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ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationship between eschatology and curriculum theory. Themes such as liberation, emancipatory knowledge, transformative pedagogy, concepts of time, impact of the future on present experience, and learning landscapes are traced in the emerging literature of theology and of curriculum theory. The mutual interest in these themes in both fields of study provides the basis for moving toward an eschatological curriculum theory. The reconceptualization which has occurred in curriculum theory and the new emphasis on eschatology in twentieth century theology both provide a foundation for this curriculum theory rooted in hope.

In contemporary theology there is a movement which parallels the reconceptualization in education. Jurgen Moltmann's work is at the forefront of the rediscovery of eschatology as the focus of the whole of theology. Also, Karl Rahner grounds eschatology in experiences of the present. The future is that which brings to completion what has already been set in motion.

The work of Moltmann and Rahner has laid the foundation for the appearance of a new framework for eschatological theology which is struggling to emerge in
the 1980s. Identifying this new framework and relating it to contemporary curriculum discourses for the purpose of moving toward a postmodern eschatological curriculum theory is the focus of this study.

If the reconceptualization reflected in theological and educational theories is to transform society and alter the conception of school curriculum, then scholarly investigation into the various dimensions of the theories must be undertaken. This study explores contemporary eschatological theology and contemporary curriculum theory for the purpose of contributing to the development of a model of education for the third millennium rooted in liberation and hope. This study contends that modern educational movements which have envisioned a new world order based upon technological solutions have not only failed to liberate humanity, but have actually resulted in an impoverishment of the human spirit verging on despondency and self-destruction. Eschatology can provide curriculum theory with a dimension that will allow hope to replace apathy as the predominant ethos in the school culture.
This study explores and identifies eschatological themes in theology and curriculum studies for the purpose of beginning a dialogue between the two disciplines. The identification of a common agenda is the first step in the process of articulating an eschatological curriculum theory. This study describes the vision of the eschatological curriculum in three dimensions: individual liberation, transformative pedagogy, and the learning milieu.

The movement toward an eschatological curriculum theory emerges for two primary reasons. First, contemporary theology incorporates the challenge of Jurgen Moltmann and Karl Rahner to reevaluate eschatology. The future must be viewed as that which brings to completion what has already been set in motion, rather than as that which awaits humanity and the individual in a state and time unrelated to the present.

Contemporary eschatology rejects the bifurcation of time and space, and it is called "proleptic" by theologians because the future is represented as the directive of the present. Therefore, it is a consequence of the present course of action. The future enters into the
present as a persuasive and directive force encouraging individuals to overcome evil. Jewish and Christian theologians attribute this experience of the future to God through grace. Atheists and humanists would describe the future as existing in the present through ideals and goals which direct human activity. The work of a representative sample of theologians and philosophers from various traditions is presented in Chapter Three. These scholars establish a framework for understanding the significance of proleptic eschatology within several disciplines. This framework allows proleptic eschatology to provide hope and liberation in the midst of evil in the world.

The second reason for the development of an environment conducive to a movement toward an eschatological curriculum is found in curriculum theory. Contemporary curriculum literature presents a reconceptualization of the function of curriculum studies. Contemporary curriculum scholars incorporate the challenge of William Pinar, Henry Giroux, Maxine Greene, Dwayne Huebner, and James Macdonald (among others) to view the function of curriculum as a scholarly and disciplined understanding of the educational experience, particularly in its political, cultural, gender, and historical dimensions. Contemporary curriculum
theorists work to legitimize conceptions of curriculum derived from philosophy, aesthetics, and theology.

This study will review the literature associated with proleptic eschatology in the field of theology and the literature associated with the reconceptualization in the field of curriculum studies. The common vision of both fields will be used to describe an emerging eschatological curriculum theory. This theory will move beyond the traditional Tylerian understanding of curriculum as the development and management of a program of studies, and beyond the traditional Apocalyptic understanding of eschatology as the last events at the end of time. This study does not propose a methodology for implementing a school program with an eschatological orientation. Rather, it challenges educators to move toward a new vision of curriculum rooted in liberation and hope. This study challenges schools and society to reevaluate concepts of the future and to approach the present course of action with a proleptic understanding of the future as directive in human activity.
INTRODUCTION

The impetus for choosing and becoming in us is not something that need be externally imposed; but it is rather a process of helping others see possibilities and helping them free themselves for going beyond this present state of embedded existence....We must keep up our hope.

James B. Macdonald
"Curriculum, Consciousness, and Social Change"
in Contemporary Curriculum Discourses

Without hope, the capacity to imagine social alternatives is a head-game, lacking force and true self-engagement.

Philip Wexler
"Body and Soul: Sources of Social Change and Strategies of Education"
in Contemporary Curriculum Discourses
The protagonist in Walker Percy's novel *Love in the Ruins* is a psychiatrist named Tom More who is living in New Orleans in the "dread latter days of the old violent beloved U.S.A. and of the Christ-forgetting Christ-haunted death-dealing Western world" (Percy, 1971). Tom More, in the midst of the desolation of modern decadence, awaits the final apocalyptic catastrophe. He concludes, "Two more hours should tell the story. One way or the other. Either I am right and the catastrophe will occur, or it won't and I'm crazy. In either case the outlook is not so good" (Percy, 1971). In Percy's novel, More seeks to make sense out of his own human experience as a survivor in the latter days of modern society. Decay is evident; the human spirit is weary. In a final effort to save humanity, Dr. Tom More produces one-hundred compact pocket-sized machines of brushed chrome which he calls the "More Qualitative-Quantitative Ontological Lapsometer, the stethoscope of the spirit" (Percy, 1971). In the end though, it is not the Lapsometer that saves society. Rather, Walker Percy's paradoxical humor finds hope as expressed in the theme that humanity must return to basic values and love if there is to be meaningful survival. The novel ends on Christmas Day. Tom More and his wife, reunited in the midst of the decay and ashes, go to bed "twined about each other as the ivy twineth" (Percy,
1971). They make love in the ruins. And just as the wisteria vines are growing out of the ashes, a resurgence of nature, life, and hope occurs. Mardi Gras awakes to Ash Wednesday and awaits Easter Sunday. Percy's legacy to the future of the world is described by Mary K. Sweeney as an understanding that "with the blotting out of the corruptible creations of humanity, there will be new beginnings with the miraculous sprouting of organic life" (Sweeney, 1987). In the spirit of Walker Percy, postmodern eschatology and reconceptualist curriculum theory, the focus of this dissertation, seeks to discover "love in the ruins." An analysis of the correspondence between eschatological theology and curriculum theory, as well as an examination of the concept of hope in a postmodern society, constitute the means by which this study will be conducted.

The crises in contemporary American education can be characterized as a struggle to control the ideological direction of schools for the future. Some insist that American education should return to a classical premodern vision as proposed by William Bennett in *The James Madison School* (Bennett, 1988), E. D. Hirsch in *Cultural Literacy* (Hirsch, 1987), and Allan Bloom in *The Closing of the American Mind* (Bloom, 1987). Others believe that the modern empirical-analytical paradigm should continue to
dominate research methodology and classroom practice in hopes of eventually discovering the data and objectives that will cure the ills of the public schools (Hunter, 1982). Finally, there is a growing interest in a reconceptualization of education that will support a postmodern emancipatory curriculum that respects the past and future as constitutive of present experiences (Pinar, 1988).

All three ideological positions presuppose the fact that serious deficiencies in education need immediate attention. The malaise and hopelessness in modern society translate into turmoil for school systems trying to cope with the impact of modernity on education. Henry Giroux recognizes this hopelessness and resultant turmoil; he challenges the educational community to move beyond the modern paradigm for understanding the crisis. He says, "Given the current mood of cynicism, despair, and defeatism, it is important for radical educators to move beyond theories of reproduction that do nothing more than either analyze the contradictions that exist in schools or point to the way in which schools are influenced by structural determinants in the wider society" (Giroux, 1981). Michael Apple argues that educators must become committed to ideological interests that promote emancipation. The neutrality of an unattached intellectual is impossible, he
alleges. Rather, the notion of the organic intellectual passionately involved in the struggle against hegemony becomes the norm for Giroux and Apple (Apple, 1979).

According to Apple, educators must "affiliate with cultural, political, and economic groups who are self-consciously working to alter the institutional arrangements that set limits on the lives and hopes of so many people in this society" (Apple, 1979). As affiliation with groups that challenge modern institutional arrangements grows, the concern for a postmodern curriculum will develop. Jurgen Habermas' emancipatory interests (Habermas, 1971), Leonardo Boff's liberation theology (Boff, 1985), and Paulo Freire's pedagogy of oppressed peoples (Freire, 1970) all provide a foundation for a processive movement toward this postmodern curriculum. If there is to be a renewed sense of hope in education and in society, it will be important to move beyond premodern and modern ideology to a postmodern vision rooted in emancipation and liberation. This vision will not reject the advancements of the past, but rather reject rigid enslavement to methodologies which have failed to liberate. A reconceptualization in eschatological theology and in curriculum theory offers a means for moving toward this postmodern vision.

In theology, the reconceptualization suggests a
reevaluation of the understanding of scholastic dualisms, omnipotence and omniscience, grace and anthropology, the meaning of evil, and the relationship of the present generation to the Parousia. An authentic ecumenical orientation and a proleptic vision of the goal of history will become dominant themes in the reconceptualization of eschatology. Hans Kung has recently proposed that theology is on the verge of an epochal threshold and Kuhnian paradigm change with ecumenism as the focus (Kung, 1988). This is true despite the fact that some in church leadership cling to a premodern paradigm. Kung contends,

One is surprised only how the Roman Inquisition—now under Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger—after such a 'chronique scandaleuse,' still thinks it can impose its medieval paradigm, in the face of all the findings and results from the Reformation and the modern period, in the midst of the transition to postmodernity, with the old methods (Kung, 1988).

This possibility of a paradigm change in eschatological theology, even at a time of internal church crisis over methodology, is not without historical precedence. The early Christian church had to reevaluate the belief in the imminent return of Jesus by the end of the first century, c.e., when it became apparent that the apocalyptic events would be delayed beyond the generation of the apostles and disciples. This paradigm change created the need for a radically new approach to
evangelization and hermeneutics in the early Christian community.

In curriculum theory, the reconceptualization that has occurred reevaluates themes which parallel the theological issues presented above and demands new methodologies as well. Some of the themes include issues related to power and control, curriculum as an evolving process of transformation rather than a course of subjects to be completed, autobiographical and phenomenological anthropology, student-teacher relationships, race and gender studies, and political analyses. This reconceptualization in curriculum theory and in eschatological theology provides a framework for advancing renewed experiences of hope in schools and society. Only with this renewed sense of hope will it be possible to discover "love in the ruins" of modernity.

WHY ESCHATOLOGICAL THEOLOGY?

The importance of eschatology as a framework for developing and understanding postmodern curriculum is evident in the emerging literature in both the curriculum field and in philosophical theology. Philip Phenix writes that "without hope, there is no incentive for learning,
for the impulse to learn presupposes confidence in the possibility of improving one's existence. The widespread loss of hope is one of the principal causes of educational problems that beset contemporary America" (Phenix, 1976). Phenix articulates the concern of those who recognize the problems that are arising in education because of apathy and despair. Without a vision of future possibilities impinging on lived world experiences, individuals lose the incentive to grow.

David Ray Griffin offers a concise view of the urgency of a postmodern vision, not only for improving the individual's existence, but for insuring global survival. Griffin proposes a spirituality that emphasizes internal relatedness rather than the modern view of relations to other people and things as external and accidental. Postmodern relations are internal, essential, and constitutive. There is a concern and respect for the past in which the present moment of experience is seen to enfold within itself the entire past. The future is also related to the present, not in the sense that it is decided and complete, but in the sense that the future grows out of the present and utilizes the contributions of the present. This "postmodern perspective offers the more hopeful vision that, through the emergence of a new worldview and a concomitant spirituality, with new interests, new values,
new approaches, and new practices, the course of our world can be radically changed without cataclysmic revolution" (Griffin, 1988).

Rosemary Radford Ruether also proposes that a new understanding of eschatology is essential. She refutes the view that eschatology is either an end-point of history or a transcendence of death. Rather, redemptive hope is the constant quest for internal relatedness which is the connecting point for all existences: past, present, and future. Ruether calls the messianic hope as seen in Jesus the Shalom of God: "God's Shalom is the nexus of authentic creational life that has to be reincarnated again and again in new ways and new contexts in each new generation" (Ruether, 1983). Social change for Ruether is found in the continual conversion back to an authentic creational life: "This concept of social change as conversion back to the centre, rather than to a beginning or end-point in history, seems to me a model of change that is more in keeping with temporal existence, rather than subjecting us to the tyranny of impossible expectations" (Ruether, 1983). Apocalyptic eschatology has conditioned humanity for this tyranny, and modern nihilism has provided a tyranny of meaninglessness. A postmodern eschatology, as explored in this study, can transform these experiences of despair and tyranny.
A final example in curriculum theorizing implying the importance of eschatological themes is found in a recent essay by David G. Smith. Smith records the events of one elementary social studies classroom and presents an analysis of the language used to describe school experiences. Paraphrasing Hans-Georg Gadamer, Smith writes that "language not only tells us what we are, it tells us what we were and what we hope to become" (Smith, 1988). Smith argues that curriculum research must reconcile the past, present, and future. He concludes, "An attention to the eidetic quality of our life together is an attempt to bring into the center of our research conversation everything that we are, as a way of reconciling in the present moment our ends with our beginnings" (Smith, 1988). Curriculum, like eschatology, seeks to overcome despair by providing an environment where relatedness stimulates growth.

The important themes that are emerging in contemporary curriculum discourses as well as postmodern theological reflections recognize the urgent need for transformative processes that incorporate an understanding of the past and future as constitutive of present experience. The four authors cited above--Phenix, Griffin, Ruether, and Smith--provide a sampling of the way that this emerging theme is affecting curriculum and
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theological literature. In this dissertation these themes will be evaluated with a view toward the development of an eschatological curriculum theory. Whether or not Hans Kung and others who link these themes to Kuhnian paradigm shifts and epochal thresholds are correct, it is certain that the emphasis in contemporary theology and curriculum studies on the process of transformation, emancipation, liberation, relatedness, and synthesis of time will have a significant impact on both fields of study. In curriculum and theology, the insistence on viewing past experiences and future possibilities for individuals and for society as an integral part of present reality is a dramatic shift away from the modern perspective. Modernity has accompanied the isolation of the individual, frozen in quantifiable time and space, unable to establish relationships and incapable of affecting the future course of events. In contrast, the postmodern vision of the individual person in relation to others and connected to a meaningful past and emerging future is essential for individual transformation, social change, and global survival. This emerging eschatological theme in curriculum theory and theology provides support for a new vision of education and society.
THEOLOGIANS AND CURRICULUM THEORISTS IN AN AGE OF HOPE

Popular culture envisions eschatological happiness in the attitude of Bobby McFerrin in the song, Don't Worry, Be Happy from the soundtrack of the movie Cocktail. Despite troubles with furniture thieves, demanding landlords, diminishing finances, lost relationships, and personal depression, McFerrin still finds cause to smile, reduce his anxiety, and be happy. He even offers his phone number to those who want to call him for the recipe for ontological bliss. Is McFerrin's happiness an anesthetic remedy designed to deaden the troubled human heart as a survival technique? If so, then Christopher Lasch was correct when he asserted that people have lost confidence in the future (Lasch, 1984). The arms race, terrorism, environmental deterioration, and long-term economic decline have taught people to prepare for the worst and retreat from commitments to programs which promote an orderly and secure world. In the nuclear age, personal survival and happiness override efforts to overcome evil.

Even attempts to awaken the public to global concerns often strengthen the same inertia that they seek to overcome. One author has concluded, "The great danger of an apocalyptic argument is that to the extent it persuades,
it also immobilizes" (Falk, 1971). Richard Falk's argument succinctly clarifies why the reconceptualized curriculum must include not only a dialogue, but also a common theoretical agenda with postmodern philosophical theology, especially as this theology will provide the heuristic metaphor of proleptic hope. Education can no longer rely on traditional and apocalyptic eschatology to provide appropriate metaphors for the future. The reconceptualization of eschatology where the future and transcendence become transformative for the individual and the global community is an imminent necessity.

In crises and suffering, people seek survival. They do not look back, lest they become trapped in debilitating nostalgia. They do not look ahead because impending disasters are predicted at every turn. As a result, individuals under siege retreat into a protective womb for shelter against adversity. In education, the retreat is seen in the movement to objectify every dimension of the curriculum. Statistical jargon is used to persuade a sceptical public and a hostile government that disaster can be avoided. An "objective," back-to-the-"basics," "teacher-proof" curriculum presumably provides the accountability demanded. Individual teachers and students become cogs in the educational wheel whose needs must be minimized for the sake of equilibrium. Lasch warns, "Emo-
tional equilibrium demands a minimal self, not the imperial self of yesteryear" (Lasch, 1984). In an effort to restore the imperial self, modern technological curricula have sought to promote the status of teachers and students through the accountability movements, but ironically, by rejecting the uniqueness of individual students and limiting the autonomy of the teachers, the modern movement has debilitated the very people it has sought to liberate. As an example, Stanley Aronowitz, in Politics and Higher Education in the 1980s, points out that the current education policy seeks to persuade that the basics movement can solve the economic crisis for graduating students. Aronowitz disagrees and contends that "to combat inequality students require knowledge and, most of all, hope in their collective powers to change the world so that democratic power replaces corporate control" (Aronowitz, 1981).

Mark Taylor in Erring: A Post-Modern A/Theology describes a pattern similar to Aronowitz in modern humanist movements (Taylor, 1984). The "Death of God" provided the ultimate philosophy for liberating individuals from enslavement to a deity. Modern industrial and technological advances would emancipate humanity and lift individuals to new heights of perfection in harmony with nature. However, like the technological solutions of modern educa-
tion, the individual was destroyed in the process. Taylor says, "By denying God in the name of man, humanistic athe­

ism inverts the Creator/creature relationship and trans­

forms theology into anthropology. The humanist atheist

fails to realize that the death of God is at the same time

the death of the self" (Taylor, 1984). Modernism in

education and theology have both failed to "liberate" the

self. Individuals are beginning to recognize the limits

of technological models in education, theology, and in

ecology. The goal of mastery and domination in all three

areas has failed. It has become clear that "mastery, 

utility, consumption, ownership, propriety, property, co­

lonialism, and totalitarianism form a seamless, though

seamy, web. In the shadow of the death of God, humanism

tends to become inhuman....The economy of domination car­

ries within it the seeds of its own negation. Eventually

consumption becomes all-consuming" (Taylor, 1984). The

limited usefulness of apocalyptic theology, traditional

humanism, and technological educational movements requires

that society turn to a new, postmodern metaphor. A

reconceptualized eschatology to be introduced in Chapter

Three represents one such metaphor which can bring hope

without omnipotent domination and omniscient mastery.

What is the alternative proposed for a postmodern

curriculum theory rooted in a reconceptualized
eschatology? Lasch describes it as "a new culture—a postindustrial (postmodern) culture—based on a recognition of the contradictions in human experience, not on a technology that tries to restore the illusion of self-sufficiency or, on the other hand, on a radical denial of selfhood that tries to restore the illusion of absolute unity with nature. Neither Prometheus nor Narcissus will lead us further down the road on which we have already traveled much too far" (Lasch, 1984). The postmodern curriculum, therefore, must offer a recognition of competing values and contradictory experiences, and not a recycled Tylerian program (Tyler, 1949). Neither must the curriculum propose a rejection of the individual in an attempt to find an untenable harmony between past theories and present practices. The postmodern curriculum must turn to eschatology to understand the apparently irreconcilable contradictions between (1) omnipotence/evil (authority/error) and (2) omniscience/journey (order/chaos) in human experience and education. The integration of these apparent contradictions more profoundly explicates reality than modern technological and industrial solutions or radical illusions of perfect harmony and unity between nature and the individual. Process theology recognizes that the journey, simply the process, contains the best understanding of the focus of history.
Contemporary curriculum theory also recognizes that the process of running the race, currere, best explains the focus of education (Pinar and Grumet, 1976). William Schubert summarizes this position as follows:

One of the most recent positions to emerge on the curriculum horizon is to emphasize the verb form of curriculum, namely, currere. Instead of taking its interpretation from the race course etymology of curriculum, currere refers to the running of the race and emphasizes the individual's own capacity to reconceptualize his or her autobiography. The individual seeks meaning amid the swirl of present events, moves historically into his or her own past to recover and reconstitute origins, and imagines and creates possible directions of his or her own future. Based on the sharing of autobiographical accounts with others who strive for similar understanding, the curriculum becomes a reconceiving of one's perspective on life. It also becomes a social process whereby individuals come to greater understanding of themselves, others, and the world through mutual reconceptualization. The curriculum is the interpretation of lived experiences (Schubert, 1986).

