



ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

The Role of the Church in Democratization Process in Kenya

David Hellington Kodia

Professor, Great Lakes University of Kisumu, Bishop Okullu College, Kenya

Abstract:

This article seeks to demonstrate the significant role religious society played during the fight for multiparty politics in Kenya. There are several questions which were raised with regard to the legitimacy of such an involvement. The research I carried out are based on public evidence, eye witnesses account, media report and above all the testimony of the very persons who were at the centre of this struggle. Key issues that I will be addressing include but not limited to the roles certain religious leaders played either directly or indirectly. I am also focusing on the very nature and characteristics of political equation in Kenya during this time. I am also going to demonstrate that one party system in Kenya was indeed an anathema that created powerful ruling elites in Kenya.

Key words: *Democracy, one party system, good governance, ethnic divergence, power of courage*

1. Introduction

The years between 1988-94 were remarkably historic in Africa. The wave that was baptized as the wind of change that swept across Eastern Europe, was far moving to the African continent at a rather supersonic speed. The time when Africa was somehow identified with frequent coup de ta was long gone. The people were tired of being overly tolerant to dictators and were now up in the streets to confront the monster head on. The west paid host to most African political activists who could not stand the heat of oppression at home. There was a clear line drawn between the proponents of democratic space and the pro governments. Whereas the supporters of the governments were treated as patriots, the challengers of the status quo were regarded as dissidents. The world became small as people from different parts of the globe easily exchanged ideas and concepts of good governance. Human rights issues were on the agenda of international conferences. This was the time that information technology in its present form was being born in the continent. The impact of cybernetics had had a far reaching influence for the pro democracy campaigners. It made information sharing a luxury of many rather than a preserve of just a few in the ruling class. A new chapter was open in Africa. Kenya was no exception.

2. Characteristics of Democratic Struggles in Kenya

Democracy was simply defined by Abraham Lincoln as government of the people, by the people and for the people government where people rule themselves. They set for themselves the mechanism through which they are to be directly ruled by the government they form. According to the dictionary definition, it is a government, which encourages and allows rights of citizenship such as freedom of speech, religion, opinion and association, the assertion of the rule of law, majority rule accompanied by respect for rights of minority. In this government there is treatment of each other by citizens as equals and with absence of class feelings.¹

Democracy is not to be taken as a mere password for cheap misgovernment. In his book *Church and politics in East Africa* Bishop Okullu says:

One of the basic principles of democracy is the idea of a government by consent, a people centred government, elected by the people [not selected by the ruling system] with leaders holding on to just that power which is allowed to them by the electors. Many African democracies have had a disastrous life from the very beginning in the failure to organize fair elections. People are therefore cornered into electing those who afterwards make no attempt to establish channels of communication between themselves and the electors.²

The African democracies cannot stand the test at elections. One thing, which seems to be very clear, is the unwillingness of the African leaders to hold elections or referenda to test their popularity. Election in the minds of the African leadership is and remains a political disease. It could be argued the other way that African traditions do not in fact allow for any possibility of challenging the existing powers. A challenge to such is an insult to the ruling powers. Well, not all African groups, before the coming of the outside

¹ A.S. Hornby.... Oxford Advance Learners Dictionary of Current English page 229

² Okullu J.H. Church and Politics in East Africa Uzima Press page 71.

powers, had the same systems of government. Whether these systems were democratic or not, it remains true that they were people centred. But even these pre-colonial governments were in some cases as authoritarian as modern dictatorships. The chiefs were the powers unto themselves. But they commanded the respect of the people. We could cite the case of the Buganda kingdom where the Kabaka's wielded much power, but often, they consulted their chiefs in making some important decisions. Just like today, the chiefs could sometimes advise the Kabakas' as wrongly as the case with Kabaka Mwanga, who, upon the advice of his chiefs had Bishop Hannington killed.

