

A New Kind of **Development** in Africa



Editor: Maurice N. Amutabi

ISBN 978-9966-116-66-6



9 789966 116666

**Published by the Centre for Democracy,
Research and Development (CEDRED),
Nairobi, Kenya**

A New Kind of Development in Africa

Editor: Maurice N. Amutabi

**Published by the Centre for Democracy, Research and Development
(CEDRED), Nairobi, Kenya**

ISBN 978-9966-116-66-6

ISBN 978-9966-116-66-6



Chapter 15

Democratic Citizenship Education and Public Theology: On the Possibility of Disrupting corruption in African Countries

By Jane Adhiambo Chiroma

233

Chapter 16

Influence of investment decisions on financial distress of SASRA regulated SACCOS

By Halldess Nguta Munene, James Ndegwa and Thomas Senaji

250

Chapter 17

Agricultural Stakeholders and Policymaking in Kenya: the Bates-Lipton Hypothesis Revisited

By Henry Amadi

264

Chapter 18

Critical Success Factors for e-learning adoption at St John's University of Tanzania

By Mutajwaa Alphonse Shuubi

279

Chapter 15

Democratic Citizenship Education and Public Theology: On the Possibility of Disrupting corruption in African Countries

Dr. Jane Adhiambo Chiroma (PhD)

Lecturer at ECWA Theological Seminary Department of Education, Jos;
Adjunct Faculty at the Department of Leadership and the School of
Theology

Pan Africa Christian University, Nairobi

Email: janeexperience@gmail.com alternatively,
Jane.Chiroma@pacuniversity.ac.ke

Abstract

This paper argues that democratic citizenship Education is a potential approach for thinking public theology to counteract corruption. Democratic citizenship education conceptualises Theologians to critically engage in deliberations with society (public) in order to curb corrupt practices. For people to engage in conversation to curb societal dilemmas they require an education that propagates speech, thought and character as essential element for critical engagement in public sphere. I employ philosophy of education as theoretical and methodological lenses for interpretation. The Paper considers deliberative notions of Democratic citizenship education such as public reason, communicative action; democratic iteration and responsible citizenship to unravel democratic citizenship as a sense of belonging for human interaction in the public sphere. In addition, I argue that education in public theology can be advanced through the lenses of democratic citizenship education. That is, for citizens to engage in relaying the message of the gospel to the public and to engage in public governance, both theologian and the philosopher need to engage for understanding to occur.

Key terms: Democratic Citizenship; Education and Public Theology; Corruption, Africa

Chapter 15

Democratic Citizenship Education and Public Theology: On the Possibility of Disrupting corruption in African Countries

Dr. Jane Adhiambo Chiroma (PhD)

Introduction

This paper argues that democratic citizenship Education (DCE) is a potential approach for thinking public theology to counteract corruption. Democratic citizenship education conceptualises public theology to critically engage in deliberations with society in order to curb corrupt practices. "Reflection on Christian doctrines in the public eye could benefit the public, because it will offer illumination, deepen human self-understanding, and lift up transcendent ideals to guide social aspirations" (Peters 2018:153). For people to engage in conversation to curb societal dilemmas they require a public theology that propagates speech, thought and character as essential elements for critical engagement in public sphere. This chapter employs philosophy and theology as theoretical and methodological lenses for interpretation. Public theology should both turn inward, philosophically engaging with concepts and arguments developed in academic philosophy and outward, encouraging theological publics to apply philosophical approaches of democracy and citizenship to knowledge in theology (Wortham, 2011).