The future is not simply a historical goal to be reached; the curriculum is not simply an objective to be implemented. Rather, both at their best must prioritize relations, mutual interdependence, and creative transformation. The postmodern curriculum exists whenever the future is active in illuminating the past and transforming the present. In theology, it is said that "while the modern form of the death of God comes to expression in
humanistic atheism, the postmodern form points to a posthumanistic a/theology. Posthumanistic a/theology maintains that the inversion [of the Creator/creature relationship], though it is necessary, does not go far enough" (Taylor, 1984). Postmodern theology and curriculum must move beyond, not compete with, modern movements and see that the creative tension of the "already" and the "not yet" within the individual cannot be eradicated by imposing an external apocalyptic lesson plan of prepackaged knowledge or predetermined salvation. The tension itself produces growth; therefore, accountability movements that seek to eliminate uncertainty and tension also eliminate creative transformation.

Maybe Bobby McFerrin has something else in mind when he sings, Don't Worry, Be Happy. Is McFerrin's happiness really a deep personal joy, rather than superficial resignation, because he has experienced a vision of reality other than psychic survival? Does this vision inspire his transformative hope, and is there really a reason not to worry and smile? Has McFerrin rejected the cataclysmic apocalyptic vision and interiorized the proleptic hope of process theology? Possibly Christopher Lasch's critics were not correct after all. Emotional equilibrium may depend more on a conscious acceptance of the creative tension between the "already" and the "not yet," rather than
a reduction of the individual to a minimal self. Like Lasch, William Faulkner may have had an accurate eschatological insight when he accepted the Nobel Prize for literature in 1950. Faulkner began, like Richard Falk above, by admitting that "our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it" (Faulkner, 1950). But Faulkner did not despair; he knew the role of the poet-educator in the process of establishing hope. He brings this argument to a conclusion that postmodern theologians and curriculum theorists would understand very well:

I decline to accept the end of humanity. It is easy enough to say that humanity is immortal simply because it will endure; that when the last ding-dong of doom has clanged and faded from the last worthless rock hanging tideless in the red and dying evening, that even then there will still be one more sound: that of a puny inexhaustible voice, still talking. I refuse to accept this. I believe that humanity will not merely endure: humanity will prevail. Men and women are immortal, not because they alone among creatures have an inexhaustible voice, but because they have a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance. The poet's, the writer's, duty is to write about these things. It is the poet's privilege to help humanity endure by lifting the heart, by reminding humanity of the courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of the past (Faulkner, 1950).

In the spirit of Faulkner, the postmodern educator with a new eschatological metaphor will now have philosophical and theological support for encouraging students
not merely to accept meaningless curriculum for some nebulus future good, but to tap the spirit of compassion and sacrifice and endurance within their unique souls and prevail in the struggle to live meaningful and hopeful lives in the present. By tapping this resource rich in the traditions of courage, honor, and pride, the educational community lifts hearts and transforms lives. The future is full of hope, because, although it is "not yet" clear and complete, it is "already" present and active within the individual. Christa McAuliffe, in a statement made before the launch of the space shuttle Challenger, expressed this very succinctly when she concluded, "I teach, I touch the future." This study proposes that educators should decline to design a curriculum which promotes domination of nature, mastery of external knowledge, preparation for a distant and predestined future, and mere endurance in a God-forsaken world. In the postmodern theological spirit, we should create an interdependent and emancipatory curriculum full of tension, question, struggle, grappling, and sharing, with a holistic process rather than a whole product as our goal. Let us reach back and beyond and give our students a reason to hope. Let us touch the future, now.
Our bureaucratic method gives the individual the feeling that there is nothing which can be initiated and organized without the help of the bureaucratic machine. As a result, it paralyzes initiative and creates a deep sense of impotence.

Eric Fromm
in *The Revolution of Hope*
The crises that beset education in the 1980s and threaten to erode public confidence in institutions of learning beyond the 1990s and into the third millennium are a reflection of the pervasive social turmoil which has been fermenting for the past three decades. The Soviet satellite Sputnik not only launched humanity into the space age on October 4, 1957, and set in motion a frenzied effort in the United States to correct the perceived shortcomings of the public educational system, but Sputnik also firmly locked the global community into a modern technological trajectory, fueled by a bureaucratic machine and guided by a goal-driven command center. Extending the metaphor, the astronaut circling the globe in the orbiter who originally yearned for space exploration to fulfill the creative longings of the human spirit, is often relegated to a tool of technology and a pawn of bureaucracy. The vision experienced by the human traveler has been ignored for the sake of "progress." In the ultimate absurdity, some claim that the space shuttle Challenger was pushed beyond its limits to fulfill bureaucratic needs for meeting a time schedule with disregard for human life (Magnuson, 1986). It is ironic that the first civilian in space on board that tragic flight was a teacher, Christa McAuliffe. As was the case in 1959, the Challenger tragedy in 1986 intimately wed education and space
exploration, with the continuing paradox of failure as the central motif. Three decades of crises have not altered our modern technological orientation. It is therefore not surprising that Eric Fromm concluded that humanity has become paralyzed and impotent in the face of modern bureaucracy and technology (Fromm, 1968).

The analysis of crises in contemporary education and society in this chapter is designed to highlight the various diagnoses of the problems in American education in the second half of the twentieth century. The critique of modern educational movements occurs across the political spectrum. Various critics allege that modern education is mediocre, inadequate, impotent, ineffective, or inefficient. This chapter will explore the suggested symptoms of educational decline that have led one recent national report to conclude that the weakness of our educational institutions have made us a "Nation at Risk." The report cautioned,

We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States, and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people....If an unfriendly power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war....We have in effect been committing an act of unthinkable, unilateral
Many authors have explored the development of American education from the 1880s through the 1980s. While there is a diversity of analyses of various movements and periods by scholars, there is general agreement that the current developments in American education are influenced significantly by the historical character of education in the past century (Kliebard, 1982). For example, the Progressive Education Movement of the 1920s and 1930s is often examined for its possible contributions to education for the 1990s. Despite the fact that observable changes in teaching methods and classroom practices have taken place between 1890 and 1990, the fundamental behaviorist-associationist model has dominated American educational thought and practice for the past century (Doll, 1983b). The Progressive Education Movement is seen by some to have modified and minimized this dominant model and to have provided a sense of hope. One author describes this hope as follows:

In many ways 1932 was the best year progressive education ever had; at least it was the most hopeful. America, and the world, were in the midst of the Great Depression; capitalism had "failed." Yet the quality that comes through in George Counts' February 1932 speech to the Progressive Education Association--"Dare Progressive Education be Progressive"--is optimism. Counts and many with him firmly believed that the schools could indeed "build a new social order"; a
new order less capitalistic, more collectivistic, but thoroughly democratic and American. With all the pessimism and despair in the world this was still a time of hope (Doll, 1983b).

Doll and others (LaPage, 1987) propose that the behaviorist, industrial, and mechanistic model of education should, can, and will be changed so that the inspiration of Counts and the value of the natural condition of the child will become central elements of contemporary education. Contemporary education can look to the Progressive Education Movement for insight during this current time of debate and crisis, despite the fact that this movement continues to be criticized in the 1980s as a root cause of educational malaise in America (Bloom, 1987). The new model proposed which might eventually rival and supersede the behaviorist model rooted in the Lockean idea of the mind as a tabula rasa and in mechanistic Newtonian science is a newer, more vital paradigm (Doll, 1983b). A new paradigm could emerge because the values of an industrialized society will not be appropriate for the postindustrial age (any more than the values of the agrarian society were appropriate for the industrial age), and because of new theories of growth and development based not on Newtonian concepts of linear order, but on modern biological concepts of self-regulated order (Griffin, 1988a).
Since the industrial world did not demand extensive thinking skills, the behaviorist-mechanistic model of education predominated. However, since postindustrial society makes new demands, major shifts in curriculum and teaching will take place. This will happen because the knowledge useful to an industrial society is simple and linear. But in postindustrial society the knowledge of most worth will be that which is complex, theoretical, and abstract. Because the character of knowledge is changing, the intellectual, creative, and social ideals of progressive education are emerging in the postmodern, postindustrial society of the 1980s. The emergence of a postindustrial society creates a tension with the dominant modern industrial model of society. This tension is the foundation of the crises that plague education and society in the latter part of the twentieth century.

David Ray Griffin contends that our very survival depends upon a transition to a postmodern society: "A growing sense is now evidenced that we can and should leave modernity behind—in fact, that we must if we are to avoid destroying ourselves and most of the life on our planet" (Griffin, 1988b). Charles Jencks in *What Is Post-Modernism?* describes the tension between those who seek to hold on to modernism and those who are moving society into a postmodern age. Jencks documents this ten-
sion in architecture, art, literature, and philosophy. Like Griffin, Jencks contends that the social crises of the twentieth century demand that a global postmodern society must evolve. He says,

After the 1960s people became aware of the 'limits of growth,' of the social upheavals caused by modernisation, and aware that they could only increase as modernisation was exported to the so-called 'Second and Third Worlds'. If it isn't the destruction of the ozone layer, or another set of Chernobyls, it will be the creation of three more megalopolises of thirty million people; if it isn't limited nuclear war between two poor countries, it will be the coercion of their populations into factories to work for the richer ones....But this is unlikely to last for long since these technologies are radically decentralising in effect and by nature hard to monopolise. The Post-Modern information world will more likely result in a dynamic set of city cultures based all around the globe which will change their positions of strength relatively faster than they did in the Modern era (Jencks, 1986).

The social questions of the 1980s, the tension between modern and postmodern developments, and the retreat of those who call for a return to premodern social structures, all contribute to the crises in American education in the latter part of the twentieth century.

CRISES OF RELIGION, POLITICS, AND VALUES

The much debated "wall of separation between church
and state" is used by some educators and politicians as an all-encompassing premise of American democracy that prevents the inclusion of religious history and themes as a part of the public school curriculum in the United States. While most citizens would agree that students should be protected from proselytizing, indoctrination, and sectarian intrusion within the educational process, educators are aware that theological themes will often intersect with secular topics in the social studies, humanities, arts, and sciences. It would be impossible, as well as inaccurate, to discuss human potential, creativity, and accomplishment without examining the influence of the religious element. The overt curriculum and the hidden curriculum of schools will both undoubtedly contain various and sundry themes which will intersect with religious values and theological topics. The demand to separate the church from public education by eliminating religion, values, and theology from the curriculum does not diminish this intersection.

In contrast to those who seek to purge theology from the curriculum, religious zealots backed by a resurgence of fundamentalism demand the inclusion of materials in the curriculum that identify religious influence in human development and national growth. Some also insist upon immersion of sectarian religious values in American schools.
A return to Christian domination of the public school curriculum is advocated. School prayer is the first step in the conservative crusade for control of the classroom. In the absence of political success in this effort, some groups have labeled targeted texts as humanistic and defined "secular humanism" as a religion in hopes of removing challenged materials from the schools (Arons, 1983). Recent studies have documented increasing numbers of censorship attempts and increasing frequency of these attempts resulting in the removal of challenged materials from classrooms and school libraries. The studies have shown that many of the challenges have been coordinated by organizations on the religious right, such as Phyllis Schlafy's Eagle Forum and Pat Robertson's National Legal Foundation (Whitson, 1988).

Another approach to the conflict over the role of religion in public education is to view the debate as a struggle to control the transmission of culture. Stephen Arons in *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling* concludes,

Without a complete separation of school and state, the governing process of American schooling has been increasingly undermined by unresolvable value conflict, and individual freedom of belief, expression, and political participation has been hobbled. Schooling has become a major means of transmitting culture (Arons, 1983).

Arons identifies four major responses to this cultural
conflict by administrators, school boards, parents, and students: (1) compromise, (2) judgment of text and curriculum based solely upon educational criteria, (3) due process, and (4) the "marketplace of ideas" approach of including all value positions advocated in the community within the curriculum. Examples are provided by Arons to demonstrate that all four of these responses have failed to resolve the conflict. The result is a proliferation of private schools, home schools, and fundamentalist schools throughout the country which are perceived as a threat to the economic security of local districts and the professional status of certified teachers. Stephen Arons argues that the issues related to religion and education have deep historical roots and show no signs of abatement. Therefore, an extension of freedom in educational options for all families is proposed to guarantee government neutrality in place of the current ideological favoritism toward public education (Arons, 1983).

Some educators have sought to moderate the ideological and sometimes extreme positions described above by distinguishing between "teaching about religion" in the public schools and "religious indoctrination" (American Academy of Religion, et al., 1987). Others have called for a renewed dialogue between theologians and educators to seek a rooted and reverent educational form (Moran,
A few scholars have systematically countered positions taken by Eagle Forum and other organizations, as well as by individual writers. For example, James Anthony Whitson, in a review of Stephen Arons' *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling*, challenges Arons' argument that intellectual freedom can be reduced to a question of who gets to control the inculcating process of schools by deciding which values and beliefs will be stamped in the children's minds:

> Arons does deserve credit for raising issues that demand serious consideration. My focus here is determined by how dangerous the book's failings have become in these times, when the defense of students' intellectual freedom does need all the friends it can get....Instead of joining in the struggle for intellectually emancipatory education in public schools, Arons simply accepts coercive education as the premise for his condemnation of the public schools (Whitson, 1988).

Unfortunately, many other educators and scholars have avoided reflection on theological issues which could potentially illuminate and support curriculum theories. The tension between those who seek total immersion of religious practices and beliefs into the public school curriculum and those who insist upon a strict separation between church and state (and even state and school) agendas in the public arena hampers theoretical investigation of the possible role of theology in the postmodern curriculum. Curriculum theorists are therefore deprived of a
valuable primary source for philosophical grounding when theology is either totally disregarded in order to avoid controversy or facilely perverted in order to promote a sectarian or ideological agenda. A few curriculum theorists are beginning to understand this dilemma. William Pinar, in *Time, Place, and Voice: Curriculum Theory and the Historical Moment*, suggests:

The traditional argument regarding the separation of church and state has broken down in our time....In the Church are opportunities to develop sensibilities not obsessively psychologistic on the one hand, or standardized, masculinized, lost in the world of competition and combat, on the other. Through prayer, worship, and fellowship can come varieties of personhood and communal experience that are empowering, healing, and informing. The issue is not just prayer in the school. The issue is the constitution of curriculum, the constitution of the public sphere, as well as that of individual sensibility. The debate is taking a theological turn. For cultural, political, and spiritual reasons, it is the time, it is the place, for us to join this debate, literally and symbolically (Pinar, 1988).

William Doll is another scholar calling for curriculum theorists to enter into the theological debate. He writes, "Within the fields of architecture, art, literary theory, mathematics, the sciences, and theology, we may well find foundations for a new, postmodern curriculum. It is time for curriculum to look beyond itself to other fields, not for models to copy, but for heuristic metaphors" (Doll, 1988). Theology, which is undergoing
reconceptualization in various branches of study, may provide worthwhile models and metaphors for postmodern curriculum theories.

The summer, 1981, issue of the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing contained several papers which also raised the issue of curriculum inquiry looking beyond itself to a religious perspective for new metaphors. In that issue, Robert E. Richards contended that scholars have typically kept church and state apart in their inquiries:

Compartmentalizing knowledge is totally artificial and even hampering. What is found to be true through religious inquiry will have profound implications in every aspect of a person's life. One cannot keep religious truths apart from other truths. Truth is coherent— one whole— though some truths are far more critical in importance than others. Issues found in seemingly secular areas may be fraught with religious implications and require religious inquiry (Richards, 1981).

Richards' challenge not to compartmentalize truth and to allow for the development of religious inquiry within curriculum theorizing parallels the thesis of this dissertation.

The purpose of this study is not to resolve the debate about religion, values, and public education. Rather it is a challenge to curricularists to enter into the debate about theology and education. In Chapters Two and Three, the theological theme of eschatology will be explored as a creative mode for the development of a heuris-
tic metaphor and a new, postmodern view of curriculum. Eschatological themes in theology are of critical importance in a world where social justice, economic opportunity, environmental safety, and, ultimately, human survival are eminent issues. Before examining the possible implications of eschatology for curriculum theory, it is important to understand the dimensions of the use of eschatology in theology.

**EDUCATION AND ESCHATOLOGY**

In traditional theological discourse, eschatology seeks answers to religious questions about life after death, the end of the physical world, and salvific events to unfold in the future. Literal examinations of apocalyptic Biblical literature and Thomistic theology reveal traditional and fundamental religious truths. This traditional view is the *raison d'etre* for traditionalist and fundamentalist schools. Arons describes it as follows:

The premillennial horrors of the New Testament were in the minds of the fundamentalist school dissenters, and the moral decay they perceived in the schools was but a locally visible indication of the reality of premillennialism. Since only true Christians, those who are "saved," will survive the Last Days as described in the book of Revelation, the Biblical prediction of the future was completely consistent with the
fundamentalist view of schooling and the parental decision to pursue the "brotherhood of the saved" in Christian schools (Arons, 1983).

Contemporary theology, on the other hand, proposes a reconceptualization of eschatology. This theology envisions a unity of time and space where it is not so much the present that causes and prepares for a cataclysmic future, "but the future that causes the present, pulling humanity like a giant magnet out of a secure present and into an uncertain future" (Hayes, 1983). Schools, therefore, would serve as centers for creative interchange (Wieman, 1946), promoters of social consequences of value (Dewey, 1934), and institutions of liberation (Friere, 1970). Some of the tools utilized for the construction of a contemporary eschatology include form-criticism, hermeneutics, feminist theologies, liberation theologies, and process philosophy as seen in the writings of Alfred North Whitehead, Charles Hartshorne, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, John B. Cobb, Jr., and others. In contrast to apocalyptic fundamentalism and naturalism, the eschatology of contemporary theologians is proleptic and ecumenical. Whitehead presents a vision of religious education in Aims of Education that establishes a referent point for proleptic and ecumenical eschatology:

We can be content with no less than the old summary of educational ideals which has been current at any time from the dawn of our
The essence of education is that it be religious. Pray what is a religious education? A religious education is an education which inculcates duty and reverence. Duty arises from our potential control over the course of events. Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice. And the foundation of reverence is this perception, that the present holds within itself the complete sum of existence, backwards and forwards, that whole amplitude of time, which is eternity (Whitehead, 1929).

Contemporary proleptic eschatology and process philosophy provide important theological themes which can become creative sources for the development of a new, postmodern curriculum. A dialogue between theologians and philosophers who espouse a proleptic eschatology and curriculum theorists, both of whom have witnessed a reconceptualization in their respective fields, would inform such a curriculum theory. The dialogue could provide philosophical grounding for a new approach to the church and state stalemate that threatens to erode further confidence in public education. Gabriel Moran presents a concise view of the possible benefits of this dialogue:

In religion's meeting with education two things are likely to occur: (1) a transformation of the religious group from within, resulting in changed institutions and in new methods for transmitting the religious life to the next generation; (2) a conversation with other religious groups that will eventually lead to increased tolerance and mutual understanding. From education's side, an appreciation of religion might lead to a recovery of forms of education that were pushed aside by the modern school.
Education could then transcend some of the rationalistic bias which limits our conceptions of maturity, adulthood, and "the whole human being" (Moran, 1981).

The time is certainly ripe for beginning the dialogue between theologians and curriculum theorists, and eschatology should be an important focal point for the discussion. The seeds of future growth are rooted in the present hope. This hope provides a passage from modern crises in education to postmodern transformative pedagogy.
CHAPTER TWO:

CORRESPONDENCES:
CONTemporary CURRICULUM THEORY AND THEOLOGY

To become present among ourselves, not as atomized, acquisitive individuals posturing for individual gain but as individuated beings giving our shared experience form and reality through our words and actions, to become so present, the self allows its circumference to extend into its own past and into what is metaphysically transcendent.

