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Preface

Corruption, impunity and tribalism are the greatest threats to the stability, peace and prosperity in Kenya. The vices have permeated and penetrated the national life like gangrene; imprisoning both the leaders and the led in a vicious circle and entangling every sphere of life like an octopus does its prey.

These vices have led to the desperation and frustration, burdens and baggage, that Kenyans carry on their shoulders every day as they eke a living in the villages, towns and cities. Every minute they pray and toil in the hope that one day, God will deliver them from the yoke of poverty, ignorance and disease and most importantly – from a leadership that worships unjust riches, oppresses the poor and sheds innocent blood.

In this seminal work, Michela Wrong provides us with a graphic portrait of corruption that reveals the axis of evil that suffocates peace and prosperity in Kenya: Corruption, impunity and tribalism. The book tells the story of John Githongo, the former Permanent Secretary for Governance and Ethics in the government of Kenya, a position he served from 2003 - 2005, with an easy and flowing prose that is a must read for all Kenyans. It demonstrates what one man’s contribution to the fight against corruption can achieve, and the painful consequences it unleashes on a whistle blower. The book clearly demonstrates the weaknesses of our national value systems.

The book uses rich African metaphors and imagery to depict the crisis of corruption with statements such as: “It’s our turn to eat”; A pile of “layers of manure”; He is “one of ours”; and “we can’t eat bones when others are eating meat”.

Commenting on the book, the New Black Magazine said: “Michela Wrong has written a book that will change Kenyan history. The sloth, stupidity, prejudice and greed - the complete moral collapse - of our political class is laid bare: our fathers lie naked to the world in all their ugliness. Nothing will ever be the same”.

We in NCCK call upon all the people of Kenya to unite and eliminate corruption and tackle impunity and tribalism. In doing so, we must bear in mind that majority of ordinary Kenyans are bystanders in the drama of corruption but are enjoined by the political leaders to protect them against accountability for sins they have committed alone.

It is my prayer that Kenyans will demonstrate their love and pride in our heritage and do all in their power to fight corruption.

May God bless Kenya!

Rev Canon Peter Karanja
General Secretary
12 June 2009


Corruption in Kenya is not a Problem - It is a Crisis

“And yet, the reason I speak of the freedom that you fought so hard to win is because today that freedom is in jeopardy. It is being threatened by corruption. Corruption is not a new problem. It’s not just a Kenyan problem, or an African problem. It’s a human problem, and it has existed in some form in almost every society. My own city of Chicago has been the home of some of the most corrupt local politics in American history, from patronage machines to questionable elections. In just the last year, our own U.S. Congress has seen a representative resign after taking bribes, and several others fall under investigation for using their public office for private gain.

But while corruption is a problem we all share, here in Kenya it is a crisis – a crisis that’s robbing an honest people of the opportunities they have fought for – the opportunities they deserve.

I know that while recent reports have pointed to strong economic growth in this country, 56% of Kenyans still live in poverty. And I know that the vast majority of people in this country desperately want to change this.

It is painfully obvious that corruption stifles development – it siphons off scarce resources that could improve infrastructure, bolster education systems, and strengthen public health. It stacks the deck so high against entrepreneurs that they cannot get their job-creating ideas off the ground. In fact, one recent survey showed that corruption in Kenya costs local firms 6% of their revenues, the difference between good-paying jobs in Kenya or somewhere else. And corruption also erodes the state from the inside out, sickening the justice system until there is no justice to be found, poisoning the police forces until their presence becomes a source of insecurity rather than comfort.

Corruption has a way of magnifying the very worst twists of fate. It makes it impossible to respond effectively to crises – whether it’s the HIV/AIDS pandemic or malaria or crippling drought.

What’s worse – corruption can also provide opportunities for those who would harness the fear and hatred of others to their agenda and ambitions.

It can shield a war criminal – even one like Felicien Kabuga, suspected of helping to finance and orchestrate the Rwandan genocide – by allowing him to purchase safe haven for a time and robbing all humanity of the opportunity to bring the criminal to justice.
Terrorist attacks – like those that have shed Kenyan blood and struck at the heart of the Kenyan economy – are facilitated by customs and border officers who can be paid off, by police forces so crippled by corruption that they do not protect the personal safety of Kenyans walking the streets of Nairobi, and by forged documents that are easy to find in a climate where graft and fraud thrive.

Some of the worst actors on the international stage can also take advantage of the collective exhaustion and outrage that people feel with official corruption, as we’ve seen with Islamic extremists who promise purification, but deliver totalitarianism. Endemic corruption opens the door to this kind of movement, and in its wake comes a new set of distortions and betrayals of public trust.

In the end, if the people cannot trust their government to do the job for which it exists – to protect them and to promote their common welfare – all else is lost. And this is why the struggle against corruption is one of the greatest struggles of our time.

The good news is that there are already signs of progress here. Willingness to report corruption is increasingly significantly in Kenya. The Kenyan media has been courageous in uncovering and reporting on some of the most blatant abuses of the system, and there has been a growing recognition among people and politicians that this is a critical issue.

Among other things, this recognition resulted in the coalition that came to power in the December elections of 2002. This coalition succeeded by promising change, and their early gestures – the dismissal of the shaky judges, the renewed vigor of the investigation into the Goldenberg scandal, the calls for real disclosure of elected officials’ personal wealth – were all promising.

But elections are not enough. In a true democracy, it is what happens between elections that is the true measure of how a government treats its people.

Today, we’re starting to see that the Kenyan people want more than a simple changing of the guard, more than piecemeal reforms to a crisis that’s crippling their country. The Kenyan people are crying out for real change, and whether one voted orange or banana in last year’s referendum, the message that many Kenyans seemed to be sending was one of dissatisfaction with the pace of reform, and real frustration with continued tolerance of corruption at high levels.

And so we know that there is more work to be done – more reforms to be made. I don’t have all the solutions or think that they’ll be easy, but there are a few places that a country truly committed to reform could start.

We know that the temptation to take a bribe is greater when you’re not making enough on the job. And we also know that the more people there
are on the government payroll, the more likely it is that someone will be encouraged to take a bribe. So if the government found ways to downsize the bureaucracy – to cut out the positions that aren’t necessary or useful – it could use the extra money to increase the salary of other government officials.

Of course, the best way to reduce bureaucracy and increase pay is to create more private sector jobs. And the way to create good jobs is when the rules of a society are transparent – when there’s a clear and advertised set of laws and regulations regarding how to start a business, what it takes to own property, how to go about getting a loan – there is less of a chance that some corrupt bureaucrat will make up his own rules that suit only his interests. Clarifying these rules and focusing resources on building a judicial system that can enforce them and resolve disputes should be a primary goal of any government suffering from corruption.

In addition, we know that the more information the public is provided with, the easier it will be for your Kenyan brothers and sisters our in the villages to evaluate whether they are being treated fairly by their public servants or not. Wealth declarations do little good if no one can access them, and accountability in government spending is not possible if no one knows how much was available and allocated to a given project in the first place.

Finally, ethnic-based tribal politics has to stop. It is rooted in the bankrupt idea that the goal of politics or business is to funnel as much of the pie as possible to one’s family, tribe, or circle with little regard for the public good. It stifles innovation and fractures the fabric of the society. Instead of opening businesses and engaging in commerce, people come to rely on patronage and payback as a means of advancing. Instead of unifying the country to move forward on solving problems, it divides neighbor from neighbor.

An accountable, transparent government can break this cycle. When people are judged by merit, not connections, then the best and brightest can lead the country, people will work hard, and the entire economy will grow – everyone will benefit and more resources will be available for all, not just select groups.

Of course, in the end, one of the strongest weapons your country has against corruption is the ability of you, the people, to stand up and speak out about the injustices you see. The Kenyan people are the ultimate guardians against abuses.

The world knows the names of Wangari Maathai and John Githongo, who are fighting against the insidious corruption that has weakened Kenya. But there are so many others, some of whom I’m meeting during my visit here – Betty Murungi, Ken Njau, Jane Onyango, Maina Kiai, Milly Odhiombo, and Hussein Khalid. As well as numerous Kenyan
men and women who have refused to pay bribes to get civil servants to perform their duties; the auditors and inspectors general who have done the job before them accurately and fairly, regardless of where the facts have led; the journalist who asked questions and pushed for answers when it may have been more lucrative to look the other way, or whip up a convenient fiction. And then there are anonymous Kenyan whistleblowers who show us what is, so that we can all work together to demand what should be. 

By rejecting the insulting idea that corruption is somehow a part of Kenyan culture, these heroes reveal the very opposite – they reveal a strength and integrity of character that can build a great country, a great future. By focusing on building strong independent institutions – like an anti-corruption commission with real authority – rather than cults of personality, they make a contribution to their country that will last longer than their own lives. They fight the fight of our time.

Looking out at this crowd of young people, I have faith that you will fight this fight too.

You will decide if the standards and the rules will be the same for everyone – regardless of ethnicity or of wealth.

And you will determine the direction of this country in the 21st century – whether the hard work of the many is lost to the selfish desires of a few, or whether you build an open, honest, stronger Kenya where everyone rises together. This is the Kenya that so many who came before you envisioned – all those men and women who struggled and sacrificed and fought for the freedom you enjoy today.

I know that honoring their memory and making that freedom real may seem like an impossible task – an effort bigger than you can imagine – but sometimes all it takes to move us there is doing what little you can to right the wrongs you see”.

**Senator Barrack Obama (now President Barrack Obama), Speech Delivered at the University of Nairobi, in September 2006**
How to Use the Study Guide

This study guide is meant for both individual and group use. It is structured in such a way that some passages are quoted from the book It’s Our Turn To Eat followed by probing questions to ensure that the reader has understood and internalized the message in that section. That is then followed by a Bible passage that has a related or similar message, accompanied by discussion questions on the same.

For best results, study the two passages (from the book and from the Bible) together.

Notes for the Leader

To get the most out of it as a group, the leader needs to adequately prepare before the study time. Below are few hints to lead the discussion.

Before the Meeting

1. Study the passage prayerfully until God has spoken to you through it.
2. Go through the questions and study to learn what God may be saying to you personally and to the group. In this guide you will find three types of questions.
   - Observation - Questions of facts from the passage.
   - Interpretation - Questions of the meaning or understanding of the facts.
   - Application - Questions on personal or group application of the lessons learnt.
3. Pray for both the study and each individual in your group.

During the Meeting

1. Create a free and cheerful atmosphere where each member feels free to participate.
2. Have the passage read aloud by one or more members.
3. Make a brief introduction to the study. (One is included at the beginning of each study)
4. Proceed with the questions. Be flexible. Rephrase questions if need be, but keep the discussion centered on the passage.
5. Watch the time so that you cover the study adequately and have time for prayer and sharing.

Remember

It is important to spend enough time observing the text in order to answer interpretation and application questions meaningfully.

6. Aim at each member leaving the study with at least one specific application.
7. Encourage members to prepare individually for the next study.
After the Meeting

1. Be sensitive to any needs of members that should be attended to and make any necessary follow up.

2. Encourage members to meet each other informally during the week and share their experience.

The bible study passages in this study are based on the New International Version of the Bible. The actual wording of various verses may vary depending on the version of the Bible you are using.

Notes for the Members

For your small group to grow and build itself up, each member must do his/her part. Here are some suggestions:

1. Prepare

   a. The group Study-
      Going through the study questions beforehand will lead you into a deeper personal discovery of truth. This will help you relate God’s word more to your life. It will also help you to be a better participant rather than a spectator during the group discussion.

   b. Daily quiet time
      Your own personal walk with God will greatly affect the group. Reading and meditating upon the Scriptures daily will make you a better member.

   c. Your heart
      The group study may be exciting or boring depending on your attitude. Always come with an expectant and joyful spirit and contribute toward making it not only worthwhile but refreshing too.

2. Participate

   a. In the Discussion
      Each member’s discoveries are important. Even if you are shy, take courage to speak. If you are talkative, let others speak first.

   b. In the Groups Activities
      The small group includes more than Bible study. It also includes Prayer, Fellowship and Witness. Do your part to encourage each other.

   c. With one another
      Try to know one other member well, perhaps as a prayer partner.

