because of bad debts,

*Ssal p’uri* (Shamanistic Ritual for Rice): Here rice symbolizes Korea’s struggle against the Western world. The drama criticized the way the government dealt with the Uruguay Round Table Talks by depicting how rural agriculture and the traditional Korean cultural identity would be destroyed by an influx of foreign capital and culture. Practices toward peasants and workers also marked the madanggük by the mid-1980s.

These madanggük works are inclined to conjoin closely with the minjung movement because madanggük or t’alch’um was the only medium through which laborers could

express their reality.

#### 4.3.4.2 Labor Drama

With 1987 as its starting point, madanggük began to show the features of the public dialogue for laborers and farmers much more strongly. Before this, public dialogue through madanggük underwent a temporary stoppage during the oppressive political phase between 1985 and 1986.<sup>43</sup> The leading figures took advantage of the standstill period by concentrating on writing about the history and the principles of madanggük. On the other hand, the existing theatre troupes, for instance, the Yonu-mudae, also attempted the modernization of traditional performance.<sup>44</sup>

However, the retrogression of cultural public dialogue was overcome by the efforts of the activists of the madanggük movement, and the period of public dialogue for workers began in earnest. The June Democratization movement of 1987, which aimed at fighting against the dictatorship to prolong the life of Chun Doo Hwan's regime, caused the government to proclaim "the June 29 Declaration." The 6.29 Declaration made it possible to hold a presidential election according to the revised constitution, to release political prisoners, and to secure the freedom of press and speech. Right after the June Resistance, the so-called "Great Labor Strife" broke out on a nationwide scale and lasted from July to August and September of the same year.

In addition, with the turning point to appeasement of a government policy, freedom was given to some extent to the performing art movement. During this time, many madanggük works with formally controlled and suppressed themes poured out (Lim J.T.

---

<sup>43</sup> College madanggük during this period declined not only because of the oppressive situation, but also because of the lack of creative power for madanggük and field experiences with which to fill the contents of madanggük.

<sup>44</sup> Compared with the previous madanggük from college, labor and peasant in their field of work, the dramas "in" the stage space focused on a stage-formalization of folk theme, and so they did not represent the vivid reality that was a characteristic of madanggük performed on "madang" outside the established art world. Therefore, it had its limitations in that it confined the folk performance's living force to the stage.

1990:148), and public dialogue through performing art became widely active in a lawful space.<sup>45</sup> This was the emergence of “a full labor theatre.”

The labor theatre at that time was characterized by an expression of the labor reality focusing on cases representative of the struggle. It aimed to support the struggle, so each dramatic work was performed provincially between 100 or 150 times. According to Rah Won Sick (1989:11), the t'alch'um or madanggük clubs, which were organized in the work place, played a role in increasing the laborers' consciousness and thus drew the masses into cultural public dialogue. He goes on: “The activities of t'alch'um or madanggük contributed much to the achievement of victory for labor dispute by bolstering their enthusiasm for strife.”

The works written after the mid-1980s focused on revealing the collective struggles of minjung against the social contradictions, which is a typical trend in madanggük. The case runs as follows:

*Haetaejegwa Nodongjangui Sarye-gŭk* (A Case Drama of Labor Strife at the Haetae Confectionary Company) dramatized the struggle process for women's right to work in 1985.

*Sunbong-e Soso* (In the Van) treated the Guro collective strife of 1985.

The labor drama of spring of 1987 began with *Shuetmul-cherum* (Like a Rust Stain) and *Uottyon Sang-il nal* (A Certain Birthday) that were performed for workers in a small cultural space of the Guro industrial complex in Seoul (Lee Y.M. 1991:453).

*Saenalul Yonun Saramdul* (People Opening a New Day) reported the struggle case of a mine in Taebak, Kwangwon province.

*Uri Syungli-harira* (We shall Win!) described women's labor struggle of the Free Fashion of German Clothing Company in the City of Irry.

*Makjang-ul Ganda* (Going to Mine) portrayed the struggle of Samchyuk Mine

---

<sup>45</sup> As the first “*Minjokgŭk Hanmadang*” (folk drama festival) started throughout the country in March and April 1988, and the “Association for National Folk Drama Movement” was organized in July, the madanggük movement performed nationwide both nominally and literally.

Industry in Kwangwon province.<sup>46</sup>

*Hoetpul* (Torch), *Nodingja-ui Saebyuk* (Laborer's Dawn), *Don Nolbu-jun* (Korean Scrooge), *Kkyuptegirul Byutkoso* (Taking Off a Shell) were performed by the theatrical troupe "Hyunjang." *Uri Gongjang I'yagi* (A Story of Our Factory), *Ilto-ui Hamsung* (A Great Outcry from Working Place) were performed by "Noripae Handurye." *Huttojimyun Juknunda* of 1989 (If Scattered, We shall Die), *Dongjiyo! Nowa Hamkkeramyun* (Comrade! If We are Together), *Pass Dujang, Pirohwoebokje Hanal* (Two Pieces of PAS, One Pill of Fatigue-Recovering Medicine) and *Himchan Saenal-ul Hyanghoe* (Toward a Powerful New Day) were performed by "Noripae Ilteo."

Among them *Huttojimyun Juknunda* (If Scattered, We shall Die) in particular were made with the aim of supporting all the other struggles for wage increases, by dramatizing the exemplary struggle case for wage increases of the Changwon Sammi Metal Company.

*Minjukkotshinparam* (Democratic Flower and New Wind) portrayed the fight of the democratic labor union against the contemptible maneuvers of the union of Apollo Shoe-making Factory in the City of Pusan.

*Ddaldul-a Iryunara* (Daughters, Stand up!) dealt with the struggle case of the Junil Textile Company of the City of Kwangju.

Meeting spontaneous audiences collectively and continuously through a tour all over the country, performing each play dozens or hundreds of times, these labor madanggük performances tested the madanggük pattern and popularized it at last.

On the other hand, the peasant madanggük was performed against the backdrop of the great peasants' movement which started in 1989. For instances, *Homi pu'ri* (A Story of a Hoe), *A'chum'ma Manse!* (Woman, Hurrah!) and *Hwangso Ul'um* (Cow's Tear)

---

<sup>46</sup> *Uri Syungli-harira!* (We shall Win!) and *Makjang-ul Ganda* (Going to mine), made by the 'Handurye' theatrical troupe in cooperation with the Korean Women's Labor Association during the period of July and August Great Strife, were favourably received by the workers as they dealt with the vivid reality of the labor field and the laborers' optimism and dynamism. That point contrasted strikingly with the works of college madanggük and professional theatrical troupes that showed stylized performances and idealialism.

portrayed the reality of rural problems, touring through agricultural villages. Besides this, there were *Woel'kub Toduk* (Salary Thief) dealing with labor problems, and *Sunsaem'yo* (Teacher!) dealing with educational problems. As mentioned above, the characteristics of madanggŭk as public dialogue after the mid-1980s are condensed in the labor and peasant drama (Lee Y.M. 2001:59-62; 1997a:82,197).

Meanwhile, there is the madanggŭk that deals not with contemporary events but with the past historical events and struggles.

*Horangi Nory* (Tiger Play, 1981) and *Ilosoneun Saramdl* (Standing People, 1988) dealt with the Kwangju May Resistance of 1980.

*Hanlasan* (Hanla Mountain) portrayed the historical event of the 3.1 Mass Slaughter of Cheju island directly after the 1945 Liberation of Korea.

*Zam'nyo pu'ri* (A Shamanistic ritual for Women Divers) showed the struggle of the women divers' of Sehwa village on Cheju island under the rule of Japanese imperialism.

*Gab'ose Ga'bose* (Gab'ose Let's go! 1988) dealt with the historical event of the *Donghak* Revolution of 1894.<sup>47</sup>

*Iddang'un Nikang Nakang* (This Land, Mine or Yours?) relived the massacre of the innocent people of Kuechang.

#### 4.3.5 New Attempts for Cultural Public Dialogue

The public dialogue of the 1980s lays its emphasis through its performances on the inspiration of the collective spirit and on spreading propaganda on a large scale. By ensuring the collective spirit, referred to as *shinmyong*, in the field of student activities and popular assemblies, cultural public dialogue distilled the recognition and the emotion of the people into one, bringing about a voluntary participation in the social movement. After the Gwangju Resistance of May 1980, as new trials of cultural public dialogue, the concepts such as "*madang gut*," "*daedong nori*," "*chongŭk*" and "*tal nori*"

---

<sup>47</sup> *Donghak* Revolution is the revolution that the faithful followers of *Donghak* religion took in leading the protest against the governor's corruption and foreign invasion in 1894.



were proposed. These aimed to strengthen both social participation and the sense of festivity. The purpose was to intensify the directivity toward minjung and their field through “the spirit of play” (Chae & Lim 1982:85).<sup>48</sup>

#### **4.3.5.1 From *Madanggŭk* To *Madanggut***

As a much more progressive and broader notion and praxis became necessary, and in an effort to solve the ideology and mode of performance an article by Chae Hee Wan and Lim Jin Taek (1982:69-87,139) “*From Madanggŭk to Madanggut*” appeared. The literal meaning of *gut* is “a ritual for exorcism.” However, here “*gut*” indicates “festivity of the community” taking root in the life of minjung. The “from *madanggŭk* to *madanggut*” established some guidelines. Firstly, *madanggut* emphasized the need to overcome a Western dramatic mode and to adopt an expressive form of traditional folk performance. It thus suggested that *madang* (an open place for *madanggŭk* performance) should be the central place for *madanggut* and for a field-centered social movement and the collective spirit, *shinmyong*. Secondly, beyond a mere performance tour or an invitation performance, *madanggut* pursued harmony with the assemblies and the events making “life, play, and fight.” Thirdly, to spearhead the cultural and social movements in this age, it should utilize much more diverse expressive media. In one word, the “from *gŭk* to *gut*” implies not a change of expressive mode, but rather a shift from performance-centered to assembly-centered, and from culture to social movement. It is a proclamation of a close relationship with the social movement creating a minjung assembly.

The *madanggut* laid great emphasis on social movement directivity, but was a mere name or an ideological notion in the coercive political atmosphere (Lim J.T. 1990:140). Nevertheless, after 1987, attempts to practice *madanggut* emerged; including *Liberation gut*, *Unification gut*, *Labor gut*, *Street gut* at the tenth anniversary celebration of the Gwangju Resistance, and *Kkotdazi*, that is, a “singing gut” (Lim J.T. 1990:149).

---

<sup>48</sup> Chae Hee Wan and Lim Jin Taek (1982:85) insisted, “The representative spirit of *madanggŭk* is “play-spirit” and “*madang*-spirit.”

#### 4.3.5.2 Life Drama, Short Drama and *Talnori* (Mask Play)

The activists of cultural public dialogue, who had contact with farm villages and laborers, realized the necessity for the simplification of the art form for participation in minjung's reality and society. In the field of labor and peasant, some of the theatrical group proposed "life drama," a kind of amateur drama that the workers created by themselves and in co-operation with co-workers in their life field.<sup>49</sup> "Short drama" was highly thought of in that it suggested a concrete alternative plan to life drama or life education drama with an easy approach based on the *madang* formative principle of t'alch'um (Lim J.T. 1990:144). "*Talnori*" was suggested by the t'alch'um study group when they were in the process of exploring ways to revitalize t'alch'um for effective public dialogue in the present day. It is a style of play in which performers wear a mask and dance out a simple plot during a village or street festival.

These kinds of madanggük are "educational" dramas rather than events or assemblies (Lee Y.M. 2001:86-87). They are part of the programs for non-professionals' self-development or conscientization. So the effect of madanggük as educational drama is not merely confined to recognition and awareness, but encompasses also the acquisition of positive self-expression and confidence, and identifies and intensifies collectivity and community-spirit. This awareness and communal experience allow the participants to experience a voluntary participation in the world.

#### 4.3.5.3 *Daedong Nori*

"*Daedong Nori*" (literally meaning "a play in solidarity") emphasized the festivity, reconciliation and the unity of the community, while *madang-gut* focused on the directivity of political rallies and social movements through collective *shinmyong* (Lim

---

<sup>49</sup> A successful case of public dialogue through a life drama is "*Datzzi puri*" performed by a drama group of housewives called *Dong-uri*, and "Daughter play *madang*" (*Talnori madang*) performed at a function of Women's Equal Fellowship. The reason these live dramas were successful is that groups with common social background performed them voluntarily. However, it has the limitation of mere artificial "drama-making" portraying personal troubles instead of common social consciousness, which results in the loss of collective cohesion.

J.T. 1990:143). Ryu Hae Jung's (1985:155-159) theory of *daedong nori* is emphatic on the need for conscious *daedong nori*, urging the importance of "*Chon-gŭk* (a short drama)." On the assumption that "t'alch'um of today is a short drama *concours* of minjung of today," he regarded a play in the life field as the new *daedong nori* of the present day, consisting of short drama *concours*→ chaotic festival→ group dancing→ candlelight ritual, based on the structure of traditional *daedong nori*<sup>50</sup>. On the other hand, Kim Sung Jin's (1983) theory is a modern seasonal *daedong nori*, setting its core in communal play such as *p'ungmul*, a frantic festival and group fighting-play in a passage ritual.

*Daedong Nori*, which laid stress on collective *shinmyong* and communal relationships, was used as a cultural mechanism for public dialogue in both large and small communities. In fact, *daedong nori* with *p'ungmul*, a tug of war, a singing contest, and a party piece contest was used to solidify the community very effectively during college festivals or cultural festivals of the workers.

#### 4.3.5.4 *Daedonggut* and *Jipchye-gŭk* (Collective Drama)

The concept of "*daedong gut*" appeared to consolidate the directivity of the social movement much more than "*daedong nori*" which advocated festivity and the play spirit.<sup>51</sup> A representative model of *daedong gut* that concentrated all the desires of the community is "*Kkotdazi of Noraepangut*," a large-scale public performance. *Kkotdazi* attempted public dialogue with the collective *shinmyong* in order to solve the workers' common issues by dealing with the reality of the laborer audiences as a theme, thus encouraging active social participation by the audience. It strengthened the totality of life and art, and the collective *shinmyong* among spectators, which are distinctive features of '*gut*' (Park I.B. 1993:30). At the same time, along with such festivity it

<sup>50</sup> The traditional order is street parades (*kil nori*) → chaotic festival (*nanjang*)→ group dancing (*kunmu*)→ mask dance play (*tal nori*)→ ending play (*dwit p'uri*).

<sup>51</sup> The principle of "*gut*" is to release "*han*" of *minjung*. "*Gut*" means that the humans and god enjoy resolving problems together in the process of the play, so the place of "*gut*" indicates the place of "play" (Moon M.M. 1994:140-141; Park I.B. 1987:163-164).

revealed the circumstances and struggles of the public through a combination of diverse genres such as song, drama, *p'ungmul*, dance, poem recitation, and pictures.

In the 1980s the minjung movement increased in size, and public assemblies were open on a large scale. To meet the needs of the times, the madanggŭk performances were also large in size, and focused on festivities in the mode of "total art." As a result, in the latter half of the decade, *Jipchye-gŭk* (Collective Drama) emerged as a new performance art. This was a kind of "total drama" which is formed through a combination of all sorts of media such as music, dance, pictures etc. Besides "*Kkotdazi of Noraepangut*" (1989~1994, 1999), "*Gobu Yuksamazi Gut*" (1984), "*Daedong Jangseunggut for National Unification*" and "*The World Where Minjung Becomes the Host*"(1988) continue to be performed annually by the Minjung Cultural Movement Association as Collective Dramas.

The madanggŭk of the 1980s continued to dramatize the reality of the suffering minjung as it had done during the 1970s. When the government banned speech and writing on a broad scale, many performances mainly covered the facts and events. At the end of the 1980s labor and peasant drama in particular became the main channel for public dialogue through madanggŭk.

As has been noted above, even the characteristics of the style of madanggŭk are connected to the ideological values. In the development of the madanggŭk movement, various concepts were proposed, such as creative drama, minjung drama, field drama, creative *t'alch'um*, *madang-gut*, situational drama, life drama, short drama, *tal-nori* (mask play), *drama-nori* (drama-play), *daedong-nori*, *daedong-gut*, drama of the workers, *noraepangut*, *street-gut*,<sup>52</sup> and collective drama. Through these dramatic forms the principles of festivity and community became strengthened in a social movement-oriented public dialogue through madanggŭk. These concepts embrace the

---

<sup>52</sup> *Street-gut* is an effort to integrate performance with political activity, for instance, "*Streetgut for the True National Liberation*" (1984).

meaning of both the notion of value and of style, and the practical methodology of a performing group. As such, madanggük is not fixed in the style of madanggük but adapts itself to public dialogue with minjung.

Park In Bae (1991:2) explains that the cultural public dialogue through performance art developed on the basis of “three roots of madanggük,” which correspond to the three stages of the development of madanggük. Firstly, it started to form a creative and realistic drama movement, which can be seen as the first root. The second root is the t'alch'um revival movement. In the 1960s minjung consciousness was understood through the lines and contents of the Korean mask dance t'alch'um; in the 1970s the open structure of the *madang pan* and movements based on *shinmyong* of the populace began to be understood through a new type of creative t'alch'um; and in the 1980s the expression of collective *shinmyong* emerged strongly in madanggük, which was not a simple mask dance drama, but a creative and modern application of community culture. The third root is a cultural movement in the field of reality, which originated from making good use of the cultural medium in the agrarian and labor movements. Reaching this root or stage, it was possible for the madanggük to overcome both a mode-centered and a mode-despised perspective, by recognizing the practical attitude and activity of participants beyond the aesthetic or mode-centered pattern. Madanggük played the role of a mechanism for a rich and varied self-expression of minjung reality, from which the public could gain a sense of minjung.

Therefore, as mentioned before, a distinctive characteristic of madanggük as cultural public dialogue is to reflect the reality of minjung life directly in the drama. Madanggük emerged from the practical concern and the expression of reality rather than from pure dramatic experiment (Yeo K.D. 1986:163). Indeed, madanggük developed together with minjung under the Korean national, ethnic and socio-political situation, because it is an activity of artistic expression produced when the practices of justice, peace, and human rights coincided under uncertain circumstances. It was a critical discourse *by* minjung and *for* minjung. That is why madanggük as public dialogue is described as “minjung-

oriented performance art for social change” beyond “a form of art in *madang* (public space).” In this respect, madanggük differed from the established theatre that followed the market trends and targeted particular spectators.

#### **4.4 Interpretation on the Communicability of Madanggük**

Public dialogue through madanggük should be described in terms of the subject, the approach to the subject, and the basic ideology that is followed, because it was more than a performing art in a *madang* space. Thus Chae Hee Wan and Lim Jin Taek (1982:70) describe madanggük as “a concept of value with an ideological system, which is difficult to understand with the explanation of the word only. It is a new ideology created in the process of exploring what the real spirit of theatre is.” It is thus necessary to understand the practical and ideological spheres of madanggük as well as its artistic sphere. In the process of observing who the subject or owner of madanggük is, “the possibilities and limitations of communicability” of madanggük will be explored: its structures; practical approaches to minjung; its ideology; characteristics; meanings and limitations of the practice of the madanggük movement.

##### **4.4.1 Rediscovery of the Populace (Minjung)**

The concern with minjung occurred in both artistic and social spheres. Confronting the reality of minjung alienation in these two spheres, madanggük begins by asking some questions—who should be the main audience, who is the subject of the theatre/drama, and who is the subject of the nation. As has already been explained, the reflection on the loss of traditional heritage and indiscriminately imported Western drama, from which madanggük appeared, meant a criticism of the “anti-minjung directivity” (Lee Y.M. 1997a:35) of the contemporary dramas that had alienated the ordinary people (minjung) from art. The rediscovery of minjung and the awareness of national cultural tradition together formed madanggük. Reflecting on the fact that modern theatre had

become an exclusive art form for a small number of intellectuals only and one which did not deal with the actual lives of the common people, madanggük approached minjung with the purpose of helping them to become the subject of reforming art-culture and society. As Kang Young Hee (1989:193-194) notes, the madanggük movement, resolutely adopting self-renewal by rejecting the mode of imported Western art, became a decisive switchover to the establishment of the “popular orthodoxy of the reformative art movement.” In the process, madanggük has performed public dialogue as a new way to communicate culturally with minjung and to establish minjung’s own initiative.

The concern with minjung is, however, not simply confined to an artistic sphere, but has advanced to accept minjung as “the reformative subject of society” as well as the subject of art. The minjung-oriented madanggük, recognizing minjung as the subject of expression, played an important role as an artistic medium for public discourse under an oppressive social system.

**Voluntary Participation:** The major premise of the populace-centered approach is based on “minjung’s own initiative.” This is revealed, first of all, in that the spectators are accepted as participants. In madanggük performances, there is no sharp distinction between the performer and the audience, which is quite different from conventional drama in which a stage demarcates the theatrical arena from the audience. In most of modern dramas, the theatre concerned selects a specific performance independently, while the audience maintains a passive role and is made up of strangers who have no prior relationship to each other. They do not experience any shared joy or participation during a performance. On the contrary, during madanggük performances, the audience is an indispensable element of the whole drama. The reason is that madanggük is a drama which is created not only unilaterally by performers but also by the active intervention of the audience and is performed through an incessant, direct communication between players and spectators. Through shared dialogue between the two groups, and through the audience’s participation in the whole theatre in a very

open atmosphere, the meaning and symbols of the play are dramatically transmitted from actors to audience.

What is typical of madanggŭk is the audience's experience of sharing the message through "their voluntary participation" in the play. In order to maximize the degree of audience participation, copies of the songs are distributed among them so that they can join in the singing when necessary. During the performance the audience participates in it with appropriate responses such as clapping or certain gestures and cries such as "*olssu!* (Yippee!)" "*olshigu!* (Whoopee!)" and "*chot'a!* (Hurray!)" (Kim K.O. 1997:14). Kim Kwang Ok (1997:11-12) notes that "dialogue is frequent between actors and audience, and the audience responds to the questions and requests of the actors. ... All the audience joins the actors in unveiling the power elites' hypocrisy, greediness, corruption, violation of social justice, and distortion of popular history and so on. After some show of lamentation, the oppressed begin to ridicule the established authority in their own way." At the climax, the drama portrays the victory over evil elements. As Kim Kwang Ok (1997:12) states, "overwhelmed by the joy of the people's victory, all the participants join hands and sing ... and dance" with the performers, or they "raise their fists and shout political slogans at particular dramatic situations" (Kim K.O. 1997:11) in the middle or at the end of the drama. Thus all participants share in the creation of their own communal world.

The fact that *p'ungmul nori* (dancing play with Korean peasant music) is a favorite among the common people before and after madanggŭk and t'alch'um performances show their voluntary desire to play and to speak rather than merely to listen and watch. In this manner, madanggŭk becomes a new medium for realizing their participative will, and for developing a new consciousness by focusing their participative power (Kim S.J. 1983:139).

**Openness:** The space of "*madang*" is also a decisive factor in acceptance of the audience, who are usually minjung (the common people), as the subject of public



dialogue through performance. Madanggük performances are mainly held in a large open door space or a round open area surrounded by spectators, instead of on a conventional stage in a well-appointed theatre. Here, “openness” of space and time is of greatest importance. The open round space of the performance fosters a sense of self-initiative and spontaneity in minjung, which raises the audience’s group spirit. Madanggük does not use stage sets or props, or flats, which divide the performance area into smaller sections.

Lee Yong Mi (1997b:50) explains: “Unlike a proscenium stage where everyone in the audience has the same directional view and where a fixed stage set and a number of props are used, madanggük audiences view the event sitting in a complete circle, all facing the center.” They watch the center of the *madang*, but at the same time they can also easily see the persons sitting next to them or across from them on the other side of the *madang*. Consequently it is possible that “they laugh at the performers from their own viewpoints, but each also shares in the laughter of the people on the other side.” With “multiple perspectives,” the performer and the audience enjoy reacting to each other as a unified group (Lee Y.M. 1997b:50).

Kim Kwang Ok (1997:9) comments on the power of openness as follows: “By sharing a space on the same level, actors and the audience are united to destroy the demarcation lines between themselves, and to deconstruct the wall between the ordinary and the ‘extra’-ordinary world or that between normal and abnormal. ... The madanggük constructs a communal space in which all differentiation and heterogeneity cease to exist throughout the performance.”<sup>53</sup> In one word, it provides a space in which both share in the experience of creating a new world.

**Creative Ability:** Public dialogue through madanggük also devotes itself improving minjung’s creative cultural power. In the madanggük world, minjung is finally

---

<sup>53</sup> That is why even though it is not held outdoors, a performance can be considered as *madanggük* if the performance is held in an open atmosphere, and so a semicircular or fan-shaped performance area is acceptable, provided it is used like a circular space.

perceived as a creative person who has the faculty to produce popular culture fundamentally as well as a participant and the subject of dialogue. Madanggük itself functions as an opportunity to show off their creative ability while participating in collective writing and producing of madanggük works. One participates in madanggük not only to share a particular message, but also to project one's ideas onto the message. In this aspect, the participants both produce and receive what is generated by the drama.

Madanggük acknowledges minjung as participants in a performance, as subjects of public dialogue through the performing art, and further, as persons with a creative power in producing a dialogic play. It evokes a world of renewal and creativity. The most important point is the fact that this concern with minjung results in a change in the concept of minjung from a "stationary understanding" that considers minjung as the oppressed class to a "dynamic understanding" that regards minjung as the subject of history and a reformative being (Jung C.Y. 1984:157-158). In madanggük, the audience (who is mainly minjung including students and activists) is not only the object but also the subject of performance. The minjung-inclined public dialogue throughout madanggük strengthens the communal spirit and the participative spirit of "we are one," and goes beyond the demarcation paradigm of "subject and object."

#### **4.4.2 Re-Creation of Traditional Folk Culture**

The madanggük movement for public dialogue is a new starting point, as mentioned above, in that it acknowledges the function of art as a new method of communication accepting minjung as the subject of art and society. Popular directivity in the dimension of art means looking at the contemporary phenomenon squarely with minjung's eyes and putting oneself in minjung's place. Therefore, Lim Jin Taek (1990:14-16) asserts that "the culture that does not deal with minjung reality such as their suffering, joy and sorrow is difficult to call true culture." It means that the value of a performance depends not on the character of the dramatic piece itself, but on whether it deals with the reality

of minjung or not, and whether all minjung can accept and enjoy it or not.

Madanggük is of significance in that a new performing art for public dialogue was independently created on the basis “not of the foreign but of the Korean native” when the Korean culture had reached an extreme point in the extinction of traditional culture through the reckless import of Western culture and the government’s restoration of traditional culture. In a word, madanggük is a product of a reflection on the transplanted and imitation of Western drama. At the same time, with the subjective consciousness of art, it has the character of positively developing Korean traditional performing art that had been undervalued since the colonial period (Lee Y.M. 2001:70).

Madanggük used traditional Korean culture such as *p’ungmul*, *t’alch’um* including traditional peasant musical instruments like the drum, *changgo* and folk song to develop public discourse by minjung and for minjung. These had been invented by the minjung themselves and they had enjoyed them without the special instructions of professionals. Therefore, on the premise that the minjung of today can also create and enjoy them just as the minjung of the past did, madanggük used the patterns of traditional culture. As already mentioned, college students who participated in the madanggük movement discovered a space to achieve the re-creation of national culture and the restoration of minjung-directivity in “Korean folk culture.” In the place of folk culture, they intended to combine the two tasks of nation and minjung, and then to stir up zeal for national consciousness and minjung consciousness (Chae 1982:195). Many modern-day playwrights have experimented with applying traditional aspects to their own plays. However, Lee Yong Mi (1997b:58) states: “Unfortunately, these modern-day plays have only applied the superficial aspects of traditional performing arts such as dances and scene, characters and events, texture, and musical and artistic elements. Only madanggük has fully accepted and applied the deep, overall principles of Korea’s traditional performance arts.”

Indeed, the internal formalizing theory and unique characteristics of madanggük are

nothing other than the basic principles of Korea's traditional performing arts. The key aspects of madanggŭk such as the *p'an* (context, field), its utilization of time and space, the relationship between the performers and the audience, the play's unique and artistic characteristics, and its attitude toward the common people and the world have all been directly inherited from traditional Korean performing arts.

For instance, madanggŭk's script does not flow as smoothly or as inevitably as the well-crafted contemporary scripts of other theatre. The flow between episodes and details may be presented in an omnibus style, and a certain level of suspense may occur as in a folktale. The appearance of different characters and topics in each episode is typical of traditional mask-dance theatre. By contrast, a coherent story and a degree of suspense as in a folktale are typical of *p'ansori*. Moreover, the spectators' response to the drama also follows a traditional cultural pattern. Spectators who are also participants are expected to properly understand the direction of the story and to participate appropriately in the drama with the basic knowledge to appreciate traditional popular culture. They know how to give the proper responses at various stages during the performance process. Participants take any seat they choose and they eat homely foods such as *p'ajon* (spring onion pancake) and *ttok* (steamed rice cake) with *makkolli* (peasant rice liquor). Immersing themselves in peasant fare, they abandon their refined table manners, partaking of peasant traditions and singing and dancing in a rather rustic way.

**Popular Aesthetic Sense:** Various social, cultural and religious organizations took considerable interest in folk culture such as *nong-ak* (peasant music), *p'ansori*, and *t'alch'um* which had been treated contemptuously as being vulgar and thoughtless, and *gut* which had even been condemned as a superstition. Why is folk cultural heritage widely regarded as irrational and vulgar in the academic and religious realms? It is because of "the minjung-inclination toward the folk culture," which is closely related to the life of the populace.

Folk culture is the expression of an activity and struggle for production by minjung with their body and language. The minjung-directivity, minjung aesthetic sense and minjung's acting power in folk culture coincided with the line madanggük activists took in cultural consciousness and action policy (Park I.B. 1987:147; Chae 1982:168-170). At madanggük performances such as traditional mask dance drama, the humble and secular objects, which are cultural elements in particular traditional performances, are mobilized and organically intertwined in order to weave the entire story. Performers wear dirty and shabby peasant clothes, and use coarse and vulgar language. Their gestures and body language are often obscene and they are given to impromptu expressions of unbridled emotion as might be witnessed in the everyday milieu of the common people.

Madanggük emphasizes the importance of the body. The performers' movements are the most important tools in the performance, because those who work physically for their living are more prominent than those who make their living by using their intelligence and education. So the actions of the main characters carry more weight and importance than their lines in madanggük. Madanggük introduces quite a few key characters from the lower social classes. The main characters often do not rely on intellectual knowledge, but use wisdom gained from life experience. They usually have minor character flaws, but the play deals with these characters optimistically and humorously. These characters display individuality, but the performance group itself often appears as "collective hero" in the performance. In addition, the madanggük plays use colloquial language in vulgar expressions and gestures, while other modern and contemporary Korean plays sometimes use literary expressions that render conversation somewhat stilted and awkward. For troupes performing in rural areas, the appropriate use of the particular region's dialect and unique vernacular can be crucial to the play's success. As in Korea's traditional performances, madanggük likewise frequently uses comic dialogue and wordplay as well as impromptu conversation among the performers and between the performers and the audiences. Rather than beauty or sublimation, madanggük highlights the ugly and the vulgar, the sorrows of

the lower classes rather than heroic tragedy, and satirical, humorous beauty rather than the tragic beauty.

Although it takes its artistic mode from traditional folk, madanggük does, however, transform it creatively. The adaptation of traditional culture in madanggük performances is a “creative or reformative” inheritance effectively revealing the popular reality and minjung features in both style and content through traditional culture appropriate to the dynamic expression of popular life (National Theatre Institute 1988:336).