William F. Pinar
"Time, Place, and Voice: Curriculum Theory and the Historical Moment"
in Contemporary Curriculum Discourses
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Eschatology as a theological term in its broadest definition seeks to explain the ultimate hope and destiny for the future of humanity and all of creation. Personal eschatology focuses on the destiny of people. National eschatology is concerned with the future for a race, its progeny, its remnant. Universal eschatology concerns itself with the fate of the whole world. The study of eschatology is an attempt to discover hope in the midst of depravation, evil, domination, and self-annihilation. Eschatology is not owned by any one religious or philosophical ideological orientation. Christian eschatology finds its hope in the person of Jesus Christ. Karl Barth said, "Christianity which is not totally and entirely eschatology has separated itself totally and entirely from Christ" (Barth, 1975). Jewish eschatology focuses on the expectation of a liberating political messiah or a messianic age. Hans Kung points out that "all eschatological hope culminates in the expectation of the Messiah, the anointed king of the blessed people of God" (Kung, 1967). Atheistic Marxist eschatology locates its hope in the labor of the proletariat to build the ideology of state or a classless society. James Miller summarizes this hope in History and Human Existence: "Labor comprised the principal medium of man's objective being. Through labor, man's restless power of objective action transformed the world
and appropriated it as his reality; humanity as a whole proved itself in work" (Miller, 1979). Liberalism finds hope in individual emancipation through capitalism. Rosemary Radford Ruether summarizes this hope in her book Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology:

Liberalism has been the ideology of bourgeois democracy. It has found its center in the defense of civic freedom and it also seeks justice through equality of opportunity, particularly through education and access to professions. But it is hostile to economic egalitarianism that touches private property (Ruether, 1983).

These and other eschatologies can take several forms. Realized eschatology places the fulfillment of all hopes in the present generation or its immediate progeny. Apocalyptic eschatology locates all hope in the future because the immediate generation is too depraved for reform. Imminent eschatology is prepared for the object of hope to appear on the horizon of the future, but the present generation must wait with patient endurance and urgent expectation. Finally, proleptic eschatology balances the hopes unrealized ("not yet") with the hopes realized ("already"), and the anticipated future is experienced in the present, although veiled. The history of eschatologies is rich in its diversity and profound in its impact on civilization. A contemporary study of eschatology and curriculum theory can reveal the impact of common themes in both on educational practice. Social,
political, and religious world views are not removed and isolated from educational practice and curriculum decisions. The texts selected for analysis in this chapter all address the topic of eschatology either directly or through unavoidable and unconscious assimilation. This chapter will review, categorize, and evaluate the eschatological orientation of several texts and their contribution to the discussion of eschatology in contemporary curriculum theories and practices.

Western consciousness of the past two-hundred years has developed three streams of critical culture in opposition to inherited religion and institutions of Christendom according to Ruether. She classifies the three streams of critical culture as liberalism, romanticism, and Marxism, and gives the following definitions:

Liberalism embraces the ideas of progress and believes that world conditions will gradually be ameliorated through worldwide evolutionary development of liberal institutions (Ruether, 1983).

Ruether discusses romanticism as a stream of critical culture in the following summary:

Romanticism reacts against the rationalistic scientific and technological aspects of modernity. Far from regarding these as the great instruments of human redemption, it sees technological rationality as alienating man from his roots in nature. Nature becomes the irrational, intuitive, the organic over against the machine culture. Romanticism celebrates what rationalism despised—the underclasses of society (Ruether, 1983).
Finally, Ruether discusses the third aspect of critical culture, Marxism, in the following summary:

Socialism has had several traditions. Democratic socialism extends the liberal tradition into economic democracy, while anarcho-communitarian socialism has more in common with romanticism. Marxism has more in common with liberalism in its celebration of the sciences and technology, but it becomes revolutionary rather than evolutionary because it recognizes that under the present system of class control liberal freedoms are class privileges for those who own the means of production. Marxists believe that there must be an overthrow and forcible reorganization of the present system of ownership in favor of the vast majority, the masses (Ruether, 1983).

Ruether attempts to establish a relationship between these streams of critical culture and religion, and then relate both to feminism. Since liberalism, romanticism, and socialism express ideals of equity, intuition, and freedom, there is a definite connection between these theories and eschatology. The point of common understanding between Marxism and liberation theologies is the denunciation of oppressive ideologies and the promotion of hope for justice on earth. But Marxism expands the critique of religion (as well as the religious foundations of liberation theology) that was begun in the Enlightenment. For Marxism, religion is seen as the ideology of the ruling classes that attempts to justify the subjugation and deferred expectations of the lower classes. Marxism
in effect criticizes a futuristic eschatology of a delayed Parousia. But Marxism also is aware of the power of religion to promote a vision of a better world to come, and it sees religion as alienated because of its mode of expression as "heaven" and "life after death." Marxism would reinterpret futuristic religious eschatology into a hope for a new future on earth consistent with realized atheistic eschatology. But proleptic eschatology and Marxism would find common ground for discussion in their attempts to promote liberation, though Christian eschatology would reject the secularization of Biblical and prophetic religion by Marxism and the contention that religious myth is a tool of alienation and exploitation.

Ruether presents feminist versions of these three ideological traditions. She challenges feminists not to appropriate the defects of these patterns of critical thought, because liberalism is deformed into the ideology of bourgeois capitalism, Marxism is reduced into the ideology of bureaucratic state communism, and romanticism degenerates into the ideology of fascism. This brings us now to Ruether's proposal of a synthesis of pre-Christian religion suppressed by Judaism and Christianity, Biblical propheticism, Christian theology (of majority and minority culture), and the critical cultures through which Western consciousness has reflected on this heritage:
What is sought here is not the inclusion of limitless possibilities, but a working paradigm of some main trends of our consciousness, both its dominant side and its underside. Thereby we can begin to glimpse both what has been lost to humanity through the subjugation of women and what new humanity might emerge through the affirmation of the full personhood of women (Ruether, 1983a).

Ruether's synthesis not only promotes affirmation of women, but also challenges humanity itself to become liberated. Ruether states with very proleptic emphasis that individuals can experience glimpses of a new humanity through her proposed synthesis.

In *To Change the World: Christology and Cultural Criticism*, Ruether discusses changing the world, which is an integral dimension of any eschatological or educational theory. Eschatology and education seek growth, improvement, and hope for individuals and for the global community. Ruether is writing about liberation from a Christian perspective, but she insists on an ecumenical and egalitarian application of her ideology. Theology, religious education, and curriculum must all serve the cause of liberation. She claims that education cannot be neutral because neutrality only serves the cause of the oppressors. Ruether insists that the educator must use a method of teaching that is liberating and hopeful. Liberation theology is used as an example of a pedagogical method. Ruether contends that liberation theology must
criticize the emphasis on "individualism, other-worldliness, divorce of the spiritual from the social, the imaging of God and Christ as white, male ruling class persons" (Ruether, 1983b). Ruether claims that these are intellectual errors, sins of idolatry, and ideologies (in the Marxist sense of ideas that justify social injustice). Ruether insists on a pedagogy that is liberating for the powerless; her belief that a future Christian hope cannot be divorced from a present human hope is clearly proleptic. She vigorously rejects a futuristic eschatology based on ideological dualisms. She also argues against any identification of liberation theology as imminentist. She explains these concepts in "Christology and the Latin American Liberation Theology," where she writes,

There are two ways that the dominant theologies are ideological. One way is by directly identifying Christ and the church with the social hierarchies of this system and by making God the author and vindicator of it. The second way is indirect through divorcing religion from life, body from soul, Christian hope from human hope. In this way the message of liberation is alienated and directed to a never-never-land beyond the stars which has no concrete implications for this world (Ruether, 1983b).

Ruether concludes her reflection by contending that Latin American Liberation theologians have become impatient with those who accuse them of fermenting class
conflict and of being too imminentist. Ruether establishes an important understanding of proleptic eschatology as it relates to liberation theology. Ruether's challenge to educators in To Change the World is to develop a curriculum that does not separate future hope from present human hope. The liberation of the oppressed must not be reduced to a future beyond the grasp of the present generation, nor to an imminent imperative beyond reality. Her vision of changing the world will be accomplished only if individuals, especially educators, refuse to justify the status quo either by direct assimilation of present hierarchies (religious, political, and social), or by indirect rejection through the use of dualisms. Ruether's challenge strikes at the heart of religious, political, and educational institutions.

The next text for analysis addresses similar themes. Leonardo Boff, author of Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church, is considered one of the world's leading liberation theologians. As Ruether pointed out, liberation theologians are often criticized from the right for their imminentism, Marxist tendencies, and realized eschatology. Likewise, liberation theologians are sometimes criticized from the left for their religious futuristic tendencies. Like Ruether, Boff presents challenges to change the world. But is
Boff's eschatology primarily Marxist, Christian, imminent, realized, apocalyptic, or proleptic? Liberation theologians are often misunderstood and much maligned. Leonardo Boff takes a giant step forward toward clarifying the position of liberation theologians and establishing a theory that can be substantially beneficial for educators.

Boff emphasizes throughout his text that the church is the "People of God" and not a hierarchical structure. His model of church is collegial, incarnational, relational, and prophetic. The church must seek out the poor and defend the exploited. The services and offices of the church should develop after the community has formed:

Anyone who opts for the Church as the People of God must take it to its logical conclusion: to be a living church, with flexible and appropriate ministries, without theological privileges. It is interesting to note that chapter 2 of Lumen Gentium [Vatican II], which treats of the People of God, comes before the chapter on the hierarchy, illustrating in itself a new understanding of ministry. This new understanding enables one to understand the various services that are rendered within the community as manifestations of the risen Christ. Caring for the sick, conscientizing the community as to human rights, presiding over the community, are all true ministries. Courage is needed to create this popular Church and let it grow. Until very recently the Church has been a Church only of priests for the people; it is now beginning to be a Church of the people (Boff, 1985).

This vision of community can provide an interesting parallel for schools as community. What would happen if
schools were viewed as a community of people learning together, rather than an institution of administrators and teachers existing for bureaucratic and behavioral ends?

Educational institutions need liberation. Boff challenges educators to adopt an activity called "politicization." He writes,

This activity must not be confused with political chicanery. Politicization is a positive concept that signifies an educational activity aimed at social and political coresponsibility. Political chicanery is the utilization of social organizations, created for all, for the sole benefit of a few individuals or the interference of the hierarchy in questions of party politics (Boff, 1985).

Authentic politicization is only one dimension of Boff's theology; a liberating eschatology is at the heart of his ideology. His eschatology is clearly proleptic. He believes in the ultimate Christian destiny in the utopian Kingdom, but he also believes that the Kingdom is present wherever the cause of liberation exists:

This type of church [People of God] allows for a proper dialectic of the relationship of Kingdom-world-Church. The Kingdom is certainly the Christian utopia that lies at the culmination of history. But it must be repeated that the Kingdom is found in the process of history whenever justice and fraternity are fostered and wherever the poor are respected and recognized as shapers of their own destiny (Boff, 1985).

Conscientization is another important dimension of Boff's theology. Education in conscience formation is of abso-
lute necessity for individuals as well as the global community. A curriculum that challenges cultures and the individual is the only rational conclusion, because, as Boff says,

Neutrality is impossible. We all take stances; it happens that some people have not been conscious of their position. Generally, these people assume the position of the dominant class, of the established order, which in many cases is manifestly antipopular, unequal, and unjust. We need to become more conscious of the political dimensions...[of the Gospel, of faith, and of education] (Boff, 1985).

Conscientization, politicization, liberation, and community formation are at the heart of Leonardo Boff's theology. Education for justice, and, therefore, an eschatological hope, is a foundation on which this theology can be constructed.

These themes are also evident in contemporary curriculum theory. In "Hegemony, Resistance, and the Paradox of Educational Reform," Henry A. Giroux presents compelling arguments in favor of a shift toward a radical theory of classroom pedagogy. The theoretical basis of his discussion is ideology, culture, and hegemony. He examines the dialectical relationship between the general relations of society and the process of schooling. Giroux argues that the curriculum movements of the present fail to provide the theoretical framework needed to develop an adequate foundation for a critical model of pedagogical
reform. Present classroom experiences are deeply rooted in class domination and inequality, and present theories have done much to reveal the political and economic character of education. Giroux sees these theories illuminating these problems by examining schools against the landscape of capitalistic society and economy. But the critiques of the theories of radical pedagogy are rife with shortcomings. Giroux explains, "In the end, abstract negation gives way to unrelieved despair, and the discourses of radical reproductive approaches points to a mode of theorizing that belongs to the rationality of the existing administered system of corporate domination" (Giroux, 1981). Giroux here seems to be arguing against theories that do not provide hope for social change. He insists on a connection between critical theory and social action. He states that his theses is as follows: "It is imperative that such a pedagogy be informed by a political project that speaks not only to the interest of individual freedom and social reconstruction but also has immediate relevance for educators as a mode of viable praxis" (Giroux, 1981). Henry Giroux insists upon practical social change, and he concludes his text with a reference to hope for social change:

It is in the interface of domination and resistance on the one hand and structure and human energy on the other that a strategy for a radical pedagogy must be grounded.
Central to such a pedagogy is a mode of critique that is informed by a faith in the possibility of empowering both teachers and students with a hope that change is possible. In addition to the need for a vision that suggests that a qualitatively better society is possible, there is also the need for a radical pedagogy to develop a theory of intellectual struggle (Giroux, 1981).

Giroux moves beyond theories of ideology, hegemony, and culture towards a radical theory of classroom pedagogy with clear grounds for an eschatological dialogue. His theory of radical pedagogy beyond resistance and domination theories is very similar to the liberation theories proposed by Ruether and Boff, and his insistence on empowering teachers and students with "a hope that change is possible" resonates with the theologies of Ruether and Boff. All three authors can be contrasted to theorists who prefer a cynical perspective of social control in curriculum development. Giroux argues against cynicism:

A critical theory of pedagogy will have to acknowledge that within certain historical contexts concepts such as cultural reproduction, social reproduction, hegemony, and resistance may belong to the logic of abstract negation. In other words, though they provide powerful analytic tools to critique the capitalist imperatives that underlie its institutions and social relations, such concepts often take a mere negative stance toward existing social order and fail to show that something else is possible, that change can take place....Unfortunately, the crisis that capitalism faces has not translated itself into large-scale political opposition; instead it has developed into massive and pervasive forms of cynicism. Given the current mood of cynicism, despair, and
defeatism, it is important for radical educators to move beyond theories of reproduction that do nothing more than either analyze the contradictions that exist in schools or point to the way in which schools are influenced by structural determinants in the wider society. If we are going to take the concept of class struggle seriously, it makes more sense to heed Horkheimer’s suggestions that theoretical concerns get translated into viable pedagogical tools for social change (Giroux, 1981).

It is clear that neither cynicism, despair, and defeatism, nor negative stances toward the status quo will bring about needed social change; rather, pedagogical theories with viable tools to stimulate change are necessary. Feminist theologians and liberation theologians would find common ground for educational theorizing in this philosophy.

Having explored some insights of both theologians and curriculum theorists, it is now important to address the question of possible assumptions about an eschatological foundation for pedagogical theories. This must be pondered in the context of the effects of eschatology on motivation of individuals. Curriculum and pedagogy are carried on by individuals. Douglas McGregor, in his popular Theory X and Theory Y formulations, clearly presents alternatives for managing individuals, particularly employees in a bureaucratic structure (McGregor, 1960). McGregor’s management theory articulates one of the most important issues facing theorists who seek to place
eschatology at the center of pedagogical discussion: human motivation. If theology can be defined as "faith seeking understanding," then eschatology might accurately be defined as "hope seeking motivation." Henry Giroux challenged the curricularist to overcome cynicism and create pedagogical theories with viable tools to stimulate social change. Eschatology, as discussed above, could be a theoretical link for this pedagogy. McGregor helps to use the tool of motivation to provide a reliable context for the discussion of the effects of eschatology on individuals, and ultimately on the curriculum.

McGregor's Theory X is the traditional view of the employee in the workplace held by managers that people are lazy. Theory X believes that the average person (educator, student) is by nature indolent, lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, and prefers to be led. People are seen as inherently evil and motivated only by coercion. Pessimism is pervasive, and competition is a natural state. Theory X relies on bifurcation and dualisms.

McGregor's Theory Y, on the other hand, assumes that people desire achievement and responsibility. (This can be compared to Maslow's self-actualization or Herzberg's intrinsic satisfiers.) People are seen as inherently good and driven by humanism. Optimism is pervasive, and cooperation is a natural state. Theory Y finds homeostasis in
harmony and synthesis.

While a more realistic position would assume that people respond along a continuum throughout their lives, the extremes of Theory X and Theory Y allow for a contrast of human motivation. Eschatological theories are influenced by theories of human motivation. An orientation toward Theory X would negate the possibility of individual conversion. Social change or an object of hope could not be experienced in the present because of the evil and selfishness inherent within humanity. Individuals could protect themselves only from the coercive forces of decay in the world; people could never expect significant changes in the internal motivators of themselves or other human beings. The external milieu could be affected only when an individual becomes motivated by personal gain. However, the resulting impact on the environment is never significantly changed, because selfish interest negates social gains. Theory X would approach eschatology apocalyptically, and the object of hope would be delayed to a future devoid of human intervention.

On the other hand, Theory Y lends itself more toward a realized or proleptic eschatology. People cooperate to bring about a social change. They are motivated by humanistic ideals for the good of the group (or nation, or world). Conversion is possible in Theory Y because
internal factors allow human beings to change themselves and help others change. This conversion can be rooted in the present only (realized eschatology), or it could be a realistic expression of the future object of hope (proleptic eschatology). Theory Y does not necessitate a dependence on dualistic structures of internal/external, present/future, or good/evil. If people are inherently good and seek cooperation for a greater social or humanistic goal, then evil is only temporary diversion. Human motivation will naturally seek to remove evil, the fortified but impregnable obstacle.

While neither position X nor position Y provides theoretically complete systems of human motivation, they do serve the purpose of contrasting the ranges of response to the effects of eschatology—from a barrier to protect individuals until the apocalyptic moment—to a driving force which transforms individuals in the proleptic moment. (The Christian would call this force "grace," the Marxist "labor," liberalism "capital," Judaism "messiah," and so forth.) Giroux's insistence upon a theory of pedagogy with viable tools for social change becomes possible only from a Theory Y eschatological perspective. We must now ask whether or not a reconceptualization of curriculum and pedagogy steeped in eschatology is not a realistic prerequisite for social transformation.
Curriculum structures rooted in behavioristic and deterministic theories tend to function to endorse status quo social relations. Dwayne Huebner, in "Toward a Political Economy of Curriculum and Human Development," and William Pinar, in "The Reconceptualization of Curriculum Studies," begin to shift the continuum toward a political view of social change:

If there is indeed a political economy of the curriculum and of child development, it will not tell us how to educate young people, but how the young and the old can live together for mutual benefit and how current structures of production and consumption intrude upon the social relations among people--young and old, near and far, rich and poor, black and white (Huebner, 1981).

Huebner's critique of present structures in society challenges educators to look beyond a production-centered curriculum to a social-relations curriculum. A new political dynamic is necessary. William Pinar writes,

A reconceptualist tends to see research as an inescapable political as well as intellectual act. As such, it works to suppress or to liberate not only those who conduct the research and those upon whom it is conducted, but as well those outside the academic subculture. Mainstream social science research, while on the surface seemingly apolitical in nature and consequence, if examined more carefully can be seen as contributing to the maintenance of the contemporary social-political order or contributing to its dissolution....Nearly all accept that a political dimension is inherent in any intellectual activity (Pinar, 1981).

Huebner and Pinar argue that social change is
possible through the studies of the individual's own complicity in the forces of domination. Huebner proposes a critical methodology that is informed by educational practices on a social, dialectical, and materialistic level. It is social because individual freedom is dependent on the quality of social life. It is dialectical because the parts must be seen in terms of the totality, the present in terms of the future, and contradictions in terms of offering a dimension of truth and understanding in the present moment. Finally, it is materialistic because it is concerned with the tangible—the human body as well as the global community. This methodology should replace the impotent educational practices which are designed for private gain.