In Kenya, fair elections were only conducted once when the Kenyans went to the polls to elect their first democratically elected leaders after independence. After that, elections had been marked by vote rigging. The most noted of all which caused the hottest controversy occurred during a by election in Kiharu. The election was manipulated and the loser was declared the winner. Bishop Gitari, angered by this, said democracy was:

Neither the rule of the administration, by the administration and for the administration, and neither is it the rule of the politicians, by the politicians and for the politicians. But democracy is the rule of the people and for the people.³

If democracy is truly a government where there is treatment of others as equals, then the understanding of this definition as applied on the Kenyan ground, nullifies this noble concept. In 1988 a driver was jailed not because he committed any traffic offence, or because he carried smuggled goods, but because he had refused to give a Provincial Commissioner a lift. The latter had his official car stuck in mud. The jailing of the driver on this ground posed some constitutional questions as to whether the driver really violated any law by refusing to give the government official a lift. The Law Society of Kenya posed the question. What was clear is that justice was miscarried under the cover of the judicial prerogatives. It is true, that the behaviour of the unfortunate driver was unethical and he could have shown some favours to the stranded PC, it could be argued that the driver was also obeying the law, which prevented him from carrying any passenger. Probably in doing so he was saving his own bread. Someone even made a joke out of this incident, saying that big men of PC's status should have inscription on their foreheads reading their titles.

Democracy is a very strange way of a government, as it will take time before it matures as an ideal political system in the African soil. In Africa, there is no difference between criticism and insult. When one criticizes a political policy, this one was construed to mean a direct insult to the person behind the policy. People therefore became very nervous, and carefully chose their words. African nations still lack mature leadership, which can withstand criticism without resorting to acts of intimidation. The Kenyan government spent a lot of money in monitoring the movements of its own citizens. All around, were the secret police: in the churches, in social centres, in schools and colleges, and places of work. This fear of being arrested made it impossible for the people to speak freely and express their opinions about the shape and form their country should take. Detention without trial and arbitrary arrest was applied as counter measures to keep out people holding to opinions, which do not comply with officially accepted, political thinking. We are obliged to say that democracy has to be democracy. There is no way of adjusting democracy, for any attempt to adjust it would definitely rob it of its tenets. With the actualisation of multiparty, now Kenyans have at least a sense of relief. They can now talk – The freedom of expression can now be fully realized. This has culminated in the emergence of gutter press, which is now flooding all the streets in big towns. The aftermath of political transformation, from a one party system to a multi-party system, has created numerous irresponsible behaviour for many. Some politicians have taken the advantage of the new political atmosphere to settle scores with those they dislike. The media is the tool for scandalization. In this case, the state has the right to censor any speech that could cause significant harm to society.⁴ Justice Oliver Wendel Holmes (when he presided over a case in the US in 1917) indicated that free speech does not mean unlimited or irresponsible speech. By way of illustration, he pointed out that in a crowded theatre, a person does not have the right to yell "fire" – where in fact there is no fire – and thus cause panic.⁵ Neither today can a person be allowed to point an accusing finger at an innocent person and expect to get away with it.

3. One Party System

Power and politics are inseparable, and the one party system existed due to a love of power. This system nullified all possibility of having accountable government in Africa. I do not mean to say that it is only the African nations, which suffer from democratic deficiency. In Eastern Europe and most of the developing nations of Latin, America and Asia, democracy, as it is understood in the West was not welcome by the ruling powers. In the minds of many, it is a new Western tool of neocolonialism.

One problem with the *single party democracy* if such a "**democracy**" really existed was that the leaders clung to power up to an unknown period of time. They got married to their offices whose vows always read "*you office, may it be made known unto all men, that I have taken thee for good or for worse, whether the people like it or not, you will remain mine from now till death do us part*". Dr. Kamuzu Banda of Malawi manipulated the parliament to declare him His Excellency the Life President. Getting someone like Julius Nyerere who could retire peacefully sounds very un-African. Many leaders wait till some disgruntled men in the armed forces take leadership into their own hands. Since Uganda got its independence from Britain, it has gone through countless governments most of which were brought by military coups. Uganda and Nigeria take the lead in this regard. Coups are always met with jubilation as the leaders always come at a time when people have lost confidence in their civilian governments and because they do not have the power to remove them through constitutional means. They therefore see the incoming government of the gun, which comes with promises, which will never be fulfilled as their last saviour. But history tells us that these governments become even worse.

³ . Daily Nation.... Feb. 11th 1989

⁴ Steve Chan – International Relations in Perspective – Macmillan – 349.