The dilemma of continuing corruption in Africa is a concern when policies and constitution that guard the various countries seems to be founded on democratic principles. For example, the Kenya constitution 2010 outlines in chapter 4, the bills of right connected to equality, human dignity and freedom (Republic of Kenya, 2010), also is the provision in Chapter 6, of the constitution for leadership and integrity where article 79 establishes Legislation for the ethics and anti-corruption commission (Republic of Kenya, 2010). Despite the presence of the anti-corruption commission, cases of corruption in Kenya are still on the increase. Waghid (2018:1) paints a similar picture for South Africa when he explains that "... South Africa, faces tumultuous political times and into the midst of several unfavourable political wrangling, especially in light of replacement of a relatively good finance minister... raising the issue about the ramifications of political autocracy as a means to hinder the democratic aspiration of a citizenry that has become aware of socio-economic and political instability in the country and on the continent as a whole." Political autocracy as Waghid (2018) stipulates is not different from corrupt practices especially in countries that claim to be a democracy. It is therefore the argument for this chapter to show how democratic engagement within public theology can counter corruption and autocracy in Africa.

The church in Africa has engaged in several instances towards democratic acts (Pillay, 2017; Nadine, 2012; De Gruchy, 1997). In South Africa for instance, the church has been concerned actively with citizen's welfare, and continues to play an important role towards democratic ends (Pillay, 2017; Nadine, 2012). Nadine (2012: 205) illustrate that the church in Africa and elsewhere has played major roles in the public space such as: building schools and hospitals, opposed apartheid, and is still considered by "state and civil society as a key player in welfare delivery." On the other hand, Nadine (2012) contends that the church has not always been a positive agent of change with regard to social change. As a result churches contributed to the regime and postulated the theological justification for apartheid. Pillay (2017:2) describes the role that South African Council of Churches (SACC) has made towards building a democracy. He recounts that SACC was a great organisation that had clarity of vision and theological foundations. He noted that it had a clear purpose and direction entrenched in a prophetic voice of the marginalised. It was seen as a source and a flare of hope. It attracted support of the many people and donors internationally. It united communities and the churches. But upon independence in 1994, the SACC lost a clear vision and corporate identity. Its sound and clear theological rationale and ecumenical vision declined.

In Kenya, mainstream churches were reluctant to criticise corruption in governance. For instance "Reverend ... who was the secretary general for National Council of Churches in Kenya (NCCCK) was appointed the head of the steering Committee on Anti-Corruption hence compromising his ability to point out massive corruption in government independently" (Kenga, 2014:1). On the other hand church leaders have engaged in public politics where they contended the political positions in government and won their seats. For example, in 2007 a prominent leader in the NCCCK resigned to seek a parliamentary seat under the ruling Party of National Unity (PNU) and he won – a gesture that sensitizes church involvement in public sphere. In addition, in 2005 the Pentecostals rallied themselves and their members alongside the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) to reject the Bomas Constitution draft during the November referendum. The church rejected the draft because it provided for sections for abortion and Islamic Kadhi courts (Kenga, 2014:1). When the Committee of Experts drafted a new constitution which was published by Parliament the NCCCK and the Catholic Church called for the removal of clauses allowing abortion and Kadhi courts hence wanted all religions to be treated equally. Christian denominations formed Kenyan Christian Leaders Constitutional Forum (KCLFC) to oppose the draft by carrying out rallies.

Biblical hook that anchor democracy and citizenship to public theology is the view of God in a relationship with His creation. First, living

in social relationship requires some form of democratic life committed to love, justice, peace, respect, reciprocity and the integrity of creation and is multifaceted. Democracy from creational perspective also depicts the significance of human dignity - to instances of God creating man in his own image, implying to the importance of valuing human dignity since humankind bears the image of God, they (humans) deserve respect and mutual reciprocity. The concept of peace (shalom) as found in both Old and New testament is connected to democratic living and citizenship where peace and justice facilitates healthy communal living. Citizenship is also addressed in man's relationship with the other, where love is accorded value in maintaining neighbourhood living - in instances of "love your neighbour as you love yourself" (Leviticus, 19:18,34; Zachariah,8:18; Ephesians 4:17; John 15:12) also "love your enemies" (Luke 6:27,35; Mathew, 5:54).

