

Theological Dilemmas and Options for the Black Church

S.S. Maimela*

Before outlining my thoughts to you on the topic assigned to me, I want to share with you my experiences at a conference organised by the Ecumenical Association of African Theologians in Cairo (August 14-20, 1987). The theme of the conference was "Africa and the Bible". And among many other things that were said was the central thesis that came very clearly to me: Africans have been turned into beggars in the realm of religion, especially in Christianity which is often understood to be the religion of the White people. Yet this is unnecessary because without Africa the world would not have had Christianity and the Jewish religion both of which have been given birth to through the contributions of the African people. Just to mention but a few examples, the very person who was given the promise of the people of God, Abraham, ran into all sorts of problems in Canaan and would have died of hunger had Egypt not come to his rescue by providing him with food. Not only was he rescued from starvation but also Africa opened its arms to him to such an extent that when he left Egypt he had accumulated property, including donkeys, cattle and sheep. He was even given slaves to help him look after his property. By saving Abraham, Africa in fact literally saved the promises that God had made to the

people of Israel. Also, Jacob and his sons were later saved from starvation by Africans in Egypt. Further, Moses whom God used to free the Hebrews from slavery was brought up in an African royal family where he was taught how to read and write. As a result Moses became useful when God later decided to reveal Godself to the people of Israel. Without the African contribution we would not have had Moses or the written Ten Commandments. Later on, of course, when Jesus himself was persecuted during the Roman occupation of Judea, he did not run away from Herod to Greece or Rome or to the most important western countries. Rather he went to his uncles and aunts in Africa. Therefore the whole promise of God to the world in the Christ event rested on what Africans could do to save the life of Jesus. Even on his way to the cross, Africa lent its hand by providing Simon from Cyrene to carry the cross for the oppressed Jesus.

All these facts should remind us that Africa has played a very important role in the development of the Jewish and Christian religions, and even Islam, whose adherents trace their roots to the patriarch, Abraham, as their forebear. We need to reclaim our place and begin to play a crucial role today in the continuing witness of Christian-

* *Prof. S.S. Maimela teaches at the University of South Africa.*

ity. In so doing we will be telling the world that Africans should not be beggars but contributors in the development of Christian theology, like our forebear who were among the leading theologians in the early church.

However, by historical accident, Africans, especially in the sub-Sahara, became Christians via missionary efforts. Because of this unfortunate historical fact, we talk today about the "theological dilemmas" that face the Black church, a church that has been *made* into a beggar. In consequence, the Black church founded both by white missionaries and Africans (the so-called African Independent Churches) in the 19th century has a problem. But before we outline what that problem is, we need to understand what we mean by the Black church. To talk about the Black church, in my view, is to talk about the churches in South Africa made up of both the African Independent Churches and the historical missionary churches which constitute the South African Council of Churches – churches in which Blacks invariably make up the majority of their membership. Indeed, in all the so-called English-speaking churches Blacks constitute 80% of the membership. This is true for Anglicans, Methodists, Roman Catholic. Therefore, the church in South Africa is by definition a Black church except perhaps for the white Dutch Reformed Church.

The problem that the Black church faces arises out of the fact that while its majority membership is Black, the leadership of the Church is largely in white hands. The Black church is thus a colonised and dominated church theologically and culturally because it has inherited all the theological slogans and expressions from our white mentors. Thus western theological

vocabulary has become part of us, constituting in our system the air we breathe. And more often than not these inherited theological slogans choke us and cause indigestion. Therefore, if we are to continue living as the Black church we have to find a formula of digesting the foreign elements in our system.

Furthermore, the Black church, consisting of the poor, dominated women and struggling workers is the church of the under-class. Yet our theology is oriented towards the middle values and emphasis, and this constitute a real problem for us as the Black church, a problem we need to reflect about so that we can begin to construct a new theology fit for an oppressed, poor church.

Having said a few things about the Black church, let me now try to outline the problems that face us as I see them. Precisely because the church was founded by white people, and Africans in the Independent Churches also borrowed white theological slogans, it is the white people who have given us definitions of the human problem, namely, what SIN is. And the Black church has unfortunately come to accept that definition of the human problem as the problem of Blacks as well. I want to suggest that as a Black church we should not accept the definitions of what sin for Blacks is because we have a different experience of reality than that of white people, who historically happened to be our colonisers, masters and oppressors. Similarly the western definitions of what constitutes salvation should not be accepted – even if those definitions were given by Luther, Calvin or Barth. I will return to these issues later on, and I mention them here in passing because they constitute a theological problem for the Black church.