Pinar likewise calls for a change, "A fundamental reconceptualization of what curriculum is, how it functions, and how it might function in emancipatory ways" (Pinar, 1981). Education must function with a politically emancipatory intent. The possibility of emancipation and the expectation that the status quo social order can be restructured parallels eschatological themes with proleptic overtones. But the proposal for reconceptualization is not tied to the distant future nor just to the present generation. It is parallel to proleptic eschatology in the sense that Pinar calls for a synthesis that is at once
empirical, interpretive, critical, and emancipatory. He claims that intolerance among traditionalists, conceptual-empiricists, and reconceptualists must give way to a new intellectual climate and regenerate curriculum studies. The seeds of change are found in the contribution of each perspective, and the real possibility for emancipation is imminent; Pinar strongly argues against a realized theory of reconceptualization. The aspiration for fundamental structural change in the culture “cannot be realized by 'plugging into' the extant order” (Pinar, 1981). By adding a few courses on autobiographical reflection or Marxism, Pinar argues, we are simply adapting to the present structure without a commitment to a critical theory.

There is a balance between what is unrealized in education and the existing educational climate. Pinar writes, "Becoming open to another genre of work does not mean loss of one's capacity for critical reflection" (Pinar, 1981). Pinar might be characterized as challenging curricularists to forsake their answers in order to study the kinds of questions that should be asked. The openness to this balance of the realized and unrealized in education and the emphasis on emancipation and social change clearly lays a foundation for dialogue with theologians who espouse a proleptic eschatology.
James Miller examines issues related to emancipation, individual freedom, and social change in *History and Human Existence: From Marx to Merleau-Ponty*. Miller focuses on individuation in various philosophical traditions in order to uncover the idea of the authentically free individual who can explore alternative social forms capable of cultivating the expressive and national capabilities of human beings, as well as satisfying their material needs. Early in the text, Miller asks whether or not the intentions of the individual, even in principle, ever contribute creatively to the emancipatory process? He reflects on this question in the context of individuation—the process where human beings become distinctive, autonomous, and self-conscious agents, each capable of purposefully reshaping the natural world and of independently evaluating moral claims—rather than individualism—which connotes selfishness and egoism. Miller explains as follows:

The perceptions generated by such a philosophy applied to the issue of individuation are not insignificant....The idea of the authentically free individual is kept alive in the philosophy's commitment to exploring alternative social forms capable of cultivating the expressive and rational capabilities of human beings, as well as satisfying their material needs. That Marxism has not created or even always adequately conceived the appropriate social forms is true enough; yet the challenge remains, with the dignity and freedom of being human at stake. Individuation, a question of autonomy, self-expression, and a personal commitment to freedom, as well as a matter
of material well-being, is then seen as the endowment, not of a monadically self-reliant agent, but rather of a person open to, and realizing his aims through, the institutions he inhabits (Miller, 1979).

The question of the individual shaping effectively individual human existence and contributing to social change is a complex issue. Miller recognizes differences in theories from Marx, Gramsci, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty. Miller approaches Karl Marx from a very unusual perspective. He characterizes Marx's vision as one that incorporates individuation as one of its central elements. Human activity and labor provides the medium for human expression. Miller argues that through labor, man's restless power of objective action transformed the world, proved itself in work, if only by facilitating the survival of the species. This vision of transformation and survival provides a framework for eschatological dialogue. Some other aspects of Marx's hopes as defined by Miller open the door to interesting questions about Marx's eschatological orientation. One example given by Miller was that Marx said the individual was characterized "not by some ineffable, interiorized particularity, but by a totalizing particularity that, in activity and thought, engage in objective projects pointing beyond [emphasis mine] the individual, and toward the universal and social community of man" (Miller, 1979). What does "pointing
"beyond" mean in relation to the individual? Does the "universal community of man" imply a dimension of a future state of man? Is this future state an apocalyptic ideal, or is it experienced in the present milieu? Miller begins to answer when he says, "As empirical science as well as prospective utopia, Marxist thought thus relied on the ability of the concrete individual to unite, in his own person, a concern for the universal as well as particular" (Miller, 1979). Universal eschatology often depends on a proleptic view of history and an interesting parallel could be explored here.

As Miller continues, he begins to expand his vision of individuation. It is interesting that Miller characterizes Marx's communism as distant from earlier and more primitive notions which had reduced the individual to a level of dull equality. Marx, by contrast, sought the fulfillment of the individual. Marx hoped to overcome dualisms; he spoke of reality as "pointing beyond the one-dimensional confines of the purely present" (Miller, 1979). This emphasis on overcoming dualisms and seeing reality beyond an experience of the present begins to open this philosophy to some aspects of the proleptic experience. Miller also talks about the transformation of the individual in the present. This, of course, can be linked to McGregor's Theory Y.
Marx went so far as to describe a communist form of society as 'the only society in which the original and free development of the individual ceases to be a mere phrase.' The full range of men's possibilities could thus only be elaborated in the future; for the present, Marx merely affirmed that the individual and his relation would be transformed under communism (Miller, 1979).

Despite the argument that Marx critically depicted the process of individual emancipation, and despite Miller's efforts to link Marx to a transformational and multidimensional philosophy, the evidence does not point beyond an eschatology that is universal. It is neither fully apocalyptic nor fully realized, and the elements of proleptic eschatology are undeveloped also.

After introducing the concept of individuation in Marx's philosophy, Miller examines the philosophies of Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Sartre where "man was something other than the being of potential enlightenment portrayed by rationalism" (Miller, 1979). Rather, the individual faced the world alone in an abyss of uncertain existence. The concept of freedom assumed in classical philosophy was now rejected. Sartre's existential Marxism envisioned man as a creature of passions, basically solitary, and an antisocial animal living in a series of conflicts. The only hope for transformation would come from an individual transforming himself or herself by overcoming feelings of inertia and fear and asserting a personal and transcending
freedom. As Miller has said,

In fact, Sartre suggested that every man desired the self-sufficient transcendence which Hegel had attributed to God, the "absolute Being" of the "in-itself-for-itself": The supreme value toward which consciousness at every instant surpasses itself by its very being is the absolute being of the self, with its characteristics of identity, purity, permanence, etc. For Sartre, as for the rationalists, men only became truly human when they recognized, affirmed, and purposefully realized their own freedom (Miller, 1979).

Sartre's self-sufficient transcendence is totally rooted in the present tense. His futurology rejects an absolute being and is founded on a sense of meaninglessness and hopelessness. But Sartre also adopted a philosophy of transcendence as the foundation of revolutionary theory which called for an abandonment of causal thinking. Sartre says "If the worker discovers the relation between cause and effect, it is not by submitting to it, but in the very act which transcends the material state... toward a certain end which illuminates and defines this state from within the future. The revolutionary dynamic of history similarly resided, not in the laws of nature, but in human transcendence" (Sartre, 1962).

The postwar crisis gave rise to the need for existence to recapture a sense of purpose. Existentialism, according to Miller, spoke directly to this mood and provided insight into the crisis of the contemporary
condition. Also, existential phenomenology provided the framework for reconsidering Marx's hopes for individuation. Miller claims that the most fruitful application of existentialism to Marxism occurred in the philosophy of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "who produced an original phenomenology of the social world which emphasized the unity of consciousness with the empirical world and man's inherent sociability" (Miller, 1979).

Merleau-Ponty's emphasis on transcendental unity and the close interplay in perception between body and mind, "cognito" (e.g., the "phantom limb" belief that an amputated limb still exists) sets a foundation for his phenomenon of perception. Merleau-Ponty's new philosophy arises from the impasse of empiricism and rationalism:

Empiricism was wed to a stimulus-response model, taking as its fundamental unit atomic sense-data. Rationalism, on the other hand, approached perception as if it were the lucid construct of consciousness. Rationalism thus mistakenly enriched perception by elevating it to the level of self-consciousness, while empiricism falsely impoverished perception by reducing it to an empty passivity. Merleau-Ponty felt that a new philosophy could arise from this impasse (Miller, 1979).

Merleau-Ponty's new philosophy certainly adds a new dimension to the discussion of emancipation and social change. John Cobb writes, "Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological analysis of the experience of the body helps to overcome the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. Whitehead's
conceptuality can carry this task farther. This is a vision of a possible future. Radical changes in human self-understanding are possible, accompanied by actual changes in the structure of existence" (Cobb, 1976). But because he still clings to the possibility that chaos was as likely an historical outcome as humane relations in society (his philosophy of ambiguity), Merleau-Ponty's philosophical orientation, like Sartre and the other existential philosophers, should still be viewed as parallel to realized eschatology. Miller's understanding of Merleau-Ponty's view of history is summarized in this way: "There is no science of the future" (Miller, 1979). But, he claims, a modest Marxism held out the hope, although it could not guarantee it, that truth and reason would prevail in the course of history. Despite Merleau-Ponty's optimism about human creativity engaged in shaping human history beyond positivist determinism or rational necessity, he does not offer a view of history that will provide substantive hope. Merleau-Ponty's consistent rejection of any proleptic, imminent, or apocalyptic dimensions to his phenomenology renders any eschatological comparisons impotent. His insistence on a phenomenological analysis in the midst of irredeemable crisis and conflict only raises further questions about experiences of the future, and it establishes a contradiction. Miller
recognizes this contradiction in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy: "The illogic of any philosophy of history founded on criteria gleaned from an harmonious end of history, an end somehow deciphered before the event, is evident. Truth might well be on the horizon, but if we have not yet encountered it, how can it shed light on the mundane world of the here and now?" (Miller, 1979). The location of truth and the encounter with the future must be further explored in Merleau-Ponty's philosophy before any useful foundations for an eschatological dialogue can begin. But, Miller's conclusion that individuation in a true communist society would transfigure human existence is a curious blend of themes common to apocalyptic, imminent, and realized eschatologies which could provide a beginning for a new dialogue.

Moving from a discussion of eschatological themes in philosophical and educational theories, this chapter will now direct attention to works on religious education to see specifically how eschatology permeates the character of this field. The first topic to be addressed at this juncture before an analysis can begin is the distinction between implicit and explicit eschatologies, or inner-worldly utopia and Christian eschatology (Rahner, 1978). Can a philosopher or educational theorist have an eschatological orientation without specifically intending
to theorize about religious eschatology? A similar question was addressed in the debate among theologians over the possibility of the "anonymous Christian." It was argued by Rahner and Panikkar, among others, that whether conscious of the fact or not, all humans had an intuitive understanding of the Spirit of Christianity. Within the religious and cultural experiences of all societies a Christian code existed, and the principles of Christianity permeated all of humanity. Hans Kung refuted this theology in his text, *On Being a Christian*, when he responded to this theology of anonymous Christianity:

 Against all well-meant stretching, blending misinterpreting and confusing of the meaning of Christian, things must be called by their true name. The Christianity of the Christians must remain Christian. But it remains Christian only if it remains expressly committed to the one Christ, who is not any sort of principle, or an intentionality, or an evolutionary goal, but a quite definite, unmistakable, irreplaceable person with a quite definite name. In the light of this very name Christianity cannot be reduced or "raised" to a nameless—that is, anonymous—Christianity. To anyone who thinks a little about the two words anonymous Christianity is a contradiction in terms, like wooden iron. Being humanly good is a fine thing even without the blessing of the church or theological approval. Christianity, however, means a profession of faith in this one name (Kung, 1976).

 The question which now must be asked is whether an anonymous or implied eschatology can be attributed to all philosophers. It will be argued here that, unlike
Christianity— which is a personal faith encounter with Jesus Christ within the context of a historical community or church— eschatology can be viewed as an orientation to reality which permeates all ontological philosophies and philosophical theologies. While existential theories of the potentialities of the individual do not by necessity demand an eschatological orientation, any collective reflection on the fate of the human race and the world must be derived within an eschatological framework (i.e., apocalyptic, proleptic, imminent, or realized). But since the destiny of the human race is accomplished through the existential experience of individuals, educational philosophy must ultimately address temporality and the dialectical relationship of the individual and the world.

Dwayne Huebner addresses this issue in Heightened Consciousness: Cultural Revolution and Curriculum Theory:

Temporality is a significant issue in education. Time is not a dimension in which we live—a series of "nows" some past and some in the future. Man does not have so many "nows" allotted. He does not simply await a future and look back upon a past. The very notion of time arises out of man's existence, which is emergent. The future is man facing himself in anticipation of his own potentiality for being (Huebner, 1974).

Huebner also contends that the past is an experience of individuals reflecting on their presence in the world. This is a moment of vision and insight where the past and future are brought together in each moment of existence.
Huebner explains this concept in the following summary:

The point is that man is temporal, or if you wish, historical. This means that human life is never fixed but always emergent as the past and future become horizons of a present. Temporality is of major importance to education in that education recognizes, assumes responsibility for, and maximizes the consequences of this awareness of man's temporality. Curricularists must encourage the moment of vision, when the past and the future are the horizons of the individual's present so that his own potentiality for being is grasped (Huebner, 1974).

Since the existential and phenomenological relationship of the individual to temporality is a dialectical process that is essential to any philosophy of the human or any educational theory of curriculum, then an eschatological orientation—whether utopian or nihilistic, apocalyptic or proleptic—is either expressed or implied in that theory. Karl Rahner in Foundations of Christian Faith demonstrates that all philosophies must have an eschatological orientation:

We cannot forego a collective eschatology of the human race and of the world in favor of a purely existential interpretation of the individual eschatology of each individual. The fulfillment of the whole of history is being accomplished in these individuals....When we discuss this collective eschatology, it could legitimately be asked what the more exact relationship is between Christianity's expectation of the kingdom of God in which a Christian awaits the absolute future which is God himself, and the inner-worldly tasks of individuals, of peoples, of nations, of historical epochs, and finally of the human race in the totality of its futurology and ideology.
about the future (Rahner, 1978).

Rahner also distinguishes between Christian eschatology and philosophical eschatology. He proposes that individual eschatology and collective eschatology must both be developed, because individual eschatology cannot be separated from the human person as a historical being. Rahner concludes,

However many distinct phrases there might be, Christian eschatology cannot understand eschatology in such a way that the world and its history simply continue on indefinitely, and only the individual as an individual is liberated from this on-going history, and hence reaches his own fulfillment as understood in an individualistic way. The eschatology of the concrete, individual person can be complete only if we also develop a collective eschatology (Rahner, 1978).

Rahner offers several contrasting phrases which are the presupposition for eschatological reflection: the individual person as a corporeal, historical reality and the individual person as a transcendental, personal spirit; the individual as a solitary being and the individual as a member of the human race, as a member of a collective reality; the individual as a spiritual person and the individual as a reality to whom there necessarily belongs a world as a milieu and environment in which actualization of existence occurs. Rahner concludes that there is necessarily an individual and a collective eschatology. The fulfillment of the concrete person cannot be expressed in
any other way except by being regarded both as an element in human collectivity in the world and also as an ever-unique and incalculable person who cannot be reduced to the world or to society.

As a dialogue between theologians and curriculum theorists begins, it will be important to distinguish between collective and individual eschatology. It will also be important to distinguish an eschatology which is an orientation toward the future, or an understanding of temporality in relation to history, from Christian eschatology which places God (in grace and in Christ) at the heart of the fulfillment of history. Unlike the anonymous Christian debate examined above, the eschatological orientation question does not depend on a theological understanding of the world as the milieu and environment of transcendental spirit. Rather, the human spirit seeks to understand its relation to the future:

For man cannot understand his present in any other way except as the beginning and the coming to be of a future and as the dynamism towards it. Man understands his present only insofar as he understands it as the approach towards and the opening up of a future. Hence he has to develop a futurology and an eschatology, but he knows about these last things by means of an aetiological anticipation of what he knows here and now about himself and about his salvific present....[Man] does not forget the fact that his final and definitive future really arises out of his present life, both individual and social, and that this future is the final and definitive validity of his...
free actions (Rahner, 1978).

Christian theology would add that these actions are of a more radical nature because of God's self-communication, and that eschatology is the individual's view of history from the perspective of the experience of salvation, the experience which is available now in grace and in Christ.

Despite these distinctions, it should be clear that a collective eschatology allows for universal application, and that the individual is intricately involved in this collective process. Using social justice issues as an example, Gabriel Moran points out that "even those people who reject the Jewish and Christian way cannot escape the continuing impact of the ideal of universal justice. Marxism, for example, with its chosen people and eschatological fulfillment, is obviously derivative from Jewish and Christian history. Education for justice can mean nothing less than education and justice for all" (Moran, 1981).

In conclusion, Chapter Two has examined themes from theological investigations, educational theories, and philosophical discourses to establish a possible common ground for a dialogue between theologians and curriculum theorists for emancipatory education with eschatology as the focal point. This grounding has been indicated by depictions of several themes, including education for
justice, liberation theology, hope for the global community, conscientization, radical pedagogy, reconceptualization, social change, individuation, and collective eschatology. While other themes certainly could be included, this list demonstrates that interests of theologians and curriculum theorists do intersect widely. With the establishment of this topical foundation, Chapter Three will now evaluate those philosophers and philosophical theologians who have presented various theories which could become useful in the eschatological dialogue and which could help establish a new sense of hope in education for individuals and for society in the postmodern era.
CHAPTER THREE:
EMERGING CONCEPTS OF ESCHATOLOGY

The true present is nothing else but the eternity that is immanent in time, and what matters is to perceive in the outward form of temporality and transience the substance that is immanent and the eternal that is present....Not merely man is cheated, but still more God is cheated, where hope does not allow one to discover an eternal present....The believer is the one who is entirely present.

Jurgen Moltmann
in Theology of Hope
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Chapter Two explored the theme that a conversation between curriculum theorists and theologians would be useful in the development of a new, postmodern understanding of education. Theological themes from proleptic eschatology and related eschatological themes implied within reconceptualist curriculum theories helped to establish a framework for discussion. In Chapter Three it will be necessary to develop this framework to support a postmodern view of curriculum rooted in hope. The conversation must move beyond the non-threatening search for thematic common ground and into the tedious debate to formulate an agenda capable of articulating a philosophically and theologically relevant postmodern curriculum. Proleptic eschatology will be utilized not only as a heuristic metaphor to advance the dialogue, but also as a fundamental element of the postmodern curriculum.

A critical challenge facing those who are attempting to advance the postmodern curriculum, as well as the dilemma of theologians and philosophers of all historical periods, is to develop a consistent and relevant understanding of the problem of evil. Personal suffering, global annihilation, and social decline all present an overwhelming problem for those who believe that hope is not only possible, but also an essential element of postmodern curriculum and theology. Even the perceptive process
theologian David Ray Griffin gives central importance to the problem of evil and self-destruction in his work:

There is a danger that human beings may involve all high forms of life on this planet in their destruction. Thus the products of billions of years of evolutionary development are threatened in a future that is to be understood in terms of decades....The sense of urgency is justified, but it must not be translated into crash programs to solve local and temporary needs. It must find form in a breakthrough into a completely new way of living that can make possible a decent survival for the human species in a rich and supportive biological context (Griffin, 1976).

If a new way of living for decent human survival is to be developed, if an emancipatory view of education is to be accepted, and if postmodern views of curriculum and eschatology are to be understood and assimilated, then the issue of evil and human survival must be addressed. Chapter Three will begin with an evaluation of the problem of evil in postmodern theology and the connection of this theology to eschatology. It will then critically examine the philosophy of the future in the works of John Dewey and the _Humanist Manifesto_, Henry Nelson Wieman, and Ernst Bloch. It will also examine the eschatology of Jurgen Moltmann and Carl Peter. These six references will allow for an exploration of the eschatological perspective of an American philosopher of education, several leading humanists, an atheist, a theist, a Jewish philosopher, a Protestant theologian, and a Roman Catholic theologian.
Additionally, this chapter will present a synthesis of philosophical process theology that will reflect a postmodern view of eschatology. This theology will be used to support a postmodern view of curriculum that sees the process of growth in education as more significant than an objective product to be mastered. Just as attempts by modern industrial society to dominate and develop nature for its own use have wrought havoc in the environment, so too will a curriculum that seeks to control and dominate individuals fail. Theology in the modern age has struggled to understand why the power of God could not solve all of the problems of evil and suffering in the world, and the response of postmodern theologians to the question of power and evil will provide a metaphor to help understand why power and domination models in education also continue to fail.