Furthermore, eschatological dimension of citizenship and democracy in biblical terms is that Christians live as good citizens, being committed with their whole heart to being "the 'salt' and 'light' (Mathew 5:13-14) in whatever human society which they are part of. This can be reflected in part on how churches come together with other faiths and civil society for justice, peace and common good for all. Citizenship also depicts belonging to the heavenly Kingdom of God, a place where the future hope motivates daily living. This implies that the contemporary notions of democracy and citizenship are reconcilable with Christianity, and therefore, A Christian living in Africa (citizen) can certainly benefit from being a democratic citizen. The concern in this chapter is not whether democratic citizenship is needed in Africa but whether it is possible to expedite its development in the African continent, especially in the public theological cycles. In addition, is a question worth pausing: what is necessary for democracy so that its distracting nature and language does not lead to its own undoing in the theological cycles? The assumption that Democracy would simply replace form of authoritarian and repressive culture in Africa is to discount the African culture, religion and the complexity of the African society. Therefore, the emergence of democratic citizenship in Africa is linked to thinking differently about the authoritarian politics and its oppressive cultural and religious interpretations and practices. If doing public theology informed by democratic thinking means disrupting the corrupt practices in Africa that must have been tied to religion, sense of community or autocratic politics, then, to avert oppressive practices should pave way for public theology, then, the Church needs to be actively involved in averting oppression in the African society, especially that of corruption within the wrong sense of belonging.

Minimalist Theories of Democratic Citizenship

Democratic citizenship depicts human interaction, which implicates a form of engagement that establishes a sense of belonging. Democratic citizenship Education has been a continuing concern in politics, colonialism and history and in cultural and socio-economic circles (Banks, 2008:129). Harris (2005:46) is of the view that democratic citizenship education is not just a matter of learning the basic facts about the institutions and procedures of political life, but that it also includes acquiring a range of dispositions, virtues and loyalties that are immediately bound up with the practice of democratic citizenship. Correspondingly, public theological education in a democratic sense should be characterised significantly by political literacy, understanding of democracy and human capability approach. Similarly, DCE offers education for justice and compassionate imaginative action for the common good of citizens. This integrates multicultural dimensions of human diversity when respect develops through listening, understanding and speaking (Waghid's (2005:55). This means exposing citizens to major histories and cultures of various groups of people, including major religious and cultural groups as well as marginalised ethnic, racial, gendered and social majorities. This imaginative action may empower citizens to delve deeper into the inner voices of others' feelings, experiences, despair, suffering and oppression, and lead to civic reconciliation and compassion in order to revert corrupt practices (Waghid (2005).

Democratic Citizenship is stronger when friendship is encompassed within the education system. Democracy and citizenship co-exist because democracy supports public theology in pursuit to countering corruption. Friendship, as a concept will enable citizens to create conducive environments to interact with each other regarding the affairs of their sense of belonging Waghid (2008:197). When citizens engage in friendly relations within the public sphere, the outcome citizen exhibit reveals the nature of the encounters to which they are exposed. One of the outcomes of DCE is the establishment of an atmosphere in which people can communicate their opinions freely and in which they are amenable to others' views – without necessarily accepting people's opinions or imposing theirs on others – as a reciprocal act of respect irrespective of their differences. This creates ample spaces for dialogue (Waghid, 2008:197). Waghid further notes that DCE should first recognise cultural, linguistic, ethnic, race and religious commonalities and then address differences. He stresses that this creates civic space for sharing our commonalities in the face of the differences of others who otherwise might be considered threatening to our own. He argues that such acknowledgement helps us to create spaces to publicly show these differences and to be able to generate cohesion to engage dialogically with others who have opposing cultural views. Therefore, the underlying idea is

that public theology in light of democratic citizenship ought to acknowledge differences, otherness, dialogism, respect, reciprocity and friendship in order for people from diverse backgrounds to co-exist in civic spaces – a demonstration of what he calls ‘democratic justice’. When democratic justice is possible, people can be able to engage in dialogue to counter corrupt practices.

From the foregoing therefore, DCE illuminates people’s engagement, sense of belonging and human interaction regarding affairs of public concern. On the basis of this understanding I will explore Rawls’s public reason, Habermas’s communicative rationality and Benhabib’s democratic iteration to assess how their understandings of deliberation, belonging and iteration in turn to advance a consideration of DC toward public theology.