The reception of traditional culture has been realized in both concepts of “creative t'alch'um” or “madanggük.” Lim Jin Taek (1990:45) claims that “while creative t'alch'um is an orthodox inheritance of traditional folk culture, madanggük is a modern inheritance.” To start with, the madanggük movement adhered to an original form of traditional t'alch'um, but gradually recomposed the t'alch'um script based on the Bible and reality. After the experience of the workplace, madanggük began to make great reforms by either ignoring t'alch'um or changing it. Advancing a step further, the modernization of tradition not only revived the spirit of social criticism found in t'alch'um, but also utilized the episodic unfolding of story and music or masks, certain dance gestures, and even the concept of performance in any possible empty space. In this manner, by accepting the expressive actions of traditional folk performance art that takes on an extrovert and open mood in a *madang*, madanggük more easily reached the minjung who had not previously been able to accept it due to difficult dance motions and language of t'alch'um (Lee G.R. 1995:30-31; Lee Y.M. 2001:47).<sup>54</sup>

However, public dialogue through madanggük needs to go beyond the limits of traditional style or creative tradition. To search for more effective ways of “mutual communication,” it attempted to mobilize all sorts of traditional cultures and mass communication media, for instance, the tape recorder, slides, film, narratives, pictures,

---

<sup>54</sup> *Chinogui* is the first work of “creative” inheritance of tradition.

cartoons, poems, popular songs, singing the rewritten words of folk songs or popular songs, monodrama, short drama, life drama, field drama, role-play, rhythmic gymnastics etc., including various folk cultures such as folk play, folk story, folk song, *p'ungmul*, *p'ansori*, *gut* and so forth. The forms of madanggük are many and varied, that is, the form of *gut* getting rid of a bitter feeling, the form of a court drama, the satirical drama form, the narrative drama form and an impromptu little dramatic performance. It conveyed its message through narrative and atmosphere rather than through individual gestures.

**Collective Spirit:** The use of the traditional aspects, especially *p'ungmul* and songs, gave rise to directives and strong group emotions and a festive quality, which are in danger of extinction in modern theatre, but distinctive to madanggük. It caused the group spirit called *shinmyong* in Korean which is a decisive factor in demonstrating the power of the community and which gave rise more effectively and voluntarily to a sense of enthusiasm for the organization and collectivization of public dialogue (Lee Y.M. 1997a:282-284). With the group spirit of *shinmyong* and the feeling of freedom produced by the open structure of madanggük, minjung could develop their consciousness more strongly and oppose the distorted establishment (Park I.B. 1985:429).

The experience of *shinmyong* and the popular aesthetics such as humor and sorrow are the essence of our human heritage. Madanggük reminds us of the ultimate beauty and virtue of that heritage, and it rediscovers the popularity and importance of the workers. Due to these minjung-oriented and minjung-representative characteristics, madanggük gained popularity.

Therefore, the concern of traditional culture in madanggük performances is not merely “a manifestation of the consciousness of nationalism, but rather a promotion of the consciousness of democracy and of the populace-directivity” (Chae 1982:193-194) with the group spirit and the minjung initiative. Such a positively creative adaptation of

traditional culture helped to prevent the cultural movement from becoming immersed in mannerism, and instead, encouraged it to approach the populace easily and to promote *minjung* so that it became the subject of art and history.

#### 4.4.3 Their Own Story and Realism

As discussed above, *madanggük* borrowed heavily for its setting and structure from traditional folk culture of the past, especially *t'alch'um*. However, it was always intensely interested in the present and realism. Opposing the existing drama that fails to concern social reality, *madanggük* is the result of a new theatrical experiment in the form of a modernized traditional performance with the aim of critical dialogue about the present distorted social reality. Therefore, according to Chae Hee Wan (1982:195,210), *madanggük* is to become “life-art” pursuing “the aggregation of life” through the group spirit called *shinmyong* in a play-*madang*, and attempting “the return of play to daily life.” Thus, as *t'alch'um*<sup>55</sup> deals with a common understanding of *minjung*'s routine affairs, including social issues, so *madanggük* contains the problems of all sorts of people from all walks of life: that is, the problems of farming villages, factories, labor disputes, local areas and suburbs, religion and historical consciousness.

These are *minjung*'s own stories and matters of common interest, in which the viewpoint of the populace, especially the angle of working people, is reflected. That is why the content of *madanggük* is generally narratives revealing *minjung* realities and not fiction. The *minjung*'s own stories help the populace to re-recognize the reality and struggle against unfair oppressive elements, and finally lead the festival to eulogize the victory of the *minjung* community in the *madanggük* performance. Therefore, *madanggük* is a path to the present-recognition and its expression, and a process of

---

<sup>55</sup> The content of *t'alch'um* deals with *minjung*'s common affairs: various conflicts of status and various confrontations of *minjung* <Yangban (the Aristocratic class) Episode>, the falsehood of formal morality and ideology <An Apostate Monk Episode>, questions of family system, the phenomenon of disintegration of peasants, and the death of *minjung* <An Old Woman called Miyal Episode>, and the questions of lives of the alienated class such as low people <A Leper or A Deformed Person Episode>.



sharing this reality-recognition.

**Familiarity:** No matter which stories madanggük deals with from political or current issues, historical events, the life stories of individuals, the fate of a particular group of people, or classical novels, the stories are so “familiar” to the spectators that they can share a prior knowledge and anticipate how the story will be developed. Instead of wondering at the outcome of the performances, the audience of madanggük revels in the expectation of how the familiar story will be presented. Just as a fascinating fairy tale is exciting no matter how many times it is told, or an annual traditional theatrical performance is a delight each year, so madanggük performance that has shared experiences and common interests as its main content is always entertaining.

**Counterculture:** It is obvious that madanggük conveys political messages with no serious consideration of aesthetics. For this reason, there have been hot debates centering on the question of whether madanggük is a new form of art or merely the cultural instrument of political movements. First of all, madanggük was regarded as an experimental attempt to create a new form of art as a challenge to the dominant one, which was based on Western traditions. In this sense, it might still be seen as an alternative offering to aesthetics. On the other hand, it was a dissembled form of resistance offering an ideal mechanism for the public discourse denied at every other level. Thus it can be said that madanggük is a kind of “counterculture” in the sense that performers apparently ridiculed the elite culture, and attempted to secularize the sacred and privileged culture of the dominant class. They argue that the elite culture is artificial without a viable sense of reality and is, instead, steeped in a grotesque misunderstanding of reality. Therefore the challenge that the new art style presents to conventional ones reveals a confrontation between the power of the dominant and the resistance of the subordinate. Through the use of violent language and gestures, they stimulated a direct confrontation with the enemy and an eventual victory over that enemy. Therefore, madanggük as a public dialogue is a space to locate cathartic,

symbolic experiences of rebellion and rejuvenation.

To experience renewal with regard to the theme and structure of the theatre provides an opportunity to transform its art into a cultural mechanism for political discourse, through which people can construct their own world of resistance. The process by which this occurs is not confined to an experience of rejecting or negating reality, but it is rather a process of creating an alternative world by elevating humble everyday life to sacred revolutionary art.

Most madanggük aims at a new historical consciousness rather than a refinement of artistic quality. Themes are various, but they share an anti-establishment ideology and a criticism of government in relation to human rights, social justice, human emancipation, and legitimacy of power. More than that, they aim, in the name of the minjung, to bring into the public arena, the historical experiences of the common people who have been subdued, silenced or made peripheral through “official” definition. Madanggük stories all share the strong message that a powerful elite-centered national history should be replaced by a history of the experience and ideas of those who have been the powerless majority, minjung. An underlying theme of various forms of madanggük is about the exploited and dominated peasants who have sacrificed themselves in order to feed the whole nation, to protect the country from foreign invasions, and to maintain a national community. Meanwhile, powerful elites such as bureaucrats, military officers, businessmen, wealthy professionals are described as greedy and immoral exploiters, brokers and agents of foreign capital and power without any sense of responsibility toward their nation. Through participation in the madanggük performance, people, regardless of their actual social status and background, are identified as the exploited and oppressed populace. Because of this, producers and active participants of the madanggük, including audiences, have to some extent come under governmental suspicion for being antiestablishment activists or potential dissidents.

**Humor and Satire:** Although their reality is miserable and poverty stricken, this reality is expressed in the way, not of tragedy and seriousness, but of “humor and satire.” At madanggük performances, the tragedy of life is dissolved into the comic through self-objectification, which becomes the motive of life. All this is done in a rather festive mood (Chae 1982:204). “Laughter” is a driving force with which the spectators who participate in madanggük will overcome the difficulties of life, and which will change their reality. The finale of madanggük maximizes the effect of laughter. “*Twit-p’uri* (Ending Play)” is arranged at the ending part of madanggük so that all performers and spectators sing and dance together. Here, the world of madanggük goes through the process of reconciliation before it ultimately reaches a festival mood that is presented in the elements of traditional performance.

Dealing with the populace’s stories as a main theme, and taking the popular traditional culture as a main form, madanggük could rouse the group spirit called *shinmyong* and win public sympathy. The *shinmyong* and a festival mood are not individual-oriented but a way in which all spectators and performers express their desires for a better future with the sense of community.

#### **4.4.4 Field Directivity outside the Theatrical World**

Public dialogue through madanggük is based on a dynamic outlook on culture; that is, culture is not only a result of the system and structure of society, but also a force to reform the system and structure of society, namely a power for “praxis.” The power to reform is actualized as the general value only through practical participation in a concrete productive field of society based on community.<sup>56</sup> In fact, the creative inheritance of tradition in madanggük means not an ideological insistence, but is related to practical action. Madanggük begins with the premise that tradition is not

---

<sup>56</sup> For this, some suggest the reform of a style of life culture, productive community movement, and community-culture with community movement (Hwang S.J. 1983:384; Park I.B. 1985:423).

isolated from the reality of today; rather, it should be used as a source to arouse the power of life of the populace.

**Change of Distribution Structure:** Therefore, public dialogue in madanggük, recognizing the populace as the subject of art and history, planned a change of “distribution structure” as well as a change of content to realism. So, it started its activities outside the theatrical world. From the beginning, considering not only the change of each theatric work, but also the structural change of the whole performance culture, including popular culture, the madanggük movement fulfilled various minjung-oriented activities outside the theatrical world (Lee Y.M. 1997a:61-64).

What is the reason for madanggük’s persistence outside the theatrical world? Because minjung-oriented madanggük pursued the place related to minjung (Lee Y.M. 1997a:44; 2001:71),<sup>57</sup> it placed the center of activities not in a theatre, but in the minjung life field. On the other hand, this is because the established theatre was only for a small number of intellectuals, so even though a progressive play was performed, if it were in the theatre, the drama could give meaning only to a handful of spectators. In contrast, the leaders of the madanggük movement always insisted that art is not a special genre for the privileged nor should it be confined to a particular space set apart from everyday life. In addition, contrary to documentary literature and objects of art, performing art disappeared after the performance in a specific space and time.

For these reasons, madanggük reached a conclusion that a mere change in the content and the style of a drama was not enough to reform the theatrical culture fundamentally, and furthermore, could not contribute to social reforms. According to the necessity for change in the whole distribution structure of performance as well as the content and style, madanggük enters the field of the minjung’s life where the people can meet, directly in the field of college students and intellectuals’ political movements,

---

<sup>57</sup> The minjung-directivity is a ground for madanggük to become active outside the existing theatre circle centering on the intellectual audience, but on the other hand, it causes madanggük to become alienated from the current system of cultural heritage.

labor movements and agricultural movements (Lee Y.M. 1997a:37,59). The main performing and acting space is moved to 'outside a stage' called *madang* which means not only open ground, but also implies the broader meaning of "the field of life" of the common people, to come into direct and close contact with them. That is why madanggük was performed at prayer meetings for the poor, at college festivals, corporate establishment day celebrations, labor union demonstration sites, village parties, and events for environmental causes.

**Social Movement-Directivity:** Considering that most national literature and national fine art generally placed importance on the activities "in" the literary world or "in" an exhibition hall, the outward approach of madanggük is unfamiliar. This very outward angle led to a realization of the fact that dramaic art and its spectators could exist even "outside" the theatrical world, and the people outside the theatre had to be the major audience of performance. As a result, madanggük spread the activities of the movement for the propagation of madanggük (Lee Y.M. 1997a:37) to the movement for a progressive drama which takes an important part in the domain of social movement. In other words, by functioning as a place for social and political discourse, it could go beyond the limits of reaction and ultra-nationalism of traditional art or a simple art movement, and advance toward the whole minjung cultural movement outside the theatrical world.

As such, the entry into the life field of minjung and social movement is a major premise of madanggük and its participation in society. As a result, madanggük is regarded in general as a progressive drama guaranteeing the directivity of social movement and injecting the truth of the minjung's reality into the theatre to the highest degree.

Meanwhile, its aspect as a progressive theatre movement outside the theatrical world incurred the criticism of both government and art purists. The government regarded madanggük as unorthodox and an anti-aesthetic act, damaging the original form of t'alch'um. Government-initiated cultural heritage strives only to preserve the original

form, and it is neither a modern inheritance nor a creative modification. On the other hand, madanggŭk has been accused of having a “single-minded ideological inclination,” of being a “tool for reactionary propaganda,” a “politically designed frame” for viewing the world, a physical space for an “uncontrolled expression of desire,” the “political instrumentalization of art” and much more. Moreover, the social movement-oriented characteristics incurred the criticism of art critics who said that madanggŭk was not refined enough to be a genre of art. Some called it a part of a dilettantish guerilla movement aimed at the destruction of conventional art criteria (Kim K.O. 1997:7-8; Lee Y.M. 2001:72).

Because of its characteristics of social participation in the field, madanggŭk could not gain any government support or industrial mass production; instead, it was reproduced and developed mainly by amateur college students and intellectuals from college drama societies and some theatrical troupes, and further the positive minjung class of the audience such as laborers and peasants. Despite these criticisms, however, it became increasingly popular among the populace. The minjung-directivity outside the government and the theatrical world evoked an intimacy with the populace, which was a decisive factor in the spread of madanggŭk to both progressive intellectuals and the common people.

Lim Jin Taek (1990:85) describes the nature of madanggŭk using the following four terms: “the situational truth,” “the collective *shinmyong*,” “the field-centered movement,” and “the minjung representativity.” Madanggŭk has the nature of “the situational truth” in that it made people face up to reality by disclosing the falseness and contradiction of society. The situational truth of reading reality evoked the collective *shinmyong* as the group spirit. Here, *shinmyong* is a driving force of the play which releases and gets rid of suffering and hardened *han* (a mixed feeling of sorrow and regret unique to Korean people) by calling together all the opposing factors, such as antagonistic relationships and conflicting opinion, into one place “*madang*.” Thirdly, the newly repetitive reading reality and the group spirit *shinmyong* induce “the field-centered movement” to allow

participation in social movements in the living field. Lastly, it shows “minjung representativity” in that minjung becomes an owner of the art and the subject of society through the artistic experience of minjung life. As Chae Hee Wan (1985b:5) asserts: “the madanggŭk movement is *the cultural movement* to unite and share the fight to live in the field of life, *the social movement* jointly to reveal and resolve the hidden reality, and *the life-community movement* to celebrate in advance the life of the Third World in national *shinmyong*.”

## 4.5 Meaning and Limitation of Madanggŭk Performance

### 4.5.1 Mutual Communication

Madanggŭk is a new attempt for public dialogue to respond to the context of both art and society through a mechanism of performing art-culture. In short, the representative characteristics of madanggŭk are summarized into four: *minjung-directivity*, *festivity/artistry*, *realism* and *praxis*, which are based on the principle of mutual communication with openness.

Firstly, public dialogue through madanggŭk accepted the marginalized people, *minjung*, as the main audience, that is, the subject which would form and reform art and society. The meaning of minjung-directivity in the sense of public dialogue is that it served to change the communication pattern of theatre from “one-way communication” in which the audience just watches the theatre on a stage, to “participative mutual-communication” in which they take part in the theatre as the subject of the artistic world.<sup>58</sup> Consequently, madanggŭk became “participative theatre” (Seo Y.H. 1997:122) based on mutual communication because the performance proceeded with participants’ active participation, and direct criticism and plain interference between

---

<sup>58</sup> The minjung-directivity, as already described, led to a change in the concept of minjung from the oppressed to the subject and the reformative being.

performers and spectators were permitted.

Secondly, through the creative adaptation of traditional Korean culture, especially the traditional mask dance which inspired the collective spirit, *shinmyong*, and minjung aesthetic senses, the cultural public dialogue fulfilled the function of social integration, because anyone who is Korean can sympathize with traditional art-culture in the performance of *madang*. It was not, however, confined to the style of traditional performance, but rather utilized diverse styles.

Thirdly, a more important point here is the fact that it neither hid in the other world with utopian illusions nor did it remain in the world of performing art-culture itself. On the contrary, by taking narratives of reality and biblical messages in the form of traditional performing art, the cultural public dialogue attempted to communicate between the past (tradition) and the present (reality of minjung and society). In fact, the content of *madanggük* not only “mirrors” the social contradictions, but also “produces” a solution.

The meaning of *madanggük* as a mutual communication is, lastly, that it showed the dimension of “Christ’s transformation of society and art-culture” by pursuing field-directivity and the social participative movement as well as dealing with reality. Public dialogue through *madanggük* accepted any “public space of life”<sup>59</sup> as a place for performance and social participation, beyond the narrow meaning of *madang* as “outdoors space.” Its very field-directivity meant entering into the life-field to take part in social movements, such as political, labor, and peasant movements. In such a praxis process, *madanggük* became a space in which the line of demarcation between social strata or between performers and spectators was ignored, and consequently, it fulfilled the function of dynamic mutual communication. Moreover, through the activities in the life field, *madanggük* tried to insure the dimension of “praxis” (in the minjung’s life-field) as well as “artistry” (based on tradition) and “realism” (in the content). The public dialogue through *madanggük* came to possess characteristics of dynamic mutual-

---

<sup>59</sup> Any place where people gather together is used as a space for *madanggük*.



communication in that it attempted a synthesis of artistic function (artistry) and social function (praxis) fundamentally on the grounds of the collective *shinmyong*, communality, and festivity that evoke the communal communication.

#### 4.5.2 Mediating Structure

Madanggŭk implies a “mediating structure” (Berger & Neuhaus 1977)<sup>60</sup> which connects the individual in private life with the large system in public life, and finally reduces the estrangement and isolation from society and public order. In addition, it has the dimensions of an “artistic” mediating structure. Gibson Winter (1981:11) suggests that the fundamental metaphor for the future should change from a techno-scientific process to an artistic process. As a matter of fact, the art culture (expressive culture) such as symbol and language has fulfilled the function of an effective communication in church and society. The Scripture is also an expression through language and symbol, through which it conveys the real meaning of the Word, and furthermore, through which the Christian community can renew the culture (Niebuhr 1951).

Madanggŭk is obviously an artistic form through which the connection of value-culture with action-culture can be maintained through the mechanism of expression-culture (art-culture). In this process, it both integrates and renovates (or transforms) both culture and society. From the viewpoint of public dialogue, madanggŭk serves as the momentum to transcend the limitations of the public dialogue of the Korean church that was set in an extreme social resistance pattern. As a new pattern of public dialogue integrating art and social movement (artistry and praxis), madanggŭk can become a mediating structure to convert a resisting pattern of public dialogue into an art-cultural pattern. That is why this dissertation considers madanggŭk as a starting point for an alternative cultural public dialogue.

---

<sup>60</sup> Peter L. Berger emphasizes the importance of the four kinds of mediation structure; neighborhood, family, church, volunteer organization.

### 4.5.3 New Reading Reality and New Field Recognition

A question should be raised here as to whether madanggük can still serve as an artistic medium for public dialogue to combine value culture and action culture, and to overcome the resistance pattern of public dialogue in the same way as before. In order to answer this question, it is essential to describe the causes of the decline of madanggük.

Madanggük was at its peak from the 1980s to the early 1990s, but from 1992 its influence declined remarkably. The change to the regime into Kim Yong Sam stirred in the people a sense of stability derived from their escape from extreme dictatorship on the one hand, and a feeling of helplessness from the failure of popular political trials and a realization that this was not a perfect democratization on the other. These two complex feelings led to political apathy among the general public and weakened the cohesive power of the existing organizations. Under these circumstances and without the collective cohesive power of the people, madanggük was confronted with a crisis of public dialogue.

Public sentiments generally turned with the changes in the political situation. By the 1980s the works of madanggük were passionate rather than calm, emotional rather than rational, with obvious rather than delicate sensibilities, and straightforward rather than indirect. Because madanggük was a historical production from the times when the division between ally and enemy was as clear as day, it was unnecessary to ask what we should be counteracted and fought against. Therefore, the times called for “an indomitable will” that aroused indignation, courage and awareness of strife rather than “recognition” of the situation and struggle (Lee Y.M. 1997a:155-156).

As a result of the changing situation, the slogan “let’s fight!” no longer has meaning; instead, “*how to fight*” becomes a serious issue. The demand of the times is to progress to a new stage. The passion for popular meeting died down and the populace

prefers a rational attitude with an objective and realistic analysis to passionate attitude. The works based on this composure are more fashionable than those of agitated or vehement emotion, and a novel presenting the reality of the day is more acceptable than sharp poetry. A lyrical popular song in minor enjoys popularity more than a combative marching song.

In addition, in earlier days, no assembly or gathering was allowed under the Law on Assembly and Demonstration except on a small scale at “*madang*” of the factory, church, and farm village. Now the situation is different from what it used to be. In the present times, it is possible to assemble in an open space, even in a public square in front of the City Administration Building and the National Assembly Building. A meeting place grows too large to be called “*madang*,” social issues are much bigger on a nationwide scale, and the group becomes a *gesellschaft* rather than a community (*gemeinshaft*). This means that the value of “*madang*” has been lost.

If madanggük is performing art for public dialogue, it ought to communicate with the changing circumstances. The communication indicates a demand for a new reading of reality and a new field consciousness. However, madanggük has failed in public dialogue in the changing present times. As a result of this failure, madanggük is regarded as only one of many traditions, and as a passing fad once used in the expression culture of public dialogue. Some insist that the cause of the decline of madanggük lies in the “un-modernity and feudalism in its form and mode” (The Writing and Producing Department of Minjung Cultural Movement Alliance 1988; Theatrical Group ‘Hankang’ 1988:3). However, the root cause is to be found in the loss of a sense of reality. Lee Yong Mi (1991:451-452; 1997a:203-217) sets forth a counter-argument about the matter of mode, and insists as follows: “Madanggük is neither a simple inheritance of the t’alch’um mode nor a simple result of a national drama revival movement. So, consequently, the madanggük mode cannot be identified with the t’alch’um mode. Therefore, the stagnation of madanggük is not because of the feudalism of the mode itself, but because it did not invent a new trend of theatrical work

suitable to the changing circumstances.”

#### **4.5.4 The Problem of Dual Opposition**

Besides new readings of reality and new field-directivity, there are other problems to solve in public dialogue through art-culture. First of all, the public dialogue through madanggük obviously leaned towards a social movement. As described above, the reason madanggük became social movement-oriented at that time was that it, including creative t'alch'um, was the only form through which the reality of the situation could be expressed culturally. Therefore, Lim Jin Taek (1990:137-138) explains that if the social situation had moved in the direction of democracy, the cultural aspect of madanggük would have flourished. However, under the situation of oppressive dictatorship, the minjung could not help throwing themselves completely into the social movement itself. They could not afford simply to enjoy the artistic production. This is why madanggük took the direction of social movement rather than that of art-culture.

Secondly, as a result of a bias towards a social movement, the theme and content of madanggük also began to deal particularly with “social events” rather than “daily life.” In the days when madanggük flourished, as a matter of fact, social events meant the daily happenings of minjung, so it was out of the question to hold a bias to social events in madanggük performances. Later, however, the society changed and gained the freedom of speech, and could publicly express their opinions about social events. This meant that it became necessary to deal with their daily life apart from social events. However, madanggük did not respond to the changing times. The trouble was that madanggük did not secure the sphere of daily life. This is the second reason for madanggük disappearing without a trace.

However, madanggük of the past should not be devaluated by being judged according to the values of the present. Considering the time when it achieved success as public dialogue, madanggük played a valuable role in that context. It read the times, so it was

possible to create art-cultural public dialogue to communicate with society as well as with the individual and art. Therefore, the focus of this dissertation lies on the transformation of public dialogue through madanggük on a basis of analysis and criticism that is appropriate to the changing context of today. This thesis examines the possibility of “the performance on *madang*” as a pattern of art-cultural public dialogue. What does it mean that madanggük performance becomes public dialogue? The term “public dialogue” is a compound word. Therefore, the word implies two tasks: one is “to dialogue,” the other is that the dialogue is “public.” It indicates the need for mutual communication. The dialogue is an “open mutual dialogue” and “public dialogue” to end all kinds of antagonism, and goes beyond the closed and private dialogue only with congenial people.

Therefore, madanggük should fundamentally overcome the phenomenon of “binary opposition” that is the basic cause of its decline so that it can retrieve the meaning of communicability as art-cultural public dialogue. The binary opposition of madanggük is summarized into three. Firstly, madanggük was confined by the limits of binary opposition in the aspect of who the subject of the performing art is. It chose minjung art in the question of whether it should be the folk art for minjung or the pure art for the minority of intellectuals. Secondly, it showed binary opposition in the aspect of ideology. It inclined to social movement orientation in the choice between artistic function (artistry) and social movement. Thirdly, it revealed binary opposition in the content and theme by choosing social events rather than daily life.

From the beginning, the madanggük was antithetical. Ironically, it appeared to be a class-oriented movement in that it was a struggle against the partial purism of high culture or Western-oriented art, it was a channel of expression for the oppressed minjung, and its stories were mainly about the lives and the ideology of oppressed and impoverished peasants and workers. It was, as already mentioned, a contribution of madanggük to acknowledge the alienated minjung in the pure art world and society as the subject of art and society. On the other hand, because of this orientation, some

critics point out that madanggük did not aim at constructing a space for public discourse among people of different classes and cultural backgrounds. In addition, considering the fact that the failure of madanggük as public dialogue in the present resulted from the fact that madanggük was bound in the antithetical structure of binary opposition, the task of art-cultural public dialogue through madanggük performance lies in the restoration of “a participative and mutual communication” and “a communal space” with turn-taking interaction between the two separate realms, i.e. the binary opposition of social-directivity and artistic-directivity.

## CHAPTER 5

# TOWARD AN ALTERNATIVE MADANG PUBLIC DIALOGUE: “THREE MODELS” OF DIALOGIC COMMUNICATION

This chapter concerns an exploration of an alternative pattern of public dialogue. The main question of this thesis is as follows: how will the church overcome church-individualism and exclusivism? How can the Christian community recover the public sphere, under circumstances in which the church has lost its influence upon others (non-Christian / society) and become itself a private matter? That is a matter of public dialogue. The concrete method to approach this will be found in Jesus' Great Commission as mentioned in Chapter 1.

*“Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them... and teaching them.”*  
(Matthew 28: 19-20)

*“Go into all the world and preach the good news to all creation.”* (Mark 16:15)

Concerning the great commission, this thesis has laid emphasis on the “public dialogue” of the church with others. Simply put, “the public dialogue through madang-theatre” is indeed a practical strategy to perform the great commission. In other words, the madang public dialogue is nothing more than following the commission.

(1) **Go!** : This is the church's first step in public dialogue or in the great commission. The church community is called upon not to remain within the wall of the church, but to “go” out; that is, not to wait for others, but to go out toward them.

If this is the case, when the Christian community goes out, the question is “where to go” and “where to encounter them.” This thesis suggests “*Madang*” as the “where.” The Christian community goes wherever people can come together: open space (madang) for everyone such as the street, park or public square. In other words, the first step is

“to get out of closed space” and “not to enter into it”; not into a house, not into the church, not into the school, not into a building and not onto a stage. Rather, it is “to go” and “to create an open space” in which everyone—family, Christians, students, workers, non-Christians, the young and the old, the rich and the poor—can gather together freely.

(2) **To All!** : The “all” signifies the object that the church goes to meet. This means that the church’s object of encounter is not only the people whom it wants to meet, but everyone.

If so, how will the Christian community encounter the “all”? Theatre is suggested as a means of the encounter here, especially madanggük. As observed in the previous chapter, madanggük, the theatre performed in “madang,” obtained the open space of “madang” and was a medium of communication itself at the same time. Madanggük thus was both the theatre and the open space for encountering “all” others regardless of whether they were rich or poor, old or young, the ruling or the ruled, the privileged or the deprived.

(3) **Make disciples, baptize and teach them!** : This is possible fundamentally through communicative action. Encounter and relationship are indeed impossible without communicative action.

What type of communicative action is necessary? It is very important to follow the commission because the type of communication indeed affects the type of relationship. In the case of one-way communication, the relationship between the church and the other can never be “dialogic.” Jesus’ apostle community was obviously a dialogic community based on mutual communication. The Christian community should explore the way of dialogic communication, that is, the way of effective public dialogue with the “all.”

The communicability of Madanggük was researched in Chapter 4. The question is whether the mode of madanggük used in the past is still suitable for the church’s public



dialogue with the other in the present day.

Madanggük was a cultural mode of communication that contributed to overcoming extremely resistant patterns of public dialogue. It facilitated the Christian community's participation in reality or society under circumstances of political dictatorship, social inequality and religious privatization. On the other hand, madanggük showed dichotomizing attitude of either/or, that is, either artistry or social movement, either the elite or minjung. It inclined toward social movement and minjung, rather than the harmony of the binary opposition. This attitude is evaluated creatively and experimentally, taking the circumstances of those days into consideration. However, in order to become a channel of the church's public dialogue these days, madanggük needs to be renewed. It needs to assume a Christian aspect. Christian madanggük means not to deal with or transmit the Christian story and message, but rather to transform it into the pattern of Christian communication. The Christian approach to madanggük is therefore to examine Christian public dialogue.

The main concern of this chapter is to explore an alternative public dialogue for the church's encounter with those outside it. The alternative theatre that the Christian community will use to communicate with others in the open public space of "madang" is different from the madanggük performed in the past. It should be a new form of madanggük that overcomes previous limitations. Thus, the new form of madanggük for public dialogue will be called "*madang-theatre*," distinguishing it from the madanggük of the past. And "the Christian community's public dialogue with the other through madang-theatre in madang" will be called "*madang public dialogue*."

This chapter deals firstly with how live theatre (unlike mechanical media such as television, radio and cinema) can be effective in practicing the church's public dialogue with others, i.e. madang public dialogue. Secondly, when the Christian community fulfills madang public dialogue, a premise is necessary: that is, to change its communication "from one-way monologue to two-way dialogue." The demand for

change applies to both the Christian community and to madang-theatre as a mode of communication. Thirdly, what is an alternative madang public dialogue based on dialogic communication? Here three alternative models (or patterns) of madang public dialogue are suggested: (1) *Incarnational Public Dialogue*, (2) *Critical Public Dialogue*, and (3) *Festival Public Dialogue*. These are practical strategies for the praxis of madang public dialogue.

As dialogic strategies of madang public dialogue, the three models are basically connected with the communicative principles of madanggük researched in chapter 4. But at the same time these models are formulated according to the dialogism of Mikhail Bakhtin, a Russian literary theorist and philosopher. (In fact, Bakhtin's dialogue theory and the communicative principles of madanggük have many points in common.)

The first model, *Incarnational Public Dialogue*, explores the way the church forms a relationship with the other; how the church can incarnate and accept the other (the audience) as a participative subject; and how the Christian community deals with the matter of difference and conflict between church and others. This is a strategy of creative participative culture in madang public dialogue. It is related to the communicative principles of madanggük: rediscovery of minjung and practices outside the theatrical world.

The second model, *Critical Public Dialogue*, concerns the way in which the incarnational principles of madang public dialogue can be embodied in the content of madang-theatre, and how the Christian community deals with the Christian story and its own voice without merging the other's stories and voices into the church's single story and voice; how it develops the audience's competency in understanding and criticism; how to form "critical detachment" in madang-theatre. This is the strategy of transformative culture in madang public dialogue. It is connected with the features of reality-recognition and reality-criticism in madanggük that is mentioned in chapter 4.

The third model, *Festival Public Dialogue*, is suggested as a time-space for fulfilling both incarnational and critical principles. It acknowledges man as the play. Festivity can function as a space for the harmony of rational and sensuous nature. And festivity and its imagination (fantasy) dialogize reality and the Christian vision of the future. To this end, the dialogic characteristics in festivity will be researched. Madanggük is a theatre with the spirit of play and the spirit of madang. The festive dialogue model is a strategy to formulate the culture of laughter, play and the imagination.