3. Pray
Above all else, pray for your group, your leader, and yourself so that together, you will overcome corruption. Finally pray for Kenya so that Justice shall be our Shield and Defender and Plenty shall be Found Within our Borders.
Chapter 1

The Big Man

Introduction
When the time comes for leaders to leave office and pave way for others, there are mixed feelings. Some leaders resist leaving office, while others leave in a huff that may easily destabilize the institution. When the British left Kenya, there were ceremonies to mark the establishment of the independent government of Kenya. The Union Jack (British flag) was lowered and in its place, the Kenyan flag was hoisted, not just in Uhuru Gardens, but also on top of Mt Kenya. In 1978, the transition from President Kenyatta to President Moi happened when the former was dead, so there was no ceremony to mark the event. In 2002, the transition from President Moi to President Kibaki took place when both of them were present at Uhuru Park. It was the first transition that Kenyans witnessed, but is that how transitions should go?

Quote from the Book
‘It was amazing thing, for one moment in a hundred years, to all feel the same way. And to feel that it was good’. Kenyan writer Binyavanga Wainana

Kibaki was followed by the outgoing Moi, ornate ivory baton clutched in one hand, trademark rosebud in the lapel of a slate-grey suit, face expressionless. Later, it was said the generals had gone to Moi when it became clear which way the election was going and offered to stage a coup. In his prime, his hold on the nation had been so tight, cynics had quipped, ‘L’état, c’est Moi.’ But the Old Man had waved the generals wearyly away, aware such times were past, Kenya was no longer destined to follow such clichéd African lines.

Eyes yellow and unreadable, Moi took his salute and delivered his last presidential speech without a hint of bitterness, hailing the rival by his side as ‘a man of integrity’. This former schoolteacher’s presidency had
been an exercise in formalism, and he was determined to fulfill this last, painful role impeccably. But the mob showed no mercy - those watching the ends of Africa’s dinosaur leaders never do. What fun, after a quarter-century of respectful forelock-tugging, to be able to let rip. 'Bye bye,' they jeered. 'Go away.' Others sang: ‘Everything is possible without Moi,’ a pastiche of the ‘Everything is possible with faith’ gospel sung in church. In the crowd, someone brandished a sign: ‘KIBAKI IS OUR MOSES’. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p.4)

**Questions**

1. What are the main events and actors in this passage?

2. In your view, how did the following people handle the transition?
   a. Former President Daniel Moi
   b. President Mwai Kibaki

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage with regard to transitions in our families, places of work, and the country?

**Samuel’s Farewell Speech** Samuel 12: 1-7

**Introduction**

Transitions are difficult time not just for the leaders, but also for the people they lead. Transitions reveal latent weaknesses, fears and attitudes that underlie legacy of the leader. The Bible offers us some valuable lessons on how to transit from one leader to another. Let us study the story of Samuel.

1 Samuel said to all Israel, "I have listened to everything you said to me and have set a king over you. 2 Now you have a king as your leader. As for me, I am old and gray, and my sons are here with you. I have been your leader from my youth until this day. 3 Here I stand. Testify against me in the presence of the LORD and his anointed. Whose ox have I taken? Whose donkey have I taken? Whom have I cheated? Whom have I oppressed? From whose hand have I accepted a bribe to make me shut my eyes? If I have done any of these, I will make it right." 4 “You have not cheated or oppressed us,” they replied. “You have not taken anything from anyone’s hand.”

5 Samuel said to them, “The LORD is witness against you, and also his anointed is witness this day, that you have not found anything in my hand.” “He is witness,” they said. 6 Then Samuel said to the people, “It is the LORD who appointed Moses and Aaron and brought your forefathers up out of Egypt. 7 Now then, stand here, because I am going to confront you with evidence before the LORD as to all the righteous acts performed by the LORD for you and your fathers..."
Questions
1. What are the main events and actors in this passage?

2. a. What is the significance of verse 3 and 4 in the passage?

   b. What kind of answers would our leaders get from the public if they posed the same questions Samuel asked?

3. What lessons can you draw from the passage in relation to

   a. Your personal character

   b. Your family

   c. Your church

   d. Your nation
Chapter 2

Unreal Guest

Introduction

Life sometimes presents dilemmas and cross roads. When one is caught between a rock and a hard place, their true characters emerge. The role of character especially when one has to put his life on the line is of paramount importance. The decision to choose between consistency and inconsistency, life and death, integrity and compromise, pal or pariah, stares you in the face. Upholding integrity especially in a corrupt and highly divided society such as Kenya takes more than principles, it takes courage. Let us learn from the experience of John Githongo.

Quote from the Book

“If you are walking in the savannah and a lion attacks, climb a thorn tree and wait for a while”. Kamba proverb

He came bearing toxic material. A nervous tremor scurried along my spine as he explained that he had done the unthinkable, wiring himself for sound in classic police informer style, taping the self-incriminating conversations of the ministers who were supposed to be his trusted workmates. The explosive contents of those recordings had been systematically downloaded onto his computer, which now sat quietly in my spare bedroom. ‘It might be an idea,’ he said, ‘for me to find a third party to take the computer while I work out what I’m going to do’. (Michela Wrong, Its Our Turn To Eat, p. 21)
As far as I could see, there were only two options. Option One: Leave government employment and keep quiet. Give the tapes and Computer material – your insurance policy against assassination – to a British lawyer, along with firm instructions that should anything happen to you, they will be released to the press. Make these arrangements clear to those in power, and assure them you will never give another media interview in your life and will never go into politics. Work abroad, go into academia, get married to your long-suffering girlfriend and wait for the affair to die down. Eventually, maybe five years down the line, you will be able to return to Kenya, and while ordinary folk will look at you with a certain cynicism and think, ‘I wonder what he knew?’, most will respect your discretion and commonsense. No man can single-handedly transform a system, and you will be joining the ranks of former civil servants with clanking skeletons in their cupboards. Your conscience may occasionally trouble you, and you will have to acknowledge that you tried and failed. But you will have got your life back.

Option Two was bleaker, more dramatic, and fitted straight into that Hollywood thriller genre. Lance the boil, go public. Blow the government you once passionately believed in out of the water and say what you know. People who matter may hate you for all eternity. You may never be able to go home again, your family and friends may suffer by association, your colleagues may regard you as a traitor, but you will have done the right, the upstanding thing, and lived up to the principles that have governed your life. You will have shown the world that others may do as they please, but as far as you are concerned, ‘Africa’ and ‘corruption’ are not synonymous (Michela Wrong, Its Our Turn To Eat, p. 28-29)

Questions
1. Describe the options and their consequences that Githongo had and the one he took as described in the passage.

2. a. In your view, which of the two options was the best and why?

   b. In your opinion, were the means used by Githongo to collect information on corruption justified?

3. Have you ever found yourself in situations that require you to make hard choices? What decision did you make and why? What lessons do we learn from this passage?

John the Baptist Beheaded  Mark 6:14-29

14King Herod heard about this, for Jesus' name had become well known. Some were saying, “John the Baptist has been raised from the dead, and that is why miraculous powers are at work in him.” 15Others said, “He is Elijah.” And still others claimed, “He is a prophet, like one of the prophets of long ago.” 16But when Herod heard this, he said, “John, the man I beheaded, has been raised from the dead!”

17For Herod himself had given orders to have John arrested, and he had him bound and put in prison. He did this because of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, whom he had married. 18For John had been saying to Herod, “It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife.” 19So Herodias nursed a grudge against John and wanted to kill him. But she was not able to, because Herod feared John and protected him, knowing
him to be a righteous and holy man. When Herod heard John, he was greatly puzzled; yet he liked to listen to him.

21Finally the opportune time came. On his birthday Herod gave a banquet for his high officials and military commanders and the leading men of Galilee. 22When the daughter of Herodias came in and danced, she pleased Herod and his dinner guests. The king said to the girl, “Ask me for anything you want, and I’ll give it to you.” 23And he promised her with an oath, “Whatever you ask I will give you, up to half my kingdom.” 24She went out and said to her mother, “What shall I ask for?” “The head of John the Baptist,” she answered. 25At once the girl hurried in to the king with the request: “I want you to give me right now the head of John the Baptist on a platter.” 26The king was greatly distressed, but because of his oaths and his dinner guests, he did not want to refuse her. 27So he immediately sent an executioner with orders to bring John’s head. The man went, beheaded John in the prison, 28and brought back his head on a platter. He presented it to the girl, and she gave it to her mother. 29On hearing of this, John’s disciples came and took his body and laid it in a tomb.

Questions
1. Describe the main events and actors in the passage.

2. a. What do you think verse 18 means?
   b. Was John justified to make such an embarrassing and personal accusation against the King? Explain.

3. a. Cite similarities between Githongo and John the Baptist
   b. Have you ever been in similar circumstances as John the Baptist? What did you do? What practical lessons do you draw from the passage?
Chapter 3

Starting Afresh

Introduction
When taking over a new office, one of the essentials is to change the working environment. When he was appointed the Permanent Secretary for Governance and Ethics, Githongo made several changes in the staff establishment by replacing the workers allocated to him with others he preferred to work with. Whereas each leader requires to work with a team he can trust, does that justify sacking or transferring existing staff? What can we learn from Githongo’s action as he set up his office in State House, Nairobi?

Quote from the Book
“Youth gives all it can: It gives itself without reserve.” Josemaria Escriva, founder of the Opus Dei
The first thing John did was to eliminate the traces of Kibaki’s predecessor. Moi’s official photo came down, replaced by a large one of Kibaki – ‘I was very proud of the president’ – and a calendar from the Japanese embassy. The civil servants assigned to the department his office replaced – run by a former Moi speechwriter – were sent packing. ‘I got rid of all the staff, with the exception of the driver. These guys’ loyalties were clear. And in any case, I wanted to get some members of civil society in to lend a hand.’ John had an inkling of how institutions and structures can end up insidiously moulding behaviour, rather than the other way round. When the administration assigned him one of Moi’s official cars, a dark-blue BMW, he tried driving it around for a day and then returned it, too ill-at-ease to continue.

In came the new team: seven specialists in human rights, governance and the law, picked to roughly reflect Kenya’s ethnic diversity. ‘Our office was very young. John was the oldest, and he was barely forty,’ remembers Lisa Karanja, a barrister and women’s rights expert recruited from Human Rights Watch’s New York office. With youth, recalls Karanja, came irreverence, absence of hierarchy, and a deliberate adoption of the informal working practices of the non-governmental world from whence so many of the staff hailed. ‘We
were like an NGO at the heart of government. People would get very shocked, coming into the office, to see John making me a cup of coffee. Here was this powerful man – because he did hold a position of huge influence – and we were calling him “John”. The contrast between these new arrivals' breezy directness and other government departments – male-dominated, obsequious and bound by etiquette – was swiftly felt. ‘You’d go to meetings with government officials and it would be “your honourable this”, “your honourable that” and “all protocols observed” before every speech, all this bowing and scraping,’ remembers Karanja. ‘I was ticked off at one point for not showing enough respect when I corrected someone who made a legal point I knew was wrong. John had to intervene and say, “Look, she’s not here just for decoration. She’s not a child.”’ (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 35)

Questions
1. What are the main actions that John takes in the passage?

2. What is the significance the choices he made regarding his new staff? Was he justified to act the way he did? Explain.

3. What lessons do we learn from John’s actions?

Josiah Renews the Covenant 2 Kings 23: 4 - 20

Josiah brought all the priests from the towns of Judah and desecrated the high places, from Geba to Beersheba, where the priests had burned incense. He broke down the shrines at the gates—at the entrance to the Gate of Joshua, the city governor, which is on the left of the city gate. Although the priests of the high places did not serve at the altar of the LORD in Jerusalem, they ate unleavened bread with their fellow priests.

