The Public Search of Religious Education in Christian Higher Education

Abstract

This study attempts to explore a new model of religious education to bridge the gap between students’ religious belief and their everyday life in Christian higher education. The researcher thinks that this model provides the proper structure of meaning between Christian faith or religious belief and academic learning in an era of secularization. In order to constitute of the structure of meaning to connect the public spheres and the private spheres in undergraduate students’ lives in Christian higher education, the researcher uses the outstanding books of Templeton Laureates and Gifford Lectures in which the tradition of natural theology is very influential.

Due to the great challenges of climate change and its academic interests, I have participated in some technological seminar for using the renewable energies. In that seminar many physical scientists and technologists presented their research papers about the future potentialities of the solar energy and the effective technologies of the solar cells. After that seminar, I had a chance to dinner with them. They wondered why a Christian pastor such as me took part in their seminar, since they dealt with very specific areas of semiconductor devices for the solar cells. They saw me as an alien creature for dinner and I also took their attention for granted. Cutting the steak with my knife, I asked a scientist sitting next some question about the relationship between religion and science. He introduced his major as inorganic material engineering of semiconductor. In spite of attending the Protestant church every Sunday, he said that science and religion had each entirely different knowledge areas. In other words, he recognized that it was impossible to search for the reconciling points of religion and science in principle. However, having their free dialogues after dinner, many organic and inorganic material engineering scientists began to pay attention to me and my major religion education. I was so surprised that they passionately described many concerns to connect their professional knowledge and technology about organic or inorganic material engineer with metaphysical consciousness such as religion and philosophy. In their surprising hospitality, they asked for my continuous participations in their academic seminars and hoped
to have some relationship with me. I never forget such surprising experience beyond my expectation. The long distance between religion and science in knowledge areas never reflects many scientists’ indifference about religion and religious education. I surely experienced how many interests scientists had, although it was only one time.

In the contemporary relational issue between religion and science, Christian Smith (2009) provides a meaningful message for emerging adults in Christian higher education. According to his recent research, the relationship between religion and science is the very important issues to decide public debates about religion among U.S. emerging adults in ages 18-23. However, Smith’s (2009) many respondents (70 percent) believe that religion and science is in conflict rather than compatible with each other (139). In addition, they (57 percent) disagree that “religion / religious faith have been strengthened by some of the discoveries of science” (Smith 2009, 139). Even “59” percent of respondents take it for granted that religion is isolated in “public debates” (Smith 2009, 139). This research reflects that religion is internalized as a private matter within so many contemporary emerging adults’ consciousness. However, that contemporary phenomenon ignites the issues whether to reassert religion in the public sphere and to carefully consider the relationship between religion and science in Christian higher education, since most students in Christian colleges and universities are the period of emerging adults. This article attempts to provide the religion-science interface model of Christian higher education in the public sphere. Since that model has both special and general characters of religious education in Christian colleges and universities, the property as the model of religious education can be validated in a pluralistic and multicultural society.

The Public Search of Religious Education

Here, I attempt to explore their meanings about the publicity in religious education based on a Forum on the theme of the 2013 REA conference with personal essays (Miedema 2013; Feinberg 2013; Roux 2013). Siebren Miedema (2013) focuses on the “pillarization of the Dutch society” in order to attempt the meaning of the publicity in religious education (236). In his article, I understand the pillarization of the Dutch society as the educational financial system to equally support state schools as well as denominational (private) school. He recognizes the excellence of pillarization in the aspect of “the equal financial treatment of denominational schools and state schools” but points out its systemic limitation perceived as “a form vertical segregation” (Miedema 2013, 236, 238). In addition, he provides us with one sentence to express the meaning of the publicity: “However, it also blocked the way for value exchange, for sharing and mutual construction of values, and for encounter and dialogue between people from different pillars” (Miedema 2013, 237). Here I can find the public domain in religious education is closely related to the activities to create the environment where it is possible to exchange each different value and belief and share mutual dialogue.
with many people from each different background and context.