According to the biblical witness the human condition is structured in such a way that individuals find themselves living in a multiple network of relationships between God and human beings, between humans themselves, and between humans and the rest of creation. Unfortunately these multiple relationships, necessary as they are for corporate life, mutual support and self-fulfilment, have been shattered and broken by sin. Sin is understood to have transformed these relationships, thus making the human condition into one of radical estrangement, separation from God, from one another, and from the rest of creation. Therefore if we look around at the world in which we live and at ourselves, the present reality of sin is made manifest in the life of individuals such as selfishness, lovelessness, refusal to lend help to their fellows, resulting in a broken world in which humans experience oppression and injustice, poverty and hunger.

The good news, according to the other side of the biblical message, is that God did not admit defeat in the face of sin. Instead, in the vicarious suffering and death of Jesus Christ on the cross, and his glorious resurrection, God procured an effective remedy for sin and its social consequences. Thus the Christ-event constitutes an atonement, that is, a healing or restoration of the broken relationships between God and humans, between humans themselves, and between humans and the rest of creation itself. For this reason St Paul in Romans 8 reminds us that creation is groaning for liberation together with God's people. The mission of the Church should have been one of proclaiming God's victory over sin, a victory that aims at renewing and restoring these multiple networks of relationships not

only between God and individual believers but also between humans.

Now, given the centrality which the Bible gives to the multiplicity of human relationships which sin has affected and broken, relationships which are restored when personal (private) sins are forgiven, and interpersonal animosities and hatred, that breed injustice and poverty, are overcome by Christ's atoning work, one would have expected the Church to see the interconnection between the mission of the Church and the problem of the poor and oppressed groups. This is especially so because poverty or oppression of one human by another is not something natural but social in its origin. People oppress one another; we have the Black church to which I have referred to which faces enormous problems because of colonialism and racial domination – all these exist because human beings, in violation of God's will that they should love and serve one another, and wilful opposition to the reconciliation effected in Christ, make others poor by promoting unloving and unjust social relationships which sin has caused. In so doing, sinful humans prevent the gospel from being experienced as a community-creating and life-giving event. In short, people are oppressed because certain people are making the gospel, that is, reconciliation ineffective. They do so in order to protect their socio-economic and political interests.

Regrettably the church has failed to make a very important *link* between its mission to proclaim the gospel of God's gracious forgiveness and reconciliation with God *and* the resultant reconciliation among humans themselves. The Church thus failed to engage itself in actions that promote justice in society so that God's love, peace and reconciliation promised by

the gospel could be made ever more present in human relationships with one another. Many reasons could be advanced to account for why the church failed to make such a crucial connection between faith and ethics. Part of the reason for that failure is the tendency to separate the dramatic stories of Genesis 3 and Genesis 4. As a result, when you read most of Christian theology or listen to sermons in the churches, the sin that is talked about is the sin of the separation between the individual and God. When people talk about being saved and singing halleluja, they sing about the salvation that pertains to them as individuals – thinking that a genuine salvation is possible apart from and in exclusion of the world in which they live. I must, in all frankness admit that Christian theology has made a very serious mistake here, in that part of the multiple relationships that constitute the Second Commandment was given less emphasis than the First Commandment. Yet when Jesus was asked: “What is the great commandment in the law?” he flatly refused to be drawn into some kind of reductionism that restricts the law only to the human condition before God. Rather he reminded his listeners that God’s law has a two-fold dimension: The first is that we love the Lord our God with all our heart, soul and mind. The second, as important as the first, is to love our neighbours as ourselves (Mt 22:36-40, Mk 12:28-31). Jesus was merely restating the summary of God’s laws as set out in the Torah (Dt 6:5, 10:12, Lv 19:11-18). God’s law as summarised by Jesus thus intends to regulate the multiple relationships into which all humans find themselves involved between God and humans, and between humans themselves. In a very important sense, therefore, the summary of

the law refers to Genesis 3 and Genesis 4 which should never be separated from one another. The tendency to separate them in the church has thus given people the false impression that it is possible for individuals to be saved and continue to promote oppression among human beings. For the church seems to suggest that it is possible to be saved and remain a racist oppressor while at the same time remaining in good standing in the church. In doing so, the church allowed unchristlike people to constitute the church.