He desecrated Topheth, which was in the Valley of Ben Hinnom, so no one could use it to sacrifice his son or daughter in the fire to Molech. He removed from the entrance to the temple of the LORD the horses that the kings of Judah had dedicated to the sun. They were in the court near the room of an official named Nathan-Melech. Josiah then burned the chariots dedicated to the sun.
12 He pulled down the altars the kings of Judah had erected on the roof near the upper room of Ahaz, and the altars Manasseh had built in the two courts of the temple of the LORD. He removed them from there, smashed them to pieces and threw the rubble into the Kidron Valley. 13 The king also desecrated the high places that were east of Jerusalem on the south of the Hill of Corruption—the ones Solomon king of Israel had built for Ashtoreth the vile goddess of the Sidonians, for Chemosh the vile god of Moab, and for Molech [C] the detestable god of the people of Ammon. 14 Josiah smashed the sacred stones and cut down the Asherah poles and covered the sites with human bones.

15 Even the altar at Bethel, the high place made by Jeroboam son of Nebat, who had caused Israel to sin—even that altar and high place he demolished. He burned the high place and ground it to powder, and burned the Asherah pole also. 16 Then Josiah looked around, and when he saw the tombs that were there on the hillside, he had the bones removed from them and burned on the altar to defile it, in accordance with the word of the LORD proclaimed by the man of God who foretold these things.

17 The king asked, “What is that tombstone I see?” The men of the city said, “It marks the tomb of the man of God who came from Judah and pronounced against the altar of Bethel the very things you have done to it.” 18 “Leave it alone,” he said. “Don’t let anyone disturb his bones.” So they spared his bones and those of the prophet who had come from Samaria. 19 Just as he had done at Bethel, Josiah removed and defiled all the shrines at the high places that the kings of Israel had built in the towns of Samaria that had provoked the LORD to anger. 20 Josiah slaughtered all the priests of those high places on the altars and burned human bones on them. Then he went back to Jerusalem.

Questions
1. What are the main events in the passage?

2. a. What is the significance of the King's actions?

   b. What is the significance of verses 16 - 20?

3. When we assume new offices and responsibilities, should we do as King Josiah did? In what ways?
Chapter 4

Mucking out the Augean Stables

Introduction
Kenya has a long history of corruption, impunity and tribalism. Corruption old and new is the same. It subverts the course of justice and violates the rule of law. For example, a leader in Kenya loots public money and invests it for the benefit of his wife and children. When he is caught and asked to account for it, he runs back to his community and claims his tribe is about to be finished or their is a witch hunt on his tribe. Most Kenyans believe such leaders. Why is this so? Should such leaders be celebrated by Kenyans, or should they be turned into pariahs and enemies of the people? But more importantly, we as Kenyans need to decide whether we want to view corruption as a good thing, or as a rotten practice that should be eliminated.

Quote from the Book
The shocking rot of Nairobi’s main market was exposed yesterday when it was revealed that 6,000 rats were killed in last week’s cleanup exercise - and an equal number made good their escape. Wakulima Market,
through which a majority of Nairobi’s three million residents get their food, had not been cleaned for thirty years. So filthy was it that traders who had been at the market daily for decades were shocked to see that below the muck, they have been wading, there was tarmac. More than 750 tonnes of garbage was removed and more than seventy tonnes of fecal waste sucked out of the horror toilets”. *East African Standard, 4 January 2005.*

Rather than a pile of manure, corruption in Kenya resembled one of the giant rubbish dumps that form over the decades in Nairobi’s slums. Below the top layer of garbage, picked over by goats, marabou storks and families of professional scavengers, lies another layer of detritus. And another. With the passage of time the layers, weighed down from above, become stacked like the pastry sheets of a *millefeuille,* a historical record no archaeologist wants to explore. Each stratum has a slightly different consistency – the garbage trucks brought mostly plastics and cardboard that week, perhaps, less household waste and more factory refuse – but it all smells identical, letting off vast methane sighs as it settles and shifts, composting down to something approaching soil. The sharp stink of chicken droppings, the cabbagy reek of vegetable rot, the dull grey stench of human effluvia blend with the smoke from charcoal fires and the haze of burning diesel to form a pungent aroma – ‘Essence of Slum’, a perfumier might call it – that clings to shoes and permeates the hair.

As Kenya has modernised, so its sleaze has mutated, a new layer of graft shaped to match each layer of economic restructuring and political reconfiguration. ‘In Kenya, corruption doesn’t go away with reform, it just migrates,’ says Wachira Maina, a constitutional lawyer and analyst. But under all the layers, at the base of the giant mound, lies the same solid bedrock: Kenyans’ dislocated notion of themselves. The various forms of graft cannot be separated from the people’s vision of existence as a merciless contest, in which only ethnic preference offers hope of survival (Michela Wrong, *It’s our Turn To Eat,* P. 41 - 42).

Questions

1. Describe the scenarios depicted in this passage in your own words.

2. a) Describe the layers of corruption in Kenyan?

   b) “In Kenya, corruption does not go away with reform, it migrates”. Is this a correct depiction of corruption in Kenya? Explain.

3. What lessons can we learn from the passage?
The word of the LORD came to me: 2 “What do you people mean by quoting this proverb about the land of Israel: “The fathers eat sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge”? 3 “As surely as I live, declares the Sovereign LORD, you will no longer quote this proverb in Israel. 4 For every living soul belongs to me, the father as well as the son—both alike belong to me. The soul who sins is the one who will die. 5 “Suppose there is a righteous man who does what is just and right. 6 He does not eat at the mountain shrines or look to the idols of the house of Israel. He does not defile his neighbor’s wife or lie with a woman during her period. 7 He does not oppress anyone, but returns what he took in pledge for a loan. He does not commit robbery but gives his food to the hungry and provides clothing for the naked. 8 He does not lend at usury or take excessive interest. He withholds his hand from doing wrong and judges fairly between man and man. 9 He follows my decrees and faithfully keeps my laws. That man is righteous; he will surely live, declares the Sovereign LORD.

Question
1. List the sins mentioned in the passage?

2. Whose sin will you be judged by as:
   a. An individual
   b. As a tribe or family.

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?

Sharing the National Cake
Analyst Gerard Prunier has christened Kenya’s post-independence system of rule a form of ‘ethno-elitism’. 7 A pattern of competing ethnic elites, rotating over time, was established which made a mockery of the notion of equal opportunity. This was viewed as a zero-sum game, with one group’s gain inevitably entailing another’s loss. In Francophone Africa, the approach is captured in one pithy phrase: ‘Ote-toi de la, que je m’y mette’ – ‘Shift yourself, so I can take your place.’ In Anglophone Africa, the expression is cruder, bringing to mind snouts rooting in troughs: ‘It’s our turn to eat.’ Given how unfairly resources had been distributed under one ethnically-biased administration after another, starting with the white settlers, each succeeding regime felt justified in being just as partisan – it was only redressing the balance, after all. The new incumbent was expected to behave like some feudal overlord, stuffing the civil service with his tribesmen and sacking those from his predecessor’s region. When no one shows magnanimity, generosity dries up across the board.
It’s actually possible to quantify the ‘Our Turn to Eat’ approach in terms of parliamentary seats, ministerial positions and jobs in the state sector, as each regime doled out appointments to those deemed in the fold. According to one study, during the Kenyatta era, the Kikuyu, who accounted for 20.8 per cent of the population, claimed between 28.6 and 31.6 per cent of cabinet seats – far more than their fair share – while the Kalenjin, accounting for 11.5 per cent of the population, held only between 4.8 and 9.6 per cent. With Moi’s arrival, the Kikuyu share of cabinet posts fell to just 4 per cent, while the Kalenjin’s share soared to 22 per cent. It was a similar story with permanent secretaries, where the Kikuyu went from 37.5 per cent under Kenyatta to 8.7 per cent under Moi, while the Kalenjin went from 4.3 per cent to 34.8 per cent. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, P. 52)

Questions
1. What are the main observations, perceptions and conclusions depicted by the writer in the passage?

2. ‘Shift yourself, so I can take your place”; ‘Our Turn to Eat’. What is the meaning of these statements? Are these true and fair statements of leadership in Kenya?

3. What lessons can we draw from this passage?

There is now no Jews or Gentiles in Christ Acts 15: 5-12

5Then some of the believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees stood up and said, “The Gentiles must be circumcised and required to obey the law of Moses.”

6The apostles and elders met to consider this question. 7After much discussion, Peter got up and addressed them: “Brothers, you know that some time ago God made a choice among you that the Gentiles might hear from my lips the message of the gospel and believe. 8God, who knows the heart, showed that he accepted them by giving the Holy Spirit to them, just as he did to us. 9He made no distinction between us and them, for he purified their hearts by faith. 10Now then, why do you try to test God by putting on the necks of the disciples a yoke that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? 11No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are.” 12The whole assembly became silent as they listened to Barnabas and Paul telling about the miraculous signs and wonders God had done among the Gentiles through them.

Rules for Holy Living Colossians 3:5 - 11

5 Put to death, therefore, whatever belongs to your earthly nature: sexual immorality, impurity, lust, evil desires and greed, which is idolatry. 6 Because of these, the wrath of God is coming. 7 You used to walk in these ways, in the life you once lived. 8 But now you must also rid yourselves of all such things as these: anger, rage, malice, slander, and filthy language from your lips. 9 Do not lie to each other, since you have taken off your old self with its practices 10 and have put on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge in the image of its Creator. 11 Here there is no Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all.
Therefore, as God’s chosen people, holy and dearly loved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience. Bear with each other and forgive one another if any of you has a grievance against someone. Forgive as the Lord forgave you. And over all these virtues put on love, which binds them all together in perfect unity.

Questions
1. a. What were the disputes addressed in the Acts 15: 5 – 12 meeting?
   
b. What were the solutions adopted by the meeting?

2. a. “Here there is no Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all”. What does this verse (Col 3:11) mean? How can it be applied in Kenya?
   
b. What are the general stereotypes, attitudes and perceptions expressed by Kenyans against people from other tribes?
   
c. What role do these stereotypes, attitudes and perceptions play in enhancing or destroying national cohesion and integration? Explain.

3. What lessons can we draw from the passages?
Chapter 5

Dazzled by the Light

Introduction
Leadership can be viewed in three aspects.
(1) The person of a leader: this entails the conduct and the character;
(2) The position of a leader: this entails the power bestowed on a leader; and
(3) The people of a leader: this encompasses the key persons around the leader and also the whole population.

One of the primary responsibilities of leadership is resolving problems when they occur in the lives of the people. If, How and When action is taken on problems or issues depends on the leader, who, as we saw above, is influenced by the people around him / her. From the relationships created between a leader and his people, one can decide on what to do - to either rectify a problem, to keep silent or to quit. Are we leaders that can discern the problem and act accordingly?

Quote from the Book
“Africans are the most subservient people on earth when faced with force, intimidation, power. Africa, all said and done, is a place where we grovel before leaders”. John Githongo, Executive Magazine, 1994.

As a journalist, John had railed against two weaknesses he saw as intrinsic to his continent’s predicament: the extraordinary deference African societies traditionally show their elders, and their meek passivity when confronted by rulers ready to use violence to remain at the helm. Moi, famously, had instructed his ministers to ‘sing like parrots’. ‘You ought to sing the song I sing,’ the president had told his cabinet. ‘If I put a full stop, you should also put a full stop. That way the country will move forward.’ The crudeness of the
order, the exhortation to abandon all critical thought, argued John, exposed a humiliating respect for
power for its own sake. Yet now that he was within the citadel, both insights momentarily eluded him.
‘There was a reverential tone in John’s voice when he talked about Kibaki,’ remembers Rasna Warah, a
columnist for the Nation and an old acquaintance. ‘It would be “the president thinks this”, “the president
wants that”, never just “Kibaki”. It was a tone of total awe, as though the man had become a living saint.’...
(Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat. 67)

It may have been a case of the ultimate idealist meeting the ultimate pragmatist, but John did not recognise
the gulf in perspectives. Bonding with Kibaki came disconcertingly easily. A politician with none of Moi’s
instinctive understanding for the ordinary wananchi, Kibaki was an unrepentant intellectual snob. Whereas
Moi, the former headmaster, was regarded as a leader who ‘knew how to talk to Kenyans with mud between
their toes’, Kibaki was more likely to hail them as ‘pumbavu’ – fools. He recognised and respected the
rigorous quality of thought in the young man, who had strayed into State House at more or less the same
age Kibaki himself had ventured into politics. There was also a certain inbuilt familiarity to the relationship.
John’s accountant father had campaigned on behalf of Kibaki’s Democratic Party, and while the Kibaki and
Githongo families were not exactly intimate, their children had gone to the same schools, they shared the
same faith, they belonged to the same patrician milieu.