Not until recently would any theologian have seriously questioned the scholastic understanding of God's omnipotence and omniscience as articulated through the centuries from Aristotle's "Unmoved Mover" (Aristotle, 1985), through Augustine's theme of the immutability of God (Augustine, 1950), to Thomas Aquinas' synthesis of Greek and Hebraic thought in his seven attributes of deity (Aquinas, 1947), and to Luther's concept of the relationship between God and evil in his On the Bondage of the
Will (Pelikan, 1955). However, process theology of the twentieth century has proposed a new understanding of God's power, of evil, and of suffering. This new theology is reflected in the popular book, *Why Do Bad Things Happen to Good People?* by Harold S. Kushner, rabbi of Temple Israel in Natick, Massachusetts (Kushner, 1981). Kushner has assimilated process theology into his reflections on God's power as it relates to his personal anguish after the death of his teenage son. In the concluding chapter, entitled "What Good, Then, Is Religion?," Kushner dramatically departs from traditional theology:

> I believe in God. But I do not believe the same things about Him that I did years ago. I recognize His limitations. He is limited in what he can do by laws of nature and human moral freedom. I no longer hold God responsible for illness, accidents, and natural disasters, because I realize that I gain little and I lose so much when I blame God for those things. I can worship a God who hates suffering but cannot eliminate it, more easily than I can worship a God who chooses to make children suffer and die, for whatever exalted reason (Kushner, 1981).

Presuming that Kushner's theology is not an isolated example of the understanding of God's power among Judeo-Christian pastors, how can this theological shift in the churches be explained? What are the implications of a process theology that perceives God's power as bounded and God's transcendence as participating in human suffering?

When process theologians describe the bounded power
of the omnipotent God and an openness to human destiny by
the omniscient God, they are moving beyond traditional
theological understandings of the deity. Some would label
statements like "bounded power" as a scandalous oxymoron.
But process theologians would respond that traditional
theological systematics leads to an ominous conclusion.
David Ray Griffin presents a formal statement of the sys-

tematic problem in traditional theology in his book *God,
Power, and Evil: A Process Theodicy*:

1. God is a perfect reality. (Definition)
2. A perfect reality is an omnipotent being. (By
definition)
3. An omnipotent being could unilaterally bring
about an actual world without any genuine evil.
(By definition)
4. A perfect reality is a morally perfect being. (By
definition)
5. A morally perfect being would want to bring about
an actual world without any genuine evil. (By
definition)
6. If there is genuine evil in the world, then there
is no God. (Logical conclusion from 1 through 5)
7. There is genuine evil in the world. (Factual
statement)
8. Therefore, there is no God. (Logical conclusion
from 6 and 7) (Griffin, 1976).

Griffin explains the dilemma facing theologians as fol-
lows: "If there is a providential God who is perfect in
both power and moral goodness, why is there evil in the
world? More precisely, is belief in the existence of such
a deity made incredible by the apparent fact that the
world is not as good as it could have been?" (Griffin,
1976). Griffin contends that a careful historical ex-
amination will help philosophical theologians to see that assumptions about the nature of God's power that made the problem of evil so difficult are not necessarily inherent in the idea of perfect power and do not necessarily belong to the essence of the Judeo-Christian idea of deity. Therefore, Griffin finds definition number three in the formal statement above to be the crux of the reconceptualization by process theodicy.

After a careful explication of the proposition statements, Griffin presents a new understanding of God, power, and evil in postmodern theology. Using Alfred North Whitehead for a philosophical foundation, Griffin concludes with the following synthesis:

If God were an impassive absolute, then all the talk about the necessity of risk-taking in order to achieve higher values would mean that it is the creatures alone which suffer the consequences of God's decision to take risks. But in process thought, the quality of God's experience depends in part upon that of the creatures. Worldly events of pain and sorrow are received into God just as they are (Griffin, 1976).

In other words, God participates in the joy and suffering of humanity. No longer is the deity seen as totally removed from human experience. Griffin continues:

Awareness of this aspect of God as envisioned by process thought not only removes the basis for that sense of moral outrage which would be directed toward an impassive spectator deity who took great risks with the creation. It also provides an additional basis, beyond that of our own immedi-
ate experience, for affirming that the risk was worth taking. That being who is the universal agent, goading the creation to overcome triviality in favor of the more intense harmonies, is also the universal recipient of the totality of good and evil that is actualized. In other words, the one being who is in position to know experientially the bitter as well as the sweet fruits of the risk of creation is the same being who has encouraged and continues to encourage this process of creative risk-taking (Griffin, 1976).

The creative risk-taking, the goading of creation to harmonies, and the experience of suffering and joy by God—which are all a part of Griffin's process theodicy—will establish a framework for understanding the eschatology of philosophers and theologians as diverse as John Dewey, Henry Nelson Wieman, Ernst Bloch, Jurgen Moltmann, and Carl Peter in the following pages.

The exploration of eschatological themes in philosophical theology will now be able to affirm God's existence and God's goodness in spite of the evil within divine creation. Process theology views individuals within creation as empowered partially to self-determination, to identify intensity and harmony as elements of intrinsic goodness capable of overcoming triviality and discord, to understand that the conditions for greater good are also necessarily the conditions for the possibility of greater suffering, and to realize that God is willing to suffer the consequence of evil by being open to new levels of
intensity and harmony. Ultimately, we will be able to see that God constantly works to overcome evil in the creation of good by seeking to increase human joy and seeking to enlist human support in the effort to overcome evil by maximizing good.

This understanding of God and the problem of evil is wisely treated as a primary theological issue by postmodern process theologians because the entire eschatological proposition rests on the understanding of evil. In order to posit that the future somehow impinges upon the present and that transcendence is experienced proleptically, it is necessary to explain God's power and love as participating in the dynamic human journey. Process theology and philosophical theologians provide this framework. S. Paul Schilling in God and Human Anguish presents the three alternative responses to evil and suffering: rebellion, passive resignation, or active affirmation of the loving purpose of God. He says, "We have found ample support for the third of these choices. We can declare with John Calvin--though without his determinism--that God is at the helm of the universe. Such confidence does not bring all storms to an end, but it assures us that our frail craft can, with his guidance, avert shipwreck and be kept on course" (Schilling, 1977).

Griffin, Schilling, and other theologians affirm a
belief in God's love and in the future toward which humanity is being lured. Creation not only groans with agony, but also awaits the future with eager longing for the appearance of God's mature sons and daughters (Christian Scriptures, Romans 8:19). The potential of actualization in the painful processes of evolution in the natural order is the reconceptualization of eschatology which now opens postmodern theology to the philosophical dialogue, and, ultimately, to theories of curriculum as well. Educators will be able to use this theological reconceptualization to support a curriculum that promotes a process of actualization in the individual who has real potential, that centers the potential for growth within the subjective experience rather than within an external objective body of knowledge, that views curriculum as a journey of an educational community searching together to overcome evil and ignorance rather than as an imposition of predetermined solutions to life's problems from a higher source of knowledge, and, finally, that understands the need to reinterpret power structures in education in such a way that hope becomes a realistic possibility where the future can be anticipated with eager longing. A liberating and transformative pedagogy in a new landscape of learning to be proposed in Chapter Four emerges from this theological reconceptualization.
Although John Dewey never explicitly used the word "eschatology" in his writing, he laid the groundwork for the discourses on the future in the Humanist Manifesto. In the early 1930s Dewey addressed a series of lectures at Yale University to "those who had given up faith in the supernatural," which were later published as A Common Faith. In this book, Dewey attempts to show people how they can be religious without professing membership in a sectarian religion. Dewey was an atheist and an idealist in the sense that he believed that humanity could incorporate change in the world independent of a supernatural being. He wrote, "All possibilities reach us through the imagination...things realized in fact come home to us and have power to stir us" (Dewey, 1934). But Dewey also raises some questions in his philosophy when, at times, he shifts from idealism to naturalism. "The aims and ideals that move us," Dewey says, "are generated through imagination. But they are not made out of imaginary stuff. They are made out of the hard stuff of the world of physical and social experience" (Dewey, 1934). Are the ideals beyond nature? Within nature alone? Or revealed in nature? This relationship is important in the understanding of the impact of the ideals on human growth.
John Dewey's philosophy characterized and recorded the American spirit of his day, and, like the 1980s, there was a growing dissatisfaction with hypocrisy, scandal, and ineptitude in organized religions. In the modern consumer society, more and more people are looking for a meaningful answer to their religious longings, and Dewey's idealism blended with naturalism has great appeal. However, even with his philosophical optimism, Dewey does not completely understand the longings of the American heart. The issues are deeper than the growth of a great human society: men and women struggle with the meaning of life and death, creation and eternity, good and evil.

Dewey's concept of the religious is dynamic. It is a growth out of his distaste for the static view of the world held by many members of religious denominations that the sacred is somehow separated from the profane. Dewey believes that the world is and can be a holy place. Harmony can be achieved to a great extent within the world. The separation of lay and cleric, body and soul, holy and secular, and, ultimately, religion and religious has led to a great crisis of faith. Dewey's concept of the "religious" is the pursuit of the ideal. It is a struggle in the world that involves faith and hope, and it can be recognized by its results (which Dewey calls social consequences of value). The religious experience is found
in the effect and not in the cause. Dewey says, "The actual religious quality in the experience described is the effect produced, the better adjustment in life and its condition, not the manner and cause of its production" (Dewey, 1934). This conclusion was reached because Dewey witnessed a "pie-in-the-sky" attitude among the religions of his time. Social change was delayed because all rewards were in heaven. There is one major weakness in this conclusion: some religions do promote faith and good works (effects). Some are active in social and political projects, and the consequences of their efforts do promote value. But in any case, Dewey's point is still well taken because very few religions have made "social consequences of value" the major premise in their theological syllogism.

Based on this understanding of the religious, Dewey outlines the way that people are motivated to take action to bring about universal harmony. He gives us five steps:

1. Experience gives rise to an idea.
2. The idea is transformed by the ideal.
3. The ideal comes from the imagination because only there can we experience something as whole.
4. We become committed in our present state of experiencing to carrying out the ideal (faith).
5. The ideal, through faith, conquers selfishness and produces a social consequence of value (a better world). "Conviction in the moral sense signifies being conquered, vanquished in our active nature by the ideal end...and use of
the word 'God' or 'Divine' to convey this union of the actual with the ideal may protect man from a sense of isolation. Thus, this fifth stage is called 'God.'" (Dewey, 1934).

(See Illustration I: John Dewey's Eschatological Schema.)

Some theologians find this schema very hopeful, and they even feel comfortable with Dewey's perceptive terms. However, process theologians would see "God" as a personal being, coming out of the future, active in ideals, and working to produce the social consequences of value. Theologians explain transcendence in this way because it clearly provides a religious hope: thus, the experience of God becomes proleptic. This theology also addresses questions of creation and beginnings; it gives humanity a partner in the struggle to create the social consequences of value.

This discussion reveals a serious flaw in Dewey's theological position. If humanity can produce social consequences of value (which postmodern theologians would agree can be accomplished), why have idealists, humanists, and naturalists been unsuccessful in this effort? Or, more to the point, why is there division and defection even in atheistic societies? One possible answer is that humanity must work in harmony with nature to produce change, and that humanity is helpless alone. Even man's capacity of idealism, imagination, and hope is not completely effective because of (A) natural evil, (B) moral
evil, (C) the limits of free choice, (D) and God's bounded power that prevents supernatural intervention (Shilling, 1977). However, these limitations need not cause hopelessness and despair. Why? Theologians would answer because personal hope lies partially in its fulfillment beyond the grave in a personal being known as God. Dewey approaches this conclusion when he calls "God" the relationship between the possibilities and the actualities. This sounds very much like Jesus' description of the Kingdom of God: existing in the present, but also to come in the future. Some theologians would say "the already and the not-yet."

One element in John Dewey's philosophy that must still be explored is a bridge for the gap between the concept of God and religious and the concept of a personal God and religion. Are not there at least some religions that articulate this successfully? Are not in fact some religious institutions more successful than some atheistic societies at implementing social consequences of value? If we must all work together "for the human good" and if we are "all parts that are marked by intelligence and purpose, having the capacity to strive by their aid to bring conditions into greater consonance with what is humanly desirable" (Dewey, 1934), then why does Dewey totally discredit a part of this whole—namely those who are members
of religions? These questions must be addressed before the otherwise brilliant philosophy of John Dewey can be utilized to the fullest in the eschatological dialogue.

The *Humanist Manifesto I* and *Humanist Manifesto II* are position papers outlining religious, philosophical, and moral positions through ideological statements about the future of humanity by influential writers, scholars, and thinkers of the twentieth century. They contend that a radical shift in the human thinking process must occur in order to preserve the values of the present generation and enhance the quality of life for the future. According to these papers, men and women must be their own saviors or they will face continued alienation and eventual obliteration. In 1933, a group of thirty-four liberal American humanists, inspired in many ways by the philosophy of John Dewey, drafted *Humanist Manifesto I*. Four decades later, in 1973, 114 prominent Americans signed a second and longer draft of the *Humanist Manifesto* proclaiming that they were committed to both human fulfillment and survival. These two documents are concerned and yet optimistic about the future of humanity, although *Humanist Manifesto II* prefaces the paper with a statement that *Humanist Manifesto I* was overly optimistic. World wars, depressions, Nazism, starvation, and other global crises revealed human brutality at its worst. But in the choice
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between despair and hope, humanists responded with a positive declaration. Their hope provides valuable insight into modern attempts to formulate an eschatological understanding within a natural philosophy.

*Humanist Manifesto I* emphasizes that the identification of the word *religion* with doctrines and sects is the greatest barrier to solving the problems of human living in the twentieth century. Religions have become powerless, so a new statement is formulated giving the means and purpose of religion. Primary among the goals are "adequate social change" and "personal satisfaction." These are laudable goals, but the fifteen position statements of *Humanist Manifesto I* are riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions. For example, how can this Manifesto in one breath "discourage unreal hopes and wishful thinking" (#11), and, in the next statement, "foster the creative in man" (#12)? Is there really an openness to creativity in imagination when these authors and humanists determine the content of creativity?

A second point on this topic is that when examining the empirical evidence and historical knowledge of world communities, the proposals of *Humanist Manifesto I* seem to have never been achieved. In fact, they may even seem impossible to achieve based on past experience. Statement number eight, "Establishing synthesis of all religions
into a single dynamic force to meet all the needs of this age," (#8) would require a lot of "wishful thinking and projection of dreams" (#11). Would the humanists eliminate the very creative capacity which led them to their own manifesto? The conclusions of Humanist Manifesto are certainly far too optimistic in the belief that humankind will voluntarily narrow its world view. It is also far too limited in its understanding of the human condition.

Another contradiction found in these papers is that without empirical evidence to the contrary, the humanists deny that the world was created and assert that it is "self-existing" (#1). But statement #4 contends that there are possibilities which have not yet been discovered: "The means of intelligent inquiring determine the value of any reality" (#4). Has the door been closed on intelligent inquiry into the creation of the universe?

Recent work by physicists (Hawkins, 1988; Davies, 1983) suggests that this is not true. A renewed interest in the history of time from the "big bang" to "black holes" is evident in the emerging literature in physics.

A third contradiction is found within statement #14 of Humanist Manifesto I: "The ultimate goal of humanism is a free and universal society with voluntary participation." But at the same time the manifesto attempts to es-
establish a "socialized and cooperative economic order to reach this goal" (#14). Order must be enforced. How will this be done? Humanist Manifesto II does not resolve this dilemma. The new-world community proposed must renounce the resort to violence or force (#13), however, the building of the world community involves the "development of a system of world law and world order" (#12). Rules and laws are subject to creative interpretation. Laws can also be violated, and, with creative thinking, they can also be revised and updated. All of this reveals that humanity is not perfectly complete at any one given moment in history. It also demonstrates that people build on past experience. The world community is now locked into a system in Humanist Manifesto II that is limited in its perspective. It contends that men and women will always have the same perspective on issues and laws. Finally, from experience it is observable that force of any kind, by its nature, can lead to resistance. Humanist Manifesto II deplores the use of force and violence but seeks to control people's lives, their religion, and their philosophy. Force is used to prevent the future use of force.

The three serious problems with the Humanist Manifesto outlined above deserve critical analysis. They reveal an internal flaw in the means used to achieve the ends of humanism. However, this should by no means
diminish the significant contribution to humanity the Manifesto has made. It has articulated the need for peace, prosperity, happiness, compassion, freedom, cooperative efforts, and hope. Humanity must creatively think of new ways to achieve these ends, and the authors must be admired for their painstaking analysis of one approach to the end of "destructive ideological differences" (#15). Humanism contends that it has "time on its side...that it has the potential intelligence, good will, and cooperative skill to implement this commitment in the decades ahead" (#15).

HENRY NELSON WIEMAN

Henry Nelson Wieman, a theistic philosopher who lived from 1884 to 1975, provides a unique perspective on eschatology which does not deny a deity, but also is not bound by traditional Christian formulations. Wieman's perspective offers the opportunity for dialogue between atheists and Christians. Throughout his life, especially during his early years as a philosopher, he tried to develop a process of humanization. Wieman believed that salvation must begin now, or else it does not occur at all. In an editorial from Interchange: The Center for
Creative Interchange, Wieman describes the process of transformation in society from an agricultural system to industrialization and civilization. Now there is a new process of transformation requiring society to direct its energies toward transforming the human mind in order to survive. Wieman says, "If it [this revolution] does not succeed, humanity will become extinct" (Wieman, 1969). This transformation is the salvation that Wieman speaks of throughout his writing. Wieman stands before the world as a believer, a prayerful man, who had an experience of God in his life. This experience has led him to a philosophy of religion based on hope and developed through creative interchange. Wieman's eschatology has been characterized as "a theology concerned with the relationship between present human needs, their existential demands, and their future fulfillment....Indeed, Wieman attempted to reconceptualize the image of God" (Minella, 1974). As a naturalist, Wieman places God within human nature as the ground of hope and the directive of history. Faith becomes an act of total trust on the part of the individual who is by nature a "hope-er." This is the essence of salvation for Wieman, who sees humanity at the brink of a new revolution. And in order to successfully begin this revolution, Wieman has developed a concrete process to establish fellowship. Like Whitehead, Hartshorne, Teilhard
and other contemporary philosophers, Wieman is a process thinker. But Wieman criticized these other philosophers as pure conjecturalists. Wieman starts with the individual person and develops an anthropological process theology based on experience. Whitehead and Teilhard were speculative thinkers who based their theology on a developmental system working from the simplest life forms to complex human beings. However, to Wieman, human beings must be examined first because they have the important role of shaping the future. This concept of human nature and Wieman's steps of creative interchange are the most positive elements in his theology, although he does not offer an explanation of personal encounters with God (grace) or an explanation of how Jesus became a catalyst for creative interchange in the Christian community.

In his concept of the individual, Wieman sees human beings as creatures of need, who are by nature hopeful. They manifest an innate capacity to reach out for that which in the present moment is a veiled future....All human works are also the works of nature, not only because men and women are themselves a part of nature, but because they are always dependent upon the rest of nature and must cooperate with it in bringing forth any good thing (Wieman, 1969).

Wieman suggests that humanity needs nature, needs
fellowship, and needs a relationship with God. The individual cannot survive in isolation. Men and women have aspirations that push them to seek the "not-yet." This must be worked out individually and within a community, for it is not automatic. Within humanity there is a potency for good and a potency for evil. Wieman contends that people experience human aspirations and drives to carry out imaginations and to be free from social limitations. Any obstacle to this transformation Wieman calls roots of sin or evil. These could be such things as to fail to appreciate value, to make self-serving judgments, and to remain closed to change in our value system. These are the human longings; these are the human limitations. There are two traditional ways of handling the conflicts between aspirations and limitations: to view the world as a static, programmed reality, or to view the world as changing according to the effects of humanity. Wieman chooses a third paradigm "where humanity is not merely what it might be in its isolated self but what it might become in relation, specifically in terms of a response to God and to the world" (Wieman, 1969). In this way, he sees faults being overcome by the individual but only with the aid of God, who gently lures men and women who are rooted in history. (God is seen here as only the directive of history and not the director of history. God is
in control of only one strand in history— but not all strands because this would put God in control of evil.) It is necessary to respond to this direction of history (God), or humanity will be caught in the meaninglessness and directionlessness of a history without fellowship. This can be called sin. The supernatural lure can lead individuals out of this meaningless existence, but they must make a decision in faith which Wieman calls "faith-hope." Thus the individual person needs to give himself or herself in ultimate commitment to God, who is gracing history and allowing transformation of individuals and the world.