In Walter Feinberg’s article (2013), I recognize that he shares with Miedema’s thesis about the public domain in religious education such as the following: “Their (religious teachers) task is to teach students how to be human within a certain community-to give and receive love; to experience gratitude, to be with others and to be open to beauty, to feel with others and to allow others to feel with them” (234). He understands the “humility” as the “human flourishing” to accept and respect others and regards such humanness as the main educational goals and “the condition” for individual rights’ “fullest expression” (Feinberg 2013, 243-244). However, his concerns about the difference between “a religious morality” and “a secular liberal morality” provide a remarkable switch (Feinberg 2013, 242). He argues that “a heightened awareness” of students’ “responsibility” makes a difference between both moralities (Feinberg 2013, 242). Here the concept of responsibility used to express some character of religious morality. However, he recognizes that such responsibility can be worked as the value system to force some people’s autonomy and liberty.

For Cornelia Roux (2013), religious education in the public domain can’t be limited within a mono-religious belief or its value system. The inclusive multireligious approach to education is recognized as the new task of religious education in society. She implicitly reflects that the traditional system of religious education in South Africa was “discriminatory” (Roux 2013, 246). Therefore, the new perspective in religious education is closely related to creating the environment to accept the other and embrace the diversity and multiplicity. She calls this educational environment as “communal safe space” (Roux 2013, 248). For her, religious education in public domain is regarded as the hermeneutical participation to overcome social, cultural, and religious differences, that is, a new reconstruction in traditional religious paradigm.

Like this, religious educators connect religious education in the public sphere with comprehensive hospitality about different traditions, beliefs, cultures, values, norms, and so on. Habermas also understands the public sphere as the social space where all reasons are validated and all participants encounter the consensus (Mendieta and VanAntwerpen 2011). He argues that religious “practices and perspectives” should be translated into “a secular idiom” and a comprehensive general language in order to vitalize the potentiality of religious tradition (Mendieta and VanAntwerpen 2011, 4-5). This emphasis of religious education in the public sphere reflects the multiplicity, plurality, and diversity of the contemporary society. That public character in religious education can be applied in the context of Christian higher education analogically. Parmach (2012) uses the character of organism to sustain equilibrium in order to describe the publicity of Christian colleges and universities such as fluidity, flexibility, and response. Here the state of equilibrium of Christian higher education symbolizes to properly assimilate its internal need and its external environment.

However, the ultimate goal of religious education in the public sphere does not mean the perfect universalization or generalization of Christian character in Christian higher education.
We do not neglect the special identity of Christian higher education in a pluralistic and multicultural society. So, some scholar supports that their religious and academic identity should be recognized as the principle to sustain their institutions “in a free and democratic society,” although Christian colleges and universities have “a tension between corporate and individual academic freedom” (Glanzer 2013, 151, 157). Glazer’s recent study about Christian higher education (2013) emphasizes how important both religious and academic freedom in Christian colleges and universities is. According to his study, if religious identity and academic freedom of Christian colleges and universities are limited for “protecting individual academic freedom,” it may be regarded as another oppressed pattern of private educational institutions by secular or “stated-controlled system of education” (Glazer 2013, 160-161). In other words, it is difficult to regard the secular or stated-controlled educational policy which limits both religious identity and academic freedom of Christian colleges and universities as the activities protecting freedom and pluralism in a liberal democracy. So, it is very difficult dilemma to sustain the harmony between general and special characters of religious education. In addition, that is the important issue of Christian higher education in the public sphere.

The Religion-Science Interface

The researcher has taught some course in the program of general education at Yonsei University which is the oldest established institution for Christian higher education in Korea. Yonsei University emphasizes the interaction between Christian faith and academic learning in the program for undergraduate students. In order to bridge the gap between students’ faithful belief and their academic life, the researcher designs some course based on the relationship between religion and science. In this course, the researcher attempts to connect the meanings of Christian faith or religious belief with the perspectives of scientific humanism and scientific materialism. The researcher consists of the contents of religious education of that course with the outstanding books of Reflections of Templeton Laureates (British Academy, London, 1 June 2012: Freeman J. Dyson, John D. Barrow, Ian G. Barbour, John C. Polkinghorne, Holmes Rolston III, and Martin J. Rees) and the famous works published recently in Gifford Lectures (Sarah Coakley, Martin H. Nowak, and Alister E. McGrath, David Daube, David Fergusson, Peter van Inwagen, and Stephen Pattison) which have a significant tradition of natural theology. Proceeding that course during one year, the researcher recognizes that many undergraduate students consist of the structure of meaning between Christian faith or religious belief and their everyday life. Based on this educational effect reflected in a series of course, the researcher attempts to explore a new model of religious education in Christian higher education. This model may provide many students in Christian higher education with both private and public adequacy and legitimacy for Christian faith or religious belief in an ear of secularization.
The relationship between religion and science is the core value of that course. However both relationships often are harmonious and sometimes disharmonious. For example, intelligent design differs from Darwin’s view in an explanation of the origin of life. Darwin’s view describes the origin of life as an undirected process such as natural selection. However, intelligent design explains that the universe and living things are designed by the Christian deity as an intelligent cause. This is the representative case to show the “creation versus evolution debates” (Moore 2007, 173). But usually many Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox Christians have reconciled religion and science. Especially, many Muslims also have originally recognized the relationship between religion and science.