Democracy and citizenship attracts various conceptual directions. Rawls (1971) presents democracy in terms of public reason. Rawls’s public reason describes how people engage with one another within the public sphere for the purpose of justice. Rawls (1971) describes justice as a balanced moral assessment of social circumstances that require public reason. Rawls views deliberation as public reasoning that is conducted in a community of people who belong together. This deliberation occurs in a just and fair manner. Rawls’s justice is necessitates equal liberty, equal opportunities and redress as illuminated in the principles of justice guiding the basic structure of society. He considers deliberation as an ethical concern. Accordingly, Public theology should help individuals to acknowledge the rights of others and ensure justice for all. This is possible when deliberation process by public theologians is guided by principles of justice. Public reason is possible in communities when citizens are able to cooperate and communicate procedurally on public matters guided by the principles of justice as fairness – in this case, principle of equal liberty and principle of equality of opportunity and difference (Rawls, 1971:60).

First, the principle of greatest equal liberty, also known as the first principle, enunciates constitutional limits on democratic government. This principle states that ‘[e]ach person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others’ (Rawls, 1971:60). This principle designates social systems that outline and secure equal liberties of citizenship and those that establish social and economic inequalities are to succumb to the principle of equal liberty. Secondly, the principle of equality of opportunity and difference states, ‘[s]ocial and economic inequalities are arranged so that they a) reasonably expected to be everyone’s advantage, and b) attached to positions and offices open to all’ (Rawls, 1971:61). This principle relates to the distribution of wealth and income and to the design of organisations that utilise differences in authority and responsibility, or chains of command. This distribution of wealth and

income needs not be equal, but must be to everyone's advantage (Rawls, 1971:61). At the same time, positions of authority and offices must be accessible to all. This second principle can be applied by holding a position open and yet subject to this constraint, which arranges social and economic inequalities so that everyone benefits. These two principles must be accompanied by democratic equality, respect and reciprocity to function in public reason for justice to be fair.

On the other hand, Habermas postulates a theory of communicative action for a democracy that bears the potentials for engaging public theology. The concept of communicative rationality refers to the interaction of two or more competent speakers and actors who can initiate interpersonal relations (Habermas, 1987b:86). These actors pursue an understanding of the particular situation; they do this by negotiating with one another by way of providing valid reasons in order to reach an agreement. Important to this is the interpretation of the central concept of action. The negotiations that take place during this process are crucial because they will determine the model in which a consensus is regulated. Habermas asserts that this process gives language a prominent role. In keeping with Habermas's notion (1987b:4), Pusey (1987:70) affirms that Habermas's intention with the theory of communicative action is to develop 'a model that will show how rationality manifests in ordinary social interaction, communication between speaking and acting subjects' in the public sphere.

To this end, communicative rationality addresses the concern of how language has the ability to coordinate action in a consensual and cooperative way, as opposed to one that is forced or manipulated. Put differently, Habermas theorises how the usage of language in contexts of interaction could produce mutual agreement on a course of action. Consequently, the ability to force agreement can be shown in the likelihood of acting communicatively. On the contrary, Habermas (1987a:286) is not concerned with how arguments are conducted to rationally assess claims of truth or of rightness, rather with the realistic presuppositions that competent speakers and actors make in trying to reach agreement on disputed claims with others. Moreover, he considers as communicative action 'those linguistically mediated interactions in which all participants pursue illocutionary aims, and only illocutionary aims, with their mediating acts of communication' (Habermas, 1987a:19).

In the same vein, the predispositions, prejudices and presuppositions that democratic citizens hold prior to deliberation require subjection to certain cognitive criticisms and capabilities in order to make informed judgments. For such actions to happen, clear communication and understanding are needed to facilitate negotiations for a consensus on the

problem at hand. The appropriate action here is that of understanding what is constructed communicatively.

On this score, public theology needs to be conceptualised in such a way that the content is depicted in a language that will aid better communication and understanding. For citizens to reach an understanding within learning communities there is a need to learn both the skills of communication and the ability to communicate in public. Public Theology as a social practice can be achieved when participants adopt an attitude oriented to reaching understanding and not only success (Habermas, 1987a:286). In this manner, understanding is regarded as the mechanism for coordinating actions (Habermas, 1987a:287).