⁵ Ibid

If you want to distinguish an African leader from the rest you will easily know them by the chain of their titles. Amin the former Ugandan dictator had numerous titles ranging from His Excellency Professor Sir to The Conqueror of The British Empire [C.B.E.]. Banda had become a nuisance to democracy in his country, a nuisance as far as the human rights are concerned. He had been misruling and misruling, persecuting and persecuting his own people. More often than not, the state-run oppression is always said to be in defence of the public interest. "Public" here is supposed to refer to the people. But it becomes very difficult to get a clear meaning of *the people* in this context. Who are the people whose interests are at stake due to the alternative voices? This question will never be answered by the leaders. "The people" as we understand it in this context are those few privileged individuals walking in the corridors of power, and whose interests get shaken when rival voices speak. So in the name of *the people* every act of injustice remains *justified*. When finally, Dr. Banda yielded to both internal and external pressure, the Life President could not believe his own political doctrine. The referendum he called proved him very wrong, as 60 percent of the voters overwhelmingly voted for multi-party democracy. Banda was later voted out of his *life presidency* in a multi-party election. One thing, which dictators and the advocates on the single party system like, is being praised like gods on earth. In fact in an interview with the Newsweek, Kamuzu Banda said that his people like singing for him. King Saul of the Bible had some strange spirits and always needed someone to play some music for him. Something must also be strange with the African leaders. Songs in praise of Our African leaders are always considered as either national or patriotic songs. We can conclude that a single party makes a leader the only cock that crows. And any other cock, which tends to develop some maturity, is either slaughtered, or forced to flee.

One bone of contention between the leaders and the people in Africa is the leaders' failure to stop clinging to the traditional mode of leadership, which make them almost untouchable. We are in a modern time with people exposed to various ways of thinking and such traditional autocracies have no place. We have to recognize the fact that so-called democracy never existed, meaning that issues like elections never arose as political challenges. However, the mode of traditional government, which dictators are badly copying, gave some room for democratic values.

Dr. Jude Ongong'a says of Luo community:

No discussion of the Luo socio-political organization can be complete without saying something about an elder and his role within the community. An elder, besides being a man of substance and integrity, was always recognized as an outstanding individual. As a result he was very influential figure and had to learn and measure up to that status. Even though the elders came from dominant lineage, they did not inherit leadership but rather demonstrated it.⁶

At a Symposium on Problems and promises for Mission: Africa Beyond 2000 organized by the All Africa Conference of Churches in Mombasa Kenya, Paul Gifford describes an African leader as The Big Man whose remarks have the power of the law. He is himself the law. "He demands thunderous applause from the legislature when ordering far reaching changes in the constitution. He blesses his home region with highways, schools, hospitals, housing projects, irrigation schemes, and a presidential mansion. He packs the civil service with his tribes men. He awards uncompetitive, over priced contracts to companies, which grant him and his family and his associates' large kickbacks. He manipulates price and import controls to weaken profitable business associates. He affects the commitment to free – market economic reform to secure multi-million-dollar loans and grants from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. He espouses the political philosophy of whichever foreign government gives him the most money. He is and he makes sure that he is known to be the richest man in the country. He buys rivals by passing them envelopes of cash. He questions the patriotism of the few he cannot buy, accusing them of corruption or charging them with serving foreign masters. Youth wingers from the ruling party harass his enemies. His enemies are detained or exiled, humiliated or bankrupted, tortured or killed. He uses the resources of the state to feed a cult of personality that defines him as incorruptible, all knowing, physically strong, courageous in battle, sexually potent, and kind to children. His cult equates his personal well being with the well being of the state. His rule has one over-riding goal: to penetrate his reign as Big Man."⁷

Paul Gifford was not attacking a particular African leader. His view represents the well known autocratic tendencies of many African leaders. In Kenya, the president was always equated with excellence and he enjoyed the monopoly of this excellence. The Kenyan president was always *Number one is everything*. When he is addressing the farming community, he is a farmer number one; when he is addressing the educators, he is teacher number one; when addressing a political rally, he is not only politician number one, but the longest serving Member of Parliament in Kenya. Whenever the President calls your name at a public function just in passing, you have to stand up. Failure to do so may cost you your Job, especially if you are a civil servant or a minister. The shallow argument which the advocates of single-party politics use, is the fact that since there are a lot of ethnic groupings in a country, it is only a single party that can unite the people, or else people would be divided into ethnic groups each forming their own political parties. The introduction of multi-party politics in Kenya proved this point when the major tribes formed some kind of anti-government parties to remove KANU from power. The outcome of the election brought a very mixed reaction. Moi, being the President of KANU, had no support in Luo land and Kikuyu dominated regions. It could be said that it is an act of betrayal for any good Kikuyu to vote for KANU where Moi, a Kalenjin, is the party's presidential candidate, especially after feeling so alienated from the presidency with all those flourishing benefits that go with it. The feeling is that most of them suffered a great deal to various degrees under Moi's rule. However, one problem, [a very bad one indeed] is the belief held by many Kikuyus is that the presidency in Kenya is synonymous with Kikuyu leadership. Due to the fact that the Kikuyu are the single largest ethnic group in Kenya, a majority of the Kikuyus have

⁶ Ongong'a Jude ... A Christian Luo Dialogue Spearhead No. 78 page 11.