Cambridge Professor John Polkinghorne, who is a mathematical physicist and Anglican priest, distinguishes religion and science. For example, in science it is possible to manipulate some data and produce some knowledge and information. For example, Isaac Newton had so precise scientific knowledge about gravity and the solar system. Some later, Albert Einstein produced the theory of general relativity through using finer scales in accuracy than Newton. Polkinghorne (1996) argues that Einstein theory of general relativity does not abolish Newtonian physics but subsumes and includes Newtonian idea. However, in religion, it is impossible to manipulate the transcendental being such as our Creator. Especially, it also is impossible to explain the whole of religion with a rational and scientific process. In addition, we cannot be sure that the contemporary 21st century theologians can access more easily to spiritual experiences and insights than the fourth or sixth centuries theologians. These characters point out the difference between religion and science.

Even though there exist these differences, Ian Barbour does not consider the relationship between religion and science as the bridge not to cross. For Barbour (1997), it is possible to reconcile “the Genesis story” and “the findings of twentieth-century astronomy” (195). The former symbolizes religion and the latter means science. As some analogy about the reconciliation between religion and science, Barbour notes Borman’s Christmas Eve message. This is greetings from the crew of Apollo 8. On Christmas Eve 1968, in orbit around the moon, he reads the opening verses of Genesis in the Bible such as the following:

In the beginning of God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the water. And God said, “Let there be light”; and there was light (Genesis 1:1-3).

In the term “light” written in the opening verses of Genesis, Barbour attempts to find a cross point with the big bang theory to describe the origin of the universe. Like Barbour, recently many peoples think that the relationship between religion and science can be “complementary rather than antithetical frameworks of analysis” (Moore 2007, 173). Then, how can be religion and science integrated? Where do both academic disciplines constitute the reconciling positions? What is the concrete method to reconcile religion and science? Here, I suggest four distinguished scholars’ perspectives to connect science with religion: Alister E. McGrath, Freeman Dyson, John D. Barrow, and Sarah Coakley.
In *A Fine-Tuned Universe: The Quest for God in Science and Theology*, Alister E. McGrath (2008), who is Professor of Theology, Ministry, and Education, and Head of Center for Theology, Religion, and Culture at King’s College, London, focuses on the fine-tuning of the universe with the perspective of natural theology. Natural theology may be regarded as the bridge concept to connect the world of science with that of religion. He understands Christian theology as the interpretive framework. For McGrath, it may be a scheme to connect nature with the transcendent such as God, the Son, and the Spirit. In this book, he attempts to connect anthropic phenomena in the natural sciences with the apparent fine-tuning of the cosmos. Here, the concept of fine-tuning means the comprehensive activities that the Creator finely tuning this world. In order to describe fine-tuned system in cosmological contexts, he uses the term “anthropic principle.” This principle can be applied to biological situations toward a life-bearing universe. McGrath (2008) nevertheless does not depend on the only fine-tuning of the universe as a proof of the Christian belief in God. He focuses on the discussion and analysis of fine-tuning itself in nature. It will be related to the strictness of natural science. For example, McGrath’s description about the chemistry of carbon reflects well his trait to connect science and religion with the strictness of natural science. According to McGrath’s description, the chemistry of oligosilanes is very unstable, because the atomic radius of silicon is larger than that of carbon and silicon-silicon bond is correspondingly weaker than an organic compound of carbon. Especially, the biotic potential of silanes is very weak in oxygen-rich environments, because their chemical bonds are rapidly dismantled in the presence of oxygen. However, in the case of carbon, it is possible to form various patterns for organic compound in oxygen-rich environment. McGrath’s description about the chemistry of carbon stresses on the fine-tuning role of carbon itself in the universe. In the case of the chemistry of carbon, I find that the nature can have the capacity for fine-tuning itself. It is closely related to McGrath’s argument that there exists something to initiate an evolutionary process in the primordial constituents of the universe. It also unveils the limitations of Darwinian paradigm. Darwinian process of natural selection depends on a series pattern of repetition. However, as McGrath’s description, the biochemical systems such as some comparison between carbon and silane show well that biological evolution depends on chemical properties which were ultimately determined in the primordial state of the universe.

