The Creeds are the formulas of the confession of faith, that is, that loyalty in the life and mission of the Church. That is, the efforts to be loyal to the Gospel in a given historical moment.

The Confession of Faith is the tool of testimony, it is the answer to the requirement of the mission and, at the same time, both support and theology contained in it is necessarily a missionary theology. It is the result of the encounter between the faith experience and Gospel questioning the human situation and being questioned by it.

The Church Confession of Faith is apostolic (or evangelical) in a double sense: because it has the origin in the apostolic testimony and because it has a missionary purpose, according to which the church has been called.

The loyalty expressed by words in the Creed is legitimated by the loyalty expressed by actions. The confession (homologia) implies commitment, which leads to testimony in the very sense of martyrdom (marturia).

The Confession of faith is legitimated, in the last resort, by the missionary praxis ("the apostolic praxis").

So, the orthodoxy is ruled by its relation to pretend the eternal truths, but by its fidelity to God's action in history and personal human existence.

Orthodoxy - fidelity to the Gospel - is defined by the fidelity of the actions, that supported it, to the Gospel. For this reason, orthodoxy is necessarily tied to orthopraxis.

Orthopraxis is the fulfillment of the faith community (as one) to be loyal, in life and mission, to the Lord. This faithfulness is the proof of orthodoxy (a theology which arranges new life, is not orthodoxy).

This effort to be loyal, is the way of sanctification. Orthodoxy is the continuous searching for the holiness of
words. Orthopraxis is the continuous searching for the
truth of deeds.
Academic theology appears as reflection on that practice
and on the confession of faith that supports it.
The task of academic theology (which is not the only
way to do theology) is to found and systematize that practice and confession,
as a tool of the proclamation and teaching of the
Gospel. Consequently, the academic theology gives the
methodological tools for recognizing, evaluating,
and interpreting the personal and com-

munity's decisions made to fulfill the Church's mission.
The confession of faith is not born from academic theology
but from the missionary practice. Academic theology follows
up practice and confession.

The theology of the confession (confessional theology) is the

spelled out in its queristic preaching, prayer,
songs, liturgy, and formulas of faith affirmation (creeds).
This theology is more narrative than speculative, more
poetic than conceptual. ( "We sing our theology").
The language of faith confession is symbolic, and
so more adequate to religious language.
This symbolically character permits its text to be reinterpreted,
again and again, in renewed historical and existential
situations. Any confession of faith (like the biblical text)
has a reservoir of meaning, which leaves it open to
continuous applications (while the finished
theological systems are closed).
In fact, the confessions of faith (creeds) come to us through many reinterpretations. The evangelical faith we inherit is through the reinterpretation of the Reformers, as was revitalized by the Methodist movement, as was understood by the particular vision of the missionaries who brought to us, with the particular resonance of our own experience. These reinterpretations and many others, which mediate the message of the Gospel, were done with the purpose being loyal to it in changed situations: each one with their own material conditions: economic, political and cultural/ideological.

We are not interested in discussing about the orthodoxy of a given traditional creed (to which we have access only through reinterpretation, already marked by a different social and historical situation). Any reinterpretation and actualization adds new significations to the original sense, and even modifies its operative.

We are interested in tradition as it is operative in the present situation. Especially when a movement is going through a crisis (and this is the situation of the Methodist movement), one goes back to the very fountain to recover the original sense and spirit. But, this cannot be done by mere called conservatism, but through the reappropriation of apler new forms. Orthodoxy only can be recovered through a different prism.

We do not discuss orthodoxy in the air, but in relation with its actualization and re-actualizations.

This reactualization requires reinterpretation. This task implies an exegesis task (i.e. to discover the sense structure which ruled the original situation) and an a
hermeneutical task (i.e., to actualize it in a changed present
structure of meaning)

Any text (as that of the creeds) is inscribed in a structure
with their own particular material conditions: economic,
political and cultural/ideological. We cannot understand
it apart from these conditions. We must try to reconstruct
the original structure to discover the real sense and
descontextualize it. To descontextualize in the present
changed situation. This process (descontext and re-context)
does not mean that the truth is in any moment
independent of these material conditions. In the very
hermeneutical task we are already imposing the presuppositions
of our own present structure.

The encounter of both structures involves the
encounter of two different languages: the language of
the Gospel which is the foundation of our faith, and the
ideological language which we try to understand
and to explain the present reality.

Ideology is the rational taking a position in relation to reality, to serve as point of departure of its understandings and projection in the future.

The ideological content of the confessions of faith is
nothing new, but in situations of crisis and conflict,
quite painful. It is great politicization, it became more
evident. Always from the prophetic times - the confession
of faith meant more than religious questions in fact, the prophets were not religious in the sense we give
the term today, sometimes more, sometimes less consciously
to deny these ideological implications is at best,
vanity and, in the worst, ideological cover. Usually,
So, in any interpretation (exegetical and hermeneutical) we apply the so-called ideological suspicion. This is, the assumption that any previous interpretation and re-interpretation is already marked by the dominant ideology in the moment of its formulation, and that these presuppositions of that ideology are apparent on the fundamental texts of our faith.

This leads us to search for a new hermeneutical key (in the beginning, just methodological) to reinterpret these texts from a different social situation. That is, the re-reading of the text from the point of view of those who usually are only objects, not subjects, of theological reflection, with a renewed understanding of reality and hope.