## 5.1 Why Live Theatre?

Communicative modes using drama abound in the present day. Martin Esslin (1978:13) indicates in his *An Anatomy of Drama* that this tendency “does not only apply to such great works of the human spirit as the plays of Sophocles or Shakespeare, but also to the television situation comedy or, indeed, to that briefest of dramatic forms, the television or radio commercial.” Every individual has access to a mode of dramatic expression daily through the mass media: cinema, television and radio (Esslin 1978:20). Nowadays drama is a kind of communicative mode as well as an art. Esslin (1978:12) clarifies the fact that “through the mass media drama has become one of the most powerful means of communication between human beings, far more powerful than the merely printed word which was the basis of the Gutenberg revolution.”

This study on madang public dialogue focuses on live theatre rather than on mechanical media as a means of public dialogue between church and others. That is not because live theatre is superior to other media.

As Esslin (1978:77) indicates, there is “the basic unity of the dramatic mode of communication in the theatre and in the mass media of the cinema, television and radio.” In some respects, cinema, television and radio seem to gain easier access to the audience than live theatre. In fact, people who would never have gone to the

theatre throughout their lives are now exposed to vast quantities of dramatic material on television and radio. Thus mass media are more effective as a mode of dramatic expression (Esslin 1978:127). Mechanical media can vary the venue of the action through mechanical pre-recording, and can structure the content through photographic devices like montage and editing. The media enable the audience to experience the utmost proximity and intimacy with the action, by varying long-shots and close-ups, by cutting from one face, one locale, to another at will and by a whispered internal monologue on radio (Esslin 1978:51,78-79).

In addition, the continuity of the dramas of television and radio, regularly recurring features of set and being grouped in series, allows the audience a familiarity with the main characters of such series over many years (Esslin 1978:82-83). For this reason, Marshall McLuhan (1964:12) underlines that the advent of movies shifted the way people relate to the world. As a medium that addresses many senses at one time, the motion picture translates people “beyond mechanism into a world of growth and organic interrelation.”

What are the reasons for this study’s focus on “live theatre in madang” (madanggük) as a means of communication for public dialogue, in spite of the advantages of the mechanical media? In fact, the mechanical media need cumbersome and expensive equipment, but in the live theatre of madang (madanggük) it is possible to communicate with the audience with a minimum of equipment and expense. However, the most important answer to “why live theatre” lies in the peculiar communicability of theatre which is revealed in the features of theatrical performance.

### **5.1.1 Three-Cornered Feedback Effect**

The first reason for choosing live theatre is because it evokes a direct communicative response from the audience. While in the mechanical media “the director’s power over audience’s point of view is total” (Esslin 1978:79), in live theatre, positive or negative

reaction from the audience has a powerful effect on the performer. This is the “feedback effect” between the performer and the audience. But there is another equally powerful feedback: it is the feedback between the individual members of the audience themselves. These two kinds of feedback are what Esslin terms “three-cornered feedback.” The three-cornered feedback effect is an important element in the impact of live theatre, and this is the feature that sets it most apart from mechanically reproduced drama (Esslin 1978:25-26,78). It is the decisive factor in provoking the excitement and spontaneity of the audience. In this way, live theatre allows the audience to participate actively in a dramatic dialogue: the audience is no longer merely a passive spectator looking at a “given” story of theatre.

### **5.1.2 Immediacy and Concreteness**

The second reason for choosing live theatre is related to the features of “immediacy and concreteness” (Esslin 1978:19). Whether or not it is well rehearsed, live theatre has the three-cornered feedback effect because the feedback results from “immediate and concrete encounters” between the performer and the audience, and between the audiences. This immediacy and the concreteness are the prime characteristics of madanggük, and they are significant for public dialogue of the church with the world. The public dialogue through madang-theatre aims not “to show” something but “to *dialogue*” through immediate connection. The nature of immediacy and concreteness is closely related to the following feature of live theatre.

### **5.1.3 Presence and Present (Existence and Time)**

Thirdly, the artistic mode of live theatre has the features of “presence” and “present.” Theodore Shank refers to these features, comparing live theatre with literature. While in literature events necessarily appear to be events of the past, in a work of dramatic art they are actions, which occur in the immediate audible and visible presence (Shank 1969:26,43). Thornton Wilder (1960:106; Shank 1969:58) also notes that one of the

“fundamental conditions of drama” is “its action takes place in a perpetual present time.” Emphasizing the presence and present he indicates that if one assumes that one experiences a work of dramatic art when merely reading its scripts, one is making an error. This is because it is difficult to experience dramatic presence and present only with reading its script, as if only through reading musical scores the music cannot be experienced (Shank 1969:17,24).

But the present actions in live theatre do not remain within the present; rather they cause the audience to be in the future. The present created by dramatic art is always the “perpetual present,” so it is related to the cause of future action. In this way, the present is the “point in time when the causally related past and future are joined” (Shank 1969:44).

Henri Gouhier (1996:22) also considers the dual relation of “existence and time” (that is: “presence and present”) as an essence of the theatre. It means that live theatre makes something “be present by presence.” According to him (1996:20-22), a picture, sculpture, a novel and music are merely a kind of “mediator.” A picture reveals a painter’s thought in a stationary state. A song is not an act, and a player is not an acting person. Cinema communicates with the audience only through a mediator of its visual image. On the contrary, live theatre communicates with the audience through performers’ realistic presence. Therefore, he (1996:24) notes that “to use the very ‘benefit of presence’ is an addresser’s secret, and to base the benefit of presence on the principle of art is an essence of theatre.”

The presence and present of live theatre is important for public dialogue, because anything which belongs to the past cannot produce the dialogic events of the present. For this reason, Esslin (1978:18) asserts that live theatre is “the most concrete form in which art can recreate human situation, human relationship” because “the concreteness of drama is happening in an eternal present tense, not there and then, but here and now.”

#### 5.1.4 Performative-Word (Action-Word)

Finally, the language or words used in live theatre are so-called “action-words” or “performative-words.” According to Gordon Craig (1980:137), performing art consists of action (movement), word, line, colour and rhythm. To the question of which is the most essential element among them, he answers that no element is more important than another, but that an action (a movement) might be the most important in theatre, as a sketch is the most important in a picture, and a melody in music. In one word, the central role of theatre lies on an “action” (movement).

However, in the theatre action (movement) is not separated from word except in silent drama; action and word are closely connected. Henri Gouhier (1996:74) explains the interrelations of action and word: “We listen but, at the same time, we want seeing in order to understand more. We think but we need visual images (or pictures) in order to make clearer. When we speak, sometimes the word can catch the eye.”

What is important here is what kind of the word it is. According to Henri Gouhier (1996:99), as there was the Word in the beginning of the world, and the Word was an “action-Word” creating the world and communicating with the world, so the word of theatre is also an “action-word.” The dramatic word is therefore a word both expressing and causing an action, but it does not remain as a word itself. Auguste Comte, stressing the function of an “action-word,” remarks that when an action-word loses in performing art, the art starts to lose effect (Gouhier 1996:99).

The action-word corresponds to Austin’s (1990) “performative” word. In his *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin makes a distinction between “constative” words and “performative” words and clarifies the importance of a performative discourse/word. A constative word is related to “saying” or conveying information; it concerns a split between true and false, right and wrong. A performative word is related to “doing”; it is the word not just to give information but rather to induce an “action.” The biblical

messages from the Ten Commandments to Jesus' and Paul's teachings (sermons) are constituted not by constative words but by the performative words requiring the practice (doing) of faith. Therefore, the public dialogue of churches needs the performative words (or "action-words") relative to practice (doing), in order to affect the practice of dialogue.

Mikhail Bakhtin, in his *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship* (1985:113), defines every genre as "methods and means of seeing and conceptualizing reality." For him, a novel is a means of recognizing and criticizing the world, beyond a mere literary genre. In this way, madang-theatre as live theatre will be a means by which to recognize the world and to propose a dialogic relationship through the eye of the theatre, beyond merely performing art. Through the eye of theatre this thesis will attempt to establish a dialogic point of view in which the others (the audience) are accepted as participants in the madang-theatric dialogue, and not merely as passive onlookers.

## **5.2 From Monologism To Dialogism**

A change in Christianity's communicative method will be a starting point for dialogue with others (non-Christians and society). To explain this, the matter of pattern and competence of communication needs to be dealt with here.

Indigenization theology and Minjung theology were mentioned as theological practices of public dialogue in Chapter 4. Indigenization theology showed the advantage of recognition of traditional cultures, but it was weak in its criticism of reality. Minjung theology had the strength of socio-political criticism, but revealed limitations in comprehending a variety of voices in present society due to its partisanship of dividing the world as minjung and non-minjung.

On the other hand, Madanggük that appeared as a cultural medium of public dialogue



is significant in the sense that it was an artistic communication which accepted audiences as dialogic subjects. Madanggük was, in one word, grounded in “openness” and produced communicative method as well as a place for public dialogue. Most madanggük, however, showed an inclination toward a kind of socio-political theatre. Therefore, an alternative pattern of dialogue is necessary, one which concerns both the recognition of traditional culture and critical consciousness, and one that helps to harmonize its social aspects and its artistry for public dialogue. This harmonized theatre for public dialogue will be named “*madang-theatre*” in order to keep it distinct from the madanggük of the past.

The public dialogue through madang-theatre is a communicative action with two stories of our (church or Christians) story and your (others or non-Christians) story. The performance of madang-theatre for public dialogue, therefore, becomes an action beyond a genre. It is a word-action, a communicative action, and an interpretive action. It advances toward “praxis” on account of the nature of its action.

Praxis, as William Beardslee (1986:2) notes, “needs a dialogic world.” The necessity of dialogic competence and transactional communication is raised in a spoken word (including a drama) as well as a written word. There are generally two models of communication: “one-way” (linear) and “two-way” (transactional or helical) communication model (Smith & Williamson 1977:27-34). The one-way communication model is divided into two: “action model of linear mechanism” and “interaction model of linear feedback.” The action model lays its stress on the role of speaker/sender as the heart of communication. The interaction model is a communication in which the concept of linear feedback is added to the action model. It looks like two-way (transactional) communication, but “the interaction actually consists of a continuity of responses between sender and receiver” (Smith & Williamson 1977:30). The interaction model, thus, is a merely mechanical linear communication, and lacks a human transactional process.

On the other hand, the two-way model called “transactional” or “helical” communication views communication “as *simultaneity* of responses” (Smith & Williamson 1977:31). In the transactional model, sender and receiver are not separated in their roles, but they are both participating in the communication situation simultaneously. Meaning arises out of mutual communicative relationships between sender and receiver (Smith & Williamson 1977:40).

The communicative pattern of Korea usually depends on the interaction model in general, even under today’s democratized circumstances as well as in the past dictatorship. Feedback takes place in it, but the audience is nothing but a passive receiver. The lack of transactional communication and the problem of dominant linear utterance are phenomena not only of society but also of school (to realize the whole humanity), church (to create doing-faith events), and family (grounded in unselfish love). In addition, the deficiency of transactional communication prevails in all kinds of dialogue. What is the reason? And how can such “distorted communicative action” be overcome?

Paul Ricoeur indicates the problem of dialogue or discourse in connection with language. Ricoeur (1976:2) asserts: “With the words ‘structure’ and ‘system’, a new problematic emerges which tends, at least initially, to postpone, if not cancel, the problem of discourse that remains problematic for us today.” The central reason for the withdrawal of discourse is that “the main achievements of linguistics concern language as structure and system and not use” since the advent of the structural model by Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure.

Language as a semiotic system is “closed” because it is a mere “self-sufficient system of inner relationships ... without relations to external, non-semiotic reality” (Ricoeur 1976:5-6). The closed language tends to “constitute a world of its own” and it is “no longer treated as a ‘form of life,’ as Wittgenstein would call it. At this extreme point language as discourse has disappeared” (Ricoeur 1976:6). Therefore, Ricoer (1976:2)

insists, “Our task will be to rescue discourse from its marginal and precarious exile.”

A scholar who has concentrated on the task of rescuing dialogue from monologic exile is Mikhail Bakhtin, whose representative thought is expressed in the notion of “dialogism.” Bakhtin (1979:260, in Todorov 1984:57) points out that “Saussure ignores the fact that outside the forms of language there exist also *forms of combination* of these forms; in other words, he ignores discourse genres.” What Bakhtin criticizes here is the slant regarding language as a “thing,” an object, rather than as a medium of human interaction (Forgacs 1982:162). “Linguistics, while building the concepts of language and its syntactic, morphological, lexical, etc. elements, digresses from the organizational forms of concrete utterances and their socio-ideological functions” (Bakhtin 1985:84). He (1984:182-183) acknowledges the fact that “linguistics recognizes the compositional form of ‘dialogic speech’ and studies its syntactic and lexical-semantic characteristics.” But its problem is that “it studies these as purely linguistic phenomena, that is, on the level of language, and is utterly incapable of treating the specific nature of dialogic relationships between rejoinders in a dialogue.”

For Bakhtin, language is not individual but a “social reality of speech” (Forgacs 1982:161). In other words, the reality of language is “utterance” or “word.” This is revealed in the fact that the Russian term *slovo*, which he used for “language,” has the connotation of both “word” and “discourse.” “‘Word’ is always a dialogue and the stretch of discourse, rather than the individual speech or the components of sentence” (Forgacs 1982:161-162).

Emphasizing that dialogue is “the totality of human life,” Bakhtin (1984:183) states that “language lives only in the dialogic interaction of those who make use of it. Dialogic interaction is indeed the authentic sphere where language *lives*. The entire life of language, in any area of its use (in everyday life, in business, scholarship, art, and so forth), is permeated with dialogic relationships. But linguistics studies ‘language’ itself and the logic specific to it in its capacity as a *common ground*, as that which *makes*

*possible* dialogic interaction; consequently, linguistics distances itself from the actual dialogic relationships themselves. These relationships lie in the realm of discourse, for discourse is by its very nature dialogic.” That is why he insists that dialogue cannot be “the object of single science-linguistics” and cannot be understood “through linguistic methods exclusively” (Bakhtin 1979:297, in Todorov 1984:24).

Thus Bakhtin proposes “metalinguistics” that exceeds the limits of linguistics. The object of metalinguistics is discourse, while that of linguistics is language itself and its subdivisions (phonemes, morphemes, propositions, etc.). He (1984:202) explains that metalinguistics “studies the word not within the system of language and not in a ‘text’ excised from dialogic intercourse, but precisely within the sphere of dialogic intercourse itself, that is, in that sphere where discourse lives an authentic life. For the word is not a material thing but rather the eternally mobile, eternally fickle medium of dialogic interaction.” His concern with metalinguistics or *slove* (both language and word) is to express an alternative “dialogic” worldview against monologism. That is why Bakhtin gave his whole life in the research of dialogic novels.

When dialoguing with someone, we confront the discourse of the other and an alien word; so we cannot but enter it “in a living, tension-filled interaction” (Bakhtin 1981:79). Therefore, no dialogue “in general can be attributed to the speaker exclusively; it is the *product of the interaction of the interlocutors*, and, broadly speaking, the product of the whole complex *social situation* in which it has occurred” (Bakhtin 1976:118).

If the words in theatre and novel belong to the author, and if the author speaks not *with* the character or the audience but merely ‘*about*’ him, the novel or the theatre is, in Bakhtin’s term, “monologic.” In it, neither encounter nor dialogue takes place between author and character (audience) on a horizontal dialogic plane. Bakhtin (1984:71) regards Leo Tolstoy and his works as typical monologism: “The words and consciousness of the author, Leo Tolstoy, are nowhere addressed to the hero, do not question him, and expect no response from him. The author neither argues with his

hero nor agrees with him. ... The author's field of vision nowhere intersects or collides dialogically with the characters' fields of vision or attitudes, nowhere does the word of the author encounter resistance from the hero's potential word."

On the contrary, if the character is "not an object of authorial discourse, but rather a fully valid, autonomous carrier of his own individual word" (Bakhtin 1984:5) it is a "dialogic" novel or dialogic theatre. In such a dialogic novel and theatre, the characters are "*not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse*" (Bakhtin 1984:7). Therefore the core of a true dialogue lies in the acceptance of different sounds and various voices of the other, which Bakhtin calls "polyphony" of dialogue (this concept will be explained later). In short, polyphony means harmonizing various voices or instruments in music without merging them into one. Bakhtin (1984:6-7) thinks of Dostoevsky as "the creator of the polyphonic novel" because "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousness, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels."

In this sense, dialogue and polyphony are not to do with style but with dialogic relations among author's, character's and audience's voice as well as between author's and character's voice. This approach is, as David Forgacs (1982:163-165) explains, "a markedly different one from those we have looked at so far. Rather than seeing literature as knowledge of reality, he sees it as a practice of language within reality. ... It is not so much what the work reflects, either about the author or about the objective shape of the world, that matters for Bakhtin, but what the work is as a practice in language."

Madang public dialogue through which the Christian community dialogues with the other through madang-theatre premises a change in its way of communication and thinking from monologue to dialogue. Monologue means a dominant discourse and one-way communication. In the theatre, monologue is problematic because no

dialogue takes place in a monologic communication. The character (in relation to the author) and the audience (in relation to the author or the character) is nothing but a passive receiver and onlooker, not a participant on the same plane. The theatre is “art for art” which has no relation to the audience’s reality. Monologism, therefore, is criticized as a spirit that runs counter to the dialogic theatre in public dialogue.

Without going beyond the wall of the church to communicate with the other, Christian word/language, Christian communication and Christian education that are confined within the church tend to be “monologic.” The reason for this is that a word that is not used for dialogue with the other cannot be a “performative” word. “Monologism” therefore is equivalent to the “privatization” and the “exclusiveness” of church as well as “church-individualism” which are indicated as basic problems of the Korean church in Chapter 2.

Monologism is the tower of Babel. The tower of monologism in communication, privatization, exclusivity of the church and church-individualism must be destroyed. The reality of polyglot and multi-voices after the event of the tower of Babel is the place for public dialogue. Public dialogue in the church needs to listen to a variety of voices of the other, instead of building a monologic tower.

Walter Brueggemann, in his essay “*The Legitimacy of a Sectarian Hermeneutic*” (1989:3-34), suggests that “people of faith in public life must be *bilingual*.” Christians must have a “*public language*” for public dialogue with the others outside the wall of the Christian community. And they must have a “*communal language*” for processing behind the Christian community. He (1989:6) urges that “church education must be bilingual, nurturing people to know the language to speak on the wall in the presence of the others and to speak the language behind the wall in a community of faith where a different set of assumptions, a different perception of the world, a different epistemology are at work.”

In the bilingual, the dialogue behind the wall (communal language) takes precedence, for the dialogue outside the wall can be changed completely by the dialogue behind the wall (Brueggemann 1989:27). However, when the dialogue behind the wall ignores the other's dialogue, and it conducts a single voice, this dialogue behind the wall becomes ideological and idolatrous (Brueggemann 1989:24). This signifies exclusivism and monologism which loses the language and dialogue outside the wall of church. Brueggemann declares that when the dialogue behind the wall decisively impinges on the dialogue outside the wall, it is always a "miracle." The reason is that "the imagination of the community can break the dominant rationality." So Brueggemann (1989:27) writes: "I daresay that miraculous turns are in fact what church education is about."

When the language behind the wall remains only within the wall, it becomes a centripetal language and a closed-door conversation. The language is stagnant within the church and loses the performative capacity of the word. The task of the Christian community here will be demolishing the wall and re-establishing the language outside the wall as well as the language behind the wall. This is the first stage that the Christian community should proceed to for public dialogue with others outside the wall of the church.

The next task for madang public dialogue is to suggest alternative models of the public dialogue through madang-theatre. The alternative models are suggested in the three practical strategies of madang public dialogue. The first model is *Incarnational Public Dialogue* that is related to the attitude of audience-acceptance; it is the strategy of a creative, participative culture. The second model is *Critical Public Dialogue* that concerns the audience's cognitive, critical competency in producing madang-theatre for public dialogue; it is the strategy of a transformative culture. The third model is *Festival Public Dialogue* that functions as a zone of free, familiar contact where man's rational and sensuous nature, reason and play, criticism and festivity, incarnational and critical public dialogue are dialogized with each other, and finally realized; it is the strategy of

the culture of festivity, imagination and laughter.

### **5.3 The First Model: Incarnational Public Dialogue**

The change in madang public dialogue from monologue to dialogue starts from the question of how Christianity can incarnate and accept the other (the audience). A basic criterion to judge whether Christianity is “dialogic or monologic” is whether it accepts the other as a subject of the dialogue or not. The reason is that dialogism is fundamentally a matter of audience-acceptance.

“*Audience-acceptance*” is a matter of primary concern in madanggük. It is revealed in the madanggük characteristics of “rediscovery of alienated minjung” and “activity outside the artistic world” as mentioned in Chapter 4. In its construction madanggük regarded the audience’s active participation in the dramatic dialogue as the core of the theatre. And in the performance-place, that is, an open public space of madang, the madanggük aimed to demolish the division or border between the character and the audience, and between the individual members of the audience themselves.

Madanggük was a dialogic practice recognizing alienated people not as objects but as subjects, and accepting them as participative beings. The reason madanggük took as the performing place not the stage but the people’s place of work or any open place related to them was also because it wanted to accept the audience (all alienated people). In one word, madanggük was an “*invitation sent*” to the others. The mode of communication of madanggük was “dialogic” in that it created a “three-cornered feedback effect” among author, performers and audience. Put simply, madanggük abdicated its throne of a pure performing art to dialogue with all people. This attitude coincides with the humility and Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

In order to actualize the model of incarnated public dialogue through a communicative



medium of madang-theatre, there are at least four tasks to be discharged. The four tasks for the incarnational model of accepting others begin with four questions.

Firstly, who is the other? Thus, the first task is to establish a new image of self-identity. Secondly, what are the roles of author, character, and audience in madang public dialogue? Thus, the second task is connected with the change in position of the author, the character and the audience. Here the author implies the church that plans and composes madang public dialogue; the characters can be understood especially as Christians who perform in madang-theatre for public dialogue; and the audience is made up of non-Christians and society. Thirdly, what principle constitutes a dialogic event in madang public dialogue? Thus, the third task is connected with the functions of polyphony and unfinalizability in the dialogic event through madang-theatre. Finally, how will the Christian community accept conflicts and differences between the church and non-Christians? The fourth task is thus to suggest a method of the dialogization of differences. These four tasks will be activated as formative principles of incarnational public dialogue.

### **5.3.1 Otherness and New Self-Image**

How do churches speak and dialogue with the other? This depends on how churches recognize the other. When we dialogue with someone, there are at least two stories: my story (the story of the church, the story of the Bible) and the other's story. The dialogue between these two stories relies on the way churches define the other. In one word, the matter of dialogue is that of accepting the audience and that of recognizing the other.

The way of recognizing the other is a decisive factor in determining the way of communication. When the Christian community regards the other as a being hostile to itself or unconnected with itself, communication may assume an aggressive or silent feature. On the other hand, if the Christian community approaches the other with the

viewpoint of merging the other's story into the church's story, the other will be recognized as a passive being subordinate to the church. This approach will need persuasive or compulsive communication. It can be said that these kinds of recognition belong to a monologism based on absolutism in which only my truth (or voice) is absolute. There is no room for the occurrence of a genuine dialogic event.

There can be no doubt that the Bible is the absolute truth. The Bible, however, is absolute in respect to the truth; it does not mean that it is absolute in the way of communication. God is an absolute being, but His communicative pattern with human beings is not absolute but *dialogic*. God is not coercive; rather, God waits for our responses. God wants a transactional relationship with mankind. Similarly, when conveying the biblical truth in public dialogue to other persons, if the church thinks of them as being subject to the truth and adopts a one-way communication, this obviously constitutes an offense against God's way of dialogue. Therefore, a matter of recognizing the audience is important in forming a new method of communication.

### **5.3.1.1 General Features of the Audience**

What is the essential feature of the audience? Denis McQuail (1997:7) provides a list of the features of the audience mainly attached to the commercial newspaper, the cinema, and television.

1. Audiences are large and widely dispersed.
2. They do not know each other.
3. Their composition is always shifting and they lack any sense of self-identity, due to its dispersion and heterogeneity.
4. They appear not to act for themselves, but to be acted on from outside.
5. The relations between the audience and the mass media are impersonal.

Although this view is a definition of the audience confined to the mechanical media, the five features can also be a reflection of the audience the church contacts in madang

public dialogue; for the audience the church encounters will be a being affected by the media, and strangers to each other before the occurrence of public dialogue. The features of the audience can be expressed as “nouns”: (1) Vastness of scale, (2) Anonymity, (3) Confusion of self-identity, (4) Passivity, (5) Impersonality. These are the limits of the mechanical media as well as the features of the audience. Considering the five features, the essential limit of the media or the audience, in one word, is the lack of dialogue, or transactional communication.

To encounter the other, therefore, is to confront a situation in which there is the lack of dialogue. Therefore, it needs to create dialogue on the basis of transactional communication. In order to be public dialogue creating transactional communication through madang-theatre, a new recognition of the other is required. This new recognition of the other is ultimately connected with overcoming the five limits of the audience derived from the lack of dialogue or from a distorted communicative act. Without the other, there is no dialogue. Thus, a new recognition of the other in dialogism is that the self is “a being in need of the other” or “a being relative to the other.”

### **5.3.1.2 The Surplus of Seeing and the Mutual Answerable Being**

What is the image of the other in the madang public dialogue which accepts the audience as subjects and participants on the same level? In his *Art and Answerability* (1990:22-61), Bakhtin is emphatic about the need for the other in order to accomplish self-identity. He (1990:38) explains the correlation of “the image-categories of *I* and the *other*” with “the form in which an actual human being is concretely experienced.” The form in which I experience (see) my own does not coincide with that of the others’ experience (seeing) of me.

The difference of seeing (experience) between I and the other derives from the “outsideness” and “surplus (excess) of seeing” of the human being. That is, the

difference between “my own I” (the I that I see) and “the other person’s I” (the I that the other sees) results from the difference in time and space in which I and the other are placed or occupy. All other human beings are situated outside me. I am also placed outside the others. On account of the difference in time and space, my experience is different from the other’s experience. The outsideness of being allows me to see something that the other cannot see, and allows the other to see something that I cannot see. Therefore, the other has the surplus of seeing for me, and I also have the surplus of seeing for the other. This surplus of seeing is understood as “the surplus of humanness” (Bakhtin 1981:37) constituting the balanced self-consciousness of inner and outer.

One can never see oneself as a whole. The individual can achieve only partially with respect to himself. I myself am not something self-sufficient. In order to accomplish a fully perception of the self, the other is necessary, for the other has the surplus of seeing for myself. Bakhtin (1990:35) says that “in the category of I, my exterior is incapable of being experienced as a value that encompasses and consummates me. It is only in the category of the other that it is thus experienced, and I have to subsume myself under this category of the other in order to see myself.” According to Bakhtin (1990:32), there is, of course, an exception in the case that we can look at ourselves in a mirror. But in a mirror we see “the *reflection* of our exterior, but not *ourselves* in terms of our exterior.” After all, “I am conscious of myself and become myself only while revealing myself for another, through another, and with the help of another. The most important acts constituting self consciousness are determined by a relationship toward another consciousness” (Bakhtin 1984:287).

Gibson Winter (1966:85-118) describes as “we-relation” the correlation between I and the other based on the surplus of seeing. “We-relation is a matrix of self-actualization of the ‘I’ as being-in-the-world, but it is a matrix of mutual dependence” (Winter 1966:96). Therefore, “the ‘lived’ encounter of I and Thou” should be a prerequisite; and this encounter is the relationship based on “the face-to-face sharing” (Winter 1966:86).

Expressing this direct and immediate encounter with the other as “dancing together” he stresses the dynamic relationship.

What is the meaning of “we-relation” and “surplus-relation” in the church’s public dialogue with the other?

Firstly, if acknowledging the surplus of seeing between I (church, Christian) and the other (society, non-Christian), the Christian community can accept the other who has different seeing, voice and consciousness. It can form dialogic relationships, considering the other’s surplus of seeing as something enriching itself. Self-identity can be formed, developed, and enriched not “within” myself, but “through” the surplus of the other for myself. The self is a being created by the interaction with the other. And the other and I are “answerable” (responsible) beings constituting the self; that is, everyone becomes a participative being by the surplus of seeing. In particular, the other can be recovered as a subject and participant in dialogue as well as in self-identity. This is, in Vitalii Makhlin’s term, the “social ontology of participation” (Adlam & Vitalii 1997:46).

Secondly, the madang public dialogue based on a “being in need of the other” and a “participative and answerable being” resists a “fixed” self-image. This is because the self is not a given-being in a fixed form, but a becoming-being in the process of the mutual relations with the other. “Man is not only being but becoming. ... Man is not something completed and finished, but open, uncompleted” (Bakhtin 1968:364). The self-image of madang public dialogue is not an “already or given” image but a “not yet” image that is constituted through the other’s surplus of seeing derived from his outsideness. This “becoming” self-image allows mutual communication with the other.

Thirdly, the “not-yet” self-image of madang public dialogue opposes the submersion of one into the other. The first stage to dialogue with the other is “projecting oneself into the other.” But it does not mean to merge into the other, losing oneself. Bakhtin (1990:26) asserts “in any event, ‘my projecting of myself into him’ must be followed by

'a *return* to my own place outside the other. ... If this return into myself did not actually take place, the pathological phenomenon of experiencing another's suffering as one's own would result—an 'infection' with another's suffering, and nothing more." What is important in the relationships between I and the other is "to dialogue" with the other, not "to merge" with the other. The dialogic action constituting self-consciousness does "not take place within," but "on the boundary between one's own and someone else's consciousness, on the *threshold*" (Bakhtin 1984:287). The very threshold or boundary between I and the other becomes the "time and space of dialogue" that brings about the development, change and enrichment of the human being.

Fourthly, the most important contribution of the new recognition of the self-image is that the differences of outsideness and surplus of seeing between I and the other are here not objects to be surmounted; rather, the differences are received as the mainspring of dialogue. The understanding of the human being as a becoming being, not as a completed being, provides room for participation and dialogue, i.e. the place where dialogue takes place between I and the other, and between the human being and the world. The human being is not understood as a simple being. Rather, I myself go toward the other and participate in the experience of the other. In this manner, I myself take part in the dialogic event together with the other. The other also comes to me, participates in my event or my experience. In the process of participative dialogue, the human being can become a creative being making an event of dialogue with the other and transforming the world.

Paul Ricoeur (1976:15) suggests the concept "being-together" as "the existential condition for the possibility of any dialogical structure of discourse." The "being-together" is "a way of trespassing or overcoming the fundamental solitude of each human being." But, for Ricoeur, the solitude does not mean an isolated feeling when we are alone or in a crowd. It means "what is experienced by one person cannot be transferred whole as such and such experience to someone else. My experience cannot directly become your experience" (Ricoeur 1976:15-16). "Nevertheless,

something passes from me to you. ...This something is not the experience as experienced, but its meaning. Here is the miracle. The experience as experienced, as lived, remains private, but its sense, its meaning, becomes public.” In this way communication is to overcome “the radical non-communicability of the lived experience as lived.” The very “exteriority of discourse to itself ... *opens* discourse to the other” (Ricoeur 1976:16).

A being in need of the other signifies that “the very being of man (both internal and external) is the *deepest communion*. *To be* means to *communicate*.” It is because “to be means to be for another, and through the other, for oneself” (Bakhtin 1984:287). Consequently, it is to say that “life is dialogic by its very nature. Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth” (Bakhtin 1984:293).

When based on the self-image of otherness, public dialogue through madang-theatre has the “answerability/responsibility” to accept the other as a decisive participant in dialogue, and to fulfill mutual communication with the other. At this moment madang public dialogue can be “*incarnational*.”

The concept of otherness, that is, the other’s surplus of seeing, is applicable to every activity of the ethical, social, political and religious as well as the aesthetic. The relations between church and others can be neither antagonistic nor irrelevant. The church and the other are on complementary “dialogic relations” accomplishing and enriching each other with the surplus of seeing. As the “I” myself is consummated and enriched through the other, so the Christian community also is consummated and enriched through the others and their stories. Therefore, the church can no longer remain within the wall; rather, it recognizes the other as a being who has the surplus of seeing for the church itself, and thus requires the encounter with the other. That is why establishing a new self-image is proposed as the first step (or task) of incarnational public dialogue.