Freeman Dyson is a physicist and mathematician and Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey. He contributes to the fundamental work in quantum electrodynamics invented by Feynman, Schwinger, and Tomonaga, the Nobel laureates in Physics 1965. In his book, *Infinite in All Directions*, Dyson (2004) focuses on the diversity of the natural world and that of human reactions through his attitudes toward religion and science. He concerns the connection between cosmology and biology. For Dyson (2004), cosmology relates the architecture of the universe and biology relates the existence of its living inhabitants. He separates the origin of life from that of the universe. On the contrary to the origin of the universe, he regards that of life as a local event rather than a universal event.
Dyson (2004) wants to see the end of the universe in a branch of theology rather than a scientific discipline, because the study of the end of the universe is very few while that of the beginning of the universe is very plentiful. In order to shape the future of the universe, he mentions the words “value” and “purpose.” However, even though the words “values” and “purpose” include some taboos of twentieth-century scientific rationality, Dyson (2004) argues that the encouragement to mix knowledge and values is needed in designing the future of the universe. In other words, he includes philosophical questions such as the ultimate meaning and purpose of life within his scientific rationality to analyze the long-range future of the universe.

John D. Barrow is Professor of Mathematical Sciences at Cambridge University and Gresham Professor of Geometry at Gresham College in London. His writings focus on the relationship between human and universe in the insights from mathematics, physics, and contemporary astronomy and transcend disciplinary boundaries of scientists and theologians. In his book, *New Theories of Everything: The Quest for Ultimate Explanation*, Barrow (2007) argues that a theory of everything includes ultimate explanations of the universe. But the existence of a theory of everything is possibility rather than reality. He argues that it is impossible for scientific investigations in their nature to know their end from their beginning. It means how difficult it is to describe a theory of everything with only scientific investigations. In order to provide a proper description about a theory of everything, Barrow (2007) argues that scientific investigations as well as various ideas outside of them are needed. He focuses on the early Greeks’ atomistic viewpoint that all materials have the same elementary particles. Even though this viewpoint does not support any observational evidence, Barrow (2007) describes that it is very surprising that modern universities in their scientific courses accept the basic premises about the early Greeks’ atomistic viewpoint. It reflects his attempt to harmonize natural scientific investigations with the natural scientific groundless ideas such as philosophy, mysticism, religion, and so on. It means that Barrow’s description is similar with Dyson’s attempt to connect scientific rationality and scientific imagination in the process to draw the end of the universe.

Recently, Sarah Coakley, a distinguished Professor at Cambridge University, delivered the 2012 Gifford lecture at Aberdeen University, Scotland, with the title, “Cooperative, *alias* altruism: Game theory and evolution reconsidered.” In this lecture, Coakley (2012) focused on the evolution of cooperation in human act of sacrifice. Applying Harvard biologist and mathematician Martin Nowak’s theory, she sought to uncover the human trait of intentionality in cooperative acts. Nowak, using mathematical accounts of evolutionary processes, argues that cooperation, alongside mutation and selection, is vital for the ongoing productivity of evolutionary change. In other words, the principle of cooperation is very necessary for the construction of the genome, cells, multi-cellular organism, and animal and human societies. This means that cooperation is the core principle in “evolutionary process” through “mathematical account” (Coakley 2012, 9). Therefore, she understands the principle of cooperation as “the mysterious key to the regeneration of fitness” (Coakley 2012, 14). In
addition, Coakley (2012) finds *sacrificial behaviors* in the whole evolutionary process from individual cells to multi-cellular organisms. Especially, it is noteworthy that sacrificial behaviors provided by cooperative mechanism within the field of evolutionary biology may be related to an act of sacrifice regarded as the transcendent power of Christian theology. In both academic areas of religion and science, of course, theoretical, philosophical, ethical, and theological puzzles are still remaining. However, these puzzles can be worked as each special character of both academic areas. In the end, Nowark and Coakley (2013) argue that “evolutionary biologists working on cooperation need to take a cold *philosophical bath*” (26). This means that religion and science sincerely have their each perspective. They are sure that the sincerity of their each different academic perspective generates the interdisciplinary dynamics on their each position.