A second aspect of Wieman's philosophy is his concept of creative interchange. This is the basis of his process of transformation and salvation mentioned above. Wieman states again, "As the powers of technology increase, commitment to creative interchange must increase, else civilization will destroy itself" (Wieman, 1969). What, then, is creative interchange? Basically it is communication between individuals whereby each gains new perspectives of value which are subconsciously integrated with their own values. This expands the range of values accessible to the consciousness of each person, as well as to the community. These creative values will be beyond instrumental (functional) and intrinsic values. They will
be enlarged and made less selfish by inviting all people to participate in this fellowship. Simply stated, creative interchange is meaningful human communication under God's grace. John B. Cobb, Jr., also considers self-expression in creative interchange as a fundamental principle of process theology:

The doctrine that every occasion of experience aims at its own self-creation points to only one half of its creative aim. Equally essential is the occasions aim to pervade the environment, i.e., to be creative of the future....The aim to express oneself is universal. Like the aim at self-creation, the aim at self-expression is final causation, but it is also the anticipation of oneself as sharing in the creation of the future, and hence as an efficient cause. Accordingly, an occasion of experience in creating itself does not aim solely at its own private enjoyment; it also aims to create itself in such a way as to make a definitive contribution to the enjoyment of others (Cobb, 1976).

Cobb's explanation of creative self-expression and Wieman's creative interchange both imply that absolute egoism is ontologically impossible because no actuality is solely concerned with itself. Also, since the concern for the future is a variable means, there can be growth of the future. Finally, the anticipated positive reception of the world to the creative contribution is important for enhancing enjoyment and growth. If the free self-expression anticipates reprisals for others as well as its own future experiences, creative interchange and
enjoyment will be inhibited. Therefore, Wieman's creative interchange does not include elements of false communication such as deception, manipulation, or repetition. The interchange must be other-directed, and it must seek value. Because God does not give a blueprint of value, nor does God take away creativity, there will be, therefore, constant tension between good and evil. Wieman will insist that fellowship will be the result of creative interchange of value. Some may accuse Wieman of being an elitist at this point, but he will insist that his experience of creative interchange and fellowship can occur in all persons.

There are four sub-events in Wieman's method. The first is awareness, which comes with linguistic expression. Here is where value is passed on to others. The only difficulty with this first step is that Wieman does not allow for such things as body language in this process of awareness. The second step occurs when the personality becomes deeper and more enriched. The values I possess are enlarged and my respect and acceptance of the other person's values are increased. An integration of the positive aspects of both values takes place. Thirdly, new structures of interrelationship grow in the world. One begins to see that individual values influence large decisions. Finally, fellowship is the result if the creative
interchange is followed to completion; otherwise, meaninglessness and sin are the results. Once this fellowship and transformation is experienced, it must be sustained in order to survive. The revelation of God (grace) is active in the process of creative interchange. But from where does it come? This is one weakness in Wieman's position. He will not explore an answer to this because he says that the data is not available. However, Wieman firmly believes that God is passing on new values that make growth possible if people enter into creative interchange. It could be said that God gives the possibilities which are actualized.

At this point, it must be noted that Wieman says that Jesus was the most influential person in history because he was totally successful in carrying out this process of creative interchange:

The creative transformative power was not in the man Jesus, although it could not have occurred apart from him. Rather he was in it. The creative power lay in the interaction taking place between these individuals (disciples). It transformed their minds, their personalities, their appreciable world, and their community with one another and the whole world (Wieman, 1970).

How did Jesus become totally committed to the creative interchange and thus affect the disciples in this fashion? What was the power? This is a fundamental question not fully addressed by Wieman which must be pursued.
by future theologians to build a foundation for the philosophical and eschatological dialogue.

Henry Nelson Wieman establishes a theistic theological position with his understanding of fellowship and creative interchange that is important for the eschatological dialogue. The question of human growth through human relations is a fundamental aspect of all eschatological discussions. (See Illustration II: Henry Nelson Wieman's Eschatological Schema.)

ERNST BLOCH

Ernst Bloch was a German Jew who has caused the theological world to take a new look at its eschatology. Bloch rejected his Jewish faith in favor of a Marxist-humanist atheism, but he continued to profess in his teachings and writings that the Judeo-Christian heritage is the foundation of pure Marxism, atheism, and eschatology. Although not a Christian, Bloch believed that Jesus Christ was the greatest person to ever live on this earth. And although an avowed Marxist, Bloch was not acceptable to his contemporary Marxists (whom he believed had adulterated the true message of Marx) because he was a pacifist.
Bloch presented an optimistic attitude toward the future. He was not only open to the future, but he believed that there were real "possibilities" for humanity on the horizon. Bloch believed that humanity was always on the move in a process toward something radically new. Humanity was "not-yet" what it was becoming. This concept of the "not-yet" was one of Bloch's most important premises. It can also be explained as "The something more for man which is not from man" (Bloch, 1968). Here Bloch acknowledged that hope was within and at the same time was beyond. But unfortunately Bloch never attempted to explain where the source of hope resided. He did not discuss where the "something more" came from. Was humanity the source of everything? Was the "other" beyond humanity the source of everything? Despite his positive contribution of an understanding of the "not yet," Bloch did not answer these most important questions about the source of hope.

In his philosophical thinking, Bloch was able to evaluate Christianity and Marxism and detect some of the fundamental dimensions of Jesus Christ and Karl Marx. He very accurately characterized the disciples of both Jesus and Marx as having adulterated the original vision of their mentor. This was important because it forced modern society to look within itself in a self-critical fashion. Often people are blind to their own presuppositions.
Bloch strips presuppositions away. He challenged people to see Jesus Christ as a man of hope: the one who called for a radical change, the one who gave his life for "the cause." He likewise believed that Karl Marx was the greatest disciple of Jesus Christ: the best "day-dreamer," the man who saw in history the process by which individuals could be humanized. Bloch was like the bold prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures when he accused the modern Christian disciples of Christ of having sold their souls to the devil. This leads him to conclude that "only a good atheist can be a good Christian" (Bloch, 1968). Bloch was also forceful in his condemnation of vulgar Marxism, which denies individual human rights and expects people to work for a future freedom which they will never experience. Bloch's contribution in this area of his philosophy may be very beneficial for a future Christian-Marxist dialogue in the eschatological encounter.

Despite his ability to understand and characterize the message of Jesus and Marx in a positive way, there are some serious weaknesses in Bloch's conclusions. He was guilty of an extremely limited view of the message of Jesus Christ. Jesus cannot be characterized as "counterculture" only. It is true that Jesus associated with the poor, but he did not spend his time with them exclusively.
Moreover, he also praised the poor, but never their condition. While there must be justice for the poor, in the process of dialectical reversal there must also at some point be a metanoia on the part of the existing class structure. Bloch believes that a dialectical reversal will one day produce a classless society. However, other theologians would strongly disagree that Jesus can be used to support this position exclusively. Jesus did not profess a belief in any economic system, nor did he try to establish one. His central message was faith—faith in the kingdom (both now and in the future). Block interpreted this kingdom as "The Kingdom of Man," in which the individual person becomes his or her own savior. This is not consistent with scripture. Jesus often speaks of the "Kingdom of Heaven" and "The Kingdom of God." Bloch does not address this dilemma. This is only one example of how Bloch interprets scripture in a narrow fashion. In his analysis of St. Paul, he did not consider the social context of the message, nor the expectations of Jesus' imminent second coming within the early Christian community. In his analysis of the cross, Bloch concluded that Christ died for "the cause of the humanist struggle" (Bloch, 1968). He did not address the prominent theological and scriptural references to salvation, redemption, and God's participation in human anguish. The cross of Christ
cannot be reduced to a humanist cause alone.

The third and final aspect of Bloch's philosophy that must be examined is his view of human nature. Bloch had a very healthy and positive emphasis on the human role in changing the world. He stressed the importance of active participation in the future. He encouraged "Day-Dreaming" to counteract unimaginative and preprogrammed existence. He vocally opposed a consumerism that created artificial needs and kept humanity from being in touch with interiority. But Bloch exaggerated when he claimed that "economics makes us who we are" (Bloch, 1968). True, poverty is an evil. But humanity is far too complex to be reduced to a one-dimensional plane. Bloch's "Day-Dreaming" should produce visions of much more.

In summary, Bloch provides a dynamic view of the future, a corrective to vulgar Marxism and hypocritical Christianity, and a healthy understanding of humanity's role in shaping the future. But his three weaknesses are his refusal to discuss the source of the "future beyond," his limited interpretation of Jesus and scripture without reference to hermeneutical studies of the twentieth century, and his conclusion that economics ultimately shapes humanity. Ernst Bloch's concept of the future does, however, establish an interesting position for the eschatological inquiry.
Jurgen Moltmann, a Lutheran, and Carl Peter, a Roman Catholic, are two prominent twentieth century theologians. Both of these men have played significant roles in the development of Christian eschatology. Both Moltmann and Peter challenge the church (in an ecumenical sense) to take up the prophetic role. Moltmann is particularly adamant in his protest against Christian churches which have accommodated to society, thereby losing their prophetic impact. Likewise, Peter's eschatology sees the church as the prophetic voice of God in the world: "I see Christian faith as a necessary condition in this world for assisting and sustaining faith as such in the value of human existence. Hence I consider the church necessary for Christian faith and faith as such" (Peter, 1974). Both Peter and Moltmann also emphasize that the resurrection of Jesus Christ must be considered a reality and not a myth. Carl Peter's Christology seeks to discover as much knowledge of the historical Jesus as possible so as to establish a continuity between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. Otherwise, Peter contends, Jesus will be reduced to a myth. Moltmann and Peter also insist in their Christologies that Christians must not be afraid to speak of the resurrection as a reality because the
resurrection is eschatological. Another point of harmony in the theologies of Moltmann and Peter is the intimate relationship that is found between faith and hope in both men's writings. As Moltmann has stated:

The making present of the coming God in Christ's substitution creates faith in us. The making present of the coming God in the resurrection of Christ creates hope in us. Thus faith has the 'prius' since it is the first thing that corresponds in us to God's future. But hope owns the primacy, since in faith everything is directed to God's future and faith owes itself to the opening up of this future. In faith hope finds its ground in Christ's cross. In hope faith finds its end in Christ's Parousia. What is grounded on faith and becomes effective through hope is love. It is the new being and the resurrection life under the conditions of transiency and death (Moltmann, 1970).

Furthermore, Peter also believes that Christians must ground the credibility of their faith in hope. Individuals do not have to prove their faith, but they must be able to point to something and say, "That is why I hope." In other words, traces of God working in history must be found. Moltmann also believes that God does indeed address human needs, and that there is a reason to have hope, even though Peter's view of history will be different from Moltmann's. These points of comparison between two Christian eschatologists should not lead us to the conclusion that both men have identical theologies. Their differences are significant. In this section, it will be necessary to examine such topics as grace and
anthropology, metaphysical finalism, proleptic and futuristic eschatologies, Christology, pneumatology, sacramentology, evil, and apocalypticism to delineate the contrast between Moltmann and Peter. As this is done, it must be remembered that both men are sincere Christians who are examining their beliefs and seeking an understanding of the deep mysteries of the Christian faith, especially through the study of eschatology.

The two concepts to be examined first are an understanding of grace and a definition of metaphysical finalism. In very general terms, grace can be viewed as God's self-communication with creation. Two separate theologies of grace develop from this general understanding. The first theology is based on an intrinsic understanding of grace (usually associated with Roman Catholicism) which contends that an interior healing attitude occurs within men and women because of God's free gift of life in grace. Individuals are open to grace and can change as a result of this openness. This view sees humanity as being wounded by sin but capable of being interiorly healed. Thus, in the spirit of St. James's epistle where he says, "You must perceive that a person is justified by his works and not by faith alone," those who support this intrinsic position believe that a person can be justified and divinized. Therefore, a person can act
upon his or her faith to effect change within and in the world. A second theory, extrinsism, rejects this notion of grace (as well as St. James's epistle) in favor of the Pauline statement of justification through faith. Extrinsism is usually associated with Protestantism. In Galatians, Chapter Three, Paul asks, "How did you receive the Spirit? Was it through observance of the law?" Paul then says, "Consider the case of Abraham. He believed God and it was credited to him as justice. This means that those who believe are sons of Abraham." Passages like this one are used to support the position that the individual person is justified by faith alone. The individual is viewed as a sinner who is corrupt, but by God's grace he or she is given the power to endure the evil and suffering of this world. Therefore, the human condition of evil and suffering cannot change: it can be only lessened or endured. The individual is justified by faith, but cannot be divinized until after death. It must be noted here that extrinsism, like the intrinsic theology, suggests that God enters human history and saves humanity. The primary difference, as noted above, is that in extrinsism grace does not change the person interiorly. This brief sketch obviously should not be considered a complete explanation of the theology of grace, nor a complete exegesis of the New Testament understanding of faith.
and justification. Rather the preceding distinction between an interior healing attitude and extrinsism sets the stage for the tension between the theologies of Moltmann and Peter. (See Illustration III: The distinction between Jurgen Moltmann's and Carl Peter's theology of Grace.)

Moltmann supports the theory of extrinsism, and preconciliar Catholic triumphalism helped to strengthen his conviction. He saw that the Catholic Church presented the view that the Kingdom of God is the Church. The Church became "heaven" in itself, implying that a person could save himself or herself. Some Catholic practices and Catholic traditions certainly operated from this perspective. Protestants such as Moltmann saw the error of believing that an individual, by his or her own potency and good works, can somehow merit heaven. On the other hand, Catholic theologians such as Carl Peter acknowledge the contribution that Moltmann has made to theology by these insights, but two correctives are presented. First, it is pointed out that at The Council of Trent in the document on grace, there is an agreement that Christians are justified by faith, and that through faith Christians perform works of mercy and justice to communicate love. Thus, faith, hope, and love must all interact. Secondly, the post-conciliar Catholic view is not triumphalistic or
elitist. The Catholic Church teaches that grace heals, and that God's love is returned through individual and community works of mercy. (See Illustration IV: Soteriology Diagrams.)

Process theologians also articulate a theology of grace. Whitehead's analysis of the relation of morality and "Peace" are used to present a theological understanding of law and grace. Moral codes and laws are seen as coming from God in the sense that there would be no morality at all except for the distinction between possible ideals and actualities which God introduces into the world. The codes also express the widening of concern that God specifically causes within individuals. Finally, moral codes are necessary to sustain the forms of order that allow for individual realizations of enjoyment that are a part of God's aim (Griffin, 1976). Griffin says, "Thus the law is holy, just, and good. But it does not have the power to save us" (Griffin, 1976). In contrast to the law, grace is the inner presence of God which gives rise to justice. This presence of God within also inspires mercy, adventure, and art. This grace allows one to experience beauty and harmony, and it also allows one to experience the discord and disharmony that makes people restless with the law. Quoting Whitehead, Griffin says, "The supreme gift is 'Peace,' which is an alignment of
ourselves with God's grace. This alignment occurs only through our free decision to live from grace. This is perhaps why Whitehead says that 'experience of Peace is largely beyond the control of purpose'" (Griffin, 1976). As a result of this explanation, it is important to note that the theology of grace should not be a point of division among theologians. Grace leads to peace and justice. Rather, clarification is needed when examining the anthropology behind extrinsism and intrinsism to discover that extrinsism sees humanity as inherently evil and waiting to be healed after death, and that intrinsism views humanity as inherently good and capable of being healed in this life. A systematic anthropological ecumenical study, illuminated by Whitehead's concept of "Peace," is an important element of the eschatological agenda in postmodern theology.

The study of grace and anthropology leads naturally to the second introductory area of discussion: metaphysical finalism. Moltmann contends that Thomas Aquinas, Karl Rahner, and other Catholic theologians are metaphysical finalists. In metaphysics, one studies reality in an attempt to discover one word that will be common to all existing things (i.e., "being" or "process"). Finalism is that condition in which a being is directed to its final end because of its own ontological structure.
Metaphysical finalism is a Protestant understanding of Aristotelian concepts that contend that people have the full potency within themselves to achieve the final end (salvation, kingdom, and the like). Carl Peter argues that this is not the Catholic position. Aquinas does distinguish between natural man, who has the intrinsic capacity for growth within his being (as an acorn grows into the oak), and supernatural man, who has extrinsic power from God (grace) to activate his growth toward God. Thomas calls this grace potentia obedientialis. Moltmann's understanding of preconciliar Catholic theology and his observations of Catholic practices led him to his conclusion that the Catholic position was metaphysical finalism. Catholics will argue that this is a misrepresentation, but the conclusion of both will be that metaphysical finalism is not the appropriate metaphysics for the postmodern eschatological dialogue.

At this point, it is necessary to examine the positive approaches that Moltmann and Peter take toward postmodern eschatology. Both call their eschatology proleptic. This judgment will be accepted now and critiqued in the conclusion. The objectives of Moltmann's theological eschatology are to a) develop a system that will avoid the pitfalls of previous methods, b) develop a political theology that will restore the prophetic role of
the Church to criticize the evils of the world, and c) de­
develop a sound understanding of the death and resurrection
of Jesus the Christ, in which his death of on the cross is
seen as incarnational, and his resurrection is seen as
eschatological.

Moltmann's first objective protests against the pit­
falls of previous theological systems. He opposes cosmolog­
cal theology, which attempts to prove the existence of
God. This theology also makes God identical with the
workings of nature, and this becomes an accusation against
God, making God the source of evil. Moltmann also objects
to anthropological theology, especially Karl Rahner's,
that would posit similarities between God's nature and hu­
man nature. Moltmann believes that this makes God less
than what God is, and makes God responsible for what is
evil in humanity. He says further that anthropological
theology breaks the dialectical unity between history and
the absolute universal claim. Logos theology, a third
problem for Moltmann, makes God present in the Logos; it
also tends to repeat the past and present without a view
toward or from the future. He also protests against those
who do not realize that God's future is also revealed.
Transcendental subjectivism, knowing God within in the
present moment and not in the future, is another major
error Moltmann rejects in theology. All of this can be
summarized by saying that Moltmann strongly objects to any theology that domesticates God within the past or present rather than experiencing God as the proleptic future. Moltmann's solution has been the development of a theology as eschatology. The most fundamental problem that his theology will attempt to address is the question of evil.

Moltmann develops his eschatology with a biblical and resurrection-oriented understanding of history. First of all, as regards the Bible, it is seen that a change in the concept of history occurred from the time of Hebrew Scriptures before the time of the prophets up to the time of the Christian Scriptures. In the Hebrew Scriptures, history was seen as a continuity between the past and the present. God's promises to his chosen people were always fulfilled in continuity with the past. But with Israel's destruction and diaspora, a new view of history had to be developed. From the time of the prophets up until the present, God is understood as coming out of the future and not out of the past. God comes to reject and to judge the past. Then the past and the present are united by the future. What is experienced of God in the past and the present is the presence of the future. History, therefore, is viewed as promise (hope). God is not yet present, and the present is not yet what it should be. There is hope.
At this point, some may be inclined to call Moltmann's eschatology futuristic instead of proleptic. This is contrary to his theological self-understanding. Where will hope exist for the world in the present if Moltmann is truly proleptic, as he claims? Moltmann contends that people can experience grace, but yet remain sinners: justified sinners by faith. Can humanity ever reach a point in historical time that will be free of evil and sin? If the answer is yes, humanity is elevated to the level of God, and then God becomes the source of evil. If the answer is no, then hope will rest with the God of the future, who definitely inspires humanity in the present to do good. There is hope because God allows humanity to overcome and endure the evil of the world. With this understanding, theologians neither domesticate God nor divinize humanity.

In order to fully understand Moltmann's concept of history, it is necessary to look to Jesus Christ, the hinge of history and the reality prolepsis, the one who lies in the future and announces the future because he is the future. Looking at Jesus from the past, he becomes subordinated to God. But looking at him from the future, as we must because he is the only one whom God has raised up, then the subordination disappears. The Crucified One becomes a mode of God's being and a part of the future.
This Jesus reigns now and forever as the Crucified One, the Lord of the coming kingdom, who by his death became historical and by his resurrection became eschatological. Moltmann looks at history from the future. It is the God ahead of us who became the Crucified One, the source of faith today. Our resurrection has been earned for believers by the cross of Jesus in whom God has mediated the future as substitutionary suffering. Moltmann says, "The cross of Christ brings God's coming freedom and peace into a hostile world through self-renouncing love" (Moltmann, 1970). And the cross is universal because God wills that all be saved. But Moltmann firmly believes that if some remain godless, then they will be condemned.