### **5.3.2 The Change of Author, Performer and Audience Position**

For madang public dialogue, to accept the other as a participant, an answerable being with a surplus of seeing means not only to equalize the relations between I and the other. Rather, a matter of audience-acceptance requires a positive change of a relationship between two stories or voices from monologic relations based on a vertical structure to dialogic relations based on a transactional structure. The concepts of a surplus of seeing and mutually answerable being signify the problem of relationship: the relations of author-performer, author-audience, performer-audience, or church-Christian, church-nonChristian, Christian-nonChristian and God-human being as well as church-church, Christian-Christian, nonChristian-nonChristian.

As mentioned already, while one-way communication does not accept the audience as a participative being, mutual or transactional communication accepts the audience as an indispensable participative being in dialogue. Dialogism criticizing a monologic structure of communication regards language as a dialogue in which author and audience or speaker and listener take part simultaneously. Therefore, dialogue can be neither speaker-centered nor listener-centered, because each dialogue is jointly produced by both speaker (the author) and listener (the audience).

#### **5.3.2.1 The Audience: an Infinite Interpretative, Dialogic Being**

How does mutual communicative public dialogue on the basis of otherness change the audience's position in the dialogue through madang-theatre? In madanggük, as researched in the previous chapter, the audience is no longer a passive spectator or receiver of a given message. The author and the performers in madanggük were only one half of the total process: the other half was the audience and its reaction. In madanggük, the audience's actual and potential responses exert a performative effect on the dialogue. In this way, in madang public dialogue "I do not own or produce my words, we all do" (Emerson & Morson 1987:47-48).



Therefore, incarnational public dialogue requires affirming the “competence of infinite interpretation” of the audience. The theatre accepting the audience allows the audience freedom to make up its own mind in interpretation; it does not force the audience merely to receive a given description and message from the theatre. Dialogue is born only at the moment of accepting the other as an answerable subject in a dialogic event. What is interpretation here? Interpretation is beyond the encoding activity of a “given” message of text. Wayne Booth, in his *Critical Understanding* (1979:236), distinguishes two modes of understanding: “understanding” and “overstanding.” “Understanding” means the activity by which the audience understands and decodes the message of the text. Here, the audience is subordinate to the text by “standing under” it. On the other hand, the “overstanding” means the activity in which the audience analyses and criticizes the text. Here, the audience can control the text by “standing over” it. As already stated, madang public dialogue starts with “performative” words affecting the practice of dialogue. The competence of “overstanding” aims to acquire the competence of dialogic practice, beyond simple understanding of the meaning of the text. If the public dialogue through madang-theatre allows the audience to remain within “understanding,” it cannot be an incarnational attitude. The mission of incarnational public dialogue is to restore the audience’s right of critical “overstanding” which has generally belonged only to the author.

In this way, in incarnational public dialogue, the audience changes its position from an isolated being that had nothing to do with the composition and procedure of the theatre, to an interpretive being in the harmony of understanding and overstanding, to a participative subject in dialogue, and to a transformative subject of himself, text, and reality. To consider the audience as an infinite interpretive being is to acknowledge it as a dialogic being, for incarnational public dialogue accepts the audience as a needful being with a surplus of seeing for me (the author or church) outside me. As the other is a needful being in the constituting of the self, so in the fulfillment of madang public dialogue, the audience is accepted as a being enriching this dialogue.

### 5.3.2.2 The Death of Author and the Return of Audience

How does the position of author (speaker, text, church) change in the incarnational public dialogue that affirms the infinite interpretive, dialogue competence of the audience? If accepting the audience's faculty of interpretation, the author (church) will no longer be able to hold an all-powerful position over the character (Christian) or the audience (non-Christian), speaking only the church's own story or voice. Generally speaking, text has contained only in the author's own consciousness, voice and intention. The characters could not but obey the text/intention given by the author. The audience had no choice but to participate in a dramatic discourse; it concentrated on the activity of understanding the given, fixed message of the author; consequently there was no room for the activity of critical overstanding. In this case, no dialogue takes place between the author and the character or the audience.

The emphasis of the omnipotent author belongs explicitly to monologism. It is indifferent to the other who exists outside of the author but with the same rights, and who is capable of responding on an equal footing. In the sphere of the omnipotent author, "*another person* remains wholly and merely an *object* of consciousness, and not another consciousness. ... Monologue manages without the other. ... Monologue pretends to be the *ultimate word*" (Bakhtin 1984:293).

If the church follows the monologic view of the omnipotent author when communicating with the other, authentic dialogue will never happen. With one voice, no one can make a dialogic event. Dialogue "in principle, cannot unfold on the plane of a single and unified consciousness" of the author, "but presuppose two consciousnesses that do not fuse." The essential and constitutive element of dialogue is "the relation of a consciousness to *another* consciousness" (Bakhtin 1979:77-78, in Todorov 1984:100). Therefore, church as the author of the event of public dialogue needs to enter into dialogic relations with the other. As Jesus abandoned his divinity and incarnated to redeem and dialogue with his "others," so the church as a body of Jesus Christ must

also abandon its almighty divine right and monologic attitude in order to be incarnated in this world of others. This is basic to accomplishing incarnational public dialogue with the other.

In fact, the matter of audience-acceptance denotes the dissolution of the authorial almighty right. The divine right of the author has been problematic especially to Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Raymond Federman and Mikhail Bakhtin.

Roland Barthes (1977:142-148), using the term “the death of the author,” rejects the traditional theory that regards the author as an origin of text, a root of meaning, and a person with the exclusive rights of interpretation. He suggests that writing becomes a neutral, compound and roundabout zone where the almighty power of the author vanishes. Michel Foucault (1991:101-120, esp.102) also denies the omnipotent author in these terms: “In writing, the point is not to manifest or exalt the act of writing, nor is it to pin a subject within language; it is, rather, a question of creating a space into which the writing subject constantly disappears.”

The idea of the death of the author entails a dialogic relationship between dramatic domain and the reality, beyond an authorial action of imitation and representation. Writing relative to the death of the author’s divine power rejects the authorial action of “imitating and representing the reality” in his literary work (Realistic standpoint), or the authorial action of “expressing his own ideas and emotion” through his literary work (Romantic literature). That is, the author can no longer have the function of the representation of reality and the expression of his own consciousness through his work (Barthes 1977:147).

If so, what is the author’s role in his writing? Instead of a simple act of representation and expression, (s)he takes a more creative role. It is a role of “mediator of dialogue.” First of all, the author as a mediator of dialogue helps to form a dialogic event among the author, the character, and the audience. One voice cannot secure superiority over

the other voices. Secondly, the author should help to form an organic interaction between work and reality. The dramatic world of work enters into and enriches the reality. The reality also enters into the dramatic world of work, not only as a part of life but also as participation in the process of production. This dialogue between work and reality is possible only by renewing the work constantly through creative recognition and participation of the audience (cf. Bakhtin 1981:84).

In this way, the death of the author causes a radical change in the position of the author and the audience. The death of the author, who has predominated over the others, allows the emancipation of the audience from a passive object in relation to the author; the audience is liberated from a simple “understanding” act of the fixed and finalized text of the author, and becomes a subject with the competence of interpretation (i.e. both *understanding* and *overstanding*). Federman (1975:14) spotlights the role of the audience as follows: “The reader of this fiction will not be able to identify with its people and its material. ... In other words, no longer being manipulated by an authorial point of view, the reader will be the one who extracts, invents, and creates, a meaning and an order for the people in the fiction. And it is this total participation in the creation which will give the reader a sense of having created a meaning and not having simply received, passively, a neatly prearranged meaning.”

On the other hand, the author also becomes a participant in a dialogic event with the audience. The author is only “the point of junction” between the source and the recipient (Federman 1975:13). Federman (1975:14) points out the change of the author’s position as follows: “The writer will no longer be considered a prophet, a philosopher, or even a sociologist who predicts, teaches, or reveals absolute truths, nor will he be looked upon (admiringly and romantically) as the omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent creator, but he will stand on equal footing with the reader in their efforts *to make sense* out of the language common to both of them, *to give sense* to the fiction of life.” The death of the author is indeed a starting point for “the return of the reader” (Freund 1987), i.e. the return of the audience.

Through the death of the author, the character is also able to participate in the creation of public dialogue through madang-theatre to the same degree as the author and the audience. All of them are part of the dialogic event; all of them are responsible for it. In this way, the author, the character and the audience form a “trinity” in the creation of a dialogic event.

As mentioned above, the death of the author does not mean the absence of the author in the work. It means the death of a monologic and dictatorial relationship between the author, the performer and the audience. In other words, it does not mean the madang-theatre works without an authorial position, but rather that it denounces the exclusive, individualistic point of view of the author.

The omnipotent author with privilege corresponds to the church based on exclusive and monologic one-way communication. On the contrary, the church based on the model of incarnational public dialogue pursues the resurrection of the others (Christian, non-Christian and society) through the death of its dogma-centered monologism. In communication, a monopolistic, exclusive attitude is a monologue that can never produce a mutual dialogic event. The Christian (the character) and the audience in madang public dialogue is not “the mute, voiceless object” subordinate to the dogma of church, but rather “a carrier of a fully valid word” (Bakhtin 1984:63) in dialogue.

In order to create a dialogic event through madang-theatre it is therefore necessary for the church to speak to its Christian (the character) *dialogically*, and for the character to speak to the audience *dialogically*. The most important thing in public dialogue is a dialogic attitude between the church and the character (Christian), and between the church (and character) and the audience. The church as the author must speak ‘not *about* a character, but *with* him’ (Bakhtin 1984:71). And the acceptance of someone else’s thought and voice is possible “only on the basis of a dialogic relationship to that other consciousness, that other point of view” (Bakhtin 1984:69). For this reason, madang public dialogue requires an incarnational view of the death of the author.

### 5.3.3 Unfinalizability and Polyphony

For the resurrection of dialogic relationship through the death of the church's monopolistic orientation to occur, the establishment of the practical device (or principle) that causes dialogue in madang-theatre work is necessary. For this incarnational public dialogue which actually urges an incarnational Christian community, Bakhtin's representative concepts of *unfinalizability* and *polyphony* are suggested as the principles of madang-theatre.

#### 5.3.3.1 Unfinalizability

The term "unfinalizability," one of Bakhtin's central concepts, means "the human tendency to defy all that purports to be fixed and stable" (Emerson & Morson 1987:44). Bakhtin (1984:66) states that "nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate word of the world and about the world has not yet been spoken; the world is open and free."

To be described and led only by the author is to be finalized (Emerson & Morson 1987: 51). If everything is predetermined, closed-off and finalized by the church as the author of madang public dialogue, and if everything is united in the authorial consciousness, voice and evaluation, the problem is that in it there is no room for the development of a variety of consciousness and voice; rather, it constrains the freedom of the character and the audience. Consequently, anything finalized cannot offer dialogue. Emerson and Morson (1987:50) refer to the problem of finalizing as follows: "When the author plans the ending in advance, significance is guaranteed, but there is a cost: characters must conform to a preset pattern, they can only do what will fit, and each action can lead only in one direction. Monologic narrative cancels the most fundamental aspect of human experience—the *openness* of each action and moment, which can potentiate many patterns but which need not conform to any."

Incarnational public dialogue affirms the relational surplus of the other. Dialogue takes place between I and the other, thus no dialogue happens before the other participates in the relationship. As the self cannot be finalized by I myself without the other, so the church cannot be finalized by itself without the other. Thus, madang public dialogue cannot and “should not” be finalized by the church. It can be said that the image of self, the work for public dialogue and its meanings, indeed, are situated between “being” (already) and “becoming” (not yet). They are not anything finalized, predetermined or given, but rather they are in the present progressive form, i.e. in process. Madang public dialogue, therefore, renounces authorial intention and an exclusive one-sided attitude in the composition and conveying of a message. The church needs to invite the performer and the audience as “co-authors” to madang public dialogue, for madang public dialogue can develop through their spontaneous participation and free creativity of dialogue.

Arnold Hauser (1982:9) asserts that “artistic creation is not a hard effort to present an idea, but a struggle against covering up a thing through idea, the nature, and general concept.” What is the “covered thing”? From the point of view of madang public dialogue, it can be understood as the “dialogic relations” that are covered by the authorial church’s own consciousness and single voice. To this artistic creation that helps to recover the covered dialogic relations, unfinalizability is necessary. This is because unfinalizability is a device to denounce “positivist and determinist scientific world views” (Emerson & Morson 1987:45). It serves to rehabilitate the “covered” dialogic relationship between church and others, even including the one between church and Christian.

In fact, madanggük had a plot, but the plot was loose and not fixed. It was open to the audience’s participation, through which it became much more enriched. In other words, in some aspects it was characterized by unfinalizability. Text (plot) and its meaning were never finalized. They could be accomplished only after the audience’s participation. Madanggük was always located in the dialogic process of the author-the

performers, and the performers-the audience. The performers of madanggük communicated with its author; its audiences were participative and constitutive beings in dramatic dialogue with the performers and the author.

Unfinalizability is a “blank space” for dialogue in madang public dialogue. For Wolfgang Iser, the unfinalizability or undetermination is implied in his concept of “the blank space” of text. Between segments and cuts in text there is an empty space. The blank manifests that the text and its meaning are neither finalized nor fulfilled. Therefore, it induces and guides the reader’s constitutive activity. The blank is, as Iser (1978:201) describes, considered as a space for “the most important link in interaction between text and reader.” It means that the basic function of “the blank” like “unfinalizability” is communication between text and reader. “As an empty space they (the blanks) are nothing in themselves, and yet as a ‘nothing’ they are a vital propellant for initiating communication” (Iser 1978:195). The unfulfilled and unfinalized vacant space waits for the participative activity of the audience all the time.

In this way, the blank open space of unfinalizability in the composition of madang public dialogue is a space for dialogue, leading the audience to take part in dialogue as a subject of that dialogue. In the unfinalized madang-theatre the audience is indispensable in filling in the blanks with rich dialogue. After all, the principle of unfinalizability is to collapse dominative logic based on one-way monologism in which everything is predetermined and finalized, and to invite the audience to dialogue.

### **5.3.3.2 Polyphony**

According to Bakhtin (1981:337-339), our speech is filled to overflowing with other people’s words, interpretations and responses. In the everyday speech of any person living in society, no less than half (on the average) of all the words uttered by him are other people’s. Therefore, Bakhtin (1981:276) asserts that “the living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific



environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue. After all, the utterance arises out of this dialogue as a continuation of it and as a rejoinder to it—it does not approach the object from the sidelines.”

Thus, living dialogue is always “double-voiced discourse” (Bakhtin 1984:190) because it has “a twofold direction”—both toward the referential object of the author’s speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward other people’s discourse and speech. Dialogue occurs in the double-directed discourse which incorporates a relationship to the other’s utterance as an indispensable element, perceiving the existence of this second context of the other’s speech (Bakhtin 1984:185-186).

Concentrating on a single voice unified into an author is “monologue” in which unitary language is used. Unitary language opposes the realities of heteroglossia. Unitary language is centripetal force which serves one and the same project of centralizing and unifying a diversity of the other’s words into a unitary language of culture and truth in vital connection with the processes of sociopolitical and cultural centralization (Bakhtin 1981:270-271). Insofar as the discourse inclines toward the centralization and unification in a single and unitary language, it can never be a fundamental form of dialogue (Bakhtin 1981:325). This orientation toward unity compels one to ignore “a trope (say, a metaphor) being unfolded into the two exchanges of a dialogue, that is, two meanings parceled out between two separate voices.” After all, it is “never of the dialogic sort” (Bakhtin 1981:327-328).

Public dialogue is connected with the social and historical heteroglossia of the other, as well as in the unitary language (Bakhtin 1981:272). For Bakhtin, “heteroglossia” is used as a concept opposed to a single unitary language. It reflects the centrifugal force of decentralizing and disunifying. Heteroglossia based on centrifugal force carries on “a special type of *double-voiced discourse*, by expressing authorial intentions but in a

refracted way” (Bakhtin 1981:324). Therefore, “it serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author. In such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions. And all the while these two voices are dialogically interrelated, they—as it were—know about each other. .... A potential dialogue is embedded in them, one as yet unfolded, a concentrated dialogue of two voices, two world views, two languages” (Bakhtin 1981:324).

The harmonic co-existence of the two-voiced dialogue expresses “polyphony” which is a contrary concept of monologue or monopoly based on unitary language in centripetal force. Emerson and Morson (1987:49) define the concept of polyphony as follows: “Polyphony goes beyond the mere juxtaposition or sequential sounding of contrary voices and ideas. The musical metaphor implies that many voices are heard at the same time, uttering the same word differently. ... Voices join other voices to produce the timbre and intonation of a given communication.” Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist (1984:12) explain Bakhtin’s point of polyphonic dialogue: “I *can* mean what I say, but only indirectly, at a second remove, in words that I take and give back to the community according to the protocols it observes. My voice can mean, but with others at times in chorus, but at the best of times in dialogue. Meaning in this view is made as a product.”

Bakhtin’s polyphony of accepting the others’ voices is an alternative suggested in the process of disputing the two most influential theories in the literary world. The first is the classical theory of creativity based on algorithmic theory, in which “the solution of a mathematical problem already exists before it is sought.” Creation here is reduced to simply “discovery”; it never produces anything new. The classical account denies “unfinalizability” and it does not permit different voices. The second is the romantic theory of creativity, which is an alternative to the classical theory. The romantic theory recognizes the possibility of the new, but considers it an unexpected gift resulting from a burst of inspiration. These two algorithmic and inspirational theories are monologic.

They are dependant on a preexisting fixed plan that need only be executed (Emerson & Morson 1987:51-52).

On the contrary, neither the beginning nor the end of a dialogic work exists in the author's intention. "Both intention and unity are matters of process" (Emerson & Morson 1987:52-53). They develop in the process of dialogue. Thus, the necessity of fundamentally re-conceiving the two theories is raised. A polyphonic creator produces the work which has a plot, but the plot is open, that is, unfinalized. Furthermore, a creative activity in polyphony is regarded not as an exceptional phenomenon by an unexpected inspiration, but as a continuous one in the daily world (Emerson & Morson 1987:51-53).

In the polyphonic dialogue that accepts the other's various voices as the surplus, the author is just another participant; the characters are free from the author's all-determining plan. The characters enter into a dialogic relationship with the author, and the audiences also enter into a dialogic one with the work, saying and doing something that the author or the work had not guessed before. In this way, the nature of polyphonic dialogue demonstrates unfinalizability (Emerson & Morson 1987:49-51).

In his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin characterizes Dostoevsky as the creator of a new novelistic genre, the "polyphonic novel." Bakhtin (1984:6-7) explains the reason that Dostoevsky's works are polyphonic as follows:

What unfolds in his works is not a multitude of characters and fates in a single objective world, illuminated by a single authorial consciousness; rather a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world, combine but are not merged in the unity of the event. Dostoevsky's major heroes are ... not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse. In no way, then, can a character's discourse be exhausted by the usual functions of characterization and plot development, nor does it serve

as a vehicle for the author's own ideological position. ... The consciousness of a character is given as someone else's consciousness, another consciousness, yet at the same time it is not turned into an object, is not closed, does not become a simple object of the author's consciousness.

Madanggük as a public dialogue was also a representative performing art that introduced the audience into creative participation with dialogue. Madanggük characters threw questions at the audience, asking for their opinion during the performance. The word-exchange and active participation between the character and the audience as well as between the characters themselves served to extend the content and its meaning.

As indicated already, madanggük was performed with a plot, but it did not confine itself to this plot. The plot was open and unfinalized. The fact that madanggük was "unfinalized" and "polyphonic" in dialogue is proved in that it attached importance to "improvisation." Starting with only a basic summary of the story, performers used improvisation and all sorts of feats to complete the performance as a work of art. Thus the audience came not to hear the particulars of the story but to exchange voices and opinions through participative action. In truth, the spontaneous original improvisation of the actors, unfinalizability of the text, and polyphonic participation were possible because the madanggük story was not only the author's story, but the story of all of them: performers, audience as well as author. For this reason, it aroused a strong communal spirit among them.

In other words, in madanggük, word-exchange, improvisation, the audience-participative composition, and the "madang" of an open public space were all devices for polyphony and unfinalizability, which helped to accept and change the audience, who had been immersed in monologism, absolutism or relativism, to a being with a surplus of seeing, a dialogic being. Polyphonic and unfinalized madang-theatre can lead author, performers, and audience to create and complete a double-voiced dialogic

event through their participation.

If one uses a political metaphor, the character and the audience in this polyphonic dialogue are “not voiceless slaves,” but free people, capable of standing alongside the author, “capable of not agreeing with him and even of rebelling against him” (Bakhtin 1984:6). Emerson and Morson (1987:51) describe the relationship between the author (church) and the character, or between the work and the audience in a religious metaphor: “Substitute ‘God’ for author and ‘man’ for character, and one sees that, in endowing man with free will, God became the first polyphonic creator. He does not command, but engages in dialogue with his creatures.” Polyphonic God is listening to our various voices, and liberating us from monologic worldviews. Polyphonic God is dialogic God.

When speaker and audience are in a subordinate-relationship such as that between subject and object, or master and slave, communication is, in terms of Habermas (1987), “distorted, irrational communicative action.” However, when they are under the inter-subjective relationship based on unfinalizability and polyphonic harmony, there can be “rational communicative action.” While the former is a heteronomous action of feudal communication, the latter is an autonomous action of democratic communication.

Ideal dialogic community is possible through autonomous, democratic communicative action. In this rational communicative action based on the model of transactional communication there is no distinction between speaker and audience (sender and receiver) in the process of creating and sharing meaning. All participants are both source and receiver. From this view, audience-accepting madang public dialogue has to lay its foundation on democratic polyphonic communicative action, in order that the Christian community can be open to various voices and unfinalizability, and to assist audiences to take part in a dialogic event while keeping their autonomy. Insofar as the church approaches the coercive form of “listen, believe, and do it” without any objection, its way of communication and relationship will never move beyond the boundary of the

subordinate, irrational, and heteronomous action of communication because its approach focuses on the centripetal force of ignoring the other's voices.

The church as the body of Christ exists for the other. The world of the other is the reality that the incarnated Christian community confronts and should enter into. The madang public dialogue incarnated into the other's world, therefore, has to make the other people's voices heard on the same plain as the author's own voice. This is the purpose of polyphony in public dialogue.

The participative action in the dialogue of madang-theatre requires ethical responsibility/accountability because an invitation to public dialogue is an invitation to the dialogue of being expedited on the horizon of our life. What is this accountability? The principle of otherness that the absolute Other, God, created human beings, and the surplus of the other compensates the I myself, requires the biblical ethical answerability of "Do to others what you would have them do to you" (Matthew 7:12) and the creative answerability of "Work and take care of" (Genesis 2:15) all the others including all creatures. The ethical and creative answerability based on the principles of incarnational public dialogue can be understood as "love." Only the practice of answerability will be able to change not only reality but also the communicative action and relationship from monologism to dialogism.

The main concern here is to go beyond individual responsibility to one's behavior, and to reach a public answerability creating the new image of the other on the basis of the principle of surplus. The relationship of church and society (the other) is no longer antagonistic and unconnected. Rather, it is a relationship of complementary cooperation in completing and enriching the self-identity of each other. The death of the church's one-way, monologic intention resurrects the other's freedom and creativity. Authentic dialogue is therefore open to differences, so it takes unfinalizability as a blank space for dialogue, and pursues polyphonic harmony among different voices and worldviews. Separation is no longer necessary between church and others. What is

needed is “dialogue.” If this is the case, how can the matters of conflict, difference and dualism be solved in the public dialogue through madang-theatre?

#### **5.3.4 Acceptance of Difference and Conflict**

When the church practices madang public dialogue with the other, another problem is raised: that is, how to deal with the difference and conflict between the church/Christian and the other/non-Christian. While the first concern of incarnational public dialogue is a matter of acceptance of the other, which concerns the acknowledgement of the other and his voice as surplus and which recovers the audience as an active participant, its second concern is a matter of how to accept the difference and conflict.

To accept the other is to accept a variety of seeing and voices, and to produce different, new meanings in the process of interaction of various consciousnesses. Dialogism based on otherness and polyphony, as seen above, unlike monologism based on one-way and centripetal force, premises different double or multi-voices that are derived from the difference of the surplus of seeing. In other words, incarnational public dialogue comprehends this difference and conflict as a condition making the generation of “dialogue” or a “dialogic event” possible.

James Loder, proposing the five steps of the knowing event in his *The Transforming Moment* (1981:31-36), insists that “conflict” is an element of the first step of knowledge. A striking discontinuity takes place at the critical juncture of the knowing event. The knowing event begins with the very conflict. In this way, conflict is affirmed as a beginning of the knowing event.

Incarnational public dialogue also considers difference and conflict as the starting-point of a dialogic event. Only through the dialogic relationship can this difference and conflict be overcome. As observed above, the dialogic relationship can be designated as *polyphony*, that is, an accord of two or more heterogeneous voices as in a musical

score. While monologism pays attention to having one identical voice sound by removing difference, dialogism accepts difference and conflict, because public dialogue experiences the others as beings who have their own voices. Therefore, Clark and Holquist (1984:9) define dialogue as follows:

Dialogue is understood not merely in the obvious sense of two people conversing. Such an everyday occurrence provides an opening into the future reaches of dialogic possibility. ... Dialogue is more comprehensively conceived as the extensive set of conditions that are immediately modeled in any actual exchange between two persons but are not exhausted in such an exchange. Ultimately, dialogue means communication between simultaneous differences.

Genuine dialogue, beyond personal discourse, reaches toward interaction of differences: not only personal differences but also the differences of meanings, societies, and so forth. That is, according to them (1984:10), dialogue leads “to meditate on the interaction of forces that are conceived by others to be mutually exclusive. How, for example, can the requirement of language for fixed meanings be yoked together with the no less urgent need of language users for meanings that can be various in the countless different contexts created by the flux of everyday life? How can the requirement of societies for stability be reconciled with their need to adapt to new historical conditions? How can a text be the same and yet different in different contexts? How can an individual self be unique and yet also incorporate so much that is shared with others? Indeed, dialogue is an activity that enacts differences in values.”

How is the dialogic interaction possible in the midst of difference and antagonism?

Firstly, dialogue between differences occurs neither through simple juxtaposition of contrary voices and ideas, nor through the attitude of a single plane which deals with the voices and ideas as one and as the same thing. It goes beyond “merging” them into one. The simple juxtaposition and immersion will amount to nothing but exclusivism, subsumption or pluralistic arrangement. The dialogue of accepting differences is



possible not by merging, but by preserving and affirming one's own position of outsideness and surplus of seeing. It can thus be said that this polyphonic dialogue is a special way of forming a relationship with the others on the grounds of differences.

Secondly, the dialogue of differences does not follow a "dialectical" principle, because it is reduced to a binary opposition that ultimately transcends one voice or two-sided voices (Bialostosky 1989:216,219). Therefore, accepting differences is founded not on a dialectical, partitive principle but on a dialogical, relational principle. Paul de Man (1986:109) demonstrates this point clearly. Polyphonic dialogue among differences and conflicts is "far from aspiring to a synthesis or a resolution as in dialectical systems"; rather it is "to sustain and think through the radical exteriority or heterogeneity of one voice with regard to any other."

Communication for polyphonic harmony of differences and conflicts, therefore, is expressed not as "a dialectical either/or," but as "a dialogical both/and" (Clark & Holquist 1984:7). The "dialogical both/and" is against the predominance of a single voice and worldview; it is for entering into dialogue of permitting differences and conflicts.

The dialogic concept of both/and is also a characteristic of "conjunctive faith" that is Stage 5 in the theory of faith development stages proposed by James Fowler (1981:117-214).<sup>61</sup> According to Fowler, while Stage 4 Individuative-Reflective faith takes the dichotomizing logic of "either/or," Stage 5 Conjunctive faith "sees both (or the many) sides of an issue simultaneously." The limits of individual and dichotomizing faith of "either/or" are overcome by the movement to the conjunctive and dialogical "both/and" faith of Stage 5. Thus in describing Stage 5's style he prefers "*dialogical* knowing" to "dialectical knowing." An essential feature of Stage 5 is that "dialogue" occurs at this

---

<sup>61</sup> James Fowler suggested the six stages of faith: Stage 1. Intuitive-Projective Faith, Stage 2. Mythic-Literal Faith, Stage 3. Synthetic-Conventional Faith, Stage 4. Individuative-Reflective Faith, Stage 5. Conjunctive Faith, Stage 6. Universalizing Faith.

stage. “In dialogical knowing the known is invited to speak its own word in its own language. In dialogical knowing the multiplex structure of the world is invited to disclose itself. In a mutual ‘speaking’ and ‘hearing’, knower and known converse in an I-Thou relationship. ... Stage 5’s dialogical knowing requires a knower capable of dialogue” (Fowler 1981:185).

From this view, the development of faith is a process toward accepting differences, and the route toward knowledge is a process toward participation in dialogue. Consequently, maturity of faith and knowing is possible on the assumption that even differences and disagreement between speaker (church) and the audience would be permitted and dialogized. In dialogical faith, differences are understood as the surplus of seeing.

### **5.3.5 Dialogic Conflict in *The Gold-Crowned Jesus***

If this is the case, how can the Christian community constitute the madang-theatre of accepting differences? Observing how madanggŭk deals with these differences and conflicts will be very valuable in mapping out strategies of polyphonic dialogue. Madanggŭk aimed at dialogical understanding of both/and rather than the binary opposition of either/or, by revealing the differences and conflicts among its characters. Word-exchange as a device of disclosing differences makes continuous dialogue possible. In this process, people have the opportunity of casting away their prejudice that the human being can understand himself as a whole in an individual own world, and recognize instead that they are in need for the other’s surplus of seeing.

Madanggŭk used a technique of “dialogic clashes” between characters, by having a character meet another opposing character “dialogically.” The constitution of the character in madanggŭk and t’alch’um is based on conflict and difference: the dialogical encounter of conflicts between the ruling and the ruled, the rich and the poor, religious leaders and common people, men and women. It can be said that this binary opposition in character-constitution of madanggŭk serves to expose a distorted

dominant paradigm and monologism in reality. Accordingly, the dichotomous structure of character is used ultimately as a device to help the audience to recognize and criticize the monologic reality and to have the eyes of polyphonic dialogue.

For instance, in *The Gold-crowned Jesus* (Kim Chi Ha 1978:85-131), humble and diseased characters are juxtaposed with privileged characters, which is indeed a marked feature of most madanggŭk works. The characters are priest, nun, beggar, leper, prostitute, gold-crowned Jesus Christ, company president, policeman, and university student. A topic of dialogue is an issue of the removal of illegally built shacks, that is, the den of prostitutes, indeed the residence of the poor people.

The first dialogic conflict is seen between the priest of a parish church and the others: (1) the priest and a prostitute; (2) the priest and members of the Peace Committee for the Achievement of Social Justice; (3) the priest and a nun; (4) the priest and a leper, a beggar. While the others understand and are concerned with the removal of the den of prostitutes as a public matter, the priest reduces it to an individual matter and is concerned only with a matter of individual faith.

Priest: That is a political matter. The church is not supposed to get involved in such things.

Nun: Why not? ... Even if the national laws go against the law of God? (p.90)

The process of constant dialogic conflict gives the priest the opportunity to reflect himself, even if it does not bring about a change in him. This is revealed in his words spoken in a low voice, after the nun leaves:

“What is to become of me, what will... I wasn't like this before...  
I wasn't like this when I was young. (p.92)

The second dialogic conflict is seen in the encounter between a leper, a beggar and the nun. As the nun is walking briskly, the spiteful beggar stretches out his leg and trips the

nun, who stumbles. The beggar cries out as if his foot were hurt. At this moment, the leper argues with the beggar who sits beside him on the matter of begging for money from the nun. Beggar: “Let’s get it.” Leper: “Let it go.” (p.99) This is a dialogic conflict among the populace.