McGrath, Dyson, Barrow, and Coakley provide very ideal complementary models of religion and science. They recognize good and weak points of each religion and science. It is noteworthy that they all do not control other disciplines with one principle. Instead, they provide us with the environment to raise free debates among various disciplines. Then, the decision is placed on many readers’ responsibility rather than authors’ portion. In conclusion, the educational environment to strengthen the religion-science interface depends on equal, relational, and open communication among class members (Kim 2002). In addition, I believe that our Creator provides us with a plentiful source of initiative to create such environment.

**The Transforming Environment in Christian Higher Education**

Many students anticipate their classroom in Christian higher education is the transforming environment. James E. Loder’s (1998) case about Kierkegaard’s conversion shows well the transforming dynamics. The transforming moment has three processes: (i) collecting some people’s past information and knowledge, (ii) the encountering moment between the Divine Spirit and the human spirit, and (iii) representing the “transfigured vision” (Loder 1998, 234). According to Loder’s description, some people’s past information and knowledge is the main source to reconstruct his or her life. Through permeating by the Divine Spirit, the human spirit experiences the transforming moment in the next stage. Finally, he or she realizes the transfigured vision in their own life span. In the case of Kierkegaard, he experiences “the identity struggle of the young man” in oppressed family environment and “his authoritarian father” (Loder 1998, 237). In this period, the ego’s struggle is regarded as the preparation for resocialization due to the dynamic conversion of his personality. The transformation of ego development occurs when the Divine Spirit is working with the young man’s human spirit. Loder (1998) expresses this transforming moment as the “exocentric drive” toward “the Other” (237). After this remarkable transformation, the human spirit realizes or releases his spiritual potential. According to Loder (1998), in the case of Luther, “the proliferation of Luther’s writings and the beginning of the German Reformation” are the obvious evidences
of the release of the human spirit (245). Loder shows well the dynamic pattern of ego development from the interplay between the Divine Spirit and the human spirit. I focus on how to apply Loder’s transforming pattern of ego development to the educational environment in Christian higher education.

In order to create the transformative environment, Susanne Johnson (1990) provides the proper solution of Christian education. Her Christian educational ecology is expressed with the terms of worship, instruction, and praxis. She emphasizes all students’ participation or inclusiveness (worship), the reconstruction or reformulation of their own life stories in light of the Story (instruction), and the hospitality toward the poor, the needy, and the hunger (praxis) in Christian educational contexts. It is possible that these principles such as participation, reformulation, and hospitality can be applied in the context of Christian higher education. The participation is the principle in which students recognize themselves each part of their class. Johnson (1990) explains the process of this participation as “the recovery of the truly human” (136). This recovery process means that some student already has experienced a transforming moment. In other words, whether or not teachers focus on the participating process of their students in the class depends on whether or not the educational environment within their classes is transformative. Secondly, Johnson often uses the expressions to create their own stories in light of the Story. This means the relationship between some tradition and its interpretation. She says, “Traditions can live only through creative reappropriation by persons who are willing to reflect critically on their lives” (Johnson 1989, 144). The teaching and learning in Christian (higher) education is initiated by the proper role of “critical thinking, reflection, and inquiry” (Johnson 1989, 142). Therefore, the classroom in Christian higher education is not the prison where traditions rule over students’ freedom, but the dynamic process in which they transform their own lives within students’ spirits. Thirdly, the principle of praxis can be understood in terms of the concept of the self. Johnson (1989), in her book *Christian Spiritual Formation in the Church and Classroom*, contrasts the self with the ego. In order to initiate the dynamic transformation of Christian (higher) education, she emphasizes the role of the self rather than that of the ego. Pointing out male-oriented bias within the role of the ego, Johnson (1989) focuses on the relational role of the self in “the course of human development” (109). The principle of praxis is closely related to the relational self. She says, “Praxis emphasizes the prophetic office of the church. It refers to our total complex of action (including reflection on action), along with, and on behalf of, the dispossessed, the needy, the powerless. Praxis means we actively seek to place ourselves in the company of strangers” (Johnson 1990, 138). This emphasizes the mutuality and equality of all human in the image of God. The issues of isolation and loneliness are very important in the classroom. Therefore, the principle of praxis may provide us with the proper reasons about why and what we must share with others people.