⁷ Ecumenical Press Service ...92.02.48

developed a tribal feeling against other Kenyans, with a firm conviction that they should be leading and that the others should do the following.

It would be wrong however, to say that the majority of Kikuyus or Luos did not vote for KANU because a Kalenjin was the presidential candidate. People loved the party and even KADU after independence, dissolved itself to merge with it. People of all tribes from the coast to Lake Victoria hailed their president. So dissatisfaction with the party is not necessarily due to the ethnic background of President Moi, but due to the dictatorial nature of his rule. Moi ceased to be a people's leader. Instead he became a people's misruler, *detainer*, oppressor and conscience. The one-party system lacked accountability and transparency. It lacked checks and balances. It was used to deny people their right to exercise their prerogatives in the politics of their country. Though the one party system had a very convincing theory of uniting the people, it divided them all the more. It proved to be very bitter to the people of Kenya, it proved to be dangerous to the rights of the individuals in Zambia; and it proved to be bitter all over the world.

Sometime in 1986, the late Bishop Henry Okullu conducted a civic service in St. Stephen Cathedral Kisumu. In his sermon he provoked the ruling establishment when he called for the introduction of multi-party democracy. The Bishop broke a taboo as no one could have the courage to speak in favour of multiparty in public and get away with it. It required a lot of courage to speak those dangerous words.

The Bishop said that while he was still in Uganda in 1967 he stood firm against that country's one party system. He was then editor of *New Day*, which was owned by the Church of Uganda.

I wrote an editorial against it because I believed that one party system did not give room for democracy to prevail. The matter was taken to parliament and my views were heavily criticized. Many years have elapsed since then and I am the same Okullu.⁸

The message the Bishop was conveying was that, if he could stand firm for his principles and fight for the rights of others in their own country, he had the moral obligation to live by the same principles and fight for what is right at home where he had all the rights of a citizen to propose the political system he would prefer to be governed by.

The problem with one-party dictatorship is that, there are no alternative suggestions offered. The one proposed by the party's president is simply final. In fact it became a trend in Kenyan politics that whoever came up with a different opinion rather than the one sanctioned by the ruling power was regarded as a servant of a foreign master: dissident is sedition. One-party dictatorship under president Moi turned Kenya into a police state.

At a symposium held in Kisumu in 1988, Prof. Chinua Achebe, the famous Nigerian writer, said that the one-party system which has been so much praised by the African dictators, is an abuse of justice, as it gives no room for second opinion. Achebe's view escaped government criticism for reasons, which I cannot tell. After Bishop Okullu's bad news to the government, it was thought that the dust had settled after the torrential condemnation. But then came the Presbyterian cleric Dr. Timothy Njoya. In his new year's message Njoya said that it is wrong for African nations to try to convert the one-party system which was imported from Eastern Europe into democracy merely by baptizing them with local names. He added that all forms of social evils appear to stop being evil when baptized African. In Kenya, during the one-party dictatorship, only government sponsored candidates would win the elections.

Let us look at the quotations from the *Kenyan Weekly Review* as regards the one party dictatorship in Kenya:

At the beginning of Moi's presidential tenure, Parliament and the University of Nairobi were still the main centres of opposition to the government, but this opposition was gradually subdued through various crackdowns and detentions. In June 1982, the government introduced a constitutional bill in Parliament to make Kenya *a de jure* state and outlawing the establishment of opposition parties to KANU. This may have been partly in response to the reports that Odinga [the former Vice President] and Anyona the former MP for Kitutu East were seeking to form a new opposition party. Anyona was thrown into detention while Odinga placed under political restriction. Both were expelled from the party KANU. The constitutional amendment bill, which was introduced in parliament by the [former] minister for Constitutional affairs Mr. Charles Njonjo, sailed through parliament without opposition. Mr. Njonjo had made a strong case for making Kenya a de jure one party state, supported by the then Vice President Mr. Mwai Kibaki, and other leaders. Njonjo accused anyone who wished to start an opposition party of aspiring for the presidency. By a strange quirk of fate Njonjo himself was to fall ignominiously from power in 1983 following charges of wanting to usurp the presidency of the country by unconstitutional means.⁹

The multi-party system was reintroduced by an act of parliament in 1991 following international and internal pressure. Mr. Mwai Kibaki, who backed Njonjo in parliament for the amendment bill to introduce *a de jure* one party state, later became one of the first defectors from the ruling KANU later forming his own opposition party. Kibaki in this case showed himself a typical opportunist who lacks solid political principles. One question is, if others could use their gift of courage to challenge the one party system with all its tenets of dictatorship and accept all the consequences that lie behind this courage, then others have no excuse to say *gentlemen it was just too hot*. They say that politics sometimes is just like that.