A new hermeneutical key, only can be forged in a different social praxis, which seeks for fidelity to the Gospel in a situation of dependency, poverty, exploitation and persecution (as most people are experiencing).

On this way, orthopraxis, like orthodoxy, is not only a doctrinal question, but an ideological question too. Doctrine is the language with which we interpret the message of the Gospel. Ideology is the language with which we interpret the present situation. The first is part of our distinct ethos. The second is part of the realm of our common human experience (the realm of prevalent grace?). That requires fidelity, that requires commitment (we believe this two-fold agreement is fundamental in our Methodist heritage).

This commitment overcomes necessary the confessional borders (as nations and parties).
Our experience in the last years (living under repression) led us to understand that differences do not go along denominational or confessional lines, but of trends which go along are issues that run across the different denominations.

These trends have their equivalents in the global society (the realm of common human experience).
The discussions were not, firstly, on doctrinal questions, at all, optical which had to do with the fidelity to the Gospel in this given social situation, in most cases with clear class connotation (when we say class, we say also sexual and racial prejudices). We participate in these discussions, with the proper specificity of our faith, with other people who do not share the same faith, but with whom we share the same struggle for social transformation.
This integrates us in the realm of the common human experience, widening our understanding of ecumenism. (the realm of prevencient grace makes dialogue possible). We found the use Christians make of the term ecumenism is likely non-ecumenical. We initially used to include only the dialogue and relationship between Christians. But the sense of "ecumenism" means to share our house with all people around us.

In this sense, our reinterpretation of the Gospel must be ecumenical. We cannot do theology as though Christians were monarchs or a second class people. This will mean to repeat the error of those who, well intentioned - who, under the two eternal conquests, wanted to impose the Gospel over the rest of the world, without any consideration of their own identity.
We must answer a question: What is the meaning of faith for our people not only for believers but even for non-believers in the searching for a common historical project. How can the Gospel have meaning for indigenous people without destroy his own culture, as the conquist did. Today, when many indians want revive their own ancient religion (as a protest against the Christianity associated with oppression),

An ecumenical theology must be able to reinterpret its confessions of faith, from the encounter in dialogue with a different understanding of the world (in many senses more evangelical than many of that we inherit).

To build up this theology is not only to respect the other, but try to see a the other see. Is not sincerer to or mere superposition of and rites. Is to build up a theology which permits us to be loyal to the Lord in the situation we share with another people; to be engaged with them in the anticipation of the Kingdom of God.

We can not build up this theology without conflict. The struggle for fidelity in this world always was and will be conflictive.

A group of members of the church are doing research on the reason of the actual crisis of the Methodist Church in our country (Argentina).

One of the preliminary hypotheses is that one cause of that is the liberal pluralism in the mentality of our people.

There is a basic disagreement which is consider the fundamental virtue. Each one thinks what he wants and makes what he will." The main sin is not to deny a doctrinal question, but to deny the right to freedom to think and do according to his individual will. All worth, all is all right, even the most contradictory affirmations. This is a misunderstanding of the reformation of Methodism.

This is not to our class situation. Methodism grow up with the climbing middle class.

Crisis was not evident meanwhile were engaged in renewal,
Without criticism of the system. It appears when new models
revision the establishment model (in society, in general, or in the
church, in particular). This situation
with the crossing polarizations the development of 2d revolutionary
premises.
The answer of the institutional church was to deny the
outfit, which already cover an ideological option.
This leads us church to renounce to take decisions on the main
problems. The fear of desintegration by conflict, covered the
us that the real desintegration results of a lack of communication.
The immediate consequences of this situation is the inability
have a shared church project. The phenomenon parallel to
the failure of the leading middle class to propose a
shared national project.
We consider this is a misinterpretation and corruption of
our methoccent heritage. Methodism was an open
movement, but with a clear shared project, with an active
militancy of each member and with an effective discipline.
Methodism, more the orthodoxy, emphasize orthopraxis,
the searching for fidelity to God, in testimony and service,
with the common objective target of "consecrate the World
of Christ."
This leads to the makes impossible to the church to
assume a shared discipline, because there is not a shared militancy

The great contradiction of liberal pluralism is that it
become usually unconsciously; authority. Because
freedom of each to act according to his will favors there
the has power of decision.
This situation has a clear class conclusion: the church
is unable to assume the popular movement. The middle
lies in the church experience as danger the advance
of popular groups.
This has incidence in our conception of ecumenical
counseling. We are ready to call others, but not change ourselves
to give space to them.
This hindrance the possibility to give an organic and strategic answer to secularization, militarization and the appearance of new religious movements, and, overall, to understand the meaning of popular religiosity.

The Methodist Church in Argentina, have born (as the movement itself) in the marginal areas of the cities. To recover the spirit of this origin it must recover its mission in a popular project. This means a liberating historical project, with a consequent and discipline. Of course, is not time for imposed discipline, but a new project requires a discipline defined by the community committed by the same project.

This is, the searching for fidelity to the lord in a new historical project. Only can be a shared confession of faith, in the midst of a shared missionary praxis, and the struggle to anticipate the love, justice and peace of the Kingdom of God.