Another equally important reason that led to the failure of the church to make the intrinsic connection between the confession of faith and the confession of justice in society is the fact that there has been a serious break in the healthy relationship between the church and the poor and oppressed people. Beginning with the Constantian era when the church became an official religion, the church succumbed to its social milieu and began to exercise power, to enjoy certain economic, sociopolitical interests and so on. The church allowed itself to be hijacked and taken over by the ruling classes. In consequence, the church in its theological formulations aimed at no more than the legitimating of the social, political and the economic interests of the dominant sections of society. In the South African terminology, of course, the church’s role in society became one of legitimating the sociopolitical and economic interests of whites at the expense of the oppressed Black majority. To make matters worse, even where Whites are a minority in the so-called multiracial churches, it is the white theological formulations and leadership that continue to dominate the Black churches. This white domination of Black

churches poses for us a problem – a theological dilemma which Black Christians must sooner or later confront and overcome.

To return to our point: once the church had aligned its hopes and ambitions with those of the dominant classes in society, the Church began to accept the pessimistic view that equality, social justice and healthy human interrelationships are not possible this side of the grave. In other words, the church began consciously or unconsciously to embrace the view that Jesus' mission of saving the world and its sinful humanity has actually failed especially when it comes to correcting the social evils in society. After accepting the view that the healing of broken human relationships is beyond the power of the cross, death and resurrection of Jesus to bring about, the church began to preach a diminished, distorted gospel, namely, that it is possible for individuals to be saved in an unsaved world; that believers could close the door on the world, pray, and make things right with God. But this salvation is not enough to radically affect the way humans live with one another, thus enabling them to live happily in brotherly or sisterly relationships. The church's acceptance of this reductionist view of the gospel was very convenient for the ruling classes because they could continue both to be members of good standing in the church and to oppress the poor and the downtrodden without qualms of conscience. For this reason it was possible for the whites in the missionary dominated church to claim to be the brothers and sisters of the African people in this country while at the same time excluding Blacks from the positions of leadership – leading to the 19th-century breakaways and the formation of the

African Independent Churches.

What was involved here, as I have already indicated, was the reductionism which limited the application, the relevance and significance of the gospel to the so-called individual or spiritual sphere, where it was claimed that individuals could be saved in the midst of broken human relationships; that it was possible for individuals to be saved in the midst of broken socio-political injustices in which our fellow humans waste away under the crushing burden of poverty and oppression. Indeed, once the Church had been alienated from the poor and the dominated sections of society, the Church even began to glorify poverty itself. Poverty was thus made an ideal. To be poor and dominated were seen as something useful for spiritual growth; equality between humans was seen as possible only in the Spirit before the Lord and perhaps in the life hereafter. Religion was thus transformed into a powerful tranquilliser, an opium that enabled the poor and oppressed to endure misery with dignity and patience because they were to be rewarded in the next life. As an astute politician, Napoleon, long before Karl Marx, thus understood the sociopolitical and economic function of religion as an opium for the masses when he stated:

As far as I am concerned, I do not see in religion the mystery of the incarnation but the mystery of the social order: it links the idea of equality to heaven which prevents the rich person from being murdered by the poor How can there be order in the state without religion? Society cannot exist without inequality of fortunes and the inequality of fortunes could not subsist without religion. Whenever a half-starved person is near another who is gluttoned, it is impossible to reconcile the difference if there is not an authority to say to him: "God wills it so, it is necessary that there be rich and poor in the world; but afterwards in

eternity there will be a different distribution". (Cited by Lindberg 1984:37).

The theological justification of such a glaring inequality between humans is possible only when the Church, under the domination of the ruling class, has successfully disconnected the intrinsic link between individual salvation and restoration of broken human relationships. This makes it possible even for Christians to ignore the injustice and oppression perpetrated by their sinful social relationships. And the Church did nothing to correct this theological distortion, which allowed certain people in society to monopolise all the bread and to rationalise the exploitation of their fellow humans as blessings from God. The Church was implicated in this exploitation of one human by another because, as a co-opted institution to serve the interests of the dominant class, its theological formulations function to give ideological justification for social inequities and injustice.