In order to provide the transforming environment, the pattern of authority in the classroom is very important. We can find the good case to arise the transforming moment in the Story of the Bible. In Act 2:1-4, Luke prescribes the transforming moment in the story of Pentecost
day in Jerusalem. However, before focusing on that event, we need to refer to leadership in the community in Acts 1:15-26. The church elects Matthias instead of Judas who betrayed Jesus. For the election of Matthias, the church uses very strict condition. That is whether or not to have “any reliable facts about ‘the historical Jesus”’ (Willimon 1988, 24). Matthias is accepted with such qualification and participates in leadership in the community as one of authoritarians. However, in the most dramatic transforming event of Acts 2:1-4, the leadership of this new community passing such strict qualification process is not working at the moment. That means that some transforming event takes effect in the equal status, since the shared authority model of education can provide an ideal educational situation to initiate students’ passion and their active participation in educational environment (Kim 2009). In addition, the transforming moment makes the coexistence of “multiple” and “contradictory viewpoints” possible (Palmer and Zajonc 2010, 104). And the crowd of Luke’s account of Pentecost can hear that the disciples speak in multitude of language (Acts 2:6). That reflects that the story of Pentecost day in Jerusalem (Acts 2:1-13) has the transforming motive through the analogical interpretation. Like this, we can assume that the equal class environment may be the main condition for the transforming moment. The researcher will finish the public search of religious education in Christian higher education with the interpretive story about the romantic novelist Jane Austin’s biographical film Becoming Jane.

Epilogue: Becoming Jane

Jane Austen (16 December 1775 – 18 July 1817) was a famous English novelist. Her father George Austen served as the rector at Steventon, Hampshire. The rector is the priest of the Church of England. Jane wrote many romantic fictions: Sense and Sensibility (1811), Pride and Prejudice (1813), Mansfield Park (1814), and Emma (1816). Her works in English literature critique the novels of sensibility of the 18th century and lead the transition of 19th-century realism. Jane’s private life has been covered but her historical biographical film Becoming Jane (2007) depicted the early life of Jane Austen and her love story with Thomas Lefroy. In this film, Jane Austen who is the younger daughter of Reverend George Austen has some trouble with her mother who wishes that her daughter marries a wealthy man Mr. Wisley. He is the nephew and heir of the wealthy Lady Gresham. But Jane wishes to be a writer. Instead, she falls in love with Mr. Thomas Lefroy. Jane and Tom share very deep love with each other. But their love experiences the first despair against Tom’s uncle, the Lord Chief Judge Langlois of London. He does not accept the poverty in Jane’s family. Tom also cannot help but accept his uncle’s opposition, because Tom’s family depends on him financially. Tom chooses the responsibility to support his family instead of the love with Jane.

In this film, we can see that some people’s family has an effect on individual’s decision, since they lived in traditional society. Jane and Tom depend on their family financially. This situation appears clearly when Tom runs away with Jane. On the way, Jane finds a letter from
Tom’s mother. She knows that Tom’s family cannot survive without the financial support from his uncle. In the end, Jane and Tom experience the second despair. They choose the responsibility for their family instead of their love toward each other. The solidarity of family community is the remarkable characteristics of traditional society. The sensitive conflict between love and responsibility may be the core plot of that film.