In any case, affability came naturally to Kibaki, who possessed none of Moi’s gruff abrasiveness. While
other men commanded loyalty through the commanding magnetism of their personalities, Kibaki’s style
was one of diffuse, woolly bonhomie. He had always shrunken from making enemies, the head-on collision.
‘He’s a very unstuffy guy, very laid back and easy to shoot the breeze with,’ John remembers. The two
regularly breakfasted together, and there were also many dinners, just the two of them tête-à-tête. Kibaki
felt relaxed enough in John’s company to sit with him in the presidential bedroom, discussing politics, the
price of oil, world affairs – never anything personal. In John’s slightly star-struck eyes – who, after all, could
spend quite so much time near the nation’s most important man without feeling a little giddy? – the
president came to assume the role of alternative father figure, favourite uncle. If John used the respectful
‘Mzee’ (Elder) when addressing the president, Kibaki addressed his anti-corruption chief as ‘Kijana’ –
‘young man’, a term that almost always comes tinged with paternal affection. ‘I used to think that relationship
was very special. I had a huge amount of affection for Kibaki. Then I realised Kibaki was like that with
everyone.’ Looking back, John would come to realise that he had allowed himself – as the overly cerebral
often do – to be beguiled as much by a symbol as an individual. ‘At that time, everyone was dancing.
Everyone was right to dance.’ Encapsulating the hope of a jubilant post-Moi nation, what Kibaki represented
was more important than who he actually was (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 69).

Questions
1. What kind of a relationship is there between John and President Kibaki?

2. Compare and contrast the character and leadership styles of President Kibaki and former President,
Moi.

3. What lessons can we draw from this passage?
Nehemiah Helps the Poor - Nehemiah 5:1-19

1 Now the men and their wives raised a great outcry against their Jewish brothers. 2 Some were saying, “We and our sons and daughters are numerous; in order for us to eat and stay alive, we must get grain.” 3 Others were saying, “We are mortgaging our fields, our vineyards and our homes to get grain during the famine.”

4 Still others were saying, “We have had to borrow money to pay the king’s tax on our fields and vineyards.
5 Although we are of the same flesh and blood as our countrymen and though our sons are as good as theirs, yet we have to subject our sons and daughters to slavery. Some of our daughters have already been enslaved, but we are powerless, because our fields and our vineyards belong to others.”

6 When I heard their outcry and these charges, I was very angry. 7 I pondered them in my mind and then accused the nobles and officials. I told them, “You are exacting usury from your own countrymen!” So I called together a large meeting to deal with them 8 and said: “As far as possible, we have bought back our Jewish brothers who were sold to the Gentiles. Now you are selling your brothers, only for them to be sold back to us!” They kept quiet, because they could find nothing to say.

9 So I continued, “What you are doing is not right. Shouldn’t you walk in the fear of our God to avoid the reproach of our Gentile enemies? 10 I and my brothers and my men are also lending the people money and grain. But let the exacting of usury stop! 11 Give back to them immediately their fields, vineyards, olive groves and houses, and also the usury you are charging them—the hundredth part of the money, grain, new wine and oil.”

12 “We will give it back,” they said. “And we will not demand anything more from them. We will do as you say.” Then I summoned the priests and made the nobles and officials take an oath to do what they had promised. 13 I also shook out the folds of my robe and said, “In this way may God shake out of his house and possessions every man who does not keep this promise. So may such a man be shaken out and emptied!” At this the whole assembly said, “Amen,” and praised the LORD. And the people did as they had promised.

14 Moreover, from the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes, when I was appointed to be their governor in the land of Judah, until his thirty-second year—twelve years—neither I nor my brothers ate the food allotted to the governor. 15 But the earlier governors—those preceding me—placed a heavy burden on the people and took forty shekels of silver from them in addition to food and wine. Their assistants also lorded it over the people. But out of reverence for God I did not act like that. 16 Instead, I devoted myself to the work on this wall. All my men were assembled there for the work; we did not acquire any land.

17 Furthermore, a hundred and fifty Jews and officials ate at my table, as well as those who came to us from the surrounding nations. 18 Each day one ox, six choice sheep and some poultry were prepared for me, and every ten days an abundant supply of wine of all kinds. In spite of all this, I never demanded the food allotted to the governor, because the demands were heavy on these people. 19 Remember me with favor, O my God, for all I have done for these people.

Questions:
1. Who are the main actors in the passage and what roles do they play?
2. Compare and contrast the situation that faced people in the passage and the one facing poor Kenyans.

3. What would you do if you were placed in similar situation as Nehemiah was? What lessons can we draw from the passage?

pulled out a file he said had been given to him by a Mr A.H. Malik. That name was familiar – Malik was a Nairobi lawyer who had loaned John’s father money in the 1990s, when Joe Githongo planned to develop a piece of land on the outskirts of the city. It was one of his father’s worst business moves: he had been unable to repay the loan, Malik had gone to court, the court had found against Joe, and the dispute festered on. What had any of this to do with John? The money loaned to his father, Karat claimed, had not come from Malik at all, but had originated with Anura Perera, the Cypriot businessman behind the suspect frigate deal, the kind friend who had paid Kibaki’s London hospital bill. There seemed no getting away from this generous individual. So John’s father was in Perera’s debt, but Perera, Kiraitu said, would be happy to settle the dispute amicably so long as John agreed to turn off the heat. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 94).

On 2 June 2004, long after everyone else had gone home, Mwiraria, Kiraitu and John gathered in the finance minister’s office to survey recent events. After the weeks of tension, mutual irritation and paralysing suspicion, it felt as though a tightened spring had suddenly been released. This was the calm that comes with trust, and the joint understanding that a serious crisis has been arrowly averted by dint of pulling together. At precisely this moment of assumed complicity, John’s hidden tape recorder chose to start relaying its contents to the world at large.

He scrambled for the door, and returned expecting the worst. But fate was kind. The atmosphere in Mwiraria’s office seemed unchanged. Kiraitu, in particular, was in meditative, confessional mood, speaking more freely than he had since the scandal broke because, John sensed, he was convinced the anti-corruption czar had seen the error of his ways. ‘He admitted that he had not realised how high up and just how intricately involved members of our own administration were,’ John wrote later that night in his little black book. He had to call on all his skills as an actor to conceal his dismay at what the justice minister said next. It was confirmation of a truth John had really, in his heart, known all along but had not wanted to confront. ‘Anglo Leasing,’ Kiraitu ruefully acknowledged, ‘is us.’ It was an astonishing admission to make before the man who had been given the remit of eliminating corruption. Kiraitu’s confident assumption that John would nod quietly in agreement, rather than leap to his feet and start working the phones in sleaze-buster mode, might seem bizarre to the outsider. In fact, it was based on one all important fact, a keystone on which, in the eyes of the ministers and their colleagues, a solid edifice of cooperation and mutual protection could be built: John was one of them, John belonged. John was a Kikuyu. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 96-97).

Questions

1. What are the main events in the passage?
2. ‘Anglo Leasing, is us’. What is the meaning of this statement? Who do you think is being referred to as “US”? What does this mean to you as a person?

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?

“I have a Dream”  Genesis 37; 8-10, 19-36
8 His brothers said to him, “Do you intend to reign over us? Will you actually rule us?” And they hated him all the more because of his dream and what he had said. 9 Then he had another dream, and he told it to his brothers. “Listen,” he said, “I had another dream, and this time the sun and moon and eleven stars were bowing down to me.” 10 When he told his father as well as his brothers, his father rebuked him and said, “What is this dream you had? Will your mother and I and your brothers actually come and bow down to the ground before you?” 11 His brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the matter in mind.

“Here comes that dreamer!”  Genesis 37, 19-36
19 “Here comes that dreamer!” they said to each other. 20 “Come now, let’s kill him and throw him into one of these cisterns and say that a ferocious animal devoured him. Then we’ll see what comes of his dreams.” 21 When Reuben heard this, he tried to rescue him from their hands. “Let’s not take his life,” he said. 22 “Don’t shed any blood. Throw him into this cistern here in the desert, but don’t lay a hand on him.” Reuben said this to rescue him from them and take him back to his father. 23 So when Joseph came to his brothers, they stripped him of his robe—the richly ornamented robe he was wearing— 24 and they took him and threw him into the cistern. Now the cistern was empty; there was no water in it.

25 As they sat down to eat their meal, they looked up and saw a caravan of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead. Their camels were loaded with spices, balm and myrrh, and they were on their way to take them down to Egypt. 26 Judah said to his brothers, “What will we gain if we kill our brother and cover up his blood? 27 Come, let’s sell him to the Ishmaelites and not lay our hands on him; after all, he is our brother, our own flesh and blood.” His brothers agreed. 28 So when the Midianite merchants came by, his brothers pulled Joseph up out of the cistern and sold him for twenty shekels [b] of silver to the Ishmaelites, who took him to Egypt. 29 When Reuben returned to the cistern and saw that Joseph was not there, he tore his clothes. 30 He went back to his brothers and said, “The boy isn’t there! Where can I turn now?”

31 Then they got Joseph’s robe, slaughtered a goat and dipped the robe in the blood. 32 They took the ornamented robe back to their father and said, “We found this. Examine it to see whether it is your son’s robe.” 33 He recognized it and said, “It is my son’s robe! Some ferocious animal has devoured him. Joseph has surely been torn to pieces.” 34 Then Jacob tore his clothes, put on sackcloth and mourned for his son many days. 35 All his sons and daughters came to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted. “No,” he said, “in mourning will I go down to the grave [c] to my son.” So his father wept for him. 36 Meanwhile, the Midianites [d] sold Joseph in Egypt to Potiphar, one of Pharaoh’s officials, the captain of the guard.

Questions
1. Who are the main actors and what role do they play in the story?
2. In your view, why did Joseph’s brothers act the way they did? What was their fear?

3. What lessons do you learn from the passage?
Chapter 6

Pulling the Serpents Tail

Quote from the Book
“KANU handed us a skunk and we took it home as a pet. If you take a skunk home as a pet willingly, it’s yours, together with its disturbing fragrance. It’s disingenuous of you to blame the person you took it from for the smell and it is equally dishonest for the person who gave it to you to point at you and scream that these days you smell”. John Githongo, East African Standard, 30 September 2001.

As far as the public was concerned, Maore’s parliamentary question marked the start of the Anglo Leasing affair, the Kenyan equivalent of the break-in at the Democratic National Committee headquarters in Washington’s Watergate complex. Today Maore marvels at what followed from his moment of chutzpah. ‘It was like a dream in which you pull the tail of a snake, you keep pulling, and you find that it just goes on and on forever.’ For John Githongo, however, Maore’s action brought into the open an issue he had been probing for six long, anxious weeks, but naïvely believed he had brought under control. ‘I thought I had it contained. We’d been trying to quietly fix the problem behind the scenes. Then, suddenly, the cat was out of the bag.’ He would later come to feel a certain gratitude to Maore for exposing a matter which would prove too big for a mere permanent secretary. But at the time, convinced this was a minor affair that could be dealt with discreetly, the MP’s intervention was just another problem to add to his growing number of headaches....(Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 78)
To those watching John, it must have been clear that the death threats and smears had failed: his determination to pursue Anglo Leasing had not dimmed. On 20 May 2004 he was summoned to the justice minister’s office. ‘The general message,’ he told John, was: ‘Tell Githongo to go a bit slow.’ When John’s response was uncompromising, Kiraitu revealed his hand. Opening a drawer, he pulled out a file he said had been given to him by a Mr A.H. Malik. That name was familiar – Malik was a Nairobi lawyer who had loaned John’s father money in the 1990s, when Joe Githongo planned to develop a piece of land on the outskirts of the city. It was one of his father’s worst business moves: he had been unable to repay the loan, Malik had gone to court, the court had found against Joe, and the dispute festered on. What had any of this to do with John? The money loaned to his father, Karat claimed, had not come from Malik at all, but had originated with Anura Perera, the Cypriot businessman behind the suspect frigate deal, the kind friend who had paid Kibaki’s London hospital bill. There seemed no getting away from this generous individual. So John’s father was in Perera’s debt, but Perera, Kiraitu said, would be happy to settle the dispute amicably so long as John agreed to turn off the heat. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 94).