Besides Jesus Christ, the reality prolepsis, God also gives the word prolepsis, which contains the announcement and promise of salvation. This is Moltmann's pneumatology, for it is the Spirit of God who moves the Gospel. Moltmann says:

Christ rose into the kerygma. The present reality of the resurrection is the Gospel and the Spirit, who moves the Gospel. In everything what the Gospel says, it is revelation and manifestation of the future of God in Christ. In the fact, however, that it says this and puts it into a Word to Jews and Gentiles, it is Word-prolepsis of the glorification of Christ (Moltmann, 1970).

Thus, individuals discover the resurrection present in their future in the Word. The Word is the forerunner of
the coming glory and the "Sacrament of Hope." The Spirit is given to direct the Church. And in all of this, the mission of Christianity is to preach: a) the Gospel to the poor, b) the righteousness of God to all, and c) a hope in the resurrection which will take place after death. (See Illustration V for a synthesis of Moltmann's eschatology.)

Furthermore, there is a dialectic in Moltmann's eschatology. The past and the present are important because they give the word-prolepsis. The past will be destroyed, but somehow it will be saved. The future will be totally new, but something of the past will remain. The future will be: a) the resurrection of the dead, b) the future of Christ resurrected, c) the judgment of the good and evil, and d) the presence of God. Humanity lives in the death of Christ now, but one day we will experience the resurrection.

On the other hand, Carl Peter is an American theologian who gives a central place to eschatology, but, unlike Moltmann, he does not consider it the foundation of his theology. He accepts the fact that men and women are by nature "hope-ers" because in every present moment men and women experience the "not-yet." But unlike Moltmann, Peter believes that the individual is a co-creator of his or her own destiny. Grace, for Peter, can be a source of
divinization. Although he does not use the same terms as Moltmann, Peter would define three reality-prolepsis events: a) the cross of Christ (in Pauline terms), b) the Spirit as pledge and foretaste of the future, and c) grace. Peter's eschatology also embraces a "now" and a "not-yet" aspect of the hold of the future on the present. Peter would be inclined to look at this hold of the future from the past as well as from the future.

The most obvious advantage to Peter's eschatology is that it gives a concrete reason for the Church to be prophetic and for individuals to hope. God is working in history in common community experiences. With this perspective, Peter can support and develop the Roman Catholic sacramentology, which allows grace and the Spirit to be operative in people's lives. As a result of this, the future continues to come into the present, allowing for new revelations. The deposit of faith is not closed to that which was revealed in the past alone. This leads Peter to one of his most important theories, the theology of exceptions.

Toward what shore is the current of theological endeavors leading? Christian theology is moving toward the adoption of a perspective, one in which greater emphasis is placed on exceptions whereas formerly the accent was more concentrated on rules....Exceptions to rules and laws that man previously articulated are assuming greater importance. The hope is that the God who spoke of old in the prophets as their future
will have his word that was spoken in Jesus Christ heard again today so that man's future may in fact be better than his recent past (Peter, 1973).

At this point, it is necessary to compare Peter's eschatology with Moltmann's eschatology. (See Illustration VI: Carl Peter's eschatological schema.) Like Moltmann, Peter characterizes Jesus Christ as a reality prolepsis. The meaning of history is found in the history of Jesus, who calls us to die to evil, rise to a new creation, and ascend to the Father. This process begins now. Jesus' death conquered evil, and so individuals must seek to conquer evil, for sin obstructs fellowship. And if people cannot love their brothers and sisters in this life, how can they hope to love them in the future? This is the covenant morality in Illustration VI. One can also see in the Illustration Peter's concept of the benevolent future as Trinitarian fellowship. Hope becomes very personal for Peter. In fact he calls the Trinity "personal you's," with whom men and women can have an experience of fellowship.

Having explored the Christology, pneumatology, sacramentology, concept of evil and suffering, and eschatology of Moltmann and Peter in detail one can see the reason for the caution not to simply equate the two theologians as identical because they both present theories of Christian eschatology. Each provides a new
dimension to the dialogue begun by Dewey, Wieman, and Bloch.

SYNTHESIS

In summary, it has been seen that there is a philosophical theology of hope that can be utilized by curriculum theorists to promote reconceptualization, emancipatory interests, and postmodern concepts of curriculum. The primary emphasis in theology has been portrayed as a reconceptualization of eschatology which accepts process philosophy as a foundation on which to build a new understanding of the problem of evil. The Aristotelian and scholastic understanding of God as "Unmoved Mover" and director of history has been reevaluated. The process God is the directive of history who experiences joy and suffering with humanity in the process of growth and evolution. This parallels educational theories that explain the role of the teacher as a creative and directive force within the classroom rather than the omniscient fount of knowledge filling the students' blank slates. The concept of power is also implied within this discussion of evil. In theology, S. Paul Schilling and others have explained omnipotence not in traditional
systematic language but as "God's bounded power and unbounded love." The concept of the absolute power and domination of the teacher over submissive students must now also be challenged. Modern industrial society provided the model of domination over nature by humanity as a means of providing for the needs of individuals. In light of the ecological disaster that has resulted from modern approaches to the relationship between humanity and nature, postmodern educators, equipped with a new theological and ecological perspective, must evaluate the damage done by domination models in education (Griffin, 1988b).

Moreover, Shirley Grundy has also begun to explore this relationship between a liberating education in Paulo Freire's writings and emancipatory interests in Jurgen Habermas' writings. Grundy presents several ways that Freire's interest in liberation and Habermas' emancipatory interests resemble one another. Grundy notes, "In both we have the notion of the indissolubility of speech and freedom. Emancipation becomes the art of finding one's voice. And that can occur only in conditions of justice and equality" (Grundy, 1987). These conditions of freedom, justice, and equality, as seen in the works of Rosemary Radford Reuther and Leonardo Boff, are also the foundation of liberation theology. Likewise, Jurgen Moltmann and...
Carl Peter presented theologies of grace that demonstrated how individuals become authentically free to respond to God (see also, Cobb, 1976). In the works of Henry Giroux examined above, as well as Michael Apple's writings on hegemony (Apple, 1979), there is an insistence upon an empowerment of teachers and students. From the critical curriculum theorist's perspective, Michael Apple has said,

We are witnessing a break with mechanistic theories about people and their consciousness....[The] neglect of the concrete meanings and activities of culture and people as they interact in our institutions is unfortunate [because] it limits the very ability we have to think about how these institutions may reproduce the relations of domination and ideological conflicts....There is a concern with the structural roots of domination and exploitation (Apple, 1982).

From theologians and curriculum theorists like Apple and Giroux, to Freire and Habermas, to Reuther and Boff, to Moltmann and Peter, there is a common agenda expressing hope as a central theme.

Further, in addition to the topics of evil, power, domination, and liberation, proleptic eschatology also provides the tension between the "already" and the "not yet" in any discussion of the relationship between the present and the future. Dewey's social consequences of value, Wieman's creative interchange, Bloch's possibilities, Moltmann's reality prolepsis, and Peter's theol-
ogy of exceptions presented in Chapter Three all provide an understanding of the present reality ("already") as being immersed in the possibilities of the future ("not yet").

Theologies of hope support curriculum theories when students are viewed as having unlimited potentials which can be actualized in an evolutionary growth process, rather than as being static individuals who can be molded to conform to a predetermined future goal. The curriculum, in this view, is a journey of teachers and students together, rather than an imposed syllabus. This postmodern process view of reality provides a secure hope because the individual has the potential for shaping the future. Apocalyptic threats no longer have control over the present course of action, because the proleptic future (i.e., God, ideals, emancipatory interests, interchange) is present in daily human struggles. Fortunately, hope, a profound theme central to all human longing, would now seem to be accessible through postmodern philosophical theology and educational theory.
CHAPTER FOUR:

TOWARD AN ESCHATOLOGICAL CURRICULUM THEORY

We must develop a social vision and commitment to make the liberal arts supportive of a democratic public sphere in which despair will become unconvincing and hope a practice for students and teachers alike, regardless of race, class, religion, gender, or age.

Henry A. Giroux
"Liberal Arts, Teaching, and Critical Literacy"
in Contemporary Curriculum Discourses
In the construction of an emancipatory view of education, philosophers and theorists as diverse as John Dewey (Dewey, 1966), George S. Counts (Counts, 1930), Hannah Arendt (Arendt, 1958), and Henry A. Giroux (Giroux, 1988) have contended that schools should challenge the social order. As discussed in Chapter One, crises in education and society are reflected in the debate about the role of schools in advancing social issues, democratic themes, and religious values. Should education, as Dewey asked, be a function of society or should society be a function of education? (Dewey, 1899). Henry Giroux also questioned "whether schools [should] uncritically serve and reproduce the existing society or challenge the social order in order to develop and advance its democratic imperatives" (Giroux, 1988). Giroux has concluded that the development of a social vision and commitment to make the liberal arts supportive of a democratic public sphere must be a priority in contemporary education. Hope must replace despair as the central practice for students and teachers, regardless of race, class, religion, gender, or age.

In addition to critical theorists like Giroux, liberation theologians also propose the development of a social vision and a commitment to an emancipatory view of the Gospel which would promote hope for all people, especially the poor, regardless of race, class, religion,
gender, or age (Gutierrez, 1973). In Chapter Two we explored the work of Leonardo Boff, a leading spokesperson for liberation theology in the 1980s, and identified his process of politicization as "a call to the whole Church to be more evangelical, more at service, and more of a sign of that salvation that penetrates the human condition" (Boff, 1985). Liberation theologians reevaluate historical realities and advocate changes that are contrary to dominant social trends but that are nevertheless linked to a deep current of desire for liberation of the poor.

Some of the major themes of liberation theology have been addressed throughout this study. First, the emphasis on the universality of God's grace, as established in Karl Rahner's explanation of the doctrine of grace (Rahner, 1978), is central to liberation theology as it attributes religious and salvific value to the social, political, and economic dimensions of life (even though these realms remain autonomous on an historical level of conscious behavior by the individual). Like the postmodern proposals of the 1980s that insist on the elimination of dualisms in favor of integrated wholeness (Griffin, 1988a; Griffin, 1988b; Jencks, 1986) and the proposals of process philosophy that reject bifurcations of space and time (Whitehead, 1978), liberation theology seeks unity and in-
tegration of Christian life and the social, political, and economic realm. Liberation theology rejects the tendency to split and separate Christian faith from human response in the social secular order: "In liberation theology human life in its entirety is an encounter with God's salvific grace" (Haight, 1987).

A second area of concern for liberation theology is the life of Jesus Christ whose "praxis" involved a concern and "option" for those beyond the margin of social acceptance. Jesus is the focal point for the constructive theological imagination of liberation theology. This imagination gives rise to social action, especially for those in most need, and becomes a spiritual activity. This process parallels in many ways John Dewey's concept of ideals and imagination giving rise to social consequences of value (see Illustration I: John Dewey's eschatological schema) (Dewey, 1934).

The spiritual theme which gives rise to social concern is the third important dimension of liberation theology: "The integrality of this spirituality lies in the fact that the individual, personal, and transcendent dimensions of spirituality are preserved by being subsumed into this wider framework for a wholistic view of the Christian life" (Haight, 1987). Thus, a privatization of spirituality is rejected in favor of communitarian model.
The fourth issue central to liberation theology is the function of the church in relation to society. In answer to the fundamental question of why the church exists at all, liberation theology finds a response in the mission from God for the world (Segundo, 1979b). Roger Haight writes, "Liberation theology avoids ecclesiocentrism by resolutely reinterpreting all aspects of the church including its sacraments in terms of its having a mission for all aspects of human life in history" (Haight, 1987). This understanding of the purpose of the institutional church by liberation theology parallels the understanding of the purpose of educational institutions by critical theorists and by contemporary curriculum theorists. Henry A. Giroux writes,

All too often [tradition in the liberal arts] translates into an instrumentalism more appropriate to producing disciplinary specialists than to providing forms of moral leadership necessary for advancing the interests of a democratic society. In its most expressive form, this tradition views that the purpose of liberal arts is to initiate students into a unitary eastern cultural tradition. In this view, excellence is acquiring an already established tradition, not about struggling to create new forms of civic practice and participation. Culture is viewed as an artifact to be taken out of the historical warehouse of dominant tradition and uncritically transmitted to students (Giroux, 1988).

Just as Giroux resists viewing culture as an artifact and the school as an instrument of uncritical transmission...
of the artifact, so, too, does liberation theology resist the concept of religion as simply an artifact to be transmitted uncritically by the institutional church.

The fifth and final concern of liberation theology, eschatology, will lead us into the focus of Chapter Four of this study. Liberation theology insists that creative human freedom and human existence in society is not meaningless and must contribute to the ultimate purpose of the world. Liberation theology is opposed to a totally discontinuous eschatology and an apocalyptic eschatology which delays salvation (and in effect social justice) beyond human history. One theologian summarizes this concept as follows:

Liberation theology takes seriously the implied intention of God in the creating of freedom, the empowerment of it by cooperative grace, and the continuity between Jesus' exercise of his freedom and his resurrection, all of which point to a continuity between the values human freedom is able to create in this world and the end-time. As opposed to a totally discontinuous eschatology, liberation theology holds a partly discontinuous and partly continuous eschatology (Segundo, 1979a).

Liberation theology unites theology and social ethics in such a way that the concept of delayed Parousia and deferred justice have a doctrinal basis on which to be challenged. Also, by uniting theology, ethics, and spirituality, liberation theology provides an answer to the criticism of John Dewey and the Humanist Manifesto authors
in Chapter Three of this study who accused the church of abandoning its prophetic role in society.

The efforts to unify theology and social ethics for the purpose of emancipation and justice for the poor by liberation theologians parallels the work of contemporary curriculum theorists in the area of critical theory. Critical theory derives from the work of post-Marxist theorists of the Frankfurt school who study socioeconomic class structures and the ways that school curriculum and curricularists unwittingly perpetuate such structures. These structures, critical theorists argue, enslave subjected classes. Critical theorists contend that these people require a liberating pedagogy. An example of critical theory in practice is presented by Paulo Freire in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 1970). Freire demonstrates how the "banking" concept of education is an instrument of oppression:

Oppression—overwhelming control—is necrophilic; it is nourished by love of death, not life. The banking concept of education....education as an act of depositing in which students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor....Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat...serves the interests of oppression and is also necrophilic. Based on a mechanistic, static, naturalistic, spatialized view of consciousness, it transforms students into receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads men [sic] to adjust to the world, and
inhibits their creative power (Freire, 1970).

Freire contends that those committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety and adopt instead a problem-posing concept where people are viewed as conscious beings in relation to the world: "Problem-posing education, responding to the essence of consciousness (intentionality) rejects communiques and embodies communication. Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transfers of information" (Freire, 1970). When the illiterate peasants of Freire's Third World classrooms, as well as uncritical students of First World schools, begin to participate in a problem-posing and problem-solving educational experience, they begin to develop a new awareness of self, a new sense of dignity, and ultimately an experience of hope.

The self-conscious critique is also an essential element of critical theory. Giroux characterizes the pedagogical goals of critical theory in this way: "to assess the newly emerging forms of capitalism along with the changing forms of domination that accompanied them, to rethink and radically reconstruct the meaning of human emancipation, and [to engage in] self-conscious critique" (Giroux, 1983). This critique of the contradictions in culture allows theorists to distinguish what should be from what is. As the conditions of suffering are recog-
nized and articulated, models for change will emerge.

Ultimately, critical theory is directed in the interest of emancipation, change, and liberation. William Schubert contends,

Emancipation refers to freeing one's self to enable growth and development from the taken-for-granted ideology of social conventions, beliefs, and modes of operation. It strives to renew the ideology so that it serves as a basis for reflection and action. This requires modes of social organization that emphasize power. It is perceived necessary to empower people, whatever their situation in institutionalized education, to question the value of such forces as the governance structures that direct their political life, the systems by which goods and services are generated and delivered that govern their economic life, the rules and conventions that define their social life, and the beliefs and ideals that contribute to their psychological life (Schubert, 1986).

As individuals become conscious of these political, economic, social, and psychological dimensions articulated by Giroux and Schubert, and as students experience a problem-posing education as proposed by Freire, they will be stirred by a new hope. People will no longer be willing to be mere objects responding to changes occurring around them. Rather, they will be more likely to take upon themselves the struggle to change the structures of society that have until the present only served to oppress.

In order for the experience of hope to inspire active participation in social change and social justice, there
must be a clear understanding of the meaning and implications of a liberating hope. This dimension of the ideology of critical theorists is where theology can inform and support emancipatory interests. Edward Schillebeeckx makes it clear that that theology is moving beyond traditional parochial concerns. He says,

In the light of the liberating gospel, an attempt is made to trace out those points where particular structures and prevailing attitudes obstruct rather than further freedom and humanity, and thus hold back the coming of the kingdom of God. This includes a political responsibility for the salvation of the community, and of the community for the wholeness of the world (Schillebeeckx, 1981).

Schillebeeckx challenges the church to accept an eschatological orientation that views liberation in the context of political responsibility not only for salvation of the community, but also of individuals actively involved in a holistic approach to the well-being of the entire global community. Like the basic ecclesial communities of liberation theology and the adult literacy project of Paulo Freire, Schillebeeckx believes that change in institutional structures, particularly church hierarchical structures, will emerge from the ministry of grassroots leaders who are non-ordained and often frustrated pastoral workers who continue to assume more of the burden of the community leadership as time goes on.

In education, these "grassroot ministers" are teach-
ers, often women, who continue to empower students despite the institutional burdens that plague them. Madeline Grumet documents this concept in *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching* (Grumet, 1988) as she explores the passage women teachers make daily between their public and private worlds, and the contradictions they confront when they bring their commitments to children into the politics and knowledge systems of institutional education. Like the frustrated ministers described by Schillebeeckx, Grumet offers a view of teachers divided by opposing forces. She says, "The task when viewed in the structural complexity of our social, political, economic situation appears herculean" (Grumet, 1988). However, Grumet offers advice consistent with the critical theorists and liberation theologians examined above. She challenges women teachers with the following eschatological insight:

Only when we suspend the despair that isolates us from our history and our future can our reproductive capacity reclaim the procreative promise of our species, not merely to conceive but to reconceive another generation. We, the women who teach, must claim our reproductive labor as a process of civilization as well as procreation. The task is daunting (Grumet, 1988).

The task is also intimidating; but it is not impossible. Empowering ministers, teachers, peasants, students, and laborers to become leaders of emancipatory education and liberating community is the task before us.
In the 1988 United States presidential campaign, candidate Jesse Jackson challenged the "rainbow coalition" to "keep hope alive." The goal of an eschatological curriculum theory is to keep hope alive in the pedagogy of those marginalized by the modern technological educational movements. As this study moves toward an eschatological curriculum theory, the challenge will be to expose and eliminate structures that suppress hope and structures that engender despair.

**TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGY**

The movement toward an eschatological curriculum theory rooted in liberation and emancipation must be informed by an understanding of education beyond schooling and of pedagogy beyond teaching. Elliot Eisner writes, "Unlike schooling or learning or socialization (all of which are descriptive terms), education is a process that fosters personal development and contributes to social well-being....One can learn to become neurotic, be schooled to become a scoundrel, or socialized to be a bigot. Education implies some personal and social good" (Eisner, 1985). Gabriel Moran proposes a concept of "educational journey" which is an interplay of bodily and
social forms that are always open to growth and development. "What would be helpful," says Moran, "is to start distinguishing the work of schoolteaching from the whole of education [and to] start proposing educational complements to schooling" (Moran, 1983). A transformative pedagogy recognizes the importance of the educational journey as described by Moran, otherwise education is reduced to the modern premise that people of a specific age (children) must go to a specific place (school) to receive a specific package of information (curriculum) to obtain a specific product (education). This premise reduces the concerns of education to the construction of better school buildings capable of accommodating more children and providing more efficient and effective information systems. Education, in this model, would cease with the reception of the degree.