During the conflict, the nun shows the figure of the Good Samaritan, saying, “I’m sorry. I’ll be back to see you in a little while.”(p.100) This is quite different from the attitude of the priest, who escapes from reality saying “I’m in a hurry.”(p.106) A helping relationship forms between beggar and nun. A beggar is a minjung, a defective common person; a nun is a person who understands the defective. The good Samaritan means one who participates in reality, that is, in dialogue with reality.

After the priest disappears, other dialogic conflict between leper and beggar arises on the matter of judging church and Christian (which will be dealt with in detail in the topic of Critical Public Dialogue).

In this work, a company president appears to buy a sexy girl with “money” before the leper and the beggar. After that, a policeman appears and demands that the leper and the beggar pay money for the place:

“Hurry up. Slip me a fiver. Quick, before anyone sees us.”

Beggar: “Today was a total flop.” (pp.113-114)

The juxtaposition of characters in *The Gold-crowned Jesus* reveals binary opposition in reality. Furthermore, it is a mirror reflecting each other through dialogue, that is, manifesting the difference of my own I from the other’s I. The heroes of madanggük are usually characterized as “defective” characters as in this work. The defective characters use their defects to show the privileged ruling characters their own deceitfulness.

The defective characters never keep silent about the ruler's monologic utterance, nor do they antagonize in a fury. The defective heroes carry on dialogue through continuous "word-exchange," instead of silence or wrath. Through dialogue, the characters experience the strange others in and around themselves in spite of or beyond disagreement and conflict.

In addition, the defectives also have their own different voices, so dialogic conflicts even break out among themselves. Their different voices are not merged into one voice, even into an authorial voice. Rather, in the relationship of dialogic conflict between the self and the other, the self experiences the other as a subject. That is, both the self and the other become subjects producing meanings. The dialogic interaction of opposed points of views and voices provides a momentum to collapse unitary monologic thinking and dichotomizing dominant logic.

In the process of polyphonic dialogue between opposed characters, all characters realize the nature of the statue of the "gold-crowned Jesus" who is waiting for the moment when the gold crown will be removed. They perceive the fact that Jesus will be alive when they remove the golden crown, but Jesus is just a statue when they put the crown on Him. A ruling worldview and monologism that do not accept the others' voices made the living Jesus into a statue of the gold-crowned Jesus. Only at the moment that polyphonic dialogue occurs can the golden crown of privileged monologism be taken off, and Jesus start his activity for the world.

It is through the constant dialogue between the opposed characters that the golden crown of monologism seems to be demolished. Removal of the gold-crowned monologue does not rely on a dichotomizing way of either/or in right-wrong. Rather, it is possible through the process of polyphonic dialogue of both/and because the polyphonic process helps to accept others by understanding the surplus of seeing of each other, and by realizing or creating genuine meaning autonomously.

In *The Gold-crowned Jesus* the leper helps to remove the crown from the head of the statue. But the priest, the company president and the policeman look on it in astonishment and snatch the crown from the leper. In an instant, the gold crown is returned to the head of Jesus, who grows as stiff as he had been before. The last scene ends in the justification or defense of monologism; that is, the priest, the company president, the policeman and a university student are all busy defending themselves. The last line from the student reveals clearly their monologism and their evasion of reality: “Don’t put that spotlight on me. Please, I beg you not to do that.” (p.131) The removal of the crown from Jesus still remains as the Christian’s mission.

### **5.3.6 The Mission of Removal of the Monologic Gold Crown**

In a polyphonic encounter, conflict and difference are the starting point of dialogue. The polyphonic approach is not a utopian dialogue that has nothing to do with the reality. Rather, as mentioned above, it begins with recognizing the reality of difference and contradiction, and criticizing monologic reality. The polyphonic approach has nothing in common with relativism. As Bakhtin (1984:69) indicates, “Both relativism and dogmatism equally exclude all argumentation, all authentic dialogue, by making it either unnecessary (relativism) or impossible (dogmatism). Polyphony as an *artistic* method lies in an entirely different plane.”

The polyphonic dialogue moves beyond a mere reconciliation. It is an event of accepting conflicts and differences. Thus, the way the Christian community deals with differences is not a merging of various voices into one, but rather a way of preparing the blank space for polyphonic dialogue through conflict. The blank space is at the boundary of two (or more) voices or two worldviews. If the two are not open to each other, dialogue is impossible. In one word, the occurrence of dialogue is possible neither through monologue nor binary opposition, but in the open space between opposed things.

This public dialogue of accepting differences demands ethical answerability. A dialogic community assumes the responsibility of accepting even the defective others. The dialogic community should have the ability to see the context behind his defects. Jesus' community accepted even the traitor Judas Iscariot who had an extreme defect. The community with a dialogic eye should help to accomplish his true self through dialogue with the defective others.

Therefore, difference is not something to be removed, but demands an awakening of the community of faith to bear the responsibility for the other dialogically. The truth of God is not one-way monologism, but polyphonic dialogism. Both the truth of God and polyphonic dialogue can be expressed as "love" in Christian terms. Love seems to be a unitary language in the view of Christian ethics, but it has in fact the nature of polyphony in the sense of accepting even the defective others. It thus appears that in Christian love, double-voiced discourse and polyphonic dialogue are possible.

In simpler terms, the polyphonic approach in madang public dialogue is a dialogic attitude to accepting differences and conflicts between the church and the others; so it is the high point of incarnational public dialogue. Incarnational public dialogue resists the logic of dichotomy based on the "fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil" which concentrates its attention on splitting things into good and evil, right and wrong. In the "dichotomy thinking," dialogue seems to be of secondary importance, or there seems to be no dialogue. On the contrary "Incarnational thinking" places accent on the "Tree of Life" that is a Christian logic of "giving life." Judging the evil with the good would belong to God in nature. Success and failure of the public dialogue through madang-theatre depend on "how to give life" to the other, and how to lead the other to a dialogic event in transactional (mutual) and polyphonic relationships.

The difference and conflict between church and society, Christian and non-Christian, are not factors that cause an estrangement. Rather, they are prerequisites to produce meaning and a dialogic relationship. Seeing in the light of otherness and outsidership,

the Christian community can accomplish church identity through the dialogic relations with the other. And the reverse is also true. The reason for the praxis of madang public dialogue being based on incarnational principles is that church and society should enter a dialogic relationship of enriching each other through a polyphonic approach. The church sees the other, and, at the same time, the church sees itself through the seeing of the other. Therefore, it can be said that the way toward society (non-Christian) is not only the way toward the other, but also the way toward the church itself. At this moment, the necessity that the church sees its reflection in the other is raised. Hence, society becomes a space and time for delving into church identity. In spite of their differences, the church and the other (society) enter into dialogic relationships through incarnated madang public dialogue.

#### **5.4 The Second Model: Critical Public Dialogue**

The first alternative model for public dialogue through madang-theatre is Incarnational Public Dialogue that aims at audience participation and difference-acceptance under the principles of otherness, outsidership, unfinalizability and polyphony. The second alternative model focuses on practical ways to embody the principles of the incarnational public dialogue practically in madang public dialogue. The praxis of incarnational dialogue demands a critical point of view because it starts from recognizing and correcting the distorted communication and relationship of monologism. Therefore, it is directly linked to the ways of bringing to fruition the audience's critical competency of reality-cognition, reality-criticism and reality-change. That is why the second alternative model is named "Critical Public Dialogue."

Critical Public Dialogue deals with the following matters. Firstly, madang public dialogue takes the function of reality-recognition and reality-criticism, which enables the audience to be an interpretive being in madang-theatre, by developing the competency of understanding and overstanding (criticism). Secondly, the model of critical public



dialogue concerns how to solve a temptation to convey fixed Christian messages in a monologic way. Thirdly, it deals with how to create the “dialogic” madang-theatre according to the incarnational principles of public dialogue, proposing practical strategies.

In order to produce dialogic madang-theatre, the alternative model of critical public dialogue handles three questions. The first question is how the Christian community will contain two voices (Christian’s own voice and the audience’s voice), and express two<sup>62</sup> (or more) sides (i.e. ambivalence or multivalence) of a certain dramatic situation in madang-theatre. The second question is how the Christian community will communicate a Christian story without merging the audience’s voices into the Christian’s own story or its single voice. The third question is why empathy and identification with a given story/voice are problematic in forming a true subject and a dialogic event, what the scheme for overcoming the matters of empathy and identification is, and how the Christian community can help the audience to return as a participative subject with an interpretive and critical ability.

#### **5.4.1 Cognition, Criticism, and Change of Reality**

One of madanggük’s characteristics, as revealed in Chapter 4, is that it was an instrument of a cognitive and critical process of reality. Madanggük functioned as an organ that expressed the reality of the common people (*minjung*) and public opinion by informing the truth of reality, and by criticizing and correcting what had been misreported during a period when people were deprived of the freedom of speech (Chae 1985:4).

---

<sup>62</sup> Strictly speaking, there are more voices and sides than “two”, that is, multi-voices and many-sides. But here the “two” will be used as a term that connotes the meaning of “multi” and “many” because madang public dialogue focuses mainly on the dialogic relationship between the “two” of church (including Christians as performers) and others (non-Christian as audiences).

The Christian community of madang public dialogue starts from the point of reflecting and criticizing a distorted church-individualism and its monologic communication and relationships. In fact, it is due to these distorted attitudes that the Christian community can no longer exercise its influence over the others (society or non-Christian). Therefore, cognition and criticism have to aim for “change.”

“Critical” public dialogue is concerned with promoting recognition, criticism and a change in relationships and methods of communication as the first step toward change. The reason is that, first of all, by means of this shift from monologic relationships and communication methods to dialogic ones, the Christian community and society might be structurally transformed themselves from monologism to dialogism.

Bertolt Brecht is a playwright and producer who created modes in the theatre for the cognition, criticism and change of reality. He combined his theatric activity with political alternatives, and considered the utility of art in connection with social reality, rather than with matters intrinsic to art. As a result, he proposed the “Epic Theatre” and “Lehrstück” (The Learning Theatre)<sup>63</sup> as theatric models to actively advance the reformation of reality. Epic Theatre encourages the audience to see the theatre with an “objective and critical” eye by blocking empathy and merging into it. Brecht adopted the mode of “epic” in which the story of “the past” i.e. history is unfolded. Epic Theatre thus helps the audience to recognize that this theatre is not real but just a fiction. They are related to the action of recognizing and criticizing the reality that art and culture degenerated into a slave of politics, by atrophying the people’s socio-political consciousness through art and culture. In this reality, Brecht attempts to reconstruct theatre as a means of reality-transformation. To start with, he completely discarded the communicative system of “production—transmission—reception” of conventional theatre (Geiger & Haarmann 1996:49-56).

---

<sup>63</sup> In the case of Lehrstück participants perform in the theatre without spectators, emphasizing the learning act in the process.

In this sense, Brecht's theatre of reality-recognition and reality-change has a close resemblance to madanggük. Brecht and madanggük proposed the principle of "the audience-participation in theatre" as an alternative to produce cognitive, critical and dialogic theatre. Their works are constructed around a simple plot and a small number of characters, who are mainly students and amateurs. Their main concern is neither a so-called "art for art" nor "art for showing" but "art for reality." Therefore, through the participative and dialogic communicative channel of theatre, both concentrated on promoting the reality-cognition and on revealing the contradictions of reality. The criticism implies an "act", that is, an act of transformation. For this reason, Heinz Geiger and Hermann Haarmann (1996:51) called Brecht's performing art a "practical negative art" in the sense that it is "a criticizing art with an eye of change-possibility."

How, then, will the Christian community make madang public dialogue an act of cognition, criticism, and change, on the basis of incarnational principles? And what problems are inherent in this process?

For Esslin (1978:21,23), theatre is the most concrete form in which we can think about human situations; that is, it is "a method by which we can translate abstract concepts into concrete human terms, or by which we can set up a situation and work out its consequences." Thus he (1978:21) suggests that the best way to argue and discuss a certain theme, for example, "capital punishment is effective or ineffective," is to write and act out a play about it. In order to make reality-cognitive theatre, the "process" of cognition must be brought to the fore of expression.

However, a problem is raised here if it is implied that themes of theatre may be worked out arbitrarily according to the author's intention. The reason it is problematic is that it is a monologic communication in which a single authorial voice maintains a superior position over the voices of the others. There is no room for the audience's participation, i.e. for the dialogic encounter of two stories (our story and the other's story) and for double-voiced discourse. Consequently, the audience remains a passive consumer. In

one word, it runs counter to the spirit of incarnational dialogue.

In incarnational madang-theatre, the author and the performers are, as already mentioned, only one half of the total process: the other half is the audience and its reaction. For madang public dialogue, moreover, the competency of infinite interpretation and creative participation returns to the audience; the audience thus becomes a producer of meaning and change through the process of cognition and the criticism of reality.

In audience-returned madang public dialogue, the audience can agree or disagree with the author-centered intentional theatre with their competency of infinite interpretation. Therefore, as Esslin (1978:113) said, even though the author makes all kinds of efforts to perceive a theme or scene as invested with authorial special meaning, it will still have a great many different meanings.

The point not to be overlooked here is that the audience's cognitive, participative acts are not an individual but a "collective" reaction in the theatre. Anyone who has ever performed, including the author, will confirm their collective reaction to theatre. Esslin (1978:100) points out that because of the very collective (unlike individual) responses, "it is very revealing to see how over-propagandist drama defeats its own ends." The interpretative activity expressed into the collective reaction of the audience reinforces the activity of consensus or criticism to the author's subjective intention. If the author's intention turns out to be irrational, it will face strong, collective criticism expressed by the audience, and, in the end, the empathy toward the individual intention will be blocked. That is why Esslin (1978:100) asserts as follows: "Thus the message (political or otherwise) which a play contains always coexists with a demonstration of its reception by a social unit, the collectivity of the audience."

The example of "the campaign for the abolition of the death penalty" will help to comprehend the relation between the authorial intention and the audience's critical

reaction. Esslin (1978:96) explains: “A playwright wants to write a powerful piece against hanging. So he may invent a story about a murder, in which the victim is as guilty as the murderer. He will be tempted, in order to achieve his very laudable aim, to weight the case as much against the death penalty, as much in favor of the condemned man as possible. If he does that, the supporters of the death penalty will come out as black villains, determined on punishment as revenge. But, if the author concerned yields to this temptation, the effect of the play will nevertheless be quite different from the one he intended. For his exaggeratedly villainous characters will appear as cardboard figures and in performance the audience will remain unconvinced of the truth of the argument.”

In this case, the author’s irrationality is clearly revealed, so the audience’s criticism can be followed with not too much difficulty. But, in the case of an author’s intention being covered up, it is not easy for the audience to recognize it.

The fact that the audience has the faculty of interpretation and of agreeing or the right of disagreeing with the single authorial voice is not to say that the author’s single intention should be permitted without limitation. Rather, it is obvious that the competency of understanding and overstanding, cognition and criticism cannot be developed automatically. Therefore, it is necessary for the Christian community to make a plan to foster the critical faculty of the audience.

#### **5.4.2 Temptation toward Monologic Communication of Fixed Messages**

When practicing madang public dialogue, new “heroism” tempts the Christian community all the time. This is the temptation of the so-called “holy pursuit” of “inculcating” religious values in the audience. The Christian community is always tempted to make the audience subordinate to the church’s single story or voice, ignoring the others’ stories or voices. The reason for this is that the church community

has a tendency to make a deep impression on the audience with messages from the Scriptures or doctrine.

However, as already indicated, the Bible is constructed in “performative” words that provoke actions of praxis, criticism, beyond the dimension of merely “receiving” fixed meanings. The Bible, filled with performative words, throws open its values and meanings to the audience’s interpretive ability. So the audience not only “understands” but also analyzes and practices it by standing over the messages. The development of the two faculties (i.e. recognition and criticism, understanding and overstanding) is a central purpose of critical public dialogue. It seems to be facilitated only by the practice of incarnational principles of public dialogue, that is, by returning the infinite interpretative competency to the audience, by accepting the audience as a participative subject through the death of the church’s monologism, and by accepting the differences between church and audience in polyphonic harmony. If the Christian community makes the audience remain only in “understanding,” it cannot be a real incarnational public dialogue accepting the audience as a participant. It is because, in this process, only the author or speaker is alive; the audience disappears into the passive role.

When the Christian community tries to transmit all meanings in its own voice, it can never move beyond a church-centered monologic world, and never fulfill genuine public dialogue. A critical principle of Christian madang public dialogue, therefore, requires recognition of the temptation of monologic communication, and a criticism of the monologic attitude in which the church despises the infinite interpretive competency of the audience. Therefore, the competency of cognition and criticism becomes a key to open dialogue because it functions to resist a monologic communication and a relationship based on a single voice and unitary centripetal language, and recovers the audience as an active participant in madang public dialogue.

If the Christian community is to comply with the “critical” principle in madang public dialogue, it has to overcome the temptation of making un-dialogic theatre such as

propaganda theatre that carries only an authorial “single intention” and “transmits” “fixed” messages with “dogmatic” attitudes. Henri Gouhier (1996:186) asserts that an edificatory theatre and a propaganda theatre are only to reflect the expression of religious passion and intention. He goes to say that advocacy or propaganda is a spirit of preaching, a political argument, a public prosecutor’s address, and rhetorical justification.

Propagandist theatre is removed from dialogic theatre. It cannot serve dialogue. An effort to make theatre according to the styles of persuasion or testimony cannot but modify dialogic theatre to the theatre of demonstration. Such an edificatory theatre or propagandist theatre does not accept the other’s voice or consciousness. These theatres deprived of dialogic nature will eventually fail to foster the audience’s faculty of recognition and criticism. Considering that madang public dialogue focuses on the praxis of “dialogue,” to select only Christian themes and to dramatize the life of Jesus or the saints is not sufficient to create a dialogic event with others in the theatre.

### **5.4.3 Expression of Ambivalence**

#### **5.4.3.1 Cognition and Expression**

During the period of the madanggük, it is obvious that lack of expression caused lack of cognition and criticism. Under the loss of the freedom of expression, the people lost the opportunity to understand and criticize its reality. So it can be said that cognition and criticism are acquired only at the moment they are “expressed.” Benedetto Croce (1974:40-41; 1992:1-11) asserts that feeling, cognition through intuition, exists within expression; so recognition and expression cannot and should not be separated in nature. For Croce, all art is expression; all expression is art. And the reason an artist can be a person of outstanding stature is not because of the greatness of his technical ability but because of the greatness of his expressive ability (Hauskeller 2003:96-98). Therefore, it is important that the process of cognition and criticism is “expressed” in

the madang-theatre for public dialogue.

If this is the case, what will be expressed in so-called “cognition and criticism-theatre”? And how will it be expressed? The former is a matter of content of expression, and the latter a matter of method of expression. The critical model of madang public dialogue that emphasizes cognition, criticism and change suggests the expression of ambivalence or multivalence, double-voiced discourse, self-criticism, an estrangement effect and a making of critical distance as its content and methodology.

#### **5.4.3.2 Ambivalence of Beauty and Ugliness**

To begin with, the ambivalence of the beauty and ugliness of reality has to be expressed simultaneously in madang public dialogue. The ambivalence is an actual condition of reality. Hegel (1970:37, 206-208) focused on depicting only beauty as the sole purpose of art. For him, anything revealing the deficiency and darkness of life such as human suffering or difficulties should not be objects of artistic expression (cf. Hauskeller 2003:77-84). On the contrary, Croce (1992:82-90; 1974:49) insists, what is expressed is itself beauty, so there is no ugliness in art. For him, “expression and beauty are not two concepts, but a single concept.” It means that to express the sufferings and ugliness of reality is no less beautiful than to depict pleasure and rightness.

One representative scholar who criticizes “art for beauty” is Karl Rosenkranz who concentrated on the expression of the ambivalence of reality. Deploring the trend of art that is intentionally silent on the ugliness of reality, Rosenkranz (1990:9, in Hauskeller 2003:86-87) asserts that life is not always beauty; rather “we exist entirely in ugliness. Thus art indeed cannot be restricted within beauty. We should not hesitate to express ugliness.”

This emphasis on the expression of ugliness is not because beauty is highlighted by



contrast with ugliness, but because to restrict reality within beauty is nothing but a superficial understanding of reality (Rosenkranz 1990:38, in Hauskeller 2003:88). In this way, refusing to acknowledge ugliness not only constitutes passing over reality but also falsifying an idea and a truth. The content of madang public dialogue, thus, should contain the ugliness of the real as well as the ideal of beauty. This ambivalence between ugliness and beauty expressed in madang-theatre will form the groundwork for building up the audience's balanced ability for cognition and criticism of reality, and transformation toward an ideal at the same time.

#### **5.4.3.3 Ambivalence of Two Sides and Two Voices**

Besides the beauty and ugliness of reality, madang public dialogue has to show the ambivalence of two (or multi) sides of a situation in a theatrical work. The two sides of a situation are closely connected with the two voices—the authorial voice and the other's voice. As reality contains the ambivalence of beauty and ugliness, so a concrete situation of reality has two or more sides and voices.

What are two sides of a situation? How can the ambivalence sides be concretely expressed in the madang-theatre for public dialogue without yielding to the temptation of monologism? It can be clearly explained in the example of “the campaign for the abolition of the death penalty” mentioned above. In this case, one side is the voice of the author who insists on the abolition of the death penalty. In order to drive home his point, the author will declare that the victim is as guilty as the murderer. However, if (s)he is a dialogic dramatist, (s)he will express the ambivalence of the two sides/voices of the situation, that is, the victim's side/voice and the murderer's side/voice, regardless of the author's intention. So “he will have to let us see the sufferings of the family of the murder victim, the consequences of letting a murder go unpunished on other potential murderers, and so on” (Esslin 1978:97).

To express the ambivalence of two sides or two voices is not easy for an author who

manifests self-assertion. The author would feel uneasy about the expression of ambivalence. The author would suspect that the expression of ambivalence spoils his/her plan and intention. However, Esslin (1978:97) believes that with the approach of ambivalence, it is possible to set the theatre against the death penalty, because the effect of theatre depends not on the author's intention and his/her own voice but on the quality of objective theatre and the so-called ambivalence. If theatre allows the audience to see a dramatic situation from two viewpoints all the time, "it will have a profound effect, but a long-term one. ... And that long-term effect may be quite different from the one immediately intended."

If the Christian community does not transmit fixed messages and their meanings, how can the audience approach meaning? The answer is, in one word, "*through dialogue*." Inevitably, a collision between two sides or two voices takes place. And in the process of the dialogic collision, the audience approaches meaning with its faculty of autonomous interpretation. From the critical point of view of madang public dialogue, meaning is, indeed, not an object of possession, but a fruit of the process of dialogic collision between two sides/voices. Meaning does not belong to a certain person; that is, it belongs to neither the author and the character nor the audience. It belongs to a dialogic process. Bakhtin (1984:110) describes the dialogic nature of meaning as follows: "Meaning—truth—is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born *between people* collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction." The audience's participation and active response to dialogic interaction and collision are a prerequisite for producing meaning.

Therefore, there is no reason to suspect that the expression of ambivalence spoils the church's voice and plan. Rather, to sound the two voices, to express the two sides, that is, the dialogic encounter between the church's story and the other's story, results in the creation of meaning and the return of the audience to an interpretative and participative subject. The activity of interpretation and meaning produced by the audience in the process of a dialogic interaction is, therefore, a creative activity that

supplements and enriches the unfinalized blank of the story. Meaning results from “co-creativity” (Bakhtin 1986:142) of two or multi-voices.

#### **5.4.3.4 Three Types of Double-Voiced Discourse**

To express ambivalence (two or more sides) in madang-theatre does not guarantee a *cognitive* and *dialogic* theatre. In other words, the discourse accepting the other’s voice, double-voiced discourse, does not always guarantee a participative dialogue. The reason is that the expression of ambivalence or double-voiced discourse can be misused for the purpose of highlighting the author’s single voice. Depending on “the purpose” for which the two voices are expressed, it can be determined whether the madang-theatre is *dialogic or not*. Therefore, the question of “*dialogic or not*” relies not on whether it expresses the ambivalence, but on what the purpose of that ambivalence is.

According to Bakhtin (1984:199), two-voiced discourse can be classified into three types. (1) The first type is “uni-directional double-voiced discourse,” which tends toward a fusion of two or multi-voices into one. (2) The second type is “vari-directional double-voiced discourse.” In this type, vari-directional two voices become internally dialogized. But this tends to disintegrate into the first type of discourse, for here are two voices, but the mutual relationship between them is not active. (3) The third type is “the active type”—“vari-directional double-voiced discourse reflecting the other’s voices.” Diverse forms of mutual relationship with the other’s voices are possible here.

In the light of the three types of double-voiced discourse, any intensification of the other’s voices in a certain discourse or in a certain madang-theatre can be only a game, in which the author permits the expression of ambivalence in order that his own single voice and consciousness might be heard more strongly later. All voices here are gathered together in a single speech. The other’s voices are “subordinated to the verbal and semantic dictatorship of a monologic, unified style and a unified tone” (Bakhtin 1984:204). In this case neither authentic dialogue nor polyphonic harmony

takes place between two voices.

How, then, can the Christian community avoid the distorting tendency of the expression of two voices in making a madang public dialogue? How will the Christian community approach the third type, that is, the “vari-directional double-voiced discourse reflecting the other’s voices” in it? For the third type, at least three steps must be followed.

*The first step is to re-check the purpose (or intention) of the expression of ambivalence:* why are two voices reflected in madang-theatre? When the two-voiced discourse aims to form a unified spirit, it reverts to monologism, because it cannot draw the audience’s spontaneous participation in madang public dialogue, and cannot develop its interpretation and criticism. The purpose of the double-voiced discourse for madang public dialogue needs to lie in polyphonic harmony toward dialogic interaction of two different voices and worldviews without one overlapping onto the other or merging into a single voice.

*The second step is to express the two sides and voices as coexisting,* so that the audience can hear and understand all sides and voices immediately and simultaneously. What is important here is the fact that the simultaneous coexistence of two voices can, and should be expressed in the form of not only agreement or consensus, but also of collision or polemic. In this way, not only “the possibility of simultaneous coexistence” but also “the possibility of being side by side one against the other” (Bakhtin 1984:29) is allowed in madang public dialogue. However, to juxtapose and counterpose two sides/voices should not be for the purpose of fusion into a single voice. It should aim to accept differences and conflicts on the basis of the polyphonic harmony of dialogism.

*The third step is the “dialogic interaction” of two voices,* which is the most important essential in madang public dialogue. The key method of critical public dialogue is interaction through the artistically organized “coexistence” and “dialogic collision” of two

or a variety of voices, not the representation of a unified spirit of the Christian community. The interaction of two voices, therefore, will follow not dialectic thinking based on binary opposition of either/or, but dialogic thinking based on polyphonic harmony of both/and. As long as a dialogue remains multi-leveled and multi-voiced, as long as people are still arguing in the dialogue, as Bakhtin (1984:39) remarks, there is no reason to despair over the absence of a solution, because here the collapse of a monologism of the so-called “new Tower of Babel” occurs, instead of a conventional solution that signifies the centralization of various voices in an authorial single voice.

#### **5.4.4 Self-Criticism: How to Communicate the Christian Story**

It has been mentioned above that critical public dialogue should show the two voices in madang-theatre for public dialogue, avoiding the transmission of an authorial intention of the Christian community. If so, does it mean that the Christian community can never tell its own story?

The answer is simple. Avoiding a single authorial voice does not mean that the Christian community is prohibited from communicating its own story and message in madang public dialogue. Dialogue is a transactional encounter of the two sides of a situation, the two stories and voices of church and audience. Dialogue thus demands both. The problem is not whether the church speaks the Christian story or not, but “how” it speaks its own story. The Christian community, therefore, has the task of devising how to deal with its own story and voice in madang public dialogue, keeping polyphonic harmony with others.

Critical public dialogue, the second alternative model of madang public dialogue, here proposes a “*critical approach*” as a method of dealing with Christian messages. In madang public dialogue the Christian community considers madang-theatre as a mirror in which the church looks at itself, and as a time-space of cognition and criticism that contributes to great changes. This critical method of dealing with the church’s own story

allows the church to reflect on and criticize itself in public. Here, the madang-theatre and its madang space function as a place for self-reflection and self-criticism in public.

*The Gold-crowned Jesus* reveals some concrete examples of the church's self-recognition and self-criticism. Here are presented three examples of church's self-criticism.

Firstly, through a priest the church criticizes the indifference toward reality of the church leaders, as mentioned above. The priest is reflected as a representative of church-individualism and its privatization. He is careless about social, political matters and the poor, defective people at the same time.

Priest: That is a political matter. The church is not supposed to get involved in such things. (p.92)

Leper and beggars: Give us something, please.

Priest: I'm in a hurry. (Quickly gets out of their way and leaves the stage very hurriedly without looking back.) (p.106)

The second example is the church's self-criticism through the character of the beggar.

Beggar: ...why you think Christians are good?

Leper: I'm not saying that all Christians are good, but I like her kind of Christian; she is different. (She is 'nun'.)

Beggar: Christians are all the same. They're all crooks. ...I was raised in an orphanage and the Christians there were the biggest thieves of all... They'd robbed the funds. (p.102)

Beggar: Do you still like Christians?... Does Jesus feed you?

Leper: There's a difference between Jesus and Christians... I feel it.

Jesus is okay, but the Christians sold him out.

Who is this Jesus who was sold out by the Christians? (pp.106-107)

The third example is the self-criticism through the dialogue of Jesus and the leper.

Leper: Jesus, Jesus, Jesus, what could I possibly be to Jesus? Why would you even bother with someone like me? Once I was a believer.  
But... “Don’t complain about being hungry, but suffer it.”  
Even when they beat and abuse you, torment you, they say this is necessary —if you are to enter heaven—and they call it the “will of God.”  
When your house gets torn down, “Stay silent, don’t fight, and turn the other cheek...” “Obey them, for these are the *true* believers.” (p.119)

The leper vomits the *soju* wine and throws himself down before the statue of Jesus. He examines the statue very closely and removes the crown from the head of the statue. As soon as he has removed it, Jesus breaks the silence and addresses the leper. The dialogue of Jesus and the leper is abridged as follows:

Jesus: I have been closed up in this stone for a long, long time.

Leper: Who put you in prison?

Jesus: They pray using my name in a way that prevents my reaching out to poor people like yourself. In my own name, they nailed me down to the cross again.

Leper: What can be done to free to you, Jesus, make you live again so that you can come to us?

Jesus: People like you must help to liberate me.

Leper: Jesus, I am helpless.

Jesus: It is for that exact reason you *can* help me. Take it and share it with your friends. (pp.121-124)

The relation of madang-theatre with the audience is a surplus-relationship. With the surplus of seeing of the audience, the Christian community can see, enrich and criticize itself. In the same way, the audience can also see, enrich and criticize itself through the surplus of seeing of the Christian community. On the basis of the surplus-relationship, church and audience criticize themselves. The artistically organized self-critical action brings about a change in communication from monologism to dialogism. On the one hand, this self-criticism will lead to an internal change in the Christian community itself, by demolishing both the partitioning wall and the exclusive, monologic way of

communication which concerns only its own voice. On the other hand, it will cause an external change of relationship with the other, by listening carefully to the audience's different voices and by reflecting the other's point of view in a madang public dialogue.

Moreover, the Christian community's self-critical act helps to open the audience's closed mind to the church. As a result, the audience may also join in self-recognition and self-criticism, and listen to other stories and voices (including the church's story and voice) which are different from theirs. From this view, critical action in madang-theatre will inevitably induce a dialogic event and a transformative event such as the social innovation of the monologic status quo.

#### **5.4.5 Empathy and Critical Detachment**

The last question in the praxis of the incarnational principles through a critical approach is how the Christian community will lead the audience to take a critical point of view as they experience the madang-theatre. This is connected with the task of returning the audience to an interpretive and critical "subject" in order to participate in dialogue and to create a dialogic and transformative event through the madang-theatre.

##### **5.4.5.1 An Interpellated Subject and a Matter of Empathy**

To accept the audience as a participative "subject" in the realm of dialogic madang-theatre is not a simple matter. As researched above, all two-voiced discourse is not always a dialogue in which the other's voices are reflected without overlapping or merging into a single voice. It is because the double-voiced discourse can be misused for the hidden authorial purpose of highlighting the author's single voice. Through the distorted two-voiced discourse, a distorted subject might be shaped.