The second point of that film is Jane’s decisive turning. Before Jane’s leaving to go home, Tom asks Jane if she loves him, and she replies, “Yes, but if our love destroys your family, then it will destroy itself, in a long, slow degradation of guilt and regret and blame.” Here, we need Jane’s psychology with feministic perspective. Harvard psychologist Carol Gilligan has studied “women’s reasoning, decision making, and moral action” (Kim 2002, 107). The following is the core value of her study:

She argues in her study that women expressed their moral concerns in terms of an ethic of care and responsibility. In other words, the moral concern for women comes out in the conflict in which the feminine voice struggles to reclaim the self in relationships to others and to resolve the moral dilemma “in such a way that no one is hurt” (Kim 2002, 107-108).

In that film, Jane focuses on the relationship between Tom and his family members. And she resolves her moral dilemma in a way that their relationship is not hurt. We can easily find that the ethic of care and responsibility transcends her lovely desire toward Tom. In other words, the sensitive tension between “selfishness and responsibility” is merged into women’s postconventional development based on “relationality and connectedness” (Kim 2002, 109).

For Jane, the best way to overcome love’s despair with Tom is to write novels. She explores her own meaning of life in writing her novels. Harvard excellent educator Robert Kegan suggests the developing process of our constructive meaning-making throughout life. In the last scene of that film, twenty years later, Jane reads her own novel *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) for Tom’s daughter. The main motive of that novel is Jane and Tom’s love story. Jane realizes the unfulfilled love with Tom through her novel *Pride and Prejudice*. Kegan describes life-span development with “the creative tension of life’s two longings: to be included and to be independent” (Kim 2002, 111). In that film, we can find that Jane and Tom meet and say goodbye over and over again. In this process, Jane becomes a successful author and Tom also becomes a reputational lawyer. Their reputations mean the development in their personality. I think that Jane and Tom’s meeting symbolizes to be included and their say goodbye reflects to be independent. The repetition of meeting and saying goodbye means that between separation and integration. For Kegan, the repetition between separation and integration is the core to describe the development of human personality.

The last point of that film is some issue about faith. It is difficult for us to find the direct explanation about faith in that film. Here we need to listen to James Fowler’s description about faith. Fowler as a professor emeritus of Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia founded
the faith developmental theory. He defines some people’s faith as “transcending centers of value and power that constitute their lives’ meanings” (Fowler 1995, 16). If we diagram some people’s faith, we have a triadic shape like the following.

Here “S” means the self and “O” means the other. And “SCPV” means some people or family’s shared center of value and power. The faith is placed on the shared center of value and power between the self and the other. For example, Jane’s father is a priest of the Church of England and her family lives in such faithful tradition. We assume that the faithful tradition of the Church of England works on Jane’s family members’ living pattern and their decision making as some important principles. Of course, the core value of the Church of England is naturally their interpretation or understanding of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

In addition, if that triadic shape is applied to the relationship between Ms. Austen and Mr. Lefloy, their shared center of value and power will be found in their own love stories. Against his uncle’s opposition, Mr. Lefloy chooses the take-caring responsibility for his family, even though he has never ending lovely desire toward Ms. Austen. And when they run away and Ms. Austen finds some letter from Mr. Lefloy’s mother, even though she loves him with deep passion, Ms. Austen gives up some marriage with Mr. Lefloy. Since they all love others very passionately, they choose to sacrifice for others rather than to possess others. James E. Loder, who is the Professor of Christian Education at Princeton Theological Seminary in Princeton, New Jersey, describes “the uniqueness of the human person” in anthropological term of “exocentric centeredness” (Loder 1998, 28). He understands the exocentric centeredness as human nature toward a self-transcendence. The exocentric centeredness has the contrary movement to the selfishness in human nature. It has the activity to move from the center to the outer. So, we call such activity as altruism contrary to selfishness. James Fowler (2000) also understands “a radical decentration from the self” in the relation with “love and trust to the radical love of God” (56). This is similar pattern with the love of “A real love for others will chase those worries away” (1 John 4:18). In the end, Jane and Tom’s love story is altruistic rather than selfish and toward others’ goodness and happiness rather than seeking to passionately own others. That is similar with the definition of love in the Bible.

Love is kind and patient, never jealous, boastful, proud, or rude. Love isn’t selfish.
or quick tempered. It doesn’t keep a record of wrong that others do. Love rejoices in the truth, but not in evil. Love is always supportive, loyal, hopeful, and trusting. Love never falls!

- 1 Corinthians 13:4-8
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