With the new revitalized ruling party, KANU branches could recommend the suspension or the expulsion of any leader from the party to the governing council, which either ratified or rescinded the recommendations. [The law of the jungle applied here was that once a leader is expelled from the ruling party, he automatically loses his parliamentary seat if he is an MP, which practically implies that a clique of KANU supporters had the power, [but not the right] to annul the people's choice.

Some dissidents preferred to flee into self-exile abroad than to face the wrath of the government and the party within the country while others went underground to form such political organization as the outlawed Mwakenya movement. Organization such as the Law

⁸ Daily Nation. Sep. 22nd 1986

⁹ Weekly Review. Jan. 12th 1990

Society of Kenya, that have occasionally spoken against the government and party had been cowed into silence or muted dissidence. The only institution that remained in opposition was the church, where several clergymen became a thorn in the flesh of the government and the ruling party. The monopolies of ideas and powers held by the sole party now appeared to be assured but not guaranteed.

While many of the nationalist political parties could tolerate divergent opinion and differing political views while they were not in power, as soon as the reins of government were handed over to them by the colonial powers, opposition became intolerable.

In many African countries says one American political scientist; there is no way of ensuring that a leader will step down from power except through a military coup. Most leaders will stick to power even when they have become dangerous liabilities to the county they misrule.¹⁰

One party dictatorship had no chance of survival in this new thinking. The people are exposed to external influence and that taste of democracy in other parts of the world. As a result the democratic wind that began sweeping across Eastern Europe brought down the once all – powerful communist totalitarians became irresistible. With the electronic age, people watch on their televisions how splendid the presidential campaign could be if were given the chance to exercise a similar franchise in Africa enjoyed in the West.

One danger of having a single party is the temptation by the party to assume supremacy over other branches of government. This was the case with the communist parties of Eastern Europe and was also the case with single party in Kenya. The distribution of power remains in the balance if there is no alternative powerful legal voice to call for checks and balances in the government. Lack of alternative voice as a counter force, made Kenya's ruling party KANU assumes supremacy over parliament and even the High Court. This made it practically impossible for anyone to seek justice from Kenya's law courts. Kenya was different from Russia of 1993 in the sense that the power struggle between the first Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Parliament was open, and at least each party had the right to speak and be heard, while in Kenya even the High Court could not challenge the authority of the party. A power struggle exists only when the warring parties are free enough to stretch their muscles. Parliament in Kenya however had no muscle to stretch.

In Kenya sovereign power was to be exercised by parliament, which the late President Kenyatta once described as the chief instrument of the state. Parliament makes laws for the country; it can change our constitution, it has the power to declare war or a state of emergency; and it controls the government. It supplies the government with money and can force the government to resign. All these powers make the parliament supreme.¹¹ [But practically on the ground this has never been the case.] However, the new constitution of Kenya that was promulgated in 2010, does not give parliament this supreme authority. The constitution itself is the supreme tool of governance and it is the people of Kenya themselves who have the supreme authority to change the constitution. Any laws made by the parliament (Kenya has two chambers of parliament: the national assembly and the senate) must be subservient to the authority of the constitution.

In 1999, an opposition MP, Peter Oloo Aringo, moved a motion in parliament seeking for the creation of a parliamentary service commission. The commission would be vested with power to hire and fire all the staff of the National Assembly, and at the same time regulate the terms and conditions of service for all the members of parliament. This would mean the reduction of the powers of the executive over the legislature. After several manoeuvres, the government took over the motion – and it was successfully carried out. The Kenyan parliament, in other words, voted overwhelmingly to regain her lost glory and supremacy.

In Kenya things just work their own way. Politics has become a luxury enjoyed by those who have the power and money and are in good books of the ruling powers that be. The debate as to which is the best political theory and practice for many Kenyans remain an academic one inasmuch as the majority of Kenyans do not even understand the difference between the monolithic and pluralistic systems. One won't be surprised to hear that many Kenyans despite the long period of KANU rule still do not know the party's manifesto or anything beyond the abbreviation [KANU is Kenya African National Union]. And yet they had been forced to become KANU members. It is not surprising that when the political playing field was levelled to allow other players as well, the independent and one time most powerful political party in Africa in terms of manipulation and oppression had worst performances at the last two general elections of 2007 and 2013. In 2013, KANU could not even get 10% off the total elective posts in both houses of parliament!

4. Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, I wish to say that the church's role in championing a just social order is and has been a living testimony for the people of Africa that the church's mission does not end at the altar. It goes deeper into the people's nerves of thought and often acts as the conscience of the people by divine right especially when there is no balancing voice. We shall discuss in detail the biblical imperative for the church's participation in the politics of the day. This chapter was just meant to highlight some of the fundamental issues, which have been arising as a result of one party dictatorship in Kenya and other parts of Africa. To quote the late Bishop Okullu again:

For people to participate in nation building, they have also to participate in decision- making. The church should be concerned when power, political and economic, with all its trappings, is concentrated in too few hands, nationally and internationally. This breeds and encourages social injustice; injustice breeds violence, it nullifies accountability by those in power and leaves the great majority of the people of the world materially marginalized.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Mulusa Thomas.... Our Government. Page 15

A free society means people, people, people. People arguing, people deciding, people acting, people responding to authority and standards outside themselves, to God of the Bible.¹²

Christians and non-Christians alike should realize that the power of courage is a gift from God given to them to confront such powers, which threatens our human dignity. We have to confront such powers precisely and courageously. Christ Jesus still stands as the symbol of courage in the midst of suffering and all his followers must see their mission in this context. This mission does not begin from Jerusalem then Judea and then to Samaria, but it begins from our willingness to share equally amongst us the resources that God has freely given us. Such resources would include things like power and justice and other shared common human values. Such resources could also include change. When new ideas come up, for the sake of the shared common values, we should be ready to share such new ideas.

Though we have a wide historical, geographical and ethnic divergence in this society, we can experience, both in our prayers and concrete service to peace, the power of Christ who frees and unites. This freedom and unity in Christ obliges us often to raise our voice for peace to the world and at the same time to offer better alternative proposals to the systems we are so much fed up with.

We are made bold by true religion of Christ to proclaim with forthrightness the demand of justice, mercy and peace. Certain situations may require us to take stances, which are unpopular, such, resolute and prophetic activity, no doubt leads us to adequate decision and actions which we believe is the sermons of the gospel for us. Since peace can only be achieved through justice, the necessary prerequisite for peace is represented by the struggle against economic and political structures and power related institutions. In view of the injustice existing in the world today, we cannot remain neutral and assume the position of uninvolved observers. In this respect an adequate analysis of all the aspects, mechanisms and expressions of injustice is as necessary as the readiness to form an alliance with all those forces which preceded us in analysing, revealing and fighting against these structures. Whenever Christians support revolution our right to do this is not based on any idea of revolution but solely on the gospel. This does not belittle the revolutions goals of greater humanity and justice. On the contrary we want to achieve a deeper more level-headed, and more relevant understanding of these objectives. In other words our support for revolutionary endeavour cannot be inspired by hatred or belief in violence. It can only be inspired by our sense of oneness with the sufferers in whom Christ meets us, by our hope for a new and just order and by our readiness to forgive.¹³

The life of the church is marked with history of struggle. Struggle against oppressive powers operating under the cover of social, political and religious symbols. It is a war against the four lettered word in English called *evil*. And *Aluta continua*.

5. References

1. A.S. Hornby.... Oxford Advance Learners Dictionary of Current English page 229.
2. Okullu J.H. Church and Politics in East Africa Uzima Press page 71.
3. Daily Nation.... Feb. 11th 1989
4. Steve Chan – International Relations in Perspective – Macmillan – 349.
5. Ibid.
6. Ongong’ a Jude ... A Christian Luo Dialogue Spearhead No. 78 page 11.
7. Ecumenical Press Service ...92.02.48
8. Daily Nation. Sep. 22nd 1986
9. Weekly Review. Jan. 12th 1990
10. Ibid.
11. Mulusa Thomas.... Our Government. Page 15
12. Okullu J. H. Church and state Uzima Press...
13. Peace and Justice An Ecumenical Imperative for Christians and Churches.... C.P.C. Nairobi Nov. 23rd 1973

¹² Okullu J. H. Church and state Uzima Press

¹³ . Peace and Justice An Ecumenical Imperative for Christians and Churches.... C.P.C. Nairobi Nov. 23rd 1973