Louis Althusser (1984:44-50) studied the process of how a subject is formed by ideology. For him, ideology is not an aggregate of ideas, but a social practice in that the



function of ideology is to “recruit subjects among the individuals (it recruits them all), or transform the individuals into subjects (it transforms them all).” Then he adopts the concept of “interpellation or hailing” to explain the process of forming a subject by ideology. For example, when police (or others) hailed a man: “Hey, you there!” he (the man) recognized that the hail (interpellation) was really addressed to him, and “it was really he who was hailed.” In fact, the subject who hailed was the police; the man was an object who was hailed by police. But by the interpellation or hailing of police, he became a subject.

Althusser (1984:53) explains the event of “God’s calling of Moses” with the concept of interpellation. God, who interpellated-introduced himself as the Subject, that is, “*I am that I am,*” interpellated-called Moses. By the very interpellation, Moses recognizes that “he is a subject, a subject of God, a subject subjected to God, *a subject through the Subject and subjected to the Subject.*” The most important point is that the event that God interpellated-called Moses was the event of not only Moses himself but also the innumerable subjects of God’s people. In this same way, the mission of “interpellated-called church” as a subject is to help God’s people to be subjects, beyond the church’s individual event of calling. Madang public dialogue serves this mission for the church.

However, a serious problem is raised here: that is, the formation of a subject can be “distorted.” If it works through a monologic ideology of communication, the church community will fail in the formation of genuine subjects. Perceiving that “the existence ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects are one and the same thing,” Althusser (1984:49) remarks on the necessity of objectivity of ideology: “Ideology is necessary to be outside ideology, i.e. in scientific knowledge.” The limit of ideology is that “ideology *has no outside* (for itself), but at the same time *it is nothing but outside* (for science and reality).” This means that without objectivity of ideology, that is, unless ideology has a surplus of seeing from outside itself, the act through which ideology interpellates individuals as subjects may be “distorted.”

If so, how can the madang-theatre as a means of accepting the audience as a subject keep its objectivity or outsidership? Before answering this question, it is necessary to investigate a fundamental cause that makes theatre form a so-called “distorted” subject. The view of forming a subject by ideology or interpellation has been applied to analysis of the cinema (cf. Cho S.D. 2002:132). In the cinema, the audience becomes a subject by identifying and empathizing with the characters through his eyes and standpoint to the camera. For this reason, even though the cinema was made on the basis of a sense of male superiority, the women in the audience, far from criticizing it objectively, gave it a round of applause. The reason this was possible, concretely speaking, is that the women audience took a so-called “men’s subject” by identifying with men’s eyes and empathizing with the men-centered cinema. Empathy and identification with the cinema can be understood as an act of ideological interpellation that may cause “a distorted subject.”

In this way, not only the cinema but also mass media, including madang-theatre, easily yields to the reproduction of a monologic ideology or ruling ideology in the process of shaping the audience as a subject. In one word, the matter of accepting the audience as a subject can be misapplied by a ruling, monologic ideology. That is why critical public dialogue takes a skeptical view of matters of empathy and identification.

Since the time of Aristotle, empathy and identification have been the most important concepts in the artistic world. For Aristotle, mimesis, that is, imitation of action in a drama, signifies a catharsis through pity or horror. The catharsis through empathy and identification in art is problematic in polyphonic dialogue because it focuses on centripetal and mysterious experience, denying the social function of an objective and critical attitude. In his famous essay “*The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*” (1999:211-244), Walter Benjamin points out the problem of “art for art” that lays emphasis on empathy and the aesthetic and mysterious spirit, covering up social contradictions. This is the problem of, in his terms, “aura” that signifies a mysterious and subjective experience in art based on the features of “originality,

authenticity and uniqueness” (Benjamin 1999:217). He contends that this “pure” art, or aestheticism, contributed to the birth of Fascism. Simply expressed, the art that loses objectivity and criticism does nothing but produce monologic ideology.

Benjamin (1999:216) remarks that today’s age of mechanical reproduction demands “the mode (or manner) of human sense perception” different from the age of aura based on uniqueness, mystery and empathy.<sup>64</sup> According to his proposition, today’s art requires, instead of mysterious identification, “criticism and enjoyment.” Art is not an object of veneration any more; it becomes an object of criticism and enjoyment by the audience. This new art based on criticism and enjoyment (festivity) is an alternative that sees critically “art for art” having nothing to do with society.

To be a subject through empathy is quite different from being one through criticism of empathy. The former heads toward a single voice and centripetal force of “merging” or “empathizing” the other voices into one. It does not recognize the other’s surplus of seeing: it does not accept differences between I and the other. But the latter heads toward a polyphonic harmony of the two different sounds through co-existence or dialogic collision, instead of empathizing and merging into a single authorial voice.

In dialogism, meaning and even aesthetic value result from the process of participative dialogue among author, characters and audiences. Thus the empathy of the audience to heroes only destroys the participative production of new meaning and aesthetic value. Therefore, criticizing empathy is denying the ideology of fusion or merging into one voice. Consequently, it can be said that to form a genuine subject depends on accepting differences; so it is related to criticizing empathy and immersion.

---

<sup>64</sup> Benjamin says that the today’s age of mechanical reproduction lays emphasis on “its exhibition value” so “the work of art becomes a creation of new function” (Benjamin 1999:219).

#### 5.4.5.2 The Estrangement Effect and Keeping Critical Distance

In order to form the audience as a genuine subject, the Christian community needs to devise a method of criticizing monologic attitudes in performing art, madang-theatre. It is also a way of helping the audience to become a dialogic subject who participates in madang-theatre without merging into it. Without this method of avoiding empathy and immersion, the practice of the incarnational principles of public dialogue will become invalid. The method is connected with developing the audience's competency for understanding and criticism.

A method of overcoming the matter of immersion and empathy can be seen in Bertolt Brecht's effort. Clarifying his critical attitude about empathy, identification and catharsis distinctive to Aristotelian theatre, Brecht suggested the well-known "*Estrangement Effect* (Verfremdungseffekt)" which is often called "*Alienation Effect*" in English. He thus concentrates all his energies on the change from emotional theatre based on empathy to cognitive and critical theatre in order to reveal bourgeois social contradictions and to help new self-development and social transformation. That is why he created Epic Theatre and Lehrstück (educational theatre) mentioned above.

What is the "Estrangement Effect (V-effect)"? It is a way of estranging, alienating or separating the audience from theatre/work itself for the purpose of overcoming the temptation of immersion and empathy. It is a device for intervening in the audience's self-effacing attitude through empathy with the illusion of the theatre. According to Brecht, "the first condition of the V-effect is that stage and auditorium must be purged of all that is 'magical' and that no 'hypnotic fields' come about" (Wright 1989:27). The concrete examples (methods) of the Estrangement Effect are as follows: showing techniques of theatre, revealing the process of theatric production, interrupting the development of a story by talking to the audience during the performance, or by constituting several acts or scenes each with a different theme and so on. These are also characteristics of madanggük. That is, these show all the positions of subject and

object in the process of production, which are unfamiliar in conventional theatre.

The Estrangement Effect is a device “that remind us that representations are not given but produced” (Wright 1989:19). Thus, its function is to lead the audience to a realization of the fact that the theatre is not real but a mere fiction, and to create a critical distance lest the audience should empathize with the illusion of the theatre. By keeping a critical distance from the illusion of theatre through the V-effect, the audience can criticize the centripetal ideology that subordinates them to the monologic single order of author and characters, ignoring their voices.

Instead of individual, subjective empathy and identification, the Estrangement Effect focuses on relations and communication between theatre and the audience. All individual emotion is changed to an external form, and thus social relationships (such as that between characters and audiences) are naturally constituted in the theatre. In the process, the audience can be formed as subjects who participate in a dialogic theatre with critical, objective eyes, without merging their voices into a single voice through empathy.

Performing art which keeps a critical distance from empathy goes beyond the dimension of just “reflecting” reality, and helps to develop the competency to recognize and criticize distorted ideology and contradictions of reality. And the criticism in theatre entails not only reality-criticism as the content of madang-theatre. In fact, the matter of whether the theme criticizes reality is not vitally important in madang-theatre for public dialogue. What is more important here is whether it helps audiences to develop their competencies of recognition and criticism, instead of the fusion of two voices through empathy. This is the decisive function of criticism in madang public dialogue.

Critical public dialogue is therefore concerned with the change in the audience's attitude or position as well as the positions of text, author and characters. Text in dialogic madang-theatre has to be unfinalized, for it is accomplished through the

audience's participation. The author (church) has to create polyphonic theatre that expresses the ambivalence of two voices, two sides; a type of vari-directional double-voiced discourse that reflects the other's voices without fusion. During the performance, the performers (Christians) should also not identify themselves with the theatrical characters, but should depict characters roughly in order that the audience recognizes the difference between performers and the depicted characters of the theatre. Brecht insists that "he (the performer) never forgets, nor lets it be forgotten, that he is not the subject, but the demonstrator" (Wright 1989:32). Thus, his epic theatre takes a narrator in order to interfere with illusion. These changes will ultimately contribute to a change in the audience's attitude and position from that of a mere passive receiver to an active participant, and from a voiceless distorted subject to a creative, critical subject of a dialogic event with his own voice.

Through critical public dialogue that ensures that it sees the ambivalence and keeps critical detachment, the audience can be freed from the act of projecting itself into the theatre and from receiving its given meaning, and can approach a new image of being, that is, a dialogic subject in the same position as author or performers. This critical public dialogue implies "a moment of dispossession of the egoistic and narcissistic ego" (Ricoeur 1976:94) and the formulation of a new self-identity welcoming the surplus of the other and its differences.

## **5.5 The Third Model: Festival Public Dialogue**

The first model, *Incarnational Public Dialogue*, dealt with the church's attitude to incarnational dialogue, emphasizing the spirit of participative dialogue of the audience. The second model, *Critical Public Dialogue*, stressed the transformative spirit in making or taking part in dialogic madang-theatre. In this section, the third model—*Festival Public Dialogue* will focus on "festivity" in madang public dialogue. Madang public

dialogue has been researched as a faith-praxis from the point of view of dialogue (and of communication and relationship). Thus the model of festivity will emphasize the dialogic factors in play, festival or laughter. Festival Public Dialogue begins with some questions.

The first concern of the festival model of public dialogue is to examine how a festival field for public dialogue functions as a praxis-field to practice both incarnational and critical principles of madang public dialogue. How can the festivity deepen the dialogic relations between church and audience based on the incarnational model of public dialogue and enhance the festivity and play of madanggük? And how can the madang (an open space for public dialogue) of festival and the spirit of festival be occupied without the critical principles becoming stagnant?

The second concern of the festival model is how the festivity functions as “a zone of familiar contact” (Bakhtin 1984:158) where the church can take off the clothes of monologic and one-way communication, and engage with the other dialogically. In addition, how can the zone of contact be expanded beyond the space of madanggük performance to intensify the encounter as well as the festivity?

The madanggük as communicability was deep-rooted in festivity as well as in criticism. Thus, Chae Hee-Wan and Lim Jin-Taek (1982:85) summarize the distinctive spirit of madanggük as twofold: the “spirit of play” and the “spirit of madang.” According to them, “the spirit of play serves as an intrinsic ground of existence of an aesthetic sense of the common people (minjung) and plays a decisive role in raising communal spirit (shinmyong). In the contemporary madanggük as well, the spirit of play is the most fundamental, important spirit to make madang-performance possible.” On the other hand, “madang” (an open space) in madanggük is not only a mere playground for amusement, but a place where battles are fought against all outside forces that oppress life. So the spirit of madang is a kind of “openness” and “magnanimity” enabling even the eventual reconciliation and koinonia with antagonists. Thus Lim Jin

Taek (1990:41-42), dreaming of the festival madanggük, suggests that madanggük has to be a festival theatre as well as a folklore drama, a circumstance drama, a demonstration theatre, and an action theatre.

Considering the fact that the word “play” implies both “play” and “theatre,” the theatre contains the spirit of “play” (festivity). However, under the social activity-centered and minjung movement-oriented atmosphere, the function of play and festival has not been an object of attention. The model of Festival Public Dialogue will explore the possibility of festivity (the spirit of play and the spirit of madang), which contributes to preparing a dialogic field/place for the praxis of both incarnational and critical public dialogue.

## **5.5.1 Play and Public Dialogue**

### **5.5.1.1 *Homo Ludens* (Man the Player)**

Play has not aroused scholars' interest; rather, it has been disregarded. Freud, who deals with play from a psychological point of view, considers this and art as an instinct and an unconscious libido subject to pleasure. In his book *Jokes and Their Relations to the Unconscious*, Freud (1986:146-147) claims that laughter and jokes are not different from a dream. Jokes, like dreams, serve to discharge mental excitation in the face of obstacles. Laughter results naturally only when oppressed psychic energy like sexual energy and aggressive energy is free from psychical control. As a release from constraint, laughter is nothing but “a phenomenon of relaxation of tension” (Freud 1986:147).

Jean Piaget (1951:87) believes that play or games are not mere psychical phenomena, but essentially acts of intelligence and self-realization. He regards play as an indispensable step in the child's intellectual development. For him, “play bridges the gap between sensory-motor experience and the emergence of representative or symbolic thought” and it is “the child's way of assimilating the reality of the world



around him” (Pulaski 1971:96-97). His understanding of play is that it exceeds the domain of mere entertainment or pleasure. However, his study of play, as Roger Caillois (1961:165) indicates, is restricted to children’s play.

Johan Huizinga, a Dutch historian and cultural philosopher, looks for human nature in the play instinct. In the foreword of his book *Homo Ludens* (1949:ii), Huizinga indicates the fact that a human being has been understood as *Homo Sapiens* (Man the Thinker) since Descartes in the seventeenth century. Since the nineteenth century, to some degree free from the worship of reason and its optimism, the human being is designated as *Homo Faber* (Man the Maker). However, he says that there is a third function just as important as reasoning and creating; this is “playing.” A human being is *Homo Ludens* (Man the Player). For him, play is more than a mere physiological phenomenon or a psychological reflex. He (1949:1) says “it is a significant function.” “However we may regard it, the very fact that play has a meaning implies a non-materialistic quality in the nature of the thing itself.” Consequently, he comprehends play as a cultural phenomenon more than a biological phenomenon.

Huizinga’s study of play has significance in that by understanding “play” as the totality of man’s expressive action, he aggrandized the concept of play which had been devalued by the confrontation between emotion and reason, and which had been restricted to childhood. Nevertheless, his play-theory is limited in that the essential character of play lies in “rule.” According to Huizinga (1949:11), “as soon as the rules are transgressed, the whole play-world collapses. The game is over. ... ‘Real life’ is going again.” He misses the aspect of “play free from rule.”

On the other hand, in *Man, Play, and Games*, Roger Caillois (1961:8) points out that “many games do not imply rules.” For example, playing with dolls, playing soldiers, cops and robbers, horses, locomotives, and airplane-games are the games that presuppose free improvisation and acting “as if one were someone or something else.” In these instances, no fixed, rigid rules exist. Even though he acknowledges the

existence of play free from rule, however, he puts the nature of play in a category of rules, asserting “despite the assertion’s paradoxical character, ... the fiction, the sentiment of *as if* replaces and performs the same function as do rules.”

Jean Duvignaud (1980:14, in Kim H. 2003), distinguishing a play from a game, explains that “game” in English means a match or a contest that conforms to special rules, but “play” is free play involving playing or acting without rules. Giving thought to free “play” (not “game”), Duvignaud takes notice of play beyond rules. For him, culture anthropologically represents the totality of taboo, value and duty of a society. Play means to go beyond and protest against an established structure. Duvignaud (1980:42) thus points out that the play-cultural theory of Huizinga commits the error of integrating play into the class order. While play regulated by certain rules reproduces the already given, known rules, “to play with play (*les jeu du jeu*)” creates a new cognition which destroys an established code system (Duvignaud 1980:42). From Duvignaud’s perspective, play, unlike game, connotes the power of resistance against monologism. In this sphere of play, festival, imagination, double-voiced dialogue and even change can flourish.

### **5.5.1.2 Dialogic Features in Play**

Is play connected in any respect with public dialogue beyond monologism? This will be briefly examined on the basis of the characteristics of play.

Firstly, the “supra-logical nature” of play makes the liberation from determinism possible. According to Huizinga (1949:3-4), play takes place by breaking down absolute determinism. The very fact that there is play in a human being confirms the supra-logical nature of the human situation, and confirms that man is more than a reasonable being. This is because play has the character of non-reason or illogicality. In other words, play is an act that intends an escape from the logical world with its deterministic principles. In this way, play facilitates the prevention of determinism,

finalizability and one-way communication.

Secondly, the “voluntariness” of play can lead to participative dialogue. In fact, “all play is a voluntary activity.” Play is possible, neither by order nor by a forcible imitation of it, but only “by the quality of freedom” (Huizinga 1949:7). This corresponds with the principle of dialogue.

Thirdly, play, like dialogism, sets the other-acceptance and the difference-acceptance as a premise. Play is played between two parties or teams. So the very “playing together,” as Huizinga (1949:47) mentions, “has an essentially ‘antithetical’ character.” Just as playing alone cannot be participative play, so dialogue is impossible by one person. Playing alone and speaking alone are all monologic, and have no place for mutual relationships. Meanwhile, playing together and dialoguing together accept the other as a subject in the same position. Therefore, in this respect, play corresponds with the principles of incarnational public dialogue such as otherness, outsidersness and polyphony.

Fourthly, the characteristics of “tension and uncertainty” (Huizinga 1949:47) of play have an affinity with the principles of unfinalizability, ambivalence and critical distance in madang public dialogue. Madang public dialogue, like play, is based on the unfixed or unfinalized text. In addition, there is always a tension in creating polyphonic harmony in the two voices of the author and the other, and in expressing ambivalence and keeping a distance.

In both dialogue and play, producing meaning belongs to participants. However, in a game of pure chance, the tension is very slight (Huizinga 1949:48). If the audience takes a passive attitude in dialogue, such as leaving dialogue to fate and relinquishing its interpretative and critical activity in a dialogic event, the tension (and balance through it) between the two voices will disappear. As a result, the dialogic relationship will be severed, and there will exist only monologism in a single voice.

### 5.5.2 Madang-Theatre as Play-Art

When madang public dialogue accepts the otherness and practices the principles of incarnational and critical dialogue, the praxis of public dialogue might be restricted only in the rational aspect. But for madang public dialogue the ultimate understanding of the human being lies in a being that is in a synthesis of reason and emotion. That is why madang public dialogue needs the festive model as well as the incarnation and the critical model.

How, then, is it possible that artistic madang-theatre realizes a synthesis of reason and emotion in “festival” public dialogue? For the answer to this question, the art theory of Friedrich Schiller will be discussed. Schiller searched in “play” for the possibility of a synthesis of reason-emotion. For this reason, his study is called “play-art theory.” Man will become both a rational being and a sensuous (emotional) being, only when one acknowledges that man is a playing being. Schiller’s approach deserves further discussion in the matter of festival public dialogue, in that he found out in “play” a point of contact between reason and emotion.

In *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, Schiller (1965:64-67,74) calls the corresponding impulses of rational and sense “*formal impulse*” and “*sensuous impulse*” respectively. The sensuous impulse, which proceeds from man’s sensuous nature, furnishes cases, aiming at mutation or variation. On the other hand, the formal impulse, which proceeds from man’s rational nature, furnishes absolute values like laws or rules, aiming at immutability. However, the problem is that the two impulses are out of harmony in man; one impulse rises to predominance over the other. Schiller (1965:86) describes the problem as follows: “But I call a man taut as much when he is under the constraint of sensational as when he is under that of ideas. Every exclusive domination of either of his two fundamental impulses is for him a condition of constraint and of force.” In one word, the disharmony between the two impulses produces a monologic situation.

In order to be a dialogic being, the co-operation of both natures is necessary. It means that man should have “the twofold experience” at the same time, and feel himself both as “matter” and “spirit.” According to Schiller (1965:73-74,86), only when man has a “complete intuition of his humanity” can “freedom” exist. How can the two natures be in harmony? He suggests that there exists a third impulse that makes harmony of both the sensuous and the rational nature, and thus recovers man’s wholeness. The third impulse is “Spieltrieb” (play impulse).

The play (Spieltrieb) is, however, more than mere play; rather, it is an artistic activity. Schiller (1965:78) connects play with “beauty” as well as with “freedom.” “Beauty ... it is the common object of both impulses, that is to say of the play impulse. ...The term ... is accustomed to denote by the word play everything that is neither subjectively nor objectively contingent, and yet imposes neither outward nor inward necessity.” The play impulse (Spieltrieb) aims at “the reconciliation of becoming with absolute being, of variation with identity” (Schiller 1965:74). And beauty lies between rational and sense; that is, it is in an ideal harmonious state without being compelled by one of the two impulses. Therefore, Schiller (1965:80) says that “man shall *only play* with Beauty, and he shall play *only with Beauty*.” In conclusion, “*he is only wholly man when he is playing.*”

Schiller searched for the possibility of harmony between rational and sense in “play-art.” In this way, play is connected with beauty in order to realize both the freedom and the wholeness of the human being.

Madanggük is a kind of play-art. Thus it can be said that madang public dialogue is public dialogue through the play art of madang-theatre. It is Huizinga who lays great emphasis on the play-function of the theatre. Huizinga (1949:144) mentions that “only the drama, because of its intrinsically functional character, its quality of being an action, remains permanently linked to play.” Tragedy and comedy derive from play. Attic comedy grew out of a procession of Dionysus, and tragedy was originally a sacred play

or a played rite, far from being literature designed for the stage. Huizinga (1949:143) insists that the epic can no longer be play as soon as it becomes something to be read. And the lyric cannot be understood as a play-function when it severs its connection with music. From his emphasis on the play-function of the theatre as an action, it thus appears that the theatre is play-art as well as performing art.

### **5.5.3 Rediscovery of Festivity for Madang Public Dialogue**

The spirit of play as play-art in madanggük was incarnated in the form of festival. In other words, play and art are encountered in the festival of madanggük. This means that “festival” became a zone for the encounter of play and art. The task of festival madang public dialogue is to prepare the “festival” as a zone of free, familiar and dialogic contact between the Christian community and others. The concern with festivity is related to the embodiment of both the spirit of play and the spirit of madang, a synthesis of rational nature and sensuous nature, and the fulfillment of both incarnational public dialogue and critical public dialogue.

The great concern of Harvey Cox, in his book *The Feast of Fools*, is the return of festival. He considers the disappearance of “the feast of fools” which flourished in parts of Europe during the medieval era as a signal of a lack in civilization’s capacity for festivity and fantasy. “The demise showed that people were beginning to see their social roles and sacred convictions through eyes that could not permit such strident satire” (Cox 1971:4). Thus Cox (1971:3-6) indicates that the divine right of kings, papal infallibility, and the modern totalitarian state all became rampant after the Feast of Fools disappeared. In addition, he deplors the fact that the present festivals are sporadic or obsessive, the present fantasies predictable and politically impotent. Neither provides the spirit for genuine social transformation.

Harvey Cox and Huizinga are in agreement on the reasons for the decay of festivity (play) and fantasy. The enormous emphasis on Man as Thinker (Aquinas and

Descartes) and Man as Worker (Luther and Marx) resulted in forcing him toward “useful work and rational calculation.” On the other hand, man’s festive and imaginative faculties have atrophied. As a result, man has lost “the joy of ecstatic celebration, antic play, and free imagination” (Cox 1971:11-12). The more industrious the world is, the less playful and imaginative man becomes. Man as Worker with a bent body subject to work schedules uses his “new technologically provided leisure either to ‘moonlight,’ or to plan sober consultation on the ‘problem of leisure,’ or to wonder why we are not enjoying our ‘free time’ the way we should” (Cox 1971:9-10).

The Christian community will have to play an important role in the recovery of man’s humanity. However, Christianity has adjusted very rapidly to the tendency of modernity. Christianity has placed emphasis on the understanding of man as worker and toolmaker, reasoner and thinker. According to Harvey Cox (1971:15), the problem is that “in doing all this, it has often failed to give sufficient attention to vital dimensions of the human reality.” In fact, without protestant ethic and medieval scholasticism stressing the order of creation and the gift of reason, industrialization and scientific civilization might never have developed.

Harvey Cox understands that human is essentially festive and fanciful, that is, “*Homo Festivus*” and “*Homo Fantasia*.” Therefore, he (1971:12) suggests that in order to become fully human, industrial person must learn again “to dance and to dream.” He (1971:16) claims that this loss (of capacity for festivity and fantasy) is “calamitous” because “the loss is personal, social and religious loss: (1) it deforms man by depriving him of an essential ingredient in human existence, (2) it endangers his very survival as a species by rendering him provincial and less adaptive, and (3) it robs him of a crucial means of sensing his important place in fulfilling the destiny of the cosmos.”

When deprived of joy and laughter, the human or Christian community will become more isolated from and suspicious toward others. Without fantasy, the Christian community for madang public dialogue cannot accept the other as dialogic companions

in a new heaven and a new earth. That is why festival public dialogue for the rediscovery of festivity (including the spirit of play, madang, and fantasy) is projected as the third model of madang public dialogue.

The communicability of madanggük reflects in many respects the “*homo ludens*” of Huizinga, the “playing art” of Schiller, and the festivity and fantasy of Harvey Cox. Madanggük harmonized the rational and sensuous natures by embodying the third impulse, the Spieltrieb (play impulse). And madanggük as play art prepared “a space of festival madang” for the polyphonic harmony of thinker, reasoner, worker, toolmaker, festive being and fanciful being. But the festivity of madanggük also arouses some criticism.

The t'alch'um, the origin of madanggük, was “a folk drama with play nature” (Kim U.D. 1997:261). The madanggük creatively inherited from t'alch'um is deeply rooted in play nature as well. The characteristic of play in madanggük appeared in the way that madanggük and t'alch'um both started with and repeated the saying “Let's play to the full,” and dance, song and music were its essential elements. According to Huizinga (1949:164), “If in everything that pertains to music we find ourselves within the play-sphere, the same is true in even higher degree of music's twin-sister, the dance.” In addition, the characters or the content of madanggük, as mentioned in Chapter 4, were expressed optimistically and humorously, even when dealing with the sufferings of reality. And the actions and body movements of the characters carried more weight and importance than did their lines in madanggük. Furthermore, the procedure of madanggük was constituted based on the spirit of play and festivity (which will be dealt with in the following section). In this respect, the communicative madanggük functioned as festive performing art.

#### **5.5.4 Procedure of Festival Public Dialogue**

The next issue is how to prepare the field (place) for festival, that is, how to organize



the festival madang-theatre in order to embody play or festivity (including fantasy) in public dialogue with others. The procedure of festival public dialogue aims at the natural realization of the harmony of play and art, sense and reason, festivity and criticism in madang public dialogue. For this reason, research into the whole procedure of madang-performance is worthwhile.

The procedure of madanggük shows clearly that madanggük is itself more than play; it is a festival in nature grounded on the nature of play. Madanggük, like t'alch'um, is not performance-centered theatre. There are "*pre-performance*" programs and "*follow-up performance*" programs before and after main performance. The pre-performance is the *opening-play* or *street parade*, and the follow-up is the *ending-play*. These programs consider "play" as a decisive role, realizing the spirit of play/festivity and obtaining an expanded field for play and festival. In fact, the two programs are more important than the main performance from the point of view of festivity. Through these two programs and the main performance, madanggük could develop play nature in a festival atmosphere, expanding it to festival beyond mere play, and could secure an extended space not only for the performance but also for festival.

Madanggük has reality-recognition and reality-criticism as its basic function. However, what is important here is that madanggük approaches reality-criticism through play and parody. It thus appears that both criticism and festivity are the core of madanggük.

Lee Young Mi (2001:78-86) explains that the procedure and the function of the pre-performance (beginning-play) program and the follow-up (ending-play) program are different according to whether it is festival madanggük or societal madanggük.

**(1) Festival Madanggük:**

**Street parade → Group dance & singing → Main performance → Festival ending-play**

**(2) Societal Madanggük:**

**Singing → Main performance → Ending-play for Resolution**

In the case of festival madanggŭk, the street parade as pre-performance functions in the role of announcing the opening of madanggŭk. A peasant band goes all around, playing traditional instruments at the head of the procession, waving a peasant flag as a symbol of their prayer for fertility. The performers follow after them. People come together at the performance venue with the street parade. At this moment, the street parade is not simply a parade for public information but a device for creating collectivity and spontaneity. The street play is a procedure originating from traditional mask dance, t'alch'um. Through the street play, the performers encounter people in play and spontaneously invite them to become participants. Then the people begin to dance "the chaotic dance" (i.e. group dance) together with the performers for three or four hours. After establishing a communal spirit (*shinmyong*) between the performers and the audience through this process, the mask dance begins.

However, as Lee Yong Mi (2001:80-81) indicates, in modern society that is unaccustomed to group dance, "singing together" instead of "dancing together" plays the role of arousing spontaneity and communal spirit among the audience. After main performance the ending also focuses traditionally on group dancing to the rhythm of a peasant band. But modern audiences who are unfamiliar with traditional dances sing and dance by moving around hand in hand. Lee Young Mi (2001:81-82) mentions the function of the ending of the play as follows: "ending play has a function of connecting performance with life of the audience, that is, of sending the recognition and sentiment experienced from madanggŭk back to daily life."

Meanwhile, societal madanggŭk or social movement-centered madanggŭk starts in the form that the audience has already concentrated on in the theatre. As a result, communal spirit, unification, and spontaneity are to some extent already secured. Thus the street parade and group dancing become unnecessary. Instead, "singing together" suffices to relieve the tense atmosphere of a societal assembly (Lee Y.M. 2001:82). And in the case of societal madanggŭk, a follow-up program is generally set up for the purpose of critical discourse and activity related to the theme of the performance (Bae

S.A. 2003:204-205). Thus most cases of societal madanggük often end in a short program urging resolution and assurance. In such cases the ending-play proceeds in the form of singing and marching in line (Lee Y.M. 2001:81).

*“The Yesu-Jeon” (Biography of Jesus)* is an example of the marrying of criticism and festivity. It was written by Christian students for themselves without the aid of any outside authors. It modifies *“The Gold-Crowned Jesus”* into something much simpler, so that anyone can perform. For this reason, *“The Yesu-Jeon”* spread around the metropolitan areas and was performed in a number of churches for several years before madanggük entered into the field of labor. It also consisted of three procedures.

### 1. Beginning-Play:

- 1) Performers come out to madang one by one and dance a simplified t'alch'um.
- 2) All performer and audience sing a song.

### 2. Main Performance:

Act 1: 1) Leper and beggar appear on the stage and criticize reality.

They dance the leper's dance of t'alch'um and sing the traditional beggar ballad.

- 2) A priest and a Levite pass them by without helping them, saying “I am in a hurry.”

Act 2: A prostitute appears, dancing t'alch'um.

When people are going to throw stones at her, Jesus forgives her.

Act 3: Military demons appear to destroy Jesus' popularity.

They arrest and crucify Jesus.

(Military demons are a symbol of Chun Doo Hwan's military power; the crucifixion is a symbol of the Gwangju massacre event.)

### 3. Ending-Play:

All dance the “liberation dance” together, expecting the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

From the above research, it is clear that madanggük is a comprehensive concept including not only the madanggük performance itself but also pre-performance and

ending-play. Considering the whole procedure, madanggük has three functions.

First is its critical function. The spirit of play and the spirit of madang/street fulfill the function of keeping a critical distance. By helping the audience to recognize the fact that madanggük is a kind of play and thus by preventing the audience from experiencing empathy and immersion, the spirit of play of madanggük allows the audience to participate in the dialogic theatre using their objective and critical capacities. It goes without saying that the main performance also allows the audience to take a critical point of view. And the ending-play functions as a time-space of critical discourse as well.

Secondly, there is a festival function beyond the critical one. The audience shares a feeling of communal intimacy and a close relationship with the joyful, festival atmosphere. This festival situation begins in the street play, is established in the main performance, and is strengthened through the ending-play. In this way, the spirit of play of madanggük has a critical function on the one hand, and on the other, a festive function.