On 2 June 2004, long after everyone else had gone home, Mwiraria, Kiraitu and John gathered in the finance minister’s office to survey recent events. After the weeks of tension, mutual irritation and paralysing suspicion, it felt as though a tightened spring had suddenly been released. This was the calm that comes with trust, and the joint understanding that a serious crisis has been arrowly averted by dint of pulling together. At precisely this moment of assumed complicity, John’s hidden tape recorder chose to start relaying its contents to the world at large.

He scrambled for the door, and returned expecting the worst. But fate was kind. The atmosphere in Mwiraria’s office seemed unchanged. Kiraitu, in particular, was in meditative, confessional mood, speaking more freely than he had since the scandal broke because, John sensed, he was convinced the anti-corruption czar had seen the error of his ways. ‘He admitted that he had not realised how high up and just how intricately involved members of our own administration were,’ John wrote later that night in his little black book. He had to call on all his skills as an actor to conceal his dismay at what the justice minister said next. It was confirmation of a truth John had really, in his heart, known all along but had not wanted to confront. ‘Anglo Leasing,’ Kiraitu ruefully acknowledged, ‘is us.’ It was an astonishing admission to make before the man who had been given the remit of eliminating corruption. Kiraitu’s confident assumption that John would nod quietly in agreement, rather than leap to his feet and start working the phones in sleaze-buster mode, might seem bizarre to the outsider. In fact, it was based on one all important fact, a keystone on which, in the eyes of the ministers and their colleagues, a solid edifice of cooperation and mutual protection could be built: John was one of them, John belonged. John was a Kikuyu. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 96-97).

Questions
1. What are the main events in the passage?

2. ‘Anglo Leasing, is us”. What is the meaning of this statement? Who do you think is being referred to as “US”? What does this mean to you as a person?

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?
"I have a Dream" Genesis 37; 8-10, 19-36

8 His brothers said to him, “Do you intend to reign over us? Will you actually rule us?” And they hated him all the more because of his dream and what he had said. 9 Then he had another dream, and he told it to his brothers. “Listen,” he said, “I had another dream, and this time the sun and moon and eleven stars were bowing down to me.” 10 When he told his father as well as his brothers, his father rebuked him and said, “What is this dream you had? Will your mother and I and your brothers actually come and bow down to the ground before you?” 11 His brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the matter in mind.

"Here comes that dreamer!" Genesis 37, 19-36

19 “Here comes that dreamer!” they said to each other. 20 “Come now, let’s kill him and throw him into one of these cisterns and say that a ferocious animal devoured him. Then we’ll see what comes of his dreams.” 21 When Reuben heard this, he tried to rescue him from their hands. “Let’s not take his life,” he said. 22 “Don’t shed any blood. Throw him into this cistern here in the desert, but don’t lay a hand on him.” Reuben said this to rescue him from them and take him back to his father. 23 So when Joseph came to his brothers, they stripped him of his robe—the richly ornamented robe he was wearing—24 and they took him and threw him into the cistern. Now the cistern was empty; there was no water in it.

25 As they sat down to eat their meal, they looked up and saw a caravan of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead. Their camels were loaded with spices, balm and myrrh, and they were on their way to take them down to Egypt. 26 Judah said to his brothers, “What will we gain if we kill our brother and cover up his blood? 27 Come, let’s sell him to the Ishmaelites and not lay our hands on him; after all, he is our brother, our own flesh and blood.” His brothers agreed. 28 So when the Midianite merchants came by, his brothers pulled Joseph up out of the cistern and sold him for twenty shekels of silver to the Ishmaelites, who took him to Egypt. 29 When Reuben returned to the cistern and saw that Joseph was not there, he tore his clothes. 30 He went back to his brothers and said, “The boy isn’t there! Where can I turn now?”

31 Then they got Joseph’s robe, slaughtered a goat and dipped the robe in the blood. 32 They took the ornamented robe back to their father and said, “We found this. Examine it to see whether it is your son’s robe.” 33 He recognized it and said, “It is my son’s robe! Some ferocious animal has devoured him. Joseph has surely been torn to pieces.” 34 Then Jacob tore his clothes, put on sackcloth and mourned for his son many days. 35 All his sons and daughters came to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted. “No,” he said, “in mourning will I go down to the grave to my son.” So his father wept for him. 36 Meanwhile, the Midianites sold Joseph in Egypt to Potiphar, one of Pharaoh’s officials, the captain of the guard.

Questions
1. Who are the main actors and what role do they play in the story?
2. In your view, why did Joseph’s brothers act the way they did? What was their fear?
3. What lessons do you learn from the passage?
Introduction
Our close relatives are in most instances, the people we run to when tragedy strikes. It is almost natural that they will come to our rescue when we are in trouble. Mla nawe hafi nawe ila mzaliwa nawe, states a Kiswahili proverb. Traditionally, even when a child goes wrong and gets punished, it is easy for the parent to knowingly defend them. When these trends are carried on at the workplace and state affairs, corruption and impunity thrives with abandon. When John Githongo was appointed to his sensitive position, the wazees in his life must have understood the meaning of the proverb Zimwi likujualo, halikuli likakwisha.

Quote from the Book
‘You’re my older brother and I love you. But don’t ever take sides against the family again.’ Michael Corleone, in The Godfather.

The Land Question
Kenyatta had revealed the expansionist plans he nursed for his community during the Lancaster House Conferences, to the dismay of other delegates. ‘He said that the Gikuyu must be allowed to take up land in the Rift Valley . . . Immediately there was a long-drawn-out “Aaah” from the Kalenjin and Maasai
representatives, and Willie Murgor from the Eldoret area produced a whistle and blew a long note of alarm on it,’ recalled Michael Blundell in his memoirs. Borrowing money from Kikuyu banks and Kikuyu businessmen, tapping into the expertise of Kikuyu lawyers, the president’s fellow tribespeople rushed to buy the land of departing whites under a million-acre resettlement scheme subsidised by London. Descending from the escarpment, they flooded in their hundreds of thousands into the previously off-limits Rift Valley, seizing lands the Kalenjin and other communities regarded as having been temporarily appropriated by the white man, but rightfully theirs. Given a selling scheme based on the principle of willing buyer, willing seller, there was little the poorer tribes could do.

The Kikuyu knew in their hearts that they were doing unfairly well out of the Kenyatta presidency. But those fortune favours can always convince themselves their luck is somehow deserved. It was their community that had suffered at the hands of the British, the Kikuyu told themselves, their community that had risen up against the oppressor, their community – better-educated thanks to its early exposure to the missionaries – which taught less politically-aware Kenyans what it meant to be free. More sophisticated, cannier than their fellow Kenyans, they had led the way in these, as so many other areas, and had surely won in the process the right to both lead the country and eat their fill. By 1971, the conviction that this pleasant state of affairs should be rendered permanent had so hardened in Central Province that a party within a party was formed – the Gikuyu, Embu, Meru Association (GEMA), whose aim was to change a constitution which provided for vice president Daniel arap Moi, from a small coalition of Rift Valley pastoralists known as the Kalenjin, to take over in the event of the president’s death. If ever there was an expression of ethnic hubris, GEMA was it. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 112 - 113).

Questions

1. Who are the main actors and their roles in this passage?

2. a. Do you think the principles of “willing buyer willing seller” was the appropriate method of land distribution after independence? Explain.
   b. How can Kenya reverse or redress the historical injustices related to land?

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?

Naboth’s Vineyard 1 King 21:1-28

Some time later there was an incident involving a vineyard belonging to Naboth the Jezreelite. The vineyard was in Jezreel, close to the palace of Ahab king of Samaria. Ahab said to Naboth, “Let me have your vineyard to use for a vegetable garden, since it is close to my palace. In exchange I will give you a better vineyard or, if you prefer, I will pay you whatever it is worth.” But Naboth replied, “The LORD forbid that I should give you the inheritance of my fathers.”

So Ahab went home, sullen and angry because Naboth the Jezreelite had said, “I will not give you the inheritance of my fathers.” He lay on his bed sulking and refused to eat. His wife Jezebel came in and
asked him, “Why are you so sullen? Why won’t you eat?” 6 He answered her, “Because I said to Naboth the Jezreelite, ‘Sell me your vineyard; or if you prefer, I will give you another vineyard in its place.’ But he said, ‘I will not give you my vineyard.’” 7 Jezebel his wife said, “Is this how you act as king over Israel? Get up and eat! Cheer up. I’ll get you the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite.”

8 So she wrote letters in Ahab’s name, placed his seal on them, and sent them to the elders and nobles who lived in Naboth’s city with him. 9 In those letters she wrote: “Proclaim a day of fasting and seat Naboth in a prominent place among the people. 10 But seat two scoundrels opposite him and have them testify that he has cursed both God and the king. Then take him out and stone him to death.”

11 So the elders and nobles who lived in Naboth’s city did as Jezebel directed in the letters she had written to them. 12 They proclaimed a fast and seated Naboth in a prominent place among the people. 13 Then two scoundrels came and sat opposite him and brought charges against Naboth before the people, saying, “Naboth has cursed both God and the king.” So they took him outside the city and stoned him to death. 14 Then they sent word to Jezebel: “Naboth has been stoned and is dead.”

15 As soon as Jezebel heard that Naboth had been stoned to death, she said to Ahab, “Get up and take possession of the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite that he refused to sell you. He is no longer alive, but dead.” 16 When Ahab heard that Naboth was dead, he got up and went down to take possession of Naboth’s vineyard.

17 Then the word of the LORD came to Elijah the Tishbite: 18 “Go down to meet Ahab king of Israel, who rules in Samaria. He is now in Naboth’s vineyard, where he has gone to take possession of it. 19 Say to him, ‘This is what the LORD says: Have you not murdered a man and seized his property?’ Then say to him, ‘This is what the LORD says: In the place where dogs licked up Naboth’s blood, dogs will lick up your blood—yes, yours!’ ”

20 Ahab said to Elijah, “So you have found me, my enemy!”

“I have found you,” he answered, “because you have sold yourself to do evil in the eyes of the LORD. 21 I am going to bring disaster on you. I will consume your descendants and cut off from Ahab every last male in Israel—slave or free. 22 I will make your house like that of Jeroboam son of Nebat and that of Baasha son of Ahijah, because you have provoked me to anger and have caused Israel to sin.’ 23 “And also concerning Jezebel the LORD says: ‘Dogs will devour Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel.’ 24 “Dogs will eat those belonging to Ahab who die in the city, and the birds of the air will feed on those who die in the country.”

25 (There was never a man like Ahab, who sold himself to do evil in the eyes of the LORD, urged on by Jezebel his wife. 26 He behaved in the vilest manner by going after idols, like the Amorites the LORD drove out before Israel.)

27 When Ahab heard these words, he tore his clothes, put on sackcloth and fasted. He lay in sackcloth and went around meekly.
28 Then the word of the LORD came to Elijah the Tishbite: 29 “Have you noticed how Ahab has humbled himself before me? Because he has humbled himself, I will not bring this disaster in his day, but I will bring it on his house in the days of his son.”
Questions
1. Identify the main events and actors in this passage.

2. a) Why do you think Ahab had such a strong desire to acquire Naboth’s vineyard?

   b) Did this desire justify the means used to get the vineyard?

3. What lessons do we learn from the passage?

The Nyayo Philosophy
That golden era ended in 1978, when Kenyatta took ill on a podium in Mombasa, collapsed in the men’s toilets and later died. Despite GEMA’s best efforts, the presidency went to Moi, who could now take his revenge after years of being patronised by Kenyatta’s Kikuyu cronies. His power would be built on Kenya’s smaller tribes’ fear of a repetition of Kikuyu rule. Moi’s publicly declared philosophy might be ‘Nyayo’ – to walk in the ‘Footsteps’ of the revered Kenyatta – but for the Kikuyu, nothing would be the same again. It was now the Kalenjins’ turn to ‘eat’ at the trough of the state. The Kikuyu still flourished, but they now did so in spite of government patronage, rather than because of it. In Nairobi, the matatu routes, the taxi trade, the hotel business, real estate – areas where the domineering KANU government enjoyed no control – were all in Kikuyu hands. GEMA went into voluntary liquidation in 1980, its dreams shattered.