The reconceptualization in curriculum studies has moved beyond this limited view of education to a transformative model: "If human life is to remain always open then it cannot simply follow preordained instincts or fulfill some set plan....Education begins no later than birth, but our educational language obscures that fact. Education also continues beyond the age of sixteen, twenty-one, or whatever age we tell young people to go out and face the world. Human development stops whenever
education stops" (Moran, 1983). Recognizing education as a lifelong process of growth and development is the first step in moving toward a transformative pedagogy. This simple concept is lost in the modern obsession with accountability and productivity. The metaphor of the child sitting quietly with a grandparent provides a sensitive description of the educational journey:

The very young and the very old are co-conspirators in a world obsessed with national productivity. Beneath the differences in the number of wrinkles and the amount of physical energy, the old and the young, if given half a chance, discover a common good. Anyone whose theory of education does not include a grandparent sitting quietly in the sunlight does not have an adequate theory. If the world has a future at all, that future largely depends upon the child a few years from birth and the old person a few years from death speaking, in their own secretive way, of mysteries that the rest of the race is too old or too young to comprehend (Moran, 1983).

The concept of the importance of relationship and communication between generations as a dimension of education parallels the concerns about temporality in contemporary eschatology. In order for education to be a transformative process, a respect for the eschatological dimension is essential. An excellent example is found in the contrast between the modern and postmodern views of the function of teaching history as a part of the social studies curriculum in schools. A poster titled Occupations To Which Interest in History May Lead lists several
fields of expertise available to students of history: archeologist, historian, curator, writer, critic, anthropologist, librarian, and teacher of history. It is interesting that nowhere on this type of list will there be words to suggest the possible goal of being one who enters history. The social studies program in the eschatological curriculum must challenge students to enter into the historical process as a participant rather than as an observer.

Christian eschatology likewise challenges individuals to recognize that just as God enters into human history in the person of Jesus Christ, so too must individuals become present and active in salvation history. An important principle of eschatology suggests that a common thread runs through the doctrines of creation, redemption, and consummation. Those things which have been set in motion in creation will be brought to fulfillment in the eschaton: "Within creation God calls all human beings to communion" (Abbott, 1966). The communion with God is an experience which transforms and allows all individuals to experience salvation history as participants and not just as detached observers. Dermot A. Lane comments on this experience in his theological writings. He says,

This universal calling, this first grace, is the seed of eternal life that is made explicit in Christ, the second grace. This offer of eternal life must be freely ac-
knowledged and cultivated in present existence. Eternal life, therefore, is something that is initiated in this life and not something simply coming at the end of this life, a point emphasized by Pauline (Gal 4: 6-7; Col 3:3-4; 2 Cor 1:22; Eph 1:7, 14) and Johannine (Jn 5:24; 17:3) writings. What is all important here is the image of God adopted in our eschatology. The God of eschatology is a God who is personally copresent and coactive in creation and the Christian community. The God of Christian eschatology is the living God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Jesus, a God of historical covenant and incarnation (Lane, 1987).

This description of one of the major principles of eschatology offers a view of history that makes the past active in present experience and directed toward the future. This participation in history is what Jonathan Kozol proposes for the social studies classroom where students enter into history. Kozol argues against schooling that is not transformative and against schooling that does not participate in history. He says,

School teaches history in the same way that it teaches syntax, grammar, and word-preference: in terms that guarantee our prior exile from its passion and its transformation. It lifts up children from the present, denies them powerful access to the future, and robs them of all ethical possession of the past. History is, as the sarcastic student says, an X-rated film. The trouble is that everyone we know, love, touch, hold, dream to be, or ever might become, has first been told: I cannot enter (Kozol, 1975).

History, therefore, must not be seen as past events to be memorized, but rather as an opportunity to inform
the present and provide access to the future. Kozol challenges curricularists to adopt a transformative pedagogy in order to recover a participative mode in history education. Eschatology provides support for Kozol's challenge by providing a model of history that sees unity in creation, redemption, and consummation. A transformative pedagogy proposes a model of education with a common thread in past, present, and future experiences. This experience allows students to become active participants in local community struggles and global concerns. Emancipation and hope now become accessible through a pedagogy open to transformation and informed by eschatology.

LANDSCAPES OF LEARNING

The title for this section is taken from the text with the same name by Maxine Greene. **Landscapes of Learning**, like transformative pedagogy, challenges the educational community to expand the traditional understanding of the learning environment. Mortimer Adler writes, "Our concern with education must go beyond schooling....Education is a lifelong process of which schooling is only a small part....Schooling should open the doors to the world of learning" (Adler, 1982). The postmodern world demands
awareness of the environment and broader landscapes of learning: "The forests speak out, the oceans beckon, the sky calls us forth, the plants want to share their story, the mind of the universe is open to all of us, the planet wants to instruct. Educators, through their methods and their content, can either open wide the doors to this wonder or narrow the doorways to offer only a partial view which they can then control" (LePage, 1987). Andy LePage argues that participation in the environment is far more educational than passive observation. An eschatological curriculum theory will expand the learning landscapes. Participation in new environments and expanded horizons provides students and teachers with insights into alternative strategies for living, and therefore expanded possibilities for the future. These possibilities, in turn, offer a vision of hope to people who otherwise would have been unaware of alternatives.

Attention to the alternatives that provide hope is called "wide-awakenness" by Maxine Greene. She argues for a strong emphasis on arts and humanities in education to promote this wide-awakeness. She says, "Thoreau writes passionately about throwing off sleep. He talks about how few people are awake enough for a poetic or divine life. He asserts that to be awake is to be alive" (Greene, 1978). While the technological influences of modern soci-
ety are increasing feelings of hopelessness and powerlessness, Greene believes that a "different kind of breathing" and a sense of wide-awakeness is the key to transformation. The debilitating alternatives to wide-awakeness are characterized as a "culture of silence" (Freire, 1972) that allows for the uncritical absorption of only official (i.e., state, school, expert) renderings of life; "a society of formless emotion" (Langer, 1957) that has neglected the education of feeling; or "technical rationality" (Schon, 1983) that depends on instrumental problem solving by the application of scientific theory and techniques devoid of reflection-in-action. Education must explore new landscapes of learning if transformation, liberation, and hope are to replace these alternatives to wide-awakeness. Freire, Langer, and Schon, among others, warn of the harmful consequences of our continued attachment to these traditional alternatives. In science and religion, David Ray Griffin documents the ecological and social disasters that lurk ahead if our worldview does not shift from a modern to a postmodern vision. He says, "A great deal is at stake. We must collectively move from mechanistic and dualistic worldviews and positivist and other antiworldviews to an ecological worldview. Such a change entails profound alterations in both science and religion" (Griffin, 1988a). Griffin's postmodern proposals add a necessary
ecological and theological dimension to the landscape of an eschatological curriculum theory.

Art is one of the primary landscapes where a new mode of learning occurs for Maxine Greene. She says, "It seems to me that an adequate pedagogy might still enable modern learners to break with assimilative power and reconstitute certain works of art as occasions for transcendence, self-knowledge, and critique" (Greene, 1978). The individual's encounter with art can be an occasion for transcendence, and thus an important landscape for learning.

The artistic landscape as an occasion for learning is actually a revolutionary development in the philosophical understanding of art. It is "the kind of theory that focuses upon the response to a work of art in order to account for it, or to account for the importance of the aesthetic mode in human life" (Greene, 1978). It is important to distinguish the phenomenological assumptions in contrast to the traditional ontological philosophy of art in order to understand this landscape of learning. Ontology deals with beings as they are in themselves, regardless of the way they are apprehended or of the fact that they are apprehended at all. Phenomenology, on the other hand, is based on the assumption that we cannot speculate about what beings are in themselves. John Dewey in Art as Experience explains:
A work of art, no matter how old or classic, is actually not just potentially, a work of art only when it lives in some individual experience. A piece of parchment, of marble, of canvas, it remains self-identical throughout the ages. But as a work of art it is re-created every time it is aesthetically experienced (Dewey, 1983).

The development of phenomenology as applied to artistic-aesthetic expression has roots in Cubism and flourishes with abstract-expressionism of the twentieth century. These movements are in contrast to High Renaissance, and they are foreign to painters such as Raphael. The traditional ontological understanding of art in the Renaissance held that content is predetermined, and that the artist must focus on the form through which content is conveyed. Raphael utilized art apprentices to help paint his canvas or mural from the cartoon. This would be considered an anathema to abstract-expressionists and phenomenologists who comprehend form and content as congruent. Ronald Padgham says, "The content in the new theory is the individual in the process of becoming; becoming that which he has not yet been, but that which he is capable of becoming" (Padgham, 1988).

Maxine Greene applies this understanding of form and content to education and contends that involvement with the arts and humanities has the potential for provoking reflectiveness. She challenges educators to devise ways of integrating arts into what is taught at all levels of
the educational enterprise. This has direct implications for social issues and moral issues in an eschatological curriculum theory and in art education. The implications are explained as follows:

I would like to believe that the concerns of art educators are akin to those I have described: to enhance qualitative awareness, to release imagination, and to free people to see, shape, and transform. I would hope for the kinds of curricula that permit an easy and articulated transaction between making and attending (Greene, 1978).

The congruence of form and content is revealed in such works as Nude Descending a Staircase by Duchamp in 1912. The illusion of movement is created in the Cubist painting exactly as a camera would capture it in frames many years later. Picasso's sculptures likewise revealed a vision of what had never been seen before: "No one before Picasso had seen the now obvious similitude between the pointed saddle and handlebars of a bicycle and the visage of a bull" (Greene, 1978). Furthermore, the abstract-expressionist artist Jackson Pollock reveals his emotional reactions to society in paintings like Autumn Rhythm where the experience of the observer becomes "a communion with the artist" (Greene, 1978). Twentieth century artists have frequently discussed the existential and phenomenological nature of their methodology. Pollock has stated:

When I am in my painting, I am not aware of
what I am doing. It is only after a short get acquainted period that I see what I have been about. I have no fears about making changes, destroying the image, etc. Because the painting has a life of its own, I try to let it come through. It is only when I lose contact with the painting that the result is a mess. Otherwise there is pure harmony, an easy give and take, and the painting comes out well (Pollock, 1971).

This experience in turn leads to new expressive qualities in the observer's world. The phenomenological understanding of experience and wide-awakeness that leads to transformation can be appreciated in many diverse works: Stravinski's *Rite of Spring*, Picasso's *Guernica*, Faulkner's *The Bear*, and Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.

There is a relationship between Maxine Greene's understanding of the artistic-aesthetic experience and theological developments of the twentieth century. Traditional theology, as developed in Catholicism from the Council of Trent to Vatican II and reflected in modern catechisms, presents an ontological view of the human experience of the transcendent. Traditional catechisms progress from creed (beliefs) to code (morality) to cult (worship). It is obvious that each builds to a crescendo. Post-Vatican II Roman Catholic catechisms proceed in a new matrix from creed to cult to code. This is a major paradigm shift with enormous implications. The transformation of the individual lifestyle or moral code is an
outgrowth of the worship encounter or cult experience. This encounter with God leads to transformation, in contrast to the traditional view that adherence to the code will lead to the transcendent encounter. In an eschatological curriculum theory must a new synthesis and a new matrix be forged if higher human consciousness is to emerge? Greene states,

Lacking wide-awakeness, I want to argue that individuals are likely to drift, to act on impulses of expediency. They are unlikely to identify situations as moral ones or set themselves to assessing their demands. In such cases, it seems to me, it is meaningless to talk of obligation; it may be futile to speak of consequential choice (Greene, 1978).

Theologian Gabriel Moran also challenges educators to begin with the student experience to build faith-community. Moran, critical of popular developmental models by Kohlberg and Fowler, stresses the primacy of experience, and in his writings he contends that revelation is based on God's communication to humanity (Moran, 1981).

The result of the paradigm shift in theology, education, and art can create a renewed sense of hope. Social change becomes possible because individual transformation is a process that can be experienced (but not completed) before the moral relationship (code) is consummated. The religious code, the academic credentialing, and the artistic medium must all continue to develop beyond the process
of imposing social controls for proper performance. The goal must be to help individuals actualize themselves and become critical thinkers. Social progress occurs as individuals change, not when institutional expectations change. Greene contends that attentiveness to the moral dimension of existence should permeate classrooms, and teachers should be clear about how to ground their own values. We are no longer in a situation where character-training, values clarification, and systems of rewards and punishment (i.e., code) will make children virtuous, just, and compliant: "We recognize the futility of teaching rules, of preaching pieties, or presenting conceptions of the good. Moral education, rather, must be as specifically concerned with self-identification in a community as it is with judgments persons are equipped to make at different ages" (Greene, 1978).

Maxine Greene's understanding of moral education calls for the same paradigm shift to take place in classrooms that is underway in theology. Form and content should no longer be seen as separate; they are congruent in the new paradigm. For the educator, inquiry and reflection merge with lecturing. In theology, community and worship are the context for the moral code. Thus, neither a pedagogical, aesthetic, nor theological dualism is any longer sufficient or viable. The content (cur-
riculum, canvas, or code) in the new theories is the "in-
dividual in the process of becoming; becoming that which
he or she has not yet been but that which he or she is ca-
pable of becoming" (Padgham, 1988). The various disci-
plines become a part of the form and content, and a con-
gruence is achieved. A new viability permeates ecumenism
in this atmosphere of communion (Kung, 1988).

The congruence of form and content is not only a phe-
nomenological experience, but it also has eschatological
implications. Once the congruence is understood, then the
limitations of time and space begin to diminish. They
melt into the landscape like the watches in Salvador
Dali's painting *The Persistence of Memory.* Experiences
are no longer frozen in time, and learning involves new
landscapes:

Learning involves a futuring, a going be-
yond. Teachers who themselves are sub-
merged, who feel in some sense "finished"
like the desks before them or the chalkboard
behind them, can hardly move students to
critical questioning or to learning how to
learn. It ought to be possible to bring
teachers in touch with their own landscapes.
Then learning may become a process of the
"I" meeting the "I" (Greene, 1978).

Landscapes involve critical reflection. It is a kind
of knowing called praxis: a knowing that becomes an open-
ing to what has not yet been. One author calls it "a poem
about one human being's self-formation, recaptured through
a return (in inner time) to an original landscape, the
place where it all began" (Greene, 1978). This experience of returning is not only necessary for wide-awakeness, but also for personal wholeness. It even goes beyond the aesthetic dimension discussed above. In theology, we see that the transcendent God breaks the barriers of time and space. "The word became flesh and dwelt among us" (Christian Scriptures, John 1:14). Theologians would argue that God is compelled to create, and thus became compelled to suffer. The transcendent God is the fullness of love, and this dictates that there must be a phenomenological dimension to the transcendent. God creates and suffers and even becomes bound in order to reveal wholeness (Schilling, 1977). The transcendent is not limited to an ontological existence, but rather is beyond spatial and temporal limitation. A new understanding of eschatology now emerges.

The correspondence between the landscapes of learning discussed in this chapter and contemporary theology supports the movement toward an eschatological curriculum theory. The transcendent dimension of learning and of God is the central focus of this correspondence. In theology, it is essential that the transcendent dimension of the creational and incarnational God within eschatology be acknowledged. In emphasizing the unity of creation, salvation, and consummation, eschatology does not conclude that
historical beginnings and the eschaton are identical. Something transformative is yet to be experienced in eternal life. Dermot Lane proposes that our hope in the future is not simply about an optimistic development, or progress, or evolution of the present in an unending line. He says,

The logic of Christian hope is not the logic of inference but rather the logic of imagination. Thus we find theologians cautioning against understanding eternal life simply as the continuation of this life (K. Barth, Dogmatics in Outline, E. T. 1949; J. Moltmann, The Crucified God, p. 170)...to give this impression would be to ignore the finality of death and run the risk of playing down the uniqueness of historical existence. Instead, eternal life must be presented in terms of the completion of this life. A new and creative tension between the present and the future, between the already and the not yet, between the known and the unknown, must be maintained in eschatology (Lane, 1987).

Lane's caution not to ignore the transcendent dimension of eschatology parallels Greene's challenge "to Break through the horizons of the ordinary, of the taken-for-granted, to visions of the possible, of what is not" (Greene, 1978). This experience of the transcendent stimulates the wide-awakeness which is essential to critical awareness and necessary for a movement from the mundane to the imaginary. It is in this sense that eschatology and curriculum theory now provide a basis for hope to replace apathy as the predominant ethos of
schools. The goal of the curriculum and the aim of teaching is a concern to provide a landscape of learning where experiences of transcendence can be fostered and interpreted by students.

In conclusion, this section of Chapter Four has explored in art, theology, and curriculum new theories and paradigms that allow form and content to merge with a view toward a transcendent experience. The emphasis has shifted from the external to the internal. Artists seek an inner experience; catechisms locate the individual within a community; eschatology is not just the last things but a proleptic synthesis of the fullness of all things pointing toward the Parousia. Maxine Greene calls for wide-awakeness and transformation; otherwise, enthusiasm will be lost. She says, "Without that awareness and that hope teachers find it unimaginably difficult to cope with the demands of children in these days" (Greene, 1978). Like Horace Smith in Theodore Sizer's book Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School, teachers will "neither have the time nor energy, nor inclination to urge their students to critical reflection: they themselves have suppressed the questions, and avoided backward looks" (Sizer, 1984). This, then, is the implication of landscapes of learning for an eschatological curriculum theory: transformation and learning are
stimulated by a sense of future possibilities and a sense of what might be. Building community and enabling personal awakenness are crucial in this process. Finally, Greene moves toward the eschatological curriculum theory as she advises,

I would lay stress upon talking together, upon the mutual exchange that expresses lives actually lived together, that forges commonalities. I would work for the kind of critical reflection that can be carried on by persons who are situated in the concreteness of the world, by persons equipped for interrogation, for problematization, and for hermeneutic interpretation of the culture—of the present and the past (Greene, 1987).

This can be accomplished: education flourishes in many places because of emphasis on this type of community building. Eschatology is on the horizon of the landscapes of learning.

EPILOGUE

The movement toward an eschatological curriculum theory presented in Chapter Four includes an emphasis on liberation that views human freedom as contributing to social advancement and justice for subjected classes. The proposed problem-solving stance within an emerging self-consciousness is seen to contribute to human liberation in schools and society. Eschatological theology
informs the vision proposed by liberation theologians and critical theorists by offering an understanding of the future available for present praxis. The challenge of this first dimension of the eschatological curriculum theory is to suspend the despair that isolates human activity from the past and from the future in order to allow for the regeneration of creative energy.

The regeneration of creative powers functions as the catalyst for a transformative pedagogy, the second dimension of the eschatological curriculum presented in Chapter Four. Transformative pedagogy as described throughout this study is rooted in curriculum beyond credentialing, and conscientization beyond socialization. Transformative pedagogy encompasses more than teaching and learning; it fosters personal development and contributes to social service. The theological metaphor of the journey of faith informs the educational journey of wisdom. Both are possible because eschatology provides a bridge for the journey—a bridge of hope between a turbulent past and an uncertain future. Once engaged in the journey, the traveler no longer remains isolated and separated from the dreams and visions which give sustenance for the passage. Transformative pedagogy is most clearly understood as the engagement of this journey by teachers and students who are confident that the consummation of education is eman-
Transformative pedagogy creates new landscapes of learning, and these landscapes characterize the third dimension of the eschatological curriculum. An awareness of an sensitivity toward many environments—physical psychological, social, and spiritual—is an integral part of the postmodern proposals which inform the eschatological curriculum. Participation in new environments provides the educational community with alternative strategies for living and expanded possibilities for the future. Because contemporary eschatology (as envisioned by Rahner and Moltmann and those theologians examined in this study who have incorporated their vision) understands the future as that which brings to completion what has already been set in motion, the alternative possibilities offer a vision of hope for schools and society. This vision would remain idealized and romanticized in a utopian dream were it not for the concept of hope call "wide-awakeness" by Maxine Greene, "reflection-in-action" by Donald Schon, or "proleptic eschatology" by Jurgen Moltmann. Although characterized in many different ways, the landscapes of learning in eschatological curriculum emphasize the primacy of experience, the merging of form and content, the synthesis of time, and the actualization of the self-conscious individual. The eschatological landscape offers the indi-
individual a process for becoming that which he or she is capable of becoming. The eschatological curriculum offers schools an experience for critical reflection which is open to what has not yet been but what is also absolutely possible. Without this vision, teachers and students will have neither the time nor energy, neither the hope nor endurance, to move beyond the modern technological models and toward a postmodern eschatological curriculum.
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