The third function is to expand from a dramatic space to the street or all around the village; and to expand communication from dialogue between performers to dialogue between performers and audiences. This expanding function of madanggük intensifies the dialogic interaction and a mutual relationship between them (cf. Bae S. A. 2003:225).

To sum up, madanggük is based on not only criticism but also on festivity; that is, it can be understood as the combination of criticism and festivity. The festivity here is understood as the combination of the spirit of play and the spirit of madang. In the process of these combinations, madanggük becomes “play-art” or “festival-art” that promotes the harmony of rational and sensuous impulses.

### 5.5.5 Carnivalistic Festivity for Madang Public Dialogue

Madang public dialogue desires the return of festivity and laughter based on the spirit of play and madang. For this return to occur, it follows the procedure: “street play→ singing together→ main madang-performance→ ending play.” The next issue to be discussed will be the kind of festival it should be. The festivity of madang public dialogue lies neither in an individual festival nor in a nihilistic festival, and it is not associated with government-initiated festivals. The core of madang public dialogue is spontaneous or voluntary participation of the audience in a dialogic madang-theatre, through which the Christian community contacts and communicates with others in a free and festive atmosphere. Therefore, the festival for madang public dialogue requires a festival based on “popular,” “spontaneous” and “dialogic” characteristics, which are, according to Bakhtin, also considered the features of genuine carnival. This kind of festival for madang public dialogue will here be termed “*carnivalistic festival*,” in order to distinguish it from other sorts of festival that are not spontaneous or public but individual, nihilistic or government-initiated festivals.

Bakhtin engaged in research on the carnival as the source of a type of dialogic novel. He investigated carnival and the culture of laughter in his *Rabelais and His World*.<sup>65</sup> According to Bakhtin, while an official festival requires adherence to the past, unchangeability, finalizability and permanence of the order of the world, carnival longs for the destruction of formality or officialism and the restoration of true relations among people. In carnival, the boundary between art and life is demolished, the distinction between stage and audience disappears, and a fully-human and a dialogic space are generated. By playing an ideal in the real with fantasy, a peculiar situation occurs in which people can simultaneously experience rational being and sensuous being, working being and playing being, the real and fantasy, criticism and festivity.

---

<sup>65</sup> This is the fruit of Bakhtin’s study on the books *Gargantua* and the *Pantagruel* of Rabelais who is a famous writer. Bakhtin considers Rabelais’ literature as the model of the carnivalization of literature.

But carnival goes beyond enjoyment; it is concerned with the constant renewal and change of reality. Thus, Bakhtin (1984:166) says that carnival is “an extraordinarily flexible form of artistic visualization, a peculiar sort of heuristic principle making possible the discovery of new and as yet unseen things.” It is possible “by relativizing all that was externally stable, set and ready-made.” For Bakhtin, carnival means the combination of criticism and festivity. And carnival means the realization and expansion of the human being, communication, and relationship through the restoration of full humanity. In this sense, the “*carnivalistic festival*” has validity as a model for madang public dialogue in which the Christian community communicates with others through the principles of incarnational and critical public dialogue.

The carnivalistic festival has often been misunderstood as a frenzy of chaos. Bakhtin (1984:130-131) points out that true carnival has been misunderstood because of the degenerate forms of carnival. After the Renaissance, the high point of carnival life, communal folk carnival began to decline; instead, “a *festive court masquerade* culture” began to develop, mostly absorbing into itself an externally decorative sort of carnival. Later a broader line of festivals (no longer limited to the court) began to develop which we might call the *masquerade line* of development. Thereafter many carnival forms were completely cut off from their folk base and left the public square to enter this chamber masquerade line, which exists even today. In the end, carnival lost its meaning of “all-together-playing-dialogue” in the public square.

For a thorough understanding of the problem of carnival, Bakhtin (1984:159-160) suggests, firstly, not seeing the carnival as only a specific characteristic of Romanticism; secondly, not oversimplifying it to the idea of masquerade in modern times, or even more to a vulgar understanding of carnival; thirdly, not identifying it with that narrow theatrical-pageantry concept of carnival, so very characteristic of modern times. “For a proper understanding of carnival, one must take it at its origins and at its peaks, that is, in antiquity, in the Middle Ages and finally in the Renaissance” (Bakhtin 1984:160).

The characteristics of carnivalistic festival (in the sense of a proper understanding of carnival) are in common with madanggük. The place for both carnival and madanggük is the “street or public square,” that is, “outside” all buildings such as stage, house and church. The festivity of street-play and ending-play in madanggük has built up a worldview similar to that of carnival. In common with carnival, the worldview of madanggük is that all distance between people and hierarchical structure is suspended. In this festival world free and familiar contact between people and “a new mode of interrelationship between individuals” on an equal level was possible (Bakhtin 1984:123). Thus, rulers, rich men, thieves, and beggars could come together in madang, street, or the public square of festival “on equal terms on a single, fundamentally dialogized plane” (Bakhtin 1984:135). And carnival and madanggük functioned as a time-space for public dialogue, permitting the co-existence and interaction of a variety of different sounds and beings. In madanggük, the so-called world of “*joyful relativity*,” in Bakhtin’s (1984:107) expression, is opened by the street play, is revitalized in the main madang-theatre performance, and is heightened through the ending-play.

### **5.5.6 Dialogic Principles of Madang-Festival**

Does the festivity have a dialogic nature in any respect? Can such an expanded festival space function as a field for accomplishing the incarnational public dialogue and the critical public dialogue at the same time? The answer to these questions will be revealed in the dialogic characteristics of carnivalistic festival which make public dialogue possible, namely, the principles of carnivalistic festival.

#### **5.5.6.1 The Spirit of Carnival Debasement**

By belonging to all people and being filled with festivity, the madang or the public square could become “a zone of familiar contact” (Bakhtin 1984:158). In madang, “a special form of free and familiar contact reigned among people who were usually

divided by the barriers of caste, property, profession and age” (Bakhtin 1968:10). All hierarchical worldview stops; instead, people enter into new dialogic relationships.

The carnivalistic festival shows “the spirit of carnival debasings” because “carnival ends debase the hero and bring him down to earth, they make him familiar, bring him close, and humanize him” (Bakhtin 1984:132-133). Saying that Socrates rediscovered the dialogic nature of thought and truth on a carnival basis, Bakhtin (1984:132) explains that the reason Socrates characterized himself as a “pander” and “midwife” was because he constructed himself in the spirit of carnival debasement. The spirit of debasement must be understood in the biblical meaning of “*incarnation*” that was suggested as the first model of madang public dialogue. The festival based on the incarnational spirit of debasement leads people to be “reborn for new, purely human relations” (Bakhtin 1968:10). All inequality is suspended, and all are considered equal. The special mass actions, free carnivalistic festival gesticulation and the outspoken carnival word also show and intensify the dialogic nature of festival. During the carnivalistic festival of madang-theatre “a new mode of interrelationship between individuals” is worked out “in a concretely sensuous, half-real and half-play-acted form” (Bakhtin 1984:123).

The nature of public dialogue presumes carnival “familiarization” of relations among people who have entered the dialogue, and presumes the abolition of all distance between them. Therefore, madang public dialogue requires the place of festival-madang and the attitude of incarnation as the first dialogic principle of festival public dialogue. The festival public dialogue possible in the madang as a zone of familiar contact will activate familiarization with not only the relations among people but also the relations between people and the object of thought and truth itself.

#### **5.5.6.2 Everyone is a Participant**

In the street-parade and the ending-play of madanggük, as in carnival, there are no



footlights, and there is no distinction between performer and audience. Everyone is an active participant; everyone communes in the dialogic act of the madang-festival. Nobody needs to comply with the rules of performing art. Everyone is subject only to “the laws of its own freedom” (Bakhtin 1968:7). Thus Harvey Cox (1971:118) remarks that the essence of festival is “participation and equality, the abolition of domination and paternalism.” Carnivalistic festivals are not spectacles seen by the people and, strictly speaking, not even performed. They are life itself formed by play-art. In one word, life plays itself in madanggük (especially street parade and ending play) and carnival. Play becomes life itself during the festival. Therefore, the whole madanggük and carnival “belong to the borderline between art and life.” A festive performance can make everyone live in it and participate in it at the same time (Bakhtin 1968:7; 1984:122). This is how festival public dialogue practices the principle of dialogic participation.

### **5.5.6.3 Dialogization of Differences**

The carnivalistic festival of madanggük serves as a democratic zone in which heterogeneity, ambivalence and difference dialogize one another in free and familiar contact. The democratic madang or public square is a space not that “one” monopolizes, but that “two” (or more) dialogize with each other. Of course, the democracy of carnival does not mean the fusion and unification of a variety of voices; as Ken Hirschkop (1999:294) mentioned, it is rather “the battleground” on which conflicts and struggles take place. According to Hirschkop (1999:252-253), the public square of heterogeneity is grounded on “the peculiar indeterminacy” and “the *uneven structuring of language*.” “The public square is an image of oral speech-everyday, informal language and conversation, ... face-to-face conversation. ... There is no single form of language.”

“A striking combination of what would seem to be an absolutely heterogeneous and incompatible element” (Bakhtin 1984:134) is made in carnivalistic festival. The antitheses and contrast in carnivalistic festival are, for example, top and bottom, birth

and death, youth and old age, face and backside, praise and abuse, affirmation and reputation, tragic-comic, stupidity-wisdom, beauty-ugliness, and so forth. In festival public dialogue, these “opposites come together, look at one other, are reflected in one other, know and understand one another” (Bakhtin 1984:176, cf.126). Bakhtin (1984:135) asserts the fact that the Christian genres were so influenced by carnivalization that as in carnivalistic festival, “rulers, rich men, thieves, beggars, hetaerae come together here on equal terms on a single, fundamentally dialogized plane.” Harvey Cox (1971:131) calls the dialogization of differences, which does not smooth over the obvious contradictions, nor merges the differences into one, but accepts and even exemplifies the differences, “the method of juxtaposition.” The juxtapositional approach is “one of the principal ingredients of festivity” and even “a method for theological jesters” (Cox 1971:131,133). Bakhtin (1984:134) also says that “we can now say that the clamping principle that bound all these heterogeneous elements into the organic whole of a genre, a principle of extraordinary strength and tenacity, was carnival and a carnival sense of the world.”

In fact, through the method of juxtaposition, festival public dialogue “brings closer what was distant and unites what had been sundered” (Bakhtin 1984:134-135). In this way, the madang-theatre for public dialogue can become a play-artistic communication with a so-called “sense of joyful relativity” (Bakhtin 1968:11) to overcome the dichotomy of rational impulse and sensuous impulse, criticism and festivity. The juxtapositional approach in madang public dialogue is neither an outlet of the lazy man nor a random mishmash. It requires “the most skillful and imaginative work” and it is “a way that will introduce a new critical awareness and a fresh appreciation for both” (Cox 1971:136-137). It aims at the dialogic polyphony of differences in the concretely sensuous forms, not in an abstract thought.

The very dialogic method of juxtaposition in festival can serve the praxis of the principles of polyphony and difference-acceptance suggested in the model of incarnational public dialogue and the principles of reality-recognition and criticism in

critical public dialogue at the same time.

#### **5.5.6.4 Criticism against Monologue and Privatization**

Another dialogic characteristic of carnivalistic festival is the criticism of monologue and privatization. Instead, festival public dialogue seeks dialogue and sharing.

Firstly, the dialogic festival demolishes “the sphere of a single and unified monologic consciousness, a unified and indivisible spirit” (Bakhtin 1984:177) that isolates or ignores different voices and consciousnesses. It opposes to the one-sided or dogmatic seriousness that is hostile to change, that seeks to absolutize a given condition of existence or given social order (Bakhtin 1984:160). Bakhtin (1984:132,165) explains that “the carnival sense of the world knows no period, and is, in fact, hostile to any sort of *conclusive conclusion*.” On the contrary, carnivalistic festival is grounded on “joyful relativity” that does not permit a finalized monologic thought.

Secondly, the dialogic festival destroys privatization, for it does not know the spatial boundaries. It first of all opposes the privatization of space. The space of carnivalistic festival belongs to the public; that is, it becomes public space. And such a festival criticizes the privatization of the festival itself. The festival becomes a public festival for all people. In addition, the carnivalistic festival liberates an individualistic, bourgeois and an isolated existence from the private sphere, and lets him be born again as a “public” being who encounters and dialogues with other beings in the public space of festival. Moreover, it criticizes the privatization of language (or word) and dialogue. Dialogue also becomes the public dialogue beyond an individual conversation. The dialogic interactions among words, among people, among thoughts, and among conversations take place in the public festival.

In this way, “festivity is the way we cool history without fleeing from it” (Cox 1971:46). “A bodily and popular corrective of laughter” is related to the criticism of the individual

and narrow-minded dogmatic seriousness of the spiritual pretense (Bakhtin 1968:22).

#### **5.5.6.5 Laughter and the Pathos of Change and Renewal**

Festival is filled with the gay, liberating and regenerating element of laughter, which is the creative element. Bakhtin (1968:66) describes laughter as follows: “Laughter has a deep philosophical meaning, it is one of the essential forms of the truth concerning the world as a whole, concerning history and man; it is a peculiar point of view relative to the world; the world is seen anew, no less (and perhaps more) profoundly than when seen from the serious stand-point.”

According to Bakhtin’s (1968:11-12) belief, the laughter of carnivalistic festival is, first of all, not an individual reaction to some isolated “comic” event, but *popular*, that is, the laughter of all people.

Secondly, festive laughter is *universal* in scope; it is directed at all and every one, including the carnival’s participants. In addition, it is also directed at those who laugh. This aspect of public and universal laughter is quite different from the pure satire of modern times which is negative and places one above the object of one’s mockery. Carnivalistic festival and its laughter are far from negation, for “it denies, but revives and renews at the same time.” “Bare negation is completely alien to folk culture of laughter” (Bakhtin1968:11).

Thirdly, festive laughter is *ambivalent*. In it, ridicule is fused with rejoicing. That is, it is joyful, triumphant, and at the same time mocking, derisory. It combines death and rebirth, negation and affirmation (Bakhtin 1968:12; 1984:126-128).

Fourthly, festive laughter is characterized as “*openness*.” The openness in laughter permits much that was impermissible in more serious forms. The reason that the ambivalence is possible is the nature of openness. The openness of festive laughter

results in an expanded communication and relationship among people and among their voices and consciousness. Through the laughter of open festival, strange and different others can be permitted to the dialogic relationship and mutual communication.

The fifth feature of festive laughter is the pathos of change based on dialogic nature. Festive laughter with openness brings about the pathos of *shift and renewal*. It pursues the change and shift of power from stagnant dogma and monologic rule to a dialogic worldview. Bakhtin (1984:124) describes that the primary carnival act is “the *mock crowning and subsequent decrowning of the carnival king*.” This ritual act of crowning and decrowning a king reflects the pathos of shift and change, of death and renewal. In one word, carnivalistic festival and laughter is an “all-annihilating and all-renewing time” (Bakhtin 1984:124).

#### **5.5.6.6 Dialogization of Past, Present and Future**

Festivity contributes to dialogization of past, present and future. Human who today has lost his/her festive spirituality is isolated from the three dimensions of time. Human eradicates the past. By expunging the past in the interests of the present or for the benefit of the future, human erases the sense of him/herself as a historical being. For human, the past is a prison to escape or an antique (Cox 1971:32). On the other hand, human disregards the present as mere preparation for the future (Cox 1971:24). And yet human of today takes a dim view of the future. Concerning the problem of human isolated from time, traditional theologies emphasize faith's dependence on the past; it is historical. Radical theology glorifies the present; it is reality-participative. And the theology of hope wants to restore its future-oriented, expectant stance to faith; it is eschatological (Cox 1971:121-130).

However, the Christian community of madang public dialogue cannot be content to remain within and interpret the past. Nor can it only emphasize the present experience or bind itself wholly to future hope. God “was, and is, and is to come.” The Christian

community should therefore help everyone to hold together the three dimensions of temporality without collapsing one into another. How can this be done?

The Christian community for public dialogue suggests festival. Festivity based on the nature of juxtaposition and accepting differences helps to overcome the isolation, partiality, or immersion relative to time. In festival, the past is embraced with joy as a dimension of reality that enlarges and illuminates the present. And festival leads everyone to delight in the here and now, saying yes to experiencing the present. Festival and its fantasy link human to the future by helping him/her to see something which is not seen. Harvey Cox (1971:130) remarks that “in the life of faith itself it comes with the reemergence in our time of a spirit of festivity and fantasy in religion. This revived sensibility frees human not to fear the past but to sing and dance about it as part of his own story. It enables him to visualize the future as an undiscovered country swarming with terrors and delights, luring him to fantasy.” In this sense, festivity is a zone of dialogue where memory, experience and hope contradict but challenge each other.

In conclusion, festivity is not just a luxury in life. It provides the opportunity for the Christian community and people to reestablish a new mutual communication and relationship with the other in a free and familiar context, and to reestablish their proper relation to time, history, and eternity. This is why a rebirth of festivity can realize the principles of incarnational and critical public dialogue, and can help the church to go beyond the communicative crisis of monologism.

Those who have rejected Christian ideas because of the church’s didactic form may affirm them in festivity. Those who cannot hope may be able to laugh in carnivalistic festival. Therefore, as Harvey Cox (1971:54) states, “the gravity of conventional Christianity is its normal and even normative style. Its terrible sobriety is a distortion of its real genius. A kind of playfulness lies much closer to its heart than solemnity does.”

According to circumstances, carnivalistic festivity and its laughter can these days be reduced in the process of Christian madang public dialogue. But the reduced laughter and festivity should not be regarded as one-sided or dogmatic seriousness that absolutizes a single point of view. The greatest concern of festival public dialogue is whether festivity and laughter are dialogic or not. Therefore, it is also necessary to dialogize authentic carnivalistic festivity with our time.

The territory of festival is, for Bakhtin (1968:154), “a peculiar second world” within the official world, and is “ruled by a special type of relationship, a free, familiar, marketplace relationship. Officially the palaces, churches, institutions, and private homes are dominated by hierarchy and etiquette, but in the marketplace a special kind of speech is heard.” The church is also “a peculiar second world” within this world with the great commission to “Go into all and make disciples.”

Therefore, the pattern of communication should be dialogic beyond the conventional church’s type of monologue or one-sidedness. Its scope should not be in the church. The Christian community needs the public square to encounter people, and requires a free familiar, marketplace relationship to change this world through dialogue. Therefore, festivity is required to provide a dialogic communication and relationship in the public space. This festivity is grounded in imagination in view of the fact that it hopes for a mode of public dialogue for a new heaven and a new earth. The imagination of festivity comprehends both dialogic imagination and critical imagination. Through its openness, joyful relaxation and gay relativity, festivity helps people keep a critical distance from the dramatic festival without becoming immersed in it (but with dialogic participation). On the other hand, dialogic imagination also urges dialogue with other people. Through play and laughter, the wall of the world of dogmatic seriousness and monologue is demolished, and the dialogic world of free and familiar interaction with strangers is created.

Festivity is thus required for the “dialogic” communication of a new heaven and a new

earth rooted in the incarnational and critical principles of public dialogue. This is “*play-artistic public dialogue*” that the Christian community has to fulfill in order to make the combination of reason and sensibility in humanity, and playfulness and criticism in communication.

The three models of madang public dialogue—*Incarnational Public Dialogue*, *Critical Public Dialogue*, *Festival Public Dialogue*—cannot be separated. The Incarnation model requires and is rooted in the principles of another two models, and the other models are connected with it. If one of them is omitted, it cannot be *true madang public dialogue*. Therefore, the three models can be called “*Trinity*” *Public Dialogue*. The trinity model of public dialogue is practical strategies that serve to realize madang public dialogue between church and others effectively and dialogically.



## **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

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).



*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

“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 breach—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

“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

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

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.”

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



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.

## CHAPTER 7 A CONCLUDING VISION

### 7.1 Summary

#### 7.1.1 On Analysis of the Present Society and Church

The main concern of this thesis is how the Korean church will fulfill public dialogue while participating in the public sphere. The research into Christian public dialogue began with the problem of binary opposition between church and society, or Christian and non-Christian. As research presented in Chapter 2 showed, the present period is characterized by “private-oriented culture,” “culture of separation” and “individualization.” Far from leading present society along a communal dialogic path, the present Korean church has adopted church-individualism and group-egoism, which causes three negative phases: materialism based on a church-growth centered policy, individualistic faith and privatization, and exclusivism in terms of the faith-praxis. As a result, the church is confronted by a dual crisis—one the internal crisis of identity, the other the external crisis of relevance to others (society and non-Christians). This ghettoized church within the wall implies a “displacement of goal” and “the loss of the public realm.” As one became a separate and isolated individual, so the church tended toward church-individualism. What was the result? As a consequence to the indifference toward the world outside the wall, the church has suffered not only a drop in church membership but also a decline in its influence in the public sphere.

The analysis and critical reflection on present society and the church in Chapter 2 awakens the Korean church to a sense of her fundamental mission from God: “go to all,” which means “go and dialogue with others in the public sphere outside the wall as well as with Christians in the faith community.” In order to achieve this mission, the church should endeavor to be born again as both a spiritual and a transformative community, and ultimately as a faith-praxis community for “public dialogue” with others.

### 7.1.2 On Three Patterns of the Korean Church's Public Dialogue

This thesis puts emphasis on “public dialogue”—especially “art-cultural public dialogue” as a means of overcoming the binary opposition between church and society, between the private sphere and the public sphere. From a historical point of view, as explored in Chapter 3, the Korean church has shown three patterns of public dialogue toward faith-praxis in the public sphere.

(1) The first pattern is *healthy public dialogue* during the period from the beginning of the mission to the March First Independence Movement in 1919, in the sense that the faith church was the transformative community answering the needs of the times and the suffering of others.

(2) The second pattern is *unhealthy public dialogue* during the period from the 3.1 Independence Movement until the 4.19 Revolution in 1960. Under coercive Japanese imperialism after the failure of the March First Movement, the Korean church hid behind or within the wall, and submitted to the Japanese demands for Koreans to practice Shinto-shrine worship. After liberation from Japanese rule, as Korea was divided into two owing to ideological differences —South Korea and North Korea—so the Korean church was split into a number of denominations owing to an inability to “dialogize the conflict and difference” among them.

(3) The third pattern is *polarized public dialogue* which was dominant during the period of military dictatorship. After the 4.19 Revolution, the Korean church began to reflect on what had disappeared from the stage of history, and to participate in faith-praxis. The repentance and participative praxis, however, belonged only to some progressive churches concerned with social-participation. During the period of polarized public dialogue pattern, a significant new pattern of public dialogue emerged: “*art-cultural public dialogue through the Madanggŭk.*”



### 7.1.3 On Practices of Cultural Public Dialogue

Public dialogue in the church concerns turning one's eyes from oneself to others. As examined in Chapter 4, the practices of public dialogue toward "others" in the theological domain of Korea have largely represented two directions. (1) Indigenization theology devoted its attention to dialogue with traditional culture and religions that had been ignored. (2) Minjung (populace) theology devoted its attention to dialogue with oppressed, isolated common people. This is Korean theology's public dialogue through reality-reading.

On the other hand, the minjung cultural movement in which the progressive church was involved was also concerned with the problem of oppressed common people (minjung) through various art-cultural genres. The "*madanggŭk*" as a creative form deriving from the Korean traditional mask dance (*t'alch'um*) played a particularly significant role in participation in the distorted political, social, cultural and religious context. The communicability of *madanggŭk* is of great value to the formulation of cultural public dialogue. *Madanggŭk* was based on mutual communication, as interpreted in Chapter 4, in that (1) it rediscovered the marginalized and isolated populace as participant subjects, (2) it recreated traditional folk culture founded on festivity and communal spirit, (3) it concerned the present (reality) as well as the past (tradition) and the future (vision through festivity), (4) it criticized and went out of the theatrical world in order to meet the audience.

However, the *madanggŭk* showed the limitations of clear societal-orientation in the binary opposition of "either artistry or sociality." The *madanggŭk* went beyond the resistance pattern of public dialogue, but did not exceed the limitation of dichotomization by becoming a socio-political drama. Therefore, an alternative public dialogue to overcome binary opposition was required.

#### 7.1.4 Toward an Alternative Madang Public Dialogue —“Trinity Model”

As an alternative madang public dialogue for the purpose of shifting from monologic communication to dialogic communication, in Chapter 5 this thesis suggested “*Trinity Madang Public Dialogue*” that pursues the dialogic harmony of three models of madang public dialogue—Incarnational Public Dialogue, Critical Public Dialogue, and Festival Public Dialogue.

(1) The first model, *Incarnational Public Dialogue*, begins with a self-image of “the self is in need of the other.” The other is a being who has the surplus of seeing for the “I”. The Incarnation model leads the Christian community to acknowledge the other as a participant subject who has the competence of infinite interpretation. In the Incarnation model of public dialogue, an event of death and resurrection should occur: the death of the church’s dogmatic pattern of communication based on monologism, and the resurrection of dialogic subjects. When fulfilling Incarnational Public Dialogue, the church changes to a dialogic community with an answerability/responsibility to others (society or non-Christian), which facilitates a polyphonic harmony that dialogizes difference and conflict. Incarnational public dialogue understands the difference and conflict between church and society as a starting point of dialogue.

(2) The second model, *Critical Public Dialogue*, meets the requirements of accurate self-reflection, reality-recognition and reality-criticism in madang public dialogue of the church. To achieve accurate critical reflection, the critical model proposed that the madang-theatre for public dialogue should deal with or contain the ambivalence (or multi-valence) of two (or more) stories/voices and contexts. This is a practical strategy for the audience to give full play to his or her ability to understand and overstand (criticism) spontaneously in a madang public dialogue. In order to reflect the two voices/stories in the madang public dialogue, the madang Christian community should develop the faculty of critical reflection. In addition, the church preparing madang public

dialogue should adopt the openness toward self-criticism as well as toward reality-criticism. When creating madang-theatre according to the critical model, the church should prepare the devices for “critical distance” so that the audience can see and participate in madang-theatre with objectivity and without identification. The critical principles are practical strategies to enable the madang Christian community to dialogue with the audience, accepting them as spontaneous, relational and participant subjects in madang (public sphere).

(3) The third model is *Festival Public Dialogue*.” Madang public dialogue should be fulfilled by the combination of “mind and heart.” It therefore requires the third dimension of public dialogue. That is festivity of public dialogue. Genuine festival is based on a spirit of dialogue, a spirit of play, and a spirit of madang. It means that festival public dialogue contributes to expanding dialogue from individual to public, to expanding the human being from reason and labor to play/festivity, and to expanding the place of dialogue from “behind/within the wall” to the public sphere, such as the street or public square that has been designated as “madang” in this thesis, where people can come together freely. Furthermore, festival public dialogue enables the faith community to dialogize and celebrate the present (reality), the past (tradition) and the future (new vision toward the new heaven and the new earth).

These three models of madang public dialogue cannot be separated. The Incarnation model requires and is rooted in the principles of another two models, and the other models are connected with it. If one of them is omitted, it cannot be Madang Public Dialogue. Therefore, the three models are *Trinity Public Dialogue*.

### **7.1.5 Toward a Dialogic Christian Community** **—“Six Stages of Dialogic Praxis”**

The whole procedure of Trinity Madang Public Dialogue is as follows:

### **a. Preparatory Procedure**

If the madang Christian community intends to dialogue with the other according to the model of “trinity public dialogue,” it should first of all experience the phases of transformation—deconstructing a monologic worldview, going through the phase of transition, and reaching the phase of reconstruction toward a *dialogic madang Christian community*. The reconstruction is a task for madang Christian community before it can execute madang public dialogue in the public sphere (madang).

“The Six Stages of Dialogic Praxis” were proposed in Chapter 6 as a program for reconstructing a “*dialogic*” madang Christian community.

(1) *The Opening Stage: The Focusing Activity*

Selecting a theme of madang public dialogue

Creating a dialogic atmosphere of hospitality

(2) *Dialogic Movement 1: Expressing and Sharing Present Voice/Story*

Expressing and sharing participants’ opinions and experiences concerning the selected theme

Listening and accepting different voices/stories in polyphonic dialogue

(3) *Dialogic Movement 2: Critical Reflection on Present Voice/Story*

Finding, remembering, reflecting critically the personal and social reasons for participants’ voices and stories

Seeing the vision of a new dialogic community through creative and social Imagination

(4) *Dialogic Movement 3: Making Accessible the Christian Story/Vision*

Interpreting Christian Story/Vision relating the selected theme

(5) *Dialogic Movement 4: Incarnation Dialogue Between Christian Story/Vision  
And Participants’ Stories/Visions*

Encountering and dialogizing between two stories and visions on an incarnational approach

(6) *Dialogic Movement 5: Decision/Response for Madang Public Dialogue*

Participants in a dialogic madang-Christian community choose their roles in madang public dialogue, training for madang-theatre for public dialogue with a dialogic point of view.

**b. Performance Procedure of Madang Public Dialogue**

After reconstructing a dialogic madang Christian community through the six stages of dialogic praxis, the madang community finally enters into madang-performance. The procedure of madang public dialogue based on dialogism is as follows:

**1 Street Parade → 2 Singing & Dancing Together → 3 Main Performance → 4 Ending Play**

These four procedures of madang-performance should follow the three principles of madang public dialogue: incarnational, critical and festival models.

The trinity principle is the spirit of madang public dialogue. In order to dialogue with others in the public sphere, a madang Christian community should be able to adopt an incarnational attitude, execute critical reflection, and celebrate the dialogic event, accepting different voices and visions.

**c. After-Performance: Evaluating**

Time for an evaluation should be arranged after performing madang-theatre with others. The criteria of evaluation depend on the trinity model of madang public dialogue.

**7.1.6 Toward Incarnational-Dialogic Christian Education**

Reconstruction of a Christian community to a dialogic madang Christian community, and dialoguing with others through the performing art of madang public dialogue are activities of Christian education. In fact, Christian education assumes the responsibility for the church to practice public dialogue as a faith-praxis. In Chapter 6 an *incarnational-dialogic paradigm* of Christian education was suggested as an alternative to a schooling-instructional paradigm based on monologic communication. When

Christian education changes in paradigm from monologic to dialogic, a Christian community can be reborn as a dialogic community. It could be said that the public dialogue through madang-theatre is impossible before Christian education and a Christian community are incarnated into “dialogic” pattern.

## 7.2 Meaning and Suggestion

### 7.2.1 Meaning of Madang Public Dialogue

The church’s public dialogue through madang-theatre based on the dialogic principles of trinity madang public dialogue has the following characteristics.

- (1) It functions as a mediating medium for a dialogic relationship between church and society, Christians and non-Christians, private sphere and public sphere.  
: *Going-to-all Christians*
- (2) It extends the place of dialogue with others to “madang” (street, public squares) beyond the walls of the church, the school, the home etc.  
: *Missionary Christians*
- (3) It serves missionary work through the recovery of the public sphere.  
: *Missionary Christians*
- (4) It adopts a mutual, two-way communication through dialogue.  
: *Dialogic Christians*
- (5) It is Christian education for the whole man through a dialogic relationship, not through schooling-instruction focusing only on conveying messages.  
: *Relational Christians*
- (6) It nurtures democratization of the church through polyphony of differences.  
: *Democratic Christians*
- (7) It recovers both Citizenship and Discipleship.  
: *Participative Christians*
- (8) It promotes to change contradictions of reality through dialogue, going beyond the dimension of simply reading reality.  
: *Transformative Christians*
- (9) It renders the rediscovery of imagination and festivity with openness.

: *Celebrating Christians*

In this way, the madang public dialogue based on the trinity of dialogic principles will contribute to shaping the Christian lifestyle in faith-praxis. Ultimately, it pursues an open church and open Christianity for expansion of God's Kingdom to a new heaven and a new earth.

### **7.2.2 Suggestion and Further Study**

The suggestions for further research into madang public dialogue are as follows:

- (1) Firstly, public dialogue based on the trinity principles should not be a temporary event, but a "continuous" faith-praxis.
- (2) Secondly, the particulars need to be supplemented through the evaluation procedure after performing madang public dialogue.
- (3) Thirdly, for pervasive madang public dialogue, "ecumenical" public dialogue should be explored, going beyond church-individualistic public dialogue.
- (4) Fourthly, in addition to madang-theatre, how to make efficient use of various media for the public dialogue should also be researched.
- (5) Fifthly, an alternative madang public dialogue is not a fixed, closed-ended pattern. Rather, it is open to being "reconstructed."
- (6) Lastly, for a netizen of today's computer era, the relationship of cyberspace and public dialogue is recommended as an area for further research.