Communicative action explicates how rationality can be a valuable concept for Public Theology. Being able to communicate by providing reasons in public theological encounters and in planning and management can advance the understanding of public theology for democratic citizenry. Habermas emphasises that the clarity of rationality claims differs depending on their organisational features. Habermas indicates that this communication process requires that participants be free to raise and challenge claims without fear of coercion, intimidation and deceit, and to have equal chances to speak, make assertions, express themselves and make logical argument to challenge others. This process of communication must be relevant to the problem at hand and must provide valid reasons, as well as having an open mind to accepting criticism.

In comparison, Habermas's consensus is not predetermined by the 'original position' as in Rawls's theory of justice as fairness, but is constructed through speech (Chiroma, 2015). However, in a situation in which people cannot reach consensus by way of argumentation, then consensus can be reached through voting. In this process, deliberation must yield a majority that does not discourage the views of minorities. However, should the minority have a better reason for reversing the agreed upon temporary consensus, then they are given the opportunity to offer their reasons without exclusion.

Culture plays an important role in how communicative communities engage with one another to reach consensus. Rationality embedded in cultural values will enhance cognition for dispositions to arrive at an understanding of and a consensus on just laws that guide societies. Habermas (1987b:136) notes that culture is integral to understanding subjects in communicative practice. In the process of communication, subjects may tell their stories from their cultural background as a way of providing justification for their understanding of the problem under discussion. This manner of reasoning allows participants to locate themselves in the life worlds from which they originate and which inform their understanding of a

particular problem. As such, it provides a platform from which interaction can be sustained with all stakeholders as a way of providing reasons for the choice they support to achieve a particular consensus. Allowing cultural stories to be told in decision making may include those that might be excluded from communal decision making. In line with this argument, the notion of rationality as a basis for ascertaining communicative action suggests a particular form of liberalism – a participatory one. Habermas's (1987b:134) conception of good in a cultural sense requires a conception of a collective right to cultural survival as opposed to individual rights assigned by some traditional liberal thought. Habermas suggests that stories from diverse cultures be shared in order to promote participation by all and to sustain cultures, not in the sense of practising the culture in its entirety, but to learn from the good that cultures provide and discard what is irrelevant for contemporary concerns. In this sense, cultures are sustained for their moral good, while at the same time including voices that might otherwise be silenced by excluding cultural narratives. Culture has an important place in deciding what constitutes a good life. Therefore, a communicative process in a liberal sense should view cultural values as normative in decision making. This means that, if cultures are to survive, they must co-exist with the current discourses on democracy and freedoms; and people need make a significant effort to understand the values and cultures of others.

On the whole, Habermas's central argument in communicative action is focused on reaching mutual understanding of inter-subjective relationships between individuals who are socialised through communication and reciprocally recognise one another. Habermas contrasts communicative reason with subject-centred reason and the possibility of communicative reason in the life world. Communicative rationality, according to Habermas, establishes the possibility that we can understand each other and agree on a course of action that is acceptable to all concerned.

Furthermore, Benhabib's theory provides further nuances that hold potentials for DCE for public theology. Benhabib (2011) argues that, to be and to become a self, is to insert oneself into webs of interlocution and recognise the self in relation to others. She also acknowledges a cosmopolitan sense of belonging, because state borders have become porous, so thinking of citizenship beyond the borders of our local society imagines justice for all humanity. She recognises an understanding of the public sphere as the space in which identities and affiliations are negotiated. In addition to these, she provides a deliberative model of democracy, and highlights egalitarian reciprocity, voluntary self-ascription and freedom as an exit to constructing democracy (Benhabib, 1996:69; 2011).

Democratic iteration is a concept built on the issue of the 'right to have rights' a notion that relates to human engagement and DCE (Benhabib,

2011:76). Democratic iteration refers 'to continuing conversations, a complex dialogue, which challenges the assumption of completeness of each culture by making it possible for its members to look at themselves from the perspectives of others' (Benhabib, 2011:76).