Matters were made worse by the fact that the people who were in leadership positions, those who became the subjects of theological formulations and establishment of new churches and mission agencies, were drawn largely from the middleclass who were very much more impressed by the spiritual sins or vices to which the poor and dominated majority of human kind had succumbed, rather than by the social evils under which the poor were being dehumanised. That is why the great teachers of the Church, beginning with Augustine, Luther, Calvin and all the way down to the present, had been drawn largely from middle-class people, who had serious anxieties about their life hereafter. For this reason, the most important question for them was: How do I find the

merciful God who could save me from my personal sins and thus guarantee my life hereafter? This question was formulated in order to explain how individuals *qua* individuals could be relieved from their personal sins and guilt before God. In this perspective religion and the problem of sin were understood largely in terms of the inner person. Sin became a matter of looking inward, an introspective, navel-gazing exercise in which individuals try to find out how many divine laws they have broken, how unclean they are, and how despicable they are before God. In consequence theology from this perspective:

often emphasises individualistic sins of the human heart, the rottenness of human life on this side of the grave; it emphasises human weakness and helplessness in the face of sin and evil, and that humans are not able to bring about real fundamental changes in this fallen world; it warns people against worldly desires for comfort, money possessions and other non-eternal values (Maimela 1987:46).

Similarly salvation is understood largely as a matter of preparing people for the life to come, by making them acknowledge and confess their private sins and seek forgiveness from God. Put somewhat differently, salvation was viewed largely

... as means of rescuing individuals from their spiritual torments; it becomes a gracious act of lifting individuals out of this miserable world of injustice, poverty, hatred and oppression ... God in this religious education seems to be capable of putting only bandages on the casualties of oppression, because this God cannot really and believably bring about a fundamental transformation of this world so that God's people might be accorded dignity and social justice (Ibid).

The Church never stopped to ask whether any salvation which "allows

sinful and violent and fallen structures to remain substantially unchanged" (Driver 1986:30) can really be the good news of Jesus Christ for the people who, by virtue of their social position in society suffer from all kinds of material deprivation, racial humiliation and sociopolitical domination. The Church's preoccupation with the spiritualised gospel meant that it was not responding adequately to the questions and issues that the poor and oppressed were raising, namely: How do I find meaningful and fulfilling life in a society in which I have no economic and sociopolitical power role to play?

As fate would have it, it was only a matter of time before the poor and oppressed people in the Church would stand up and begin to challenge the religious and social systems which had promoted and abetted the situation of domination and misery, the situation which gives everything to the rich and dominant sections in society while it denies the poor and the oppressed Black people their right to be the subjects of their history both in the church and society. Therefore, by reflecting critically on what it means to be oppressed and dominated in society, the oppressed people began to seriously question the theological formulations of the Church, formulations which try to legitimate broken human relationships in the name of God. This questioning is what Black theology is continuing to do in order to liberate theology from the hands of the oppressors.

Given this theological dilemma of the Church's co-option and misuse of theology as an instrument of oppression to the point where the Church itself becomes implicated in human oppression of their fellows, Black theology needs to address a number of

important issues if theology is once again to become the instrument of liberation. Among others, the most important issue that we need to address as the Black Church is to relate out theological formulations to our socio-political, economic and cultural context. Now, let me briefly remind us, you and myself, as Blacks living in this part of Africa, that Africans are known to be people who are interested first and foremost in human interrelationships. People, according to the African anthropology, are reminded that individuals cannot make a fulfilling life possible in isolation from our fellows. For life is possible only in communal relationships in which individuals try to strike a balance in the way they live in a network of relationships with their fellows who must also be provided with space to breathe and live a meaningful life. Therefore individuals in Africa were socialised and taught ways of pursuing life in such a way that their actions would contribute toward the creation and nurturing of the network of multiple relationships to which I referred to between oneself and one's fellows, and ultimately between oneself and the spiritual world of ancestors and God. To maintain such a network of multiple relationships, it was important to teach people to avoid bad relationships and to refrain from activities that are injurious to those relationships, actions that threaten to undermine the social stability. Accordingly, individuals were expected to engage themselves in those social and personal activities that would enhance communal relationships, thus making life more humane and fulfilling.

In the light of this anthropology, sin and evil in the African context are thought to consist in the human attempt to destroy, to diminish and to

threaten the life of one's fellows. Therefore any activity which aims at destroying or injuring our fellows is regarded as a serious evil or sin, because any such unloving act towards our fellow human being is directed ultimately against God, the Creator, who has created the life of our fellows. Put somewhat differently, sin and evil in the African anthropology are measured in terms of the life of individuals who suffer injustice, oppression and destruction at the hands of their fellows. Sin is thus understood more in terms of the breach of loving fellowship with our human fellows. Sin thus manifests itself in the lack of love in interpersonal relationships, through the state of absence of brotherhood and sisterhood. Furthermore, sin is understood more in terms of the evil that people do to one another than in terms of the human transgression of the divine law. In other words, Africans do not think of sin in terms of the legalistic structure through which humans relate to the Deity outside and beyond the social life in which individuals live as social selves.