## Bibliography

- Adlam, Carol; Falconer, Rachel; Makhlin, Vitalii & Renfrew, Alastair (Eds.) 1997. *Face to Face*. Sheffield: Sheffield Univ. Press.
- Ahn, Byung Mu 1982. "Nation, Minjung, Church." In the Commission of Theological Concern of the N.C.C. of Korea (Ed.) *Minjung and Korean Theology*. 19-27. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.
1991. *The Story of Minjung Theology*. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.
- Ahn, Jong Kwan 1983. "Is Still Good Korean Drama?" In *The Present Stage of Korean Literature*. Vol. II. Seoul: Changjackkwa Bipyungsa.
- Althusser, Louis 1984. *Essays on Ideology*. London: Verso.
- An Annual Project Report of Christian Social Activity Committee in 1972, quoted in Lee Sam Ryul 2000. *Development of Korean Society and Role of Christianity*. Seoul: Hanul Publishing Co.
- Aoki, T. Tetsuo 1986. "Teaching as in-dwelling between Two Curriculum Worlds." In *The British Columbia Educator*. April/May. 1986.
1990. "Themes of Teaching Curriculum." In J.T. Sears & J.D. Marshall (Eds.) *Teaching and Thinking about Curriculum: Critical Inquiries*. New York: Educators College Press.
- Austin, John L. 1990. *How to do Things with Words*. J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (Eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bae, Seon Ae 2003. "A Study on Style Founding of Madanggük in the 1970s." In *The Journal of Korean Drama and Theatre*. (Oct. 2003). Seoul: The Learned Society of Korean Drama and Theatre.



Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1968. *Rabelais and His World*. Helene Iswolsky (Trans.). Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

1976. *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*. I.R. Titunik (Trans.). New York: Academic Press.

1979. *The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation*. Moscow: S.G. Bocharov: Quoted from Todorov, Tzvetan 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Wlad Godzich (Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M.Bakhtin*. Michael Holquist (Ed.) Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist (Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Caryl Emerson (Eds. Trans.). Manchester: The University of Manchester.

1985. *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Albert J. Wehrle (Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1986. *Speech Genres & Other Essays*. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist (Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

1990. *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Michael Holquist & Vadim Liapunov (Eds.) Vadim Liapunov (Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barthes, Roland 1977. "The Death of the Author." In Stephen Heath (Eds. Trans.), *Image-Music-Text*. 142-148. New York: Hill and Wang.

Beardslee, William A. 1986. "Changing Methods in the Study of Narrative in the New Testament." Claremont, California: unpublished manuscript: Quoted from Moore, Mary Elizabeth 1991. *Teaching from the Heart: Theology and Educational Methode*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press.

- Bellah, Robert N. 1970. "Civil Religion in America." In Robert Bellah (Ed.) *Beyond Belief*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bellah, Robert N.; Madsen, Richard; Sullivan, William M.; Swidler, Ann & Steven Tipton, M. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, Walter 1999. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In Hannah Arendt (Ed.) *Illuminations*. 211-244. Harry Zorn (Trans.). London: Pimlico.
- Berger, Peter L. 1969. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Doubledays.
- Berger, Peter L. & Neuhaus, Richard 1977. *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy*. Washington, KC.: American Enterprise Institutes.
- Beyer, Peter 1994. *Religion and Globalization*. London, U.K., California: Sage Publications.
- Bialostosky, Don 1989. "Dialogic Criticism." In G. Douglas Atkins & Laura Morrow (Eds.) *Contemporary Literary Theory*. 214-228. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Booth, Wayne C. 1979. *Critical Understanding: The Power and Limit of Pluralism*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Borgmann, Albert. 1992. *Crossing the Postmodern Divide*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bulmann, Walter 1978. *The Coming of the Third Church*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.
- Burgess, Harold 1975. *An Invitation to Religious Education*. Religious Education Press.
- Brecht, Bertolt. *Gesammelte Werke*. Vol. 15: Quoted from Elizabeth Wright 1989.

*Postmodern Brecht: A Re-presentation*. London: Routledge.

Browning, Don S. 1983. *Religious Ethics and Pastoral Care*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1989. "Religious Education as Growth in Reflection and Action." In Mary C. Boys (Eds.) *Education for Citizenship and Discipleship*. 133-162. New York: The Pilgrim Press.

1991. *A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and Strategic Proposal*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Brueggemann, Walter 1989. "The Legitimacy of a Sectarian Hermeneutic." In Mary C. Boys (Eds.) *Education for Citizenship and Discipleship*. 3-34. New York: Pilgrim Press.

Byun, Sun Hwan 1982. Dialogue between Buddhism and Christianity. In *Christian Thought*. (Sep. 1982). 153-179. Seoul: Christian Literature Society in Korea.

1993. "A Task of Cultural Mission Theology in Korea." In *Korean Culture and Theology*. Seoul: Christian Literature Society of Korea.

Caillois, Roger 1961. *Man, Play and Games*. Meyer Barash (Trans.). New York: the Free Press of Glencoe, INC.

Carson, Marvin 1996. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge.

Carter, Stephen L. 1994. *The Culture of Disbelief*. New York: Anchor Books.

Cavalletti, Sofia 1983. *The Religious Potential of the Child*. New York: Paulist Press.

Chae, Hee Wan 1982. "Cultural Movement in 1970s: Centering on Folk Drama Movement." In *Culture and Politics*. 168-219. Seoul: Minjungsa.

1985. *Folk Drama of Korea*. Seoul: Changjakkwa Bypyungsa.

- 1985b. "Shinmyong as an Artistic Experience in the Folk Performance." In *Art and Criticism*. (Spring, 1985). Seoul: Yesulkwa Bipyungsa.
- Chae, Hee Wan & Lim, Jin Taek 1982. "From Madanggük to Madanggut." In Lim, Jin Taek 1990. *The Creation of Minjung Performance*.
- Chamberlin, J. Gordon 1974. "Phenomenological Methodology and Understanding Education." In David Denton (Ed.) *Existentialism & Phenomenology in Education: Collected Essays*. 119-138. New York and London: Educators College Press.
- Cho, Dong Il 1988. *The History and Principle of Talchum*. Seoul: Kirinwon.
- Cho, Seung Hyuk 1978. *The Role of the Korean Church in Urban-Industrialization*. Seoul: CIRCK.
- Cho, Soo Dong; Kim, Ju Wan; Lee, Kang Hwa & Lee, Yoon Ah 2002. *Understanding of Culture*. Seoul: Yimoon Publisher.
- Choe, Seung Woon 1988. "Art-Cultural Movement during a Transitional Period." In *Christian Thought*, (September 1988. Special Edition: Christian Movement during a Transitional period). 58-67. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.
- Christian Research Institute for Social Problem in Korea 1983. *A Study of the Korean Poor Women*. Seoul: Minjungsa.
- Clark, Katerina & Holquist, Michael 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Benknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Collins, Clinton 1974. "The Multiple Realities of Schooling." In David Denton (Ed.) *Existentialism & Phenomenology in Education: Collected Essays*. 139-155. New York and London: Educators College Press.
- Colemann, John A. 1989. "The Two Pedagogys: Discipleship and Citizenship." In Mary C. Boys (Ed.) *Education for Citizenship and Discipleship*. 35-75. New York; the

Pilgrim press.

Cooling, Trevor 1996. "Education in the Point of RE-not Religion? Theological Perspectives on the SCAA model Syllabuses." In Jeff Astley & Leslie J. Francis (Eds.) *Christian Theology and Religious Education: Connections and Contradictions*. 165-183. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Cox, Harvey 1971. *The Feast of Fools: A Theological Essay on Festivity and Fantasy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Craig, Edward Gordon 1980. *On the Art of the Theatre*. London: Heinemann.

Croce, Benedetto 1974. *The Essence of Aesthetics*. London: William Heinemann.

1992. *The Aesthetic as the Science of Expression and of the Linguistic in General*. Colin Lyas (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

De Man, Paul 1986. "Dialogue and Dialogism." In Paul de Man. *The Resistance to Theory*. 106-114. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Duvignaud, Jean 1980. *Le jeu du jeu*. Paris: Ballard: Quoted from Kim Hoe. 2003 *An Issue of Contemporary Drama*. Seoul: Drama and Man.

Eco, Umberto 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Stefan Collini (Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Carter J.; Lee, Ki Baik; Lew, Young Ick; Robinson, Michael & Wagner, Edward W. 1990. *Korean Old and New: A History*. Seoul: Ilchokak Publisher.

Eisner, Elliot 1994. *Cognition and Curriculum Reconsidered*. New York: Educators College Press.

Emerson, Caryl & Morson, Gary Saul 1987. "Penultimate Words." In Clayton Koelb; Vigil Lockke & West Lafayette (Eds.) *The Current in Criticism: Essays on the Present and Future of Literary Theory*. 43-64. Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Esslin, Martin 1978. *An Anatomy of Drama*. London: Sphere Books Ltd.

Farley, Edward 1976. *Ecclesial Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1987. "Interpreting Situations: an Inquiry into the Nature of Practical Theology."  
In Lewis S. Mudge & James N. Poling (Eds.) *Formation and Reflection: the  
Promise of Practical Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Federman, Raymond 1975. *Surfiction: Fiction Now and Tomorrow*. Chicago: Swallow  
Press.

Forgacs, David 1982. "Marxist Literary Theories." In Ann Jefferson & David Robey  
(Eds.) *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. 134-169. London:  
Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.

Foucault, Michel 1991. "What is an Author?" In Paul Rabinow (Ed.) *The Foucault  
Reader*. 101-120. New York: Penguin books.

Fowler, James W. 1981. *Stages of Faith-the Psychology of Human Development and  
the Quest for Meaning*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco-A Division of  
Harper Collins Publisher.

1983. "Practical Theology and the Shaping of Christian Lives." In Don Browning  
(Ed.) *Practical Theology: The Emerging Field in Theology, Church and World*.  
New York: Harper & Row.

1991. *Weaving the New Creation: Stages of Faith and the Public Church*. San  
Francisco: HaperSanFrancisco.

Freire, Paulo 1985. *The Politics of Education: Culture, Power and Liberation*. Donald  
Macedo & South Hadley (Trans.). MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Freud, Sigmund 1986. *Jokes and Their Relations to the Unconscious*. James Strachey  
(Trans.). London: Hogarth Press Ltd.

Freund, Elizabeth 1987. *The Return of the Reader, Reader-Response Criticism*.

London and New York: Methuen.

Gaede, S.D. 1985. *Belonging*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan: quoted from Julie A. Gorman 1993. *Community that is Christian*. Wheaton Illinois: Victor Books.

Geiger, Heinz & Haarmann, Hermann 1996. *Art and Reality-Recognition through Drama Works*. Lim Ho Il (Trans.). Seoul: Fountain of intelligence Press.

Gorman, Julie A. 1993. *Community that is Christian*. Wheaton Illinois: Victor Books.

Gouhier, Henri 1996. *The Essence of Theatre*. Park Mi Ri (Trans.). Seoul: Gypmoondang.

Groome, Thomas H. 1981. *Christian Religious Education: Sharing Our Story and Vision*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

1991. *Sharing Faith: A Comprehensive Approach to religious Education & Pastoral Ministry*. New York: HarperCollins Publisher, Inc.

1998. *Educating for Life: A Spritual Vision for Every Teacher and Parent*. Allen, Texas: ThomasMore, An RCL Company.

Habermas, Jürgen 1987. *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. I Thomas McCarthy (Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hall, Douglas 1991. *Thinking the Faith*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Han, Wan Sang 1982. "A Sociological Study on Rapid Growth of the Korean Church in Quantity." In Seo Gwang Sun (Ed.) *The Phenomenon and Structure of Korean Church Charismatic Movement*. Seoul: Daehwa Publishing Company.

Harris, Maria 1987. *Teaching and Religious Imagination*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

1989. *Fashion Me a People: Curriculum in the Church*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.

- Hauser, Arnold 1982. *The Sociology of Art*. Kenneth J. Northcott (Trans.). London, Henley and Melbourne: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Hauskeller, Michael 2003. *What is Art*. Lee Yung Kyung (Trans.) Seoul: Chulhakkwa Hyunsilsa Publishing Co.
- Hegel, Georg Friedrich Wilhelm 1970. *Vorlesungen über die Aesthetic I*. Frankfurt: Quoted from Hauskeller, Michael 2003. *What is Art*. Lee Yung Kyung (Trans.) Seoul: Chulhakkwa Hyunsilsa Publishing Co.
- Heschel, A. J. 1955. *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hirschkop, Ken 1999. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Aesthetic for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- The History Institute 2001. *A Lecture on Korean Modern History*. Seoul: Pulpit Publishing Co.
- Hodgson, Peter C. 1994. *Winds of the Spirit: A Constructive Christian Theology*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster /John Knox Press.
- Hudson, W.D. 1982. "The Loneliness of the Religious Educator." In J.G. Priestley (Ed.) *Religion, Spirituality and Schools*. Exeter: University of Exeter School of Education.
- Huebner, Dwayne 1999. *The Lure of the Transcendent*. Vikki Hillis (Ed.). William F. Pinar (Collection). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Huh, Byung Sup 1986. "A Study on the Language of Korean Minjung Drama." In *Korean Culture and Christian Ethics*. Seoul: Munhakgwa Jisungsa.
1987. *Let Them Speak Themselves: A Reflection for Korean Minjung Pedagogy*. Seoul: Hangilsa.



- Huh, Eun 1999. *Traditional Drama*. Seoul: Kyobo moongo.
- Huizinga, Johan 1949. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*. R. F. C. Hull (Trans.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited.
- Hwang, Sung Jin; Park, In Bae & Kim, Sung Ki 1983. "A Critical Reflection and a Practical Alternative for the Popular Culture." In *The Theory of Korean Nationalism*. Vol. II. Seoul: Changjackkwa Bipyungsa.
- Hwang, Yong Youn 1998. "The Politics of Identity and Minjung Theology." In *the Times and Minjung Theology*. No. 5. Seoul: the Third-periodic Christianity Institute.
- Hyun, Young Hak 1982a. "Incarnate in Minjung!" In the Commission of Theological Concern of the N.C.C. of Korea (Ed.) *Minjung and Korean Theology*. 15-18. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.
- 1982b. "Theological Understanding on Korean Mask Dance." In the Commission of Theological Concern of the N.C.C. of Korea (Ed.) *Minjung and Korean Theology*. 348-368. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.
- The Institute of Korean Church History Studies 1989a. *A History of the Korean Church*. Vol.1. Seoul: Christian Literature Press.
- 1989b. *A History of the Korean Church*, Vol.2. Seoul: Christian Literature Press.
- Iser, Wolfgang 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. London, Henley and Melbourne: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Ju, Chai Yong 1983. "A Brief Sketch of Korean History from the Minjung Perspective" In The Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (Ed.) *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*. 73-79. New York: Orbis Books.
- 1983b. *Essence and History of Christianity*. Seoul:Junmangsa.
- Jung, Chang Yul 1984. "The Consciousness of National People, the Consciousness of

Common People and the Consciousness of Popular People.” In Korean Theological Institute (Ed.) *The Theory of Korean Minjung*. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.

Jung, I Dam 1985. *The Theory of the Cultural Movement*. Seoul: Kongdongche Publishing Co.

Kang, Man Gil 1984. *Korean Modern History*. Seoul: Changjak & Bipyung Publishing Co.

Kang, Won Don 1990. “A New Exploration of Theological Hermeneutics.” In The Korean Theological Institute (Ed.) *The Development of Korean Minjung Theology in the 1980s*. 256-297. Seoul: The Korean Theological Institute 1990.

1990b. “The Discovery of Minjung Reality and the Quest of Our Things.” In The Korean Theological Institute (Ed.) *The Development of Korean Minjung Theology in the 1980s*. 84-107. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.

Kang, Young Hee 1989. “A Theoretical Establishment of Madanggük Style and a Groping of Popular Line.” In *Thought Movement of Literature*. (Autumn. 1989). Seoul: Pulpit.

Kierkegaard, Søren 1960. *Kierkegaard's Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. David F. Swenson & Walter Lowrie (Trans.). Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.

Kim, Bang Ok 1995. “A Study of Madanggük.” In *The Korean Dramatics*, Vol.7. Seoul: Korean Theater Academy.

Kim, Byung Seo 1984. “The Sociological Understanding of the Church Community.” In *Christian Thought*. (Jan. 1984). 16-27. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.

1995. *Korean Society and Protestant*. Seoul: Han-UI Publishing Company.

Kim, Chi Ha 1978. “The Gold-crowned Jesus.” In Kim Chon Sun and Shelly Killen (Eds.) *The Gold-crowned Jesus and Other Writings*. 85-131. New York: Orbis

Ebooks.

Kim, In Soo 2002. *The History of Korean Christian Church*. Seoul: Presbyterian Church of Korea Publishing Company.

Kim, Jung Ki 1982. *The Research on Growth and Faith Model of the Korean Church*. Seoul: Modern Society Institute.

Kim, Ji Chul 1993. "A Criticism on Korean Cultural Theology." In *Korean Culture and Theology*. 160-173. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society in Korea.

Kim, Kwang Ok 1997. "The Role of Madanggeuk in Korean Contemporary Popular Cultural Movement." In *Korea Journal*. Vol. 37. No. 3. (Autumn. 1997) 5-21. Seoul: Korean National Commission for UNESCO.

Kim, Kwang Sik 1987. *Indigenization theology and Hermeneutics*. Seoul: The Christian Literature Society in Korea.

1993. "The History of Korean Indigenization Theology." In *Korean Culture and Theology*. 90-99. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.

Kim, Kyung Jae 1983. *Korean Cultural Theology*. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.

1996. "Korean Culture and Christianity" In Lee Won Gue (Ed.) *The Korean Church and Society*. Seoul: Nathan Publishing Co.

Kim, Sang Geun 1984-1985. "Korean Christian Movement in the 1970s." In *Christianity Thought*. (Dec. 1984) 32-41. (Jan. 1985) 134-139.

Kim, Seung Tae 1994. *A Historical Reflection on Korean Christianity*. Seoul: Tasangulbang.

Kim, Sung Jin 1983. "Life and Play of Labor." In Koh Eun (Ed.) *The Practical Logic of Literature and Art*. 104-162. Seoul: Silchyunmunhaksa.

Kim, Uk Dong 1997. *Asthetics of T'alch'um*. Seoul: Hyunamsa.

- Kim, Yang Sun 1971. *A Study on the Korean Christianity History*. Seoul: Christian Literature Press.
- Kim, Yong Bock 1983. "Korean Christianity as a Messianic Movement of the People." In The Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (Ed.) *Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History*. 80-119. New York: Orbis Books.
- 1983b. "What is Minjung Theology." In *The Article Collection for Hong Nam Soon's 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday Anniversary*. Seoul: Hyungsungsa.
1993. "Indigenization Theology and Minjung Theology. In *Korean Culture and Theology*. 115-124. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.
- Kim, Yung Jae 2002. *A History of the Korean Church*. Seoul: The Korean Society for Reformed Faith and Action.
- Kliebard, Hervert M. 1975. "The Metaphorical Roots of Curriculum Design." In *Curriculum Theorizing*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Co.
- Korean Folklore Academy 1994. *Understanding of Korean Folklore*. Seoul: Munhak Academy.
- Kraus, Norman C. 1979. *The Authentic Witness*. Grand Rapids: Eermans.
- Kwon, Tae Hwan 1981. "Urbanization and Population." In The Institute of Korean Social Science (Ed.) *A Theory of Korean Society*. Seoul: Mineumsa.
- Lee, Dae Soo 1984. "The Development and Present State of Ecumenical Movement of Korean Christian Youth." In *Christian Thought*. (Oct. 1984) 80-99. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.
- Lee, Deok Joo & Cho, I Je 1997. *The Confessions of Korean Christians*. Seoul: Handul Publishing Co.
- Lee, Gang Ryul 1995. *The Understanding of Korean Drama*. Seoul: Kyungseowon.

- Lee, Hyun Jong 1983. *The History of Korean Independence Movement*. Vol. II Seoul: Jungum Moonhwas.
- Lee, James Michael 1973. *The Flow of Religious Instruction*. Brimingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Lee, Man Ryul 1981. *Korean Christianity and Historical Consciousness*. Seoul: Jisik Sanup Publishing Company.
- Lee, Sam Ryul 2000. *The Development of Korean Society and the Role of Christianity*. Seoul: Hanul Publishing Co.
- Lee, Sun Gyo 1993. *Rewritten Korean Christianity History*. Seoul: Pulpit Ministry Publishing Co.
- Lee, Won Gue 1992. *The Sociological Interpretation of the Korean Church*. Seoul: The Bible Research Publishing Company.
1994. *Reality and Prospect of the Korean Church*. Seoul: The Bible Research Publishing Company.
1998. *What is all about the Korean Church?* Seoul: Methodist Theological Seminary Publishing Company.
2000. *Where is the Korean Church Going?* Seoul: the Christian Literature Society of Korea.
- Lee, Young Mi 1991. *The Theory and History of National Artistic Movement*. Seoul: Hangilsa.
1993. "The Groping of the Existing Method and Performance-Principle of Madanggük." In *Racial Theater and Artistic Movement*. Vol. 5. (Winter. 1993). Seoul: National Drama Institute.
- 1997a. *Madanggük, Realism, and National Drama*. Seoul: Hyundae Mihacksa.

- 1997b. "Korean Traditional Theatre and *Madanggŭk* Theatre." In *Korea Journal*. Vol.37. No.3. (Autumn. 1997) 40-62. Seoul: UNESCO in Korea.
2001. *The Principles and Characteristics of Madanggŭk Style*. Seoul: Sigongsa.
- Lim, Jin Taek 1990. *The Creation of Minjung Performance*. Seoul: Changjackkwa Bipyungsa.
- Little, Sara 1983. *To Set One's Heart*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Loder, James E. 1972. "The Medium for the Message." In John Westerhoff III (Ed.) *A Colloquy on Christian Education*. New York: Pilgrim Press.
1981. *The Transforming Moment: Understanding Convictional Experiences*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Lonergan, Bernard J.F. 1972. *Method In Theology*. New York: A Crossroad Book.
- Luckmann, Thomas. 1967. *The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society*. New York: Macmillan.
- McGuire, Meredith B. 1992. *Religion: The Social Context*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co.
- McLuhan, Marshall 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McQuail, Denis 1997. *Audience Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Metz, Johannes Baptist 1980. *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*. David Smith (Trans.). New York: Seabury Press.
- The Ministry of Culture and Gymnastics 1993. *The Present State of Korean Religions*. Seoul: the Ministry of Culture and Gymnastics.
- Min, Kyung Bae 1987. *A History of Social Movements in Korean Churches*. Seoul: the

Christian Literature Society of Korea.

Montgomery, Barbara M. & Baxter, Leslie A. 1998. "Dialogism and relational Dialectics." In Barbara M. Montgomery & Leslie A. Baxter (Eds.) *Dialectical Approaches to Studying Personal Relationships*. 155-184. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Moon, Ho Youn 1985. "The Development of Performing Art Movement—Centering on T'alch'um and Madanggük." In *The Theory of the Cultural Movement*. Seoul: Gongdongche.

Moon, Moo Myung 1994. "Gut and Drama." In National Drama Movement Association (Ed.) *The Theory and Practice of National Drama*. Seoul: National Drama Movement Association.

Moore, Mary Elizabeth M. 1991. *Teaching from the Heart: Theology and Educational Method*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

National Theatre Institute 1988. *The Collection of National Drama Script*. Seoul: National Theater Institute.

Niebuhr, H. Richard 1951. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper.

Nisbet, Robert A. 1970. *The Social Bond*. New York: Knopf. 372.

Oh, Jong Woo 1980. "New Experiment for True Drama." In *Praxis Literature*. Vol. I Seoul: Jyunyewon.

Osmer, Richard R. 1990. *A Teachable Spirit: Recovering the Teaching Office in the Church*. Louisville Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Outler, Albert 1971. *Evangelism in the Wesleyan Spirit*. Nashville: Tidings,

Palmer, Parker J. 1983. *To know as we are known, Education as a Spiritual Journey*, San Francisco: Harper & Row.

- Park, Bong Bae 1989. "Transformation of Traditional Culture and Christianity." In Lee Won Gue (Ed.) *The Korean Church and Society*. Seoul: Nathan Publishing Company.
- Park, In Bae 1985. "The Establishment and Direction of Cultural Movement of Culture-Group." In *The Theory of Korean Nationalism*. Vol.3. 420-455. Seoul: Changjackkwa Bipyungsa.
1987. "Community Culture and Popular *Shinmyong*." In National Gut Association (Ed.) *Nation and Gut*. 145-184. Seoul: Hakminsa.
1991. "The Direction of National Drama Movement." In National Drama Movement Association (Ed.), *Materials of the Fourth Discussion Meeting of National Drama Hanmadang*. Seoul: National Movement Association.
1993. "A Theory of Writing Method and Producing for Noraepangut." In Theatrical Group HyunJang (Ed.) *The Special Lecture of Theatrical Group 'HyunJang' About Creative Production*. Seoul: Theatrical Group HyunJang.
- Park, Jong Chun 1991. *The Theology of Sangsaeng*. Seoul; Korea Theological Institute.
1998. *Crawl with God, Dance in the Spirit: A Creative Formulation of Korean Theology of the Spirit*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Piaget, Jean 1951. *Play, Dramas and Imitation in Childhood*. C. Gattegno & F.M. Hodgson (Trans.). London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Pulaski, Mary Ann Spencer 1971. *Understanding Piaget: an Introduction to Children's Cognitive Development*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Rah, Won Sik 1989. "The Trace of Cultural Artistic Activity in the Labor Field of the 1980s." In *The Literary and Artistic Movement*. Vol.3. Seoul: Pulbit.
- Ramsey, Ian T. 1964. *Models and Mystery*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*.



Texas: the Texas Christian University Press.

Roh, Chi Jun 1995. *The Organization of the Korean Church*. Seoul: Minyoung Publishing Company.

1997. "Sociological Study on the Korean Church." In Lim Sung Bin (Ed.) *The Korean Church and Social Responsibility*. Seoul: Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary Publishing Company.

1998. *Korean Protestant Sociology*. Seoul: Han-ul Publishing Company.

Rosenkranz, Karl 1990. *Ästhetik des Häßlichen*, hg. Und mit einem Nachwort von Diether Kliche. Leibzig.: Quoted In Michael Hauskeller. *What is Art*.

Ryu, Dong Sik 1975. *The History and Structure of Korean Shamanism*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

1988. *A Journey of Pungryu theology*. Seoul: Junmangsa.

Ryu, Hae Jung 1985. "For New Daedong Nori." In Jung I Dam (Ed.) *The Theory of the Cultural Movement*. Seoul: Gongdongche.

Schechner, Richard 1985. *Between Theatre and Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1988. *Performance Theory*. London: Routledge.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich 1966. *Brief Outline on the Study of Theology*. Terrence N. Tice (Trans.). Richmond, Va.: John Knox.

Schiller, Friedrich 1965. *On the Aesthetic Education of Man: In a Series of Letters*. Reginald Snell (Trans.). New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.

Schuller, David S. 1980 "Basic Issues in Defining Ministry." In David S. Schuller; Merton P. Strommen & Milo Brekke. *Ministry in America*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

- Seo, Youn Ho 1997. *The Principle and Method of Korean Traditional Performance*. Seoul: Jipmundang.
- Seymour, Jack L. 1997. *Mapping Christian Education: Approaches to Congregational Learning*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Shank, Theodore 1969. *The Art of Dramatic Art*. Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co. Inc.
- Sherill, Lewis J. 1955. *The Gift of Power*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sim, Woo Sung 1988. *The Introduction of Folk Culture*. Seoul: Dongmunsun
- Smith, Dennis R. & Williamson, L. Keith 1977. *Interpersonal Communication: Roles, Rules, Strategies and Games*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company publisher.
- Song, Ki Deuk 1990. "The Identity of Minjung Theology." In *The Development of Korean Minjung Theology in the 1980s*. 59-83. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.
- Song, Kun Ho 1981. "Nation and Christianity under Japanese Imperialism." In The Social Affair Research Institute of Korean Christianity. *The Nationalism and Christianity*. Seoul: Minjungsa.
- Steward, David & Steward, Margaret S. 1978. "Action-Reflection-Action." In Maria Harris (Ed.) *Parish Religious Education*. 87-97. New York: Paulist Press.
- Suh, Kwang Sun 1983. "Korean Theological Development in the 1970s" and "A Biographical Sketch of an Asian Theological Consultation." In The Commission on Theological Concerns of the Christian Conference of Asia (Ed.), *Minjung Theology*. 15-43. New York: Orbis books.
1986. "The Mask Dance of Liberation." In *Korean Culture and Christian Ethics*. Seoul: Munhakgwa Jisungsa.

1990. "Minjung Theology of Korea." In *The Development of Korean Minjung Theology in the 1980s*. 39-58. Seoul: Korean Theological Institute.

Suh, Nam Dong 1982. *An Exploration on Minjung Theology*. Seoul: Hangilsa.

Theatrical Group Hangang 1988. "Minjung Drama for the Future" and "About the Works 1." In the Pamphlet of *The Confrontation*. Seoul: Theatrical Group Hangang.

Todorov, Tzvetan 1984. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*. Wlad Godzich (Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tönnies, Ferdinand 1957. *Community and Society*. C.P. Loomis (Trans.) New York: Harper & Row.

Tracy, David 1981. *Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism*. New York: Crossroad.

1990. *Dialogue with the Other: Inter-Religious Dialogue*. Loovain Peeters Press.

Turner, Victor 1974. *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

1982. *From Ritual to Theatre: the Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

1986. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.

Un, Joon Kwan 1999a. *Practical Ecclesiology*. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.

1999b. *Theological Ecclesiology*. Seoul: the Christian Literature Society in Korea.

Van Gennep, Arnold 1969. *The Rites of Passage*. Monika B. Vizedom & Gabrielle L. Caffee (Trans.). Solon T. Kimball (Intro.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wachtel, Paul L. 1983. *The Poverty of Affluence*. New York: Free Press.

- Westerhoff III, John H. 1976. *Will Our Children Have Faith?* New York: Seabury Press.
- Whitehill, James E. 1974. "The Indirect Communication: Kierkegaard and Beckett." In James Waddell & F.W. Dillistone (Eds.) *Art and Religion as Communication*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Wilder, Thornton 1960. "Some Thoughts on Playwriting." In Toby Cole (Ed.) *Playwrights on Playwriting: The Meaning and Making of Modern Drama from Ibsen to Ionesco*. New York: Hill and Wang: Quoted from Theodore Shank, *The Art of Dramatic Art*.
- Wilson, Bryan R. 1966. *Religion in Secular Society: A Sociological Commitment*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.  
1982. *Religion in Sociological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Marvin R. 1989. *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Winter, Gibson 1966. *Elements for a Social Ethic: Scientific and Ethical Perspectives on Social Process*. New York: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.  
1981. *Liberating Creation: Foundation of Religious Social Ethics*. New York: Crossroad.
- Wright, Elizabeth 1989. *Postmodern Brecht: A Re-presentation*. London: Routledge.
- The Writing and Producing Department of Minjung Cultural Movement Alliance 1988. "About the Collective Drama." In the Pamphlet of *The World for Minjung to be the Host*. Seoul: Minjung Cultural Movement Alliance.
- Wuthnow, Robert 1996. *Christianity and Civil Society*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.
- Yankelovich, Daniel. 1981. *New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down*. New York: Random House.

Yeo, Kyun Dong 1986. "The Practice of *Madanggŭk*." In *The Practical Logic of Literature and Art*. Silchun Munhacksa.

Yoon, Kyung Ro 1995. *Christian Historical Understanding on Korean Modern History*. Seoul: Yeokminsa.

Yun, Sung Bum 1976. *The Theology of Sung*. Seoul: Seoul Moonhwas.