Benhabib (2011) uncovers the many schools of thought that declare that universal facts can be discovered and therefore are understood as being in opposition to relativism. Upon her reflection on the existing forms of universalism, Benhabib (2011) distinguishes her position as that of interpreting communicative freedom in relation to the 'right to have rights'. She submits that she is not in search of indubitable foundations for a solid ground upon which to build a fully-fledged theory of human rights, but provides 'a presupposition analyses.' Her contention is that any justification of human rights presupposes some conception of human agency, of human needs, human reason, as well as making some assumptions about the characteristics of our socio-political world. She therefore expands this concept of communicative freedom into an account of human agency and hospitality. Hospitality, for Benhabib (2011:7), captures the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another, and at the same time it involves precarious moments of finding out the intention of the guest in such a way that the guest will be welcomed with some suspicion until the intention is defined – a notion she borrows from Derrida's *hostipitality* – to highlight the risky moments of the first encounter with a stranger when trying to understand his intentions so that one expresses hospitality. She notes that hospitality means recognition of world citizenship that entails world peace through increasing communication between human beings. Thus, cosmopolitanism creates a sense of belonging in the creation of a fresh legal order and public domain in which humans are warranted rights based on their humanity. The implications for hospitality as a democratic practice can enable the church (believers) and society (stranger) to engage in societal ills such as corruption. In this manner, when the church creates hospitable public spaces as a civil society, there is a possibility for encounters that can address corruption as a menace that affect all citizens (common good) for just coexistence.

This section began with the proposition that any form of democracy rests on moral presuppositions relating to the way we conceive the purposes of public theology in addressing corruption. Proponents of DCE use the language of justice, freedom, liberty and rights to describe democracy. In order to explain and account for DCE and to be able to arbitrate the various views, I assessed the structure of moral argumentation for democracy and citizenship. This facilitated the development of a conceptual structure enabling me to assess competing moral democracy views relevant for public theology that can address corruption. The conceptualisation of democracy

and citizenship as conceived in this paper rests on moral assumptions that have to do with the way we conceive of the purposes of public theology in fighting corruption. The theorists discussed in this section use the language of public reason in relation to 'duty', 'rights', 'freedom', 'equal liberty', 'respect', 'redress' and principles of justice (Rawls, 1971); communicative rationality in relation to 'cognitive abilities', 'understanding', 'speaking', 'hearing', 'understanding', 'illocutionary and locutionary effects' and 'interaction'; democratic iteration in relation to the 'right to have rights' and 'cosmopolitanism', 'reflexivity' and 'hospitality', to mention but a few. This implies that for Christians to engage in public spaces in order to address corruption, they need to be active participants in deliberately finding hospitable publics for their voices to be heard regarding societal ills towards justice ends. That is, Christians have equal liberty and freedom to exercise their communicative abilities to speak and to be spoken to, to listen and to be listened to; to understand and to be understood and to engage in the iteration in such a way that their voices contribute to the general decision making for the common good for all those whom they share space.

In order to guide process of conceptualising DCE for public theology that can tenably disrupt corruption, I employed John Rawls's theory of justice as fairness as a concept that validates public reasonableness as a component for DCE for public theology. Second, I used Habermas's theory of communicative action to authenticate communicative rationality as a component and potential of DCE for public theology towards curbing corruption. Third, I analysed Benhabib's notion of democratic iteration that validates our common humanity and rights to advance universality, hospitality and cosmopolitanism in conceptualising DCE for public theology to disrupt corruption.

Fostering on the aforementioned scrutiny, various authors have contended for the persistence of various features that characterise democratic citizenship, but do not deny the transformative form of deliberative and iterative forms of democratic citizenship. The pursuit of constructing a nuanced conception of democratic citizenship is a continuing and dynamic endeavour. In other words, the very act of trying to create a defensible notion of democratic citizenship for public theology in countering corruption in Africa currently, seems almost impossible, however, the very presence of the theoretical attempt in redefining and reconstructing this notion provides optimism for the DCE and public theology.