This African perspective on anthropology, which looks at life holistically in terms of the multiple relationships in which life is lived, the perspective that lays greater stress on the social wrongs and evils which humans commit against their fellows, is one which Black theologians should lift up and offer as African contribution to theological reflection on the great questions of sin and salvation. The African perspective will remind the Church that sin is not only an evil activity that is directed against God but also has to do with all the evil deeds that are directed against our neighbours in society. Sin is thus both a vertical and horizontal reality, for in the final analysis it is not the Almighty,

self-sufficient God who suffers at the hands of those who exploit, and promote injustice. Rather it is the human beings who suffer evil and oppression. Because humans suffer, God who is the Creator of all people is also offended by the deeds of those who perpetrate evil. In the African anthropology, sin was thus correctly understood when it was seen to be committed and perpetrated through human activities that undermine all of life in the society such as witchcraft, evil spirit, hatred, evil-speaking against your fellows and lovelessness. For these threaten to destroy what makes life possible in society for all concerned. In order to overcome evil and sin in society, Africans spent enormous time and energy trying to ward off those evils. Even some among those who have converted to Christianity continue practices that are aimed at warding off evil. Hence, before a pastor baptises a child, something has already been done to fortify the life of the child against the evil forces that threaten it. Similarly before a pastor buries a deceased member of the Church, something is already done to that person. They spent so much time finding out ways to protect individuals against evil both in this life and the next, because the focus is on the individual and his/her well being in communal relationships.

This African perspective on life is the heritage that Black Christians should bring to the Church. In doing so we would be reminding the Church that the stories of Genesis 3 and Genesis 4 should never be separated if one is to have a balanced, holistic theological understanding of sin. Indeed, Black Christians should insist that Genesis 4 which talks about the sin of individuals against others is equally important as Genesis 3 for in

Christ God aimed at restoring both vertical and horizontal relationships marred by sin.

Having outlined the theological dilemma that confronts the Black Church and also having given suggestions of how that dilemma could be overcome by utilising biblical and African anthropological insights, I want to bring to your attention a few things for further theological reflection. Among others, as Black theologians we should insist that the way the Church understands sin or what the human problem consists of must change. In the past it was the legal model that influenced the way sin was understood. God was portrayed as it were a harsh monarch who gave laws in terms of which we must relate to the divine self. To sin was to disobey those laws, thus revolting against the divine overlordship on one's life. Transgressions of God's laws were regarded as mortal sins, because it resulted in a deserved punishment and even death of the sinner. The unforgiven sinner had no hope for the future but to suffer perpetually in hell. The centre of focus for the Church was to redeem people out of sin and therefore out of hell and eternal damnation.

Against this traditional view of sin, Black theology needs to remind the Church that what stands at the centre of the Scripture and its message is not so much the fact that people are related to God through the law. Rather God in both the Old and New Testament is portrayed as a God who creates covenants of fellowship with God's people. At the centre of the covenant is not law and its demand but a life giving relationships between God and human beings, relationships which makes life possible. Adam and Eve sinned not because they broke a lifeless law but because they undermined and even-

tually broke the life-giving relationships on which their life depended. And once this relationship was broken life could not continue as normal. Rather they had to suffer the consequence of the broken fellowship with their Creator: their friendship and cordial communication with God in the cool of the evening was abruptly ended. Adam and Eve began to blame one another and became alienated from one another. The story of Cain and Able is but a continuation of the broken and alienated relationship between God and humans, and between humans themselves. Because sin involves a breach of fellowship, Black theology should help the Church to make a shift in its theological focus from the legal structure to the network of multiple relationships in which human life is lived. And should any human act begin to disturb, threaten and undermine those relationships, the Church should seriously begin to talk about sin on the horizontal level, a sin which ultimately is directed against God who created and continues to uphold those relationships.