Once Moi gave in to pressure to end single-party rule in 1991, it was natural that the discontented Kikuyu community, at the forefront of every curve, should launch the first opposition parties.

Kikuyus today cite this as evidence that not only were they responsible for Kenya’s first liberation – from colonial rule – they should also be thanked for its second, from the one-party system. In every election that followed, Nairobi and Central Province would repeatedly, fruitlessly, vote against KANU, a constant reminder to Moi that this important section of the community rejected what he stood for. When the first serious ethnic violence in Kenyan history broke out in the early 1990s, with 1,500 ‘foreigners’ who had settled the Rift Valley during the Kenyatta years killed by local Maasai and Kalenjin and hundreds of thousands brutally cleansed – with the support of the police and government officials – the Kikuyu interpreted it as a warning that ethnic extermination was not entirely out of the question. ‘Lie low like envelopes or be cut down to size,’ declared Moi’s chauvinistic Maasai minister for local government, William Ntimama. Whatever protestations Moi made that he was Father to One Nation, the Kikuyu would see this bloodletting, an early signal of what the future held that no one wanted to heed, as punishment for a successful community’s defiance. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 113-114)
Questions

1. From the passage, what happened to the Kikuyu community after President Kenyatta died?

2. What is the meaning of the statement, “It was now the Kalenjins’ turn to ‘eat’ at the trough of the state” as used in the passage?

3. How can Kenya overcome the competition between her tribes for political power?

The Israelites Punish the Benjamites  Judges 20:1-46

1 Then all the Israelites from Dan to Beersheba and from the land of Gilead came out with one accord and assembled before the LORD in Mizpah. 2 The leaders of all the people of the tribes of Israel took their places in the assembly of the people of God, four hundred thousand soldiers armed with swords. 3 (The Benjamites heard that the Israelites had gone up to Mizpah.) Then the Israelites said, “Tell us how this awful thing happened.”

4 So the Levite, the husband of the murdered woman, said, “I and my concubine came to Gibeah in Benjamin to spend the night. 5 During the night the men of Gibeah came after me and surrounded the house, intending to kill me. They raped my concubine, and she died. 6 I took my concubine, cut her into pieces and sent one piece to each region of Israel’s inheritance, because they committed this lewd and outrageous act in Israel. 7 Now, all you Israelites, speak up and give your verdict.”

8 All the people rose with one accord, saying, “None of us will go home. No, not one of us will return to his house. 9 But now this is what we’ll do to Gibeah: We’ll go up against it as the lot directs. 10 We’ll take ten men out of every hundred from all the tribes of Israel, and a hundred from a thousand, and a thousand from ten thousand, to get provisions for the army. Then, when the army arrives at Gibeah in Benjamin, it can give them what they deserve for this outrageous act done in Israel.” 11 So all the Israelites got together and united against the city with one accord.

12 The tribes of Israel sent messengers throughout the tribe of Benjamin, saying, “What about this awful crime that was committed among you? 13 Now turn those wicked men of Gibeah over to us so that we may put them to death and purge the evil from Israel.” But the Benjamites would not listen to their fellow Israelites. 14 From their towns they came together at Gibeah to fight against the Israelites. 15 At once the Benjamites mobilized twenty-six thousand swordsmen from their towns, in addition to seven hundred able young men from those living in Gibeah. 16 Among all these soldiers there were seven hundred who were left-handed, each of whom could sling a stone at a hair and not miss. 17 Israel, apart from Benjamin, mustered four hundred thousand swordsmen, all of them fighting men.
18 The Israelites went up to Bethel and inquired of God. They said, “Who of us is to go up first to fight against the Benjamites?”
The LORD replied, “Judah shall go first.”

19 The next morning the Israelites got up and pitched camp near Gibeah. The Israelites went out to fight the Benjamites and took up battle positions against them at Gibeah. The Benjamites came out of Gibeah and cut down twenty-two thousand Israelites on the battlefield that day. But the Israelites encouraged one another and again took up their positions where they had stationed themselves the first day. The Israelites went up and wept before the LORD until evening, and they inquired of the LORD. They said, “Shall we go up again to fight against the Benjamites, our fellow Israelites?”

The LORD answered, “Go up against them.”

24 Then the Israelites drew near to Benjamin the second day. This time, when the Benjamites came out from Gibeah to oppose them, they cut down another eighteen thousand Israelites, all of them armed with swords.

26 Then all the Israelites, the whole army, went up to Bethel, and there they sat weeping before the LORD. They fasted that day until evening and presented burnt offerings and fellowship offerings to the LORD. And the Israelites inquired of the LORD. (In those days the ark of the covenant of God was there, with Phinehas son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, ministering before it.) They asked, “Shall we go up again to fight against the Benjamites, our fellow Israelites, or not?”

The LORD responded, “Go, for tomorrow I will give them into your hands.”

29 Then Israel set an ambush around Gibeah. They went up against the Benjamites on the third day and took up positions against Gibeah as they had done before. The Benjamites came out to meet them and were drawn away from the city. They began to inflict casualties on the Israelites as before, so that about thirty of them fell in the open field and on the roads—the one leading to Bethel and the other to Gibeah.

32 While the Benjamites were saying, “We are defeating them as before,” the Israelites were saying, “Let’s retreat and draw them away from the city to the roads.”

33 All the men of Israel moved from their places and took up positions at Baal Tamar, and the Israelite ambush charged out of its place on the west of Gibeah. Then ten thousand of Israel’s able young men made a frontal attack on Gibeah. The fighting was so heavy that the Benjamites did not realize how near disaster was. The LORD defeated Benjamin before Israel, and on that day the Israelites struck down 25,100 Benjamites, all armed with swords. Then the Benjamites saw that they were beaten. Now the men of Israel had given way before Benjamin, because they relied on the ambush they had set near Gibeah. Those who had been in ambush made a sudden dash into Gibeah, spread out and put the whole city to the sword. The Israelites had arranged with the ambush that they should send up a great cloud of smoke from the city, and then the Israelites would turn in the battle. The Benjamites had begun to inflict casualties on the Israelites (about thirty), and they said, “We are defeating them as in the first battle.” But when the column of smoke began to rise from the city, the Benjamites turned and saw the smoke of the whole city going up into the sky. Then the Israelites turned on them, and the Benjamites were terrified, because they realized that disaster had come on them. So they fled before the Israelites in the direction of the wilderness, but they could not escape the battle. And the Israelites who came out of the towns cut
them down there. 43 They surrounded the Benjamites, chased them and easily overran them in the vicinity of Gibeah on the east. 44 Eighteen thousand Benjamites fell, all of them valiant fighters. 45 As they turned and fled toward the wilderness to the rock of Rimmon, the Israelites cut down five thousand men along the roads. They kept pressing after the Benjamites as far as Gidom and struck down two thousand more.

46 On that day twenty-five thousand Benjamite swordsmen fell, all of them valiant fighters. 47 But six hundred men turned and fled into the wilderness to the rock of Rimmon, where they stayed four months. 48 The men of Israel went back to Benjamin and put all the towns to the sword, including the animals and everything else they found. All the towns they came across they set on fire.

Questions
1. What are the main events in this passage?

2. Compare and contrast the similarities between the tribal war that broke out in Israel in this passage and the tribal conflicts witnessed in Kenya.

3. What lessons do we learn from the passage? In what ways could the tribes in Kenya be able to resolve their disputes peacefully?

He is “one of ours”
In the wake of the 2002 inauguration I tracked John down with a fellow journalist, keen to hear his thoughts. We found him in frenetic mode, simultaneously hyped, exhilarated and exhausted. He had been part of the election-monitoring effort pulled together by the human rights bodies and advocacy groups that constituted Kenyan civil society, and was fielding a series of calls from reporters in search of quotes, repeating the same phrases again and again. Halfway through the conversation, he revealed another reason why he was so distracted. The Kenyan businessmen who sat on TI-Kenya’s board, old friends of both his father and Kibaki, had been in touch. ‘The wazee [old men] have put my name forward as someone to lead the fight against corruption.’ His laugh was half-embarrassed, half excited. ‘It looks as though the new team is going to offer me a post in government.’

My heart sank. I could see exactly why any new government would want John. No Kenyan could rival his reputation for muscular integrity, or enjoyed as much respect amongst the foreign donors everyone hoped would soon resume lending. In co-opting him, the incoming administration would be neatly appropriating a high profile symbol of credibility, proof personified that it deserved the trust of both the wananchi and its Western partners. But I remembered all the other shining African talents I’d seen warily join the establishment they had once attacked, persuaded that finally the time was ripe for change, only to emerge discredited, beaten by the system they had set out to cure.
'Don’t take it,' I said. ‘You’ll lose your neutrality forever. Once you’ve crossed the line and become a player, you’ll never be able to go back.’ He listened, but my advice, it was clear, was being given too late. Effectively, he explained, he wasn’t being given a choice. The old guys – Joe Wanjui, former head of Unilever in Kenya; George Muhoho, head of the Kenya airports authority; and Harris Mule, former permanent secretary at the finance ministry – had done the deal in his absence, taking his acquiescence as read. He’d gone round to Wanjui’s house and found the wazee drinking champagne, celebrating the forthcoming appointment. They had ribbed the young man over the fact that he probably didn’t even own a suit for his meeting with Kibaki, offering to lend him one. ‘They’d all cooked it up together. I drove away stunned. It was a great honour.’ In later years, he would think back over that day and detect an unappetisingly sacrificial element to the whole episode. These men he had grown up with, who had known him when he was nothing but a small boy running around in shorts, had trussed him up and delivered him to his fate. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 14 – 16)

Admittedly, John’s ancestors originated not from Kibaki’s Nyeri but from Kiambu, an area whose inhabitants were regarded by Kikuyu further north as sneaky and deceitful. But what really mattered was that he was a Kikuyu. His father, accountant for Kenyatta, was privy to the Kikuyu elite’s financial secrets. Joe Githongo had paid a personal price during the Moi era, and proved his credentials during the rumbustious multi-party years, working as a fundraiser for Kibaki’s Democratic Party. The Githongo family had prayed and played with other Kikuyu families, and John had gone to school alongside the scions of the country’s leading Kikuyu dynasties. If he could not be trusted to take the interests of the clan to heart, to instinctively grasp what mattered to the House of Mumbi, then who could?

At this point a question poses itself, one that may never be satisfactorily answered. When the elderly members of TI’s board put John Githongo’s name forward for the post of anti-corruption chief and their friends in government enthusiastically agreed, did they do so anticipating that one day they would need to appeal to his sense of tribal solidarity? Was his appointment, which originally seemed so well-intentioned, in fact the most cynical of political moves, the propelling of an impressionable young man into a position where, should a crisis develop involving his own community, he would find it virtually impossible to resist outside pressure? Did they name him intending to compromise him?

John certainly tends to that view. His feelings towards members of the group, with the exception of Harris Mule, are far more bitter than those towards any players in the Anglo Leasing affair. In his view, the old men he had trusted with his fate behaved like Abraham preparing his son Isaac for sacrifice. ‘The wazee. . .’ He shakes his head in wonder. ‘They set me up. I was the puppet, and they the puppeteers.’

My own suspicion is that they possessed no such clarity of vision. They chose John chiefly because he was the obvious candidate. The instinct to entrust a potentially sensitive post to a fellow tribesman was certainly there, but it was not particular to this clique or period. It is the bane of Kenyan life, skewing employment patterns in every sector of the economy. At the back of their minds, the old men may have vaguely sensed that having ‘one of ours’ in this key post might one day prove helpful. ‘The assumption must have been, “If he gets out of line, his father will have a quiet word,”’ guesses Wycliffe Muga, columnist for the Daily Nation. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, 118 - 119)
Questions
1. Identify the main events and actors in the passage?

2. What is the meaning of the statement “The wazees ... They set me up. I was the puppet, and they the puppeteers”?

3. Have you ever been under pressure to protect someone who was in the wrong due to personal, tribal or other relations? Share with the group.