On the Relevance of Democratic Citizenship for Public Theology in Addressing Corruption

To consider DCE for public theology accounts for the aspirations to advance the concept then set out its articulation in reasonable and persuasive way. A

democratic citizen is one who engages others on the basis of listening and makes judgments about various issues at hand (Waghid, 2018). DCE considers human engagement as essential – that is human engagement entails listening to one another and or persuasive judgements in defence of some form of deliberative mode of human enactment (Waghid, 2018). Following from the exposition of democracy and citizenship above, whether the deliberative processes entails Habermasian communicative rationality, Rawlsian public reason, Benhabibian iteration, or Derridian social encounters, what is significant is human beings performing their individual and collective responsibilities. The next idea connected to democratic citizenship is public theology – to be a public theologian in the first place, implies being brought into a form of human living that recognises what the other does in reaction to himself/herself and others in view of who God is. In a way, being a public theologian in a democracy means to apply wisdom of experiences in the world and to justify to others and oneself as to why one has believed a particular standpoint on a matter or not- this is so with respect to Africa, where corruption, ethnic conflicts and other ills continue to permeate. In this way, public theology seems to be connected to two acts: being in association with others, and engaging and justifying one's understanding in their presences. Magezi, 2018:6 puts it better

Thus public theology acts as a larger social lens that... as an attempt to understand the relation between Christian convictions and the broader social and cultural context. It deals with how the public can be described and how to theologically engage with the public.... is about interpreting and living theological beliefs and values in the public realm. Public theology is about ensuring that theology engages with issues within public spaces and not only within the church.... Theology in the public space manifests in multifarious ways, it is important to assist it with language.... public theology needs to use a common language that is understandable by people outside the Christian tradition... 'translation of the Christian vision to a wider society'... is beyond just theological reflection as it relates to living out theological beliefs and values. It is about life. It entails Christianity that breaks from the closet to be visibly engaged with the public.

Magezi's proposition of Public theology resonates with democratic understanding for instance communicative rationality (Habermas, 1987a), where language, understanding and culture play an important role in public sphere. Therefore, public theology as a democratic practice should connect theology to the public culture, where realities in the public space become

concerns of theology. Thus, public theologian plays a major role in engaging with the public to realign societal ills for justice ends.

There are basic theological themes in scripture that points to democratic citizenship. Such themes as life – which is the essential condition for human activity, human dignity as those who bear life and are created in the image of God, Love as a virtue that guides human relationships. Citizenship connotes identity, belonging and how individual plays his or her part in building a democratic society. Citizenship therefore is the way in which we live together and organise our lives together despite our differences.

The theological basis for DCE can be drawn from the following; first is belief in God who is personal and relational. God purposes to reach out beyond himself to include creation and all that dwells in it. This informs the Christian sense of citizenship as demonstrated in the Trinitarian relationship. Example in scripture can be seen in the lives of Cain and Abel – am I my Brother's Keeper? Love God, love your neighbour, thus building human community (relationships) is not an option but a part of God being. Second, Valuing of the human dignity of the people beyond ourselves is grounded in the way in which the bible describes human beings as bearers of God's image. In biblical understanding this is where human right and responsibilities is a primary concern. What it means to be a good citizen. Third, the 'otherness' is another concern of democracy and citizenship addressed in scripture. The question is how might we treat those who are different from us? For example, in Africa, there are diversities that we are confronted with daily that results into corruption, ethnic violence, xenophobia and violence just to mention a few. The Old Testament command us to "love the stranger" and this is further emphasised in the New Testament concept of the truly global community of the church where diverse nations and cultures can love together in peace and find their unity in Christ who transcends all. Fourth, links democracy in biblical theology is that of Shalom, the Hebrew word for "peace" but which its use in the Old Testament embraces the notions of healing, wholeness the unity of relationships, communal and societal. Christian theology also addresses sin and evil which is so often threatens the peace (Shalom) in the world.