This shift of emphasis in our understanding of sin leads to an important theological consequence: Black theologians should no longer merely borrow theological formulations that are unintelligible to the African perspective on human life. Formulations such as "Justification by faith alone" propounded by Luther and others were intended to give individuals assurance both about the forgiveness of sins and the life hereafter. This theological insight, however important it might be, should not be accepted by the Black Church without heavy qualifications. For the anxiety about the life hereafter, an anxiety based on the legal structure that dominated western thinking, is not an African problem.

For in the African anthropology individuals were assured of their future life because at death individuals were taken up and gathered to their ancestors. Any punishment for wrongdoing was something that was meted against sinners on this side of the grave so that at death the sinner has already made things right with his/her fellow human beings, the ancestors and God. In the light of this, individuals did not face death with fear and trembling, agonising as to whether they would be saved or condemned to hell. This brooding over the future and hell is not an African problem and Black theologians should discourage the Church from making it the central concern and focus of Church ministry among Black Christians.

Furthermore, because for us the focus is on the network of human interrelations we should insist that the Church should pay greater attention to what in the past were regarded as venial as opposed to mortal sins. The focus thus should be on our continuing sinfulness between ourselves and our neighbours. Christians should focus on the wrongs that they do to their fellows in society instead of focusing their gaze on the clouds in the sky and wondering about their future security in heaven. As we focus on those sinful activities which are hurtful to our neighbours, it will become possible for us to think of the ways and means by which we could overcome our sinful relationships. For the sphere of human interrelationships is left entirely in human hands to create death-dealing or life-giving structures. Here humans cannot plead that they are incapable of relating to their fellows in just and humane ways because it is within their power and ability to correct the destructive social structures that threaten to destroy and

undermine their corporate life. By focusing on the area of human interrelationships, the Black Church will be bringing its theological contribution to the Church at large by reminding the Church that the central focus of the biblical message is the healthy relationships which should exist between us and our fellows, and ultimately between us and our Creator.

The focus on the centrality of these relationships enables Black theologians to make necessary links between right believing and right doing, between faith and ethics – none of which can stand on its own without the other. In the past the Church was concerned that people should have the right belief, a correct dogma, regardless of whether what Christians do in life matches up to their verbal declarations. Against this view, we should insist that the right belief (orthodoxy) and the right doing (orthopraxis) belong together; both are equally important tests of the authenticity and integrity of the gospel. The emphasis on both aspects can be made only when Christians take seriously what they do to and with one another in society as the measure of their faith in the saving God. Put somewhat differently, the emphasis on the right belief and right doing (action) enables the Church to link once again our relationships between God and our fellows. As it makes this crucial link between the vertical and horizontal relationships, the Church will be calling people to account for what they do as people who try to live according to God's holy and loving will. If people claim that they believe in God, it becomes necessary for them to demonstrate the authenticity of their faith through the way they live with their fellows in society.

The testing of genuine faith by right

actions has become necessary in South Africa which prides itself on being a Christian country. And if all the people who claim that they are Christians were to live according to what they profess on Sunday, we would neither have the so-called racial problem nor all the injustices and oppressions which characterise our society. I believe it is the calling and challenge that face the Black Church to begin to call the Churches and Christians in this land to account for what they do in their relationships with their racially different neighbours in the light of what they teach and profess every Sunday. In so doing, I believe, we would be helping the Church of Jesus the Saviour to become a life-giving and community creating instrument of reconciliation between God and humanity and between humans themselves. For the promotion of justice,

peace and reconciliation in society are important dimensions of the gospel. Indeed, Christians have been called to begin to make the Kingdom of God more visible and present in what they do in relation to their fellows, and through the social structures they create. And as they do this, I believe, the love, peace and fellowship proclaimed and promised in the gospel will become realised and made more present in our world, as Christians struggle to transform their world and interpersonal relationships in preparation of the Kingdom that is to come. For the Kingdom of God is not going to drop some day from the sky but will emerge out of the dynamic creativity that aims at creating a more humane society and out of the small victories which Christians win against sin and its social consequences on this side of the eschaton.

1. Carter Lindberg "Through a Glass Darkly: A History of the Church's vision of the Poor and Poverty" in *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 33, 1981, pp. 37.
2. Simon S Maimela "What do the Churches want and expect from Religious Education in Schools?" in the *Journal of Black Theology in South Africa*, Vol. 1, 1987, p. 46.
3. *Ibid.*,
4. John Driver, *Understanding the Atonement*, (Scottsdale, Pen.: Herald Press, 1986), p. 30.