Jesus Mother and Brothers  Mathew 12-46-50

46While Jesus was still talking to the crowd, his mother and brothers stood outside, wanting to speak to him. 47Someone told him, “Your mother and brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you.” 48He replied to him, “Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?” 49Pointing to his disciples, he said, “Here are my mother and my brothers. 50For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother”.

1. What are the main events in the passage?

2. What is the meaning of verses 49 and 50?

3. In your view, what does the passage teach us about balancing the interests of people who are close to us and the demands of our mission in life?
Chapter 8

Breaking the Mould

Introduction
Kenya is not a “nation” perse. Indeed, Kenya is a country with many “nations”. These nations are what we usually refer to as “tribes” or kabila in Kiswahili. It is for this reason that political parties, enterprises, and even churches are predominantly composed of people from one ethnic community. Whereas our primary identity must remain Kenyan, our ethnic identity must also be recognized and celebrated. We must learn how to recognize our rich ethnic diversity and create space for a community of interests that is truly Kenyan and yet a true reflection of our ethnic heritage. That is part of what the National Anthem refers to as the ‘heritage of splendour’. Mutula Kilonzo summed it up thus in the Saturday Nation of 6 June 2009: “Kenya’s future as a nation depends largely on the resolution of a twin challenge: the need to recognise and celebrate diversity, and the need to build a strong and cohesive national character”.

Quote from the Book
“The hope of a secure and liveable world lies with disciplined nonconformists”. Martin Luther King

In fact, the education offered at this private school was almost quixotically international in its outlook. ‘There was a strong Western tinge to it,’ recalls John Gethi, one of John Githongo’s old school friends. ‘But of course, when you were there you thought everywhere was like that.’ English and Kiswahili were spoken, but Luo, Kikuyu or Kamba were frowned upon. ‘We don’t encourage groups to form on ethnic basis, and we don’t encourage pupils to speak in the vernacular. We are proud to say we are citizens of the world,’ says Mr Shihemi. The school authorities regarded education as part of a nation building project which would
ultimately do away with tribal differences. ‘We will eventually reach a time where we will no longer say “This is a Kikuyu or a Luo.” If more schools were like St Mary’s, it might happen faster.’ Friends would later trace John’s extraordinary ability to mix with people from radically different milieux to his school’s heterogeneous approach. ‘We were a generation that didn’t know about tribes,’ recalls Gethi. ‘I don’t think we’ll ever get back to that. It was a golden era.’ In the process of opening up to the world, certain cultural baggage had to be jettisoned. In Kikuyu tradition, circumcision looms large. The Githongo boys certainly went under the knife, but for them a rite once staged on the banks of a river, with only cold water to numb the pain, was performed in hospital. Ask John and his contemporaries about traditional Kikuyu concepts such as wiathi – becoming master of one’s destiny – and like many urban Kikuyu their age, they will hesitate, shrug and look awkward. They prefer a Robert Ludlum thriller to the latest academic work on Mau Mau, and while they might visit ‘shags’ – slang for the upcountry ‘shamba’ – at intervals and hold their grandparents in tender affection, that doesn’t mean they know a great deal about their roots (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 129 - 130).

If being a ‘good Kikuyu’ meant putting his ethnic loyalties before all else, John was very, very far from that ideal. As he would later tell a reviewer, ‘My employment contract did not say “Gikuyu Inc” at the top.’ The remits of his compassion stretched far beyond what most of his elders and many of his contemporaries regarded as normal. He was a driven, highly moral, ethnically denatured young man who, if forced to choose – and ‘Why should I?’, one can almost hear him asking – would probably say that he thought of himself as an ethical and spiritual being first, a Kenyan second, a Kikuyu third...

Kenyan newspaper columnist Wycliffe Muga, a cheerful provocateur, sees John as an African so disconnected from his roots as to fall into the ‘coconut’ category – brown on the outside, white on the inside. ‘The people John really wanted to impress were not the House of Mumbi, but the House of Windsor,’ he chuckles. ‘His loyalty to Western values – things like a belief in the importance of rules, transparency, honesty and accountability – was greater than his loyalty to the tribe. What the Mount Kenya Mafia didn’t understand was that John wasn’t a Kikuyu at all. He was a mzungu.’ To his recruiters, John represented a near-miraculous combination of skills and experience. But the forces shaping him were hardly calculated to produce the perfect presidential aide. They were calculated to produce the perfect whistleblower. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 143 - 144).

Questions
1. What are the main thoughts being raised in these passages?

2. ‘We don’t encourage groups to form on ethnic basis, and we don’t encourage pupils to speak in the vernacular. We are proud to say we are citizens of the world’. What do you understand to be the meaning of this statement? What are its implications?

3. Should such an approach be enforced in all schools? Discuss.
The Making of the Sheng Generation

Quote from the Book

“Whether Luo or Kikuyu, our children will not act the way we did”. Eva Gaitha, director of Nairobi coffin accessory company

Kenya’s demography makes radical change inevitable. A staggering 70 per cent of the population is below the age of thirty. That statistic, shared with many African nations, is as hopeful as it is terrifying. And the fact that those youngsters do not think in the same way as their parents is highlighted by the fact that they no longer speak the same language. English and Kiswahili might be Kenya’s official languages, but pupils tumbling out of school and students in the university canteens chatter to each other in Sheng, to their teachers’ despair. A witty, cheeky, freewheeling Clockwork Orange-style brew of Kiswahili, English and indigenous Kenyan languages, with added dollops of reggae jargon, American slang, French and Spanish, Sheng originated in Nairobi’s Eastlands slums in the 1980s. Adopted by matatu touts and rap artists, it radiated along the taxi and bus routes, spilling over into Tanzania and Uganda, moving from one urban centre to another. So popular has it become that sending an email or text in Kiswahili or English rather than Sheng is considered disastrously uncool by anyone below the age of twenty. Infiltrating radio stations, it has forced its way into national newspapers and spread its tentacles across the internet. Kenyan publishers promise future books in Sheng, it features large in advertising slogans – why, it even crept into Kibaki’s speeches.
This rogue language’s popularity is something of a contradiction: Sheng was originally invented to exclude the puritanical parents and ball-breaking teachers who threatened to prevent a younger generation having a good time. Kenyan youths wanted to be able to discuss their sexual adventures, hangovers and boozy nights in their elders’ presence without the latter cottoning on. A language in a hurry, it did away with the grammar and spellings slowing Kiswahili and English down, and had the same ingredients of topical humour and impish wordplay as France’s Verlan or London’s Cockney rhyming slang. Breasts are ‘dashboard’ – from the English ‘dashboard’; one of the many words for party is ‘hepi’ (‘happy’); a cigarette is a ‘fegi’ (from the English ‘fag’); a friend a ‘beste’; while both ‘mahindra’, in memory of the disastrous jeeps, and ‘karua’, a reference to minister for justice Martha Karua, are used for ‘police’.

Constantly inventing new terms was part of the game, allowing the speaker to show off his ability to dip into five or six languages without pausing for breath. As a result, a web-based Sheng-English dictionary, still being compiled, gives at least thirteen alternatives for ‘girl’ – including ‘chic’ (Spanish/American), ‘chipipi’ (Luhya) and ‘mdem’ (French) – seven for ‘money’, and five each for ‘house’ and ‘school’. Sheng spoken in Nairobi’s Dandora slum differs from that spoken in the city’s Eastlands area, and because the language is always on the move, shifting like a Chinese whisper from mouth to mouth, it dates fast. On their return home, Kenyans in the diaspora find the Sheng used in their blogs no longer matches the Sheng spoken by childhood friends. Incomprehensible not only to parents but even more so to staid grandparents back in ‘shags’, ‘deep Sheng’ is a barrier behind which the new generation can hide its secrets. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 150-151).

Questions
1. What was the initial objective of ‘Sheng’?

2. What is the significance of the following statement as used in the passage: “Kenya’s demography makes radical change inevitable. A staggering 70 per cent of the population is below the age of thirty. That statistic, shared with many African nations, is as hopeful as it is terrifying. And the fact that those youngsters do not think in the same way as their is highlighted by the fact that they no longer speak the same language”

3. What should we do to ensure the generation gap between the old and the young is bridged and they can both speak in the “same language”.

The Tower of Babel
1 Now the whole world had one language and a common speech. 2 As people moved eastward, they found a plain in Shinar and settled there. 3 They said to each other, “Come, let’s make bricks and bake them thoroughly.” They used brick instead of stone, and tar for mortar. 4 Then they said, “Come, let us build ourselves a city, with a tower that reaches to the heavens, so that we may make a name for ourselves and not be scattered over the face of the whole earth.” 5 But the LORD came down to see the city and the tower that they were building. 6 The LORD said, “If as one people speaking the same language they have begun to do this, then nothing they plan to do will be impossible for them. 7 Come, let us go down and confuse their
language so they will not understand each other.” 8 So the LORD scattered them from there over all the earth, and they stopped building the city. 9 That is why it was called Babel—because there the LORD confused the language of the whole world. From there the LORD scattered them over the face of the whole earth.

Questions
1. What are the main events in this passage?

2. What is the meaning of verses 6 and 7?

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?
Chapter 10

Everything Depends on the Boss

Introduction
The saying ‘it’s our turn to eat’ seems to have been upgraded from being a vice to being a virtue in Kenya today. It is however noticeable that there are devoted citizens who can dare fight corruption. Their endeavors are however faced with many obstacles - even threats to their very lives. Regrettably, people on many occasions say that “it is not the boss who is bad, it is those who advise and surround him”. But the fact remains true: You can judge a person by the company he keeps. The writer of the book “It’s Our Turn To Eat” demonstrates this clearly.

Quote from the Book
DAVID FROST: So what in a sense you’re saying is that there are certain situations ... where the president can decide that it’s in the best interest of the nation or something, and do something illegal?

RICHARD NIXON: Well, when the president does it, that means that it is not illegal.
Excerpts for interview, aired 19 May 1977

It didn’t take a genius to work out what was really going on. The Anglo Leasing contracts were a crude device for extracting large wads of money from the Kenyan Treasury. Where the funds would eventually end up was anyone’s guess, but it was safe to assume they would be split between those in government who authorised the deals and the entrepreneurs who provided the necessary camouflage by setting up a range of respectable-sounding shell companies and credit providers – ‘looting pipes’, John called them.
The hope must have been that the confidentiality of these security contracts would muddy the waters long enough for the perpetrators to get away scotfree. Sometimes the suppliers at the end of the chain actually existed, although one had to wonder why any legitimate firm would agree to become embroiled in such intricate, shady deals. In other cases, the supplier was no more than a street address. Twelve of these contracts had actually been signed – if not activated – under KANU and six under NARC, a detail which highlighted one of the most intriguing aspects of the scam.

This was an apolitical money-making venture. The shady players who had originally sold the idea to the Moi administration had not let the change in regime put them off their stride. Supremely flexible, these amoral, shape-shifting pragmatists had simply made their pitch to State House’s new incumbents. (Michela Wrong, *It’s Our Turn to Eat*, p. 171 – 172)

On 11 June, finance minister David Mwiraria stepped into his office to announce that Anglo Leasing had returned all the money it had been paid on the forensic laboratories contract. He was joined by justice minister Kiraitu Murungi, and together the two men urged John to back off, insisting that this was what the president had requested and warning that if he continued pursuing the case, the government was likely to fall, so many of ‘our people’ were involved. Four days later, John learnt that Infotalent Ltd, a company which had won a police security contract, had returned 5.2 million euros. By the end of June, almost a billion shillings had been repaid by bogus companies on the eighteen-item list. Some frantic back-pedalling was taking place.

It did nothing to allay John’s fears. The civil servants concerned claimed to have no idea who was returning all this money: that blank-faced ghost making his appearance once again. Yet, in a moment of indiscretion, finance minister Mwiraria let slip that he had arranged Anglo Leasing’s refund by instructing a member of staff to call Asian businessman Deepak Kamani. If Mwiraria already knew Kamani was behind Anglo Leasing, it made a mockery of the investigations being conducted by the KACC and the auditor general. The same haziness hovered around the figure of Merlyn Kettering, an American consultant whose name kept surfacing in connection with the eighteen deals. John’s informers told him Kettering attended high-level meetings in the office of the president at which sensitive military and communications projects were discussed. Yet Dave Mwangi, permanent secretary for internal security, denied Kettering’s involvement when quizzed in front of the president.