In Africa it can often takes form of corruption that does not work for the common good for the whole society. So the theological position insists that in the life, death and resurrection of Christ, the possibility of redemption and restored harmony in society is possible. For instance, in the bible, severally, Christ demonstrated concern for the poor, the marginalised and the stranger. If society is judged for how it cares for the weakest member of society in Africa, then citizenship should be conceptualised to care for oppressed members of society. So any concern for public theology for

African citizenship needs to focus on this concern. Fifth, is the eschatological dimension of citizenship and democracy in biblical terms is Christians live as good citizens, being committed with their whole heart to being "the salt and light in whatever human society which they are part of. This can be reflected in part on how churches come together with other faiths and civil society for justice, peace and common good for all. Citizenship also depicts belonging to the heavenly Kingdom of God. This kind of belonging provides certain provisions to all current political structures. So Christian needs to become good citizenship while in their societies for such goodness reflects the values of the Kingdom and may lead them to accomplish the great commission.

Potentiality of Democracy and Citizenship Education in countering corruption in Africa

DCE is conceptualised in this paper in relation to an association, and not a matter of quantification. The notions of association values relationships, communication, listening, partnership, support and value for otherness. DCE is closely related to active citizenship in the midst of plural African culture yet display respect for human dignity and the rule of law. So, for public theology to address corruption it needs to take into considerations the various components that democracy represents for a harmonious society. For instance, public theologian should come out and address the corruption in society. The voice of the church needs to be heard in public, especially in ways in which the church uphold justice. It also means that the various teaching approaches used should value democratic values and a sense of co-belonging. The focus of public theology needs to be channelled to the rights of citizens - rights to express opinion freely or the general right to safe space for eliminating corruption in society. Bezuidenhout and Naudé (2002:1) highlight three traits of a public theology: "its mode of argumentation, accessible style of communication, and its focus on contemporary social issues."

Public theology in democratic lenses can also help the church to engage in deliberation about the social inequalities such as corruption. This is because economic issues connect the Christian faith and theology which is so pronounced in African countries. Such engagement will become a culture that encourages equality among all people regardless of their colour, gender, sex and ethnic background.

Conclusion

This paper argued that DCE have the potentiality for public theology. The paper explored how public theology should both turn inward, engaging with concepts and arguments developed in academic public theology, and

References

- Banks, J. 2008. Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher* 37(3), 129-139.
- Benhabib, S. 1996. Towards a deliberative model of democratic legitimacy. In Benhabib, S. (ed.). *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*, pp. 67-94. London: Princeton University Press.
- Benhabib, S. 2011. *Dignity in adversity: Human rights in troubled times*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bezuidenhout, R. and Naudé, P. 2002. Some thoughts on 'public theology' and its relevance for the South African context. *Scriptura* 79 (2002), pp. 3-13
- De Gruchy, J. W. 1997. Christianity and Democracy: Understanding Their Relationship. *Scriptura*. Vol. 62(
- Chiroma, J. (2015). "*Democratic citizenship education and its implications for Kenyan higher education*", Dissertation presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Department of Education Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, Stellenbosch University.
- Chiroma, J. A. 2018. On the [Im]possibility of democratic citizenship education in Kenya: spheres of change. In Waghid, Y. & Davids, N. (Eds.) *African Democratic citizenship education revisited* pp 103-132. Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Habermas, J. 1996. Three normative models of democracy. In Benhabib, S. (ed.). *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*, pp. 21-30. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. 1987a. *The theory of communicative action. Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Transl. Thomas McCarthy). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. 1987b. *The theory of communicative action. Vol. 2: Life world and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (Transl. Thomas McCarthy). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Harris, C. 2005. *Democratic citizenship education in Ireland: Adult learner*. Dublin: Aontas.
- Kenga, C. 2014. *The role of religion in politics and governance in Kenya: a research Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the Degree of Master of arts in International Studies*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies.
- Magezi, V., 2018. 'A public practical-theological response and proposal to decolonisation discourse in South Africa: From #YourStatueMustFall and #MyStatueShouldBeErected to #BothOurStatues ShouldBeErected', *HTS Teologiese Studies/*