As he stumbled on lie after lie, John continued briefing the president on what he was learning. On the morning of 18 June, noting that Kibaki seemed in high spirits, John decided the time had come to make his pitch. Circumstantial evidence kept pointing to the same players, he told the president over breakfast. Given the shambolic nature of Kenya’s judicial system, the matter could not safely be left to the law. A political gesture was necessary; heads must roll. (Michela Wrong, *It’s Our Turn To Eat*, p. 173)

John had fallen victim to one of the continent’s oft-rehearsed myths. Reporting Africa, I’ve always been puzzled by the readiness otherwise intelligent diplomats, businessmen and technocrats show in embracing the ‘Blame the Entourage’ line of argument. ‘The Old Man himself is OK,’ runs this refrain, echoed at various times from Guinea to Ivory Coast, Zaire to Gabon, and Tanzania to Zambia. ‘Deeply principled, a devout Muslim/Protestant/Catholic, he observes, in his own life, a strict moral code. It’s his aides/wife/sons who are them problem. They’re like leeches. If only he’d realise what they are doing in his name and
put a stop to it. But of course he adores them. It’s his one weakness. Such a shame.’ The argument has always struck me as a form of naivety so extreme it verges on intellectual dishonesty. In countries where presidents have done their best to centralise power, altering constitutions, winning over the army and emasculating the judiciary, the notion that key decisions can be taken without their approval is laughable. If a leader is surrounded by shifty, money grabbing aides and family members, it’s because he likes it that way. These are the people he feels at ease with, whose working methods he respects. Far from being an aberration, the entourage is a faithful expression of the autocrat’s own proclivities (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 181)

Questions
1. What are the myths about presidents mentioned in the passage?

2. What is the implication of the following statement to the fight against corruption and impunity in Kenya: “If a leader is surrounded by shifty, money grabbing aides and family members, it’s because he likes it that way. These are the people he feels at ease with, whose working methods he respects”.

3. In your own views, will the fight against corruption in Kenya succeed? Why? Why not?

Micaiah Prophesies against Ahab 1 Kings 22:1-14:

1 For three years there was no war between Aram and Israel. 2 But in the third year Jehoshaphat king of Judah went down to see the king of Israel. 3 The king of Israel had said to his officials, “Don’t you know that Ramoth Gilead belongs to us and yet we are doing nothing to retake it from the king of Aram?” 4 So he asked Jehoshaphat, “Will you go with me to fight against Ramoth Gilead?” Jehoshaphat replied to the king of Israel, “I am as you are, my people as your people, my horses as your horses.” 5 But Jehoshaphat also said to the king of Israel, “First seek the counsel of the LORD.” 6 So the king of Israel brought together the prophets—about four hundred men—and asked them, “Shall I go to war against Ramoth Gilead, or shall I refrain?” “Go,” they answered, “for the Lord will give it into the king’s hand.” 7 But Jehoshaphat asked, “Is there not a prophet of the LORD here whom we can inquire of?”

8 The king of Israel answered Jehoshaphat, “There is still one man through whom we can inquire of the LORD, but I hate him because he never prophesies anything good about me, but always bad. He is Micaiah son of Imlah.” “The king should not say that,” Jehoshaphat replied. 9 So the king of Israel called one of his officials and said, “Bring Micaiah son of Imlah at once.” 10 Dressed in their royal robes, the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat king of Judah were sitting on their thrones at the threshing floor by the entrance of the gate of Samaria, with all the prophets prophesying before them. 11 Now Zedekiah son of Kenaanah had made iron horns and he declared, “This is what the LORD says: ‘With these you will gore the Arameans until they are destroyed.’ 12 All the other prophets were prophesying the same thing. “Attack Ramoth Gilead and be victorious,” they said, “for the LORD will give it into the king’s hand.” 13 The messenger who had gone to summon Micaiah said to him, “Look, as one man the other prophets are predicting success for the king.
your word agree with theirs, and speak favorably." 14 But Micaiah said, "As surely as the LORD lives, I can tell him only what the LORD tells me."

Questions
1. What are the main events in the passage?

2. What is the importance of verses 12 - 14 in the passage?

3. Are there true prophets in Kenya who can advise our leaders honestly? Name and discuss them? Are you one of them?
Western donors were not the only ones made to look gullible by the ‘Professor of Politics’. In 1999, when the second major aid freeze was beginning to bite, Moi appointed Dr Richard Leakey, one of the few white Kenyans engaged in politics, to lead a ‘Dream Team’ of technocrats which would overhaul the country’s nepotistic civil service. The president was desperate to get a new IMF lending programme and Leakey, no political naïf, became convinced he had finally accepted the need for change. ‘When I went to see him, he told me to prosecute his own son, Philip, if it proved necessary. When you have that kind of assurance, you feel you can blast your way through.’ The Dream Team worked wonders for a year. An impressed IMF, convinced Kenya was finally on the right track, approved a new agreement. ‘A week after that, direct access to Moi was closed off,’ remembers a rueful Leakey. With the removal of the president’s blessing, the Dream Team hit the buffers. ‘He’d got what he wanted. We had shot ourselves in the foot by securing that IMF deal far too quickly.’ Leakey stepped down, aware he had been thoroughly outmanoeuvred. Moi might be led to water, but could only rarely be made to drink (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 186)
But the reaction on the street was different. The British high commissioner’s residence in Muthaiga lies at the end of an almost permanently traffic-clogged thoroughfare linking Nairobi’s slums with its centre, so Clay had plenty of time on his way to work each morning to savour the public mood. Spotting his face – now familiar to every Kenyan – the touts selling newspapers at the traffic lights clustered round his car to urge him to greater efforts. ‘You’re right!, ‘It was time!’ Matatu drivers leant from their windows to cheekily offer lifts to Kamiti, Kenya’s maximum security prison. Spotting the high commissioner’s diplomatic plates, a policeman stepped forward to wave him through on a busy roundabout, a huge smile on his face. A former permanent secretary stopped him in the street, a twinkle in his eye, to remark that Clay’s shoes looked remarkably clean. 'Thank you, you have done this country a singular service,’ he added. When Clay visited his bank, the shoeshine men outside joined in the fun. 'Five shillings for shoeshine!' they yelled. 'Ten for vomit!' A beggar boy was spotted in the city centre with a sign reading, in Kiswahili: 'A penny please but don’t puke on my foot'. At Nairobi’s nyama choma joints, where roast meat was served with helpings of ugali maize meal, diners clasped bulging stomachs and joked, ‘I’m so full, I could vomit on your shoes.’ Ordinary Kenyans, it turned out, were rather less prone than the educated elite to postcolonial prickliness, bearing the brunt as they did of their government’s predatory tactics (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 202).

Questions
1. What was the response of the public to Edward Clay’s criticism of the government?

2. Compare and contrast the roles played by John Githongo and Dr Richard Leaky in the government. In what ways were the intentions of President Moi and President Kibaki similar? Discuss.

3. Is there good will from the leaders to eliminate corruption and impunity in government? Discuss.

Habakkuk’s ComplaintsHabakkuk 1.2-11
2 How long, O LORD, must I call for help, but you do not listen? Or cry out to you, “Violence!” but you do not save? 3 Why do you make me look at injustice? Why do you tolerate wrong? Destruction and violence are before me; there is strife, and conflict abounds. 4 Therefore the law is paralyzed, and justice never prevails. The wicked hem in the righteous, so that justice is perverted.

5 “Look at the nations and watch— and be utterly amazed. For I am going to do something in your days that you would not believe, even if you were told. 6 I am raising up the Babylonians, that ruthless and impetuous people, who sweep across the whole earth to seize dwelling places not their own. 7 They are a feared and dreaded people; they are a law to themselves and promote their own honor. 8 Their horses are swifter than leopards, fiercer than wolves at dusk. Their cavalry gallops headlong; their horsemen come from afar. They fly like a vulture swooping to devour; 9 they all come bent on violence. Their hordes advance like a desert wind and gather prisoners like sand. 10 They deride kings and scoff at rulers. They laugh at all fortified cities; they build earthen ramps and capture them. 11 Then they sweep past like the wind and go on—guilty men, whose own strength is their god.
Questions
1. From the above text what is Habakkuk's complaint and what is God's response?

2. Compare and contrast the Habakkuk’s complaints and the complaints of Kenyans.

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?
Chapter 12

A Form of Mourning

Introduction
The path of integrity, though not the easiest is always the best. It is unfortunate that in many instances those who chose this way are heavily outnumbered. In the case of Githongo, even the very best of his friends had changed, and the boss was not necessarily innocent either. This reminds us of the case of Elijah in the Bible, where the king led in idol worship and the prophets for the idols had grown to a staggering 400. Also, during his time, Noah was the only righteous man at a time when sin was too intense for God to withstand. How often do you find yourself standing alone in integrity, or in the company of the majority?

Quote from the Book
“It isn’t facing danger that cuts you up inside. It’s the waiting, the not knowing what’s coming”. Eliot Ness, The Untouchables

There was to be one last betrayal, in the course of one of the sparring conversations that had become a surreal feature of his working life, during which deadly-serious matters were alluded to between guffaws of phoney laughter. Following a 4 November meeting to discuss NARC’s governance strategy, Justice Aaron Ringera, head of the Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission, stayed behind for a private chat. Fraught, craving support, John ruefully confessed to the colleague whose career he had done so to further that he had
realized State House only wanted him to much go through the motions of his job: ‘Mine is the shock of a personal realization.’

Ringera nodded in agreement. ‘So you stay there, you are a little wiser and you know that you are there!’ And then this refined man of the law, John’s trusted friend, made crudely explicit the sheer horror of his predicament. ‘You can’t, in fact, afford to make any move. That’s when you will really be killed. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn to Eat, 217)

In conversations with diplomats, with the head of the KNCHR or the director of public prosecutions Philip Murgor, John rigidly held the party line. ‘Maina Kiai and I were telling John, “We’re seeing all the signs, we’re on our own,”‘ says Murgor. ‘He kept saying, “I can assure you, I was just with the president and he is behind us.” John remained loyal till the very end.’ But John could no longer hide the truth from himself. ‘Ultimately, it became clear. I was investigating the president’. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn to Eat, 220).

Questions
1. Describe the main events in the passage.

3. What was the implication of the statement: "We’re seeing all the signs, we're on our own’.

3. Give instances when you've been in similar circumstances in your personal life or place of work? What did you do? What lessons do we learn from the passage?

The Account of Noah Genesis 6:9-14, 7:1

9 This is the account of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, blameless among the people of his time, and he walked with God. 10 Noah had three sons: Shem, Ham and Japheth. 11 Now the earth was corrupt in God’s sight and was full of violence. 12 God saw how corrupt the earth had become, for all the people on earth had corrupted their ways. 13 So God said to Noah, “I am going to put an end to all people, for the earth is filled with violence because of them. I am surely going to destroy both them and the earth. 14 So make yourself an ark of cypress wood; make rooms in it and coat it with pitch inside and out.

Questions; 
1. Describe the characters and the events in the passage?

2. What is the meaning of verse 13?

3. Give examples of circumstances that required you to stand out for integrity and how you did it.
Chapter 13

In Exile

Quote from the Book
“... Now whether it be
Bestial oblivion, or some craven scruple
Of thinking too precisely on the event
... I do not know
Why yet I live to say “This thing’s to do”.
William Shakespear, Hamlet

The only other form of self-protection he could muster was his old stalwart: information. Knowing what was happening back in Kenya, perhaps better than many of the residents of State House, was a weapon of a sort. The network of informants he had established when in office had not evaporated with his departure. If some assumed that with resignation came irrelevance, many continued feeding him snippets. Now, no one expected to be paid. They acted out of a sense of civic duty, the fury of frustrated zeal, or simply took a punt on a distant future: ‘One day you will be a Big Man and you will look after me,’ some texted him, invoking the very patronage principle John regarded as holding the key to Kenya’s psychosis. Electric cables trailed across his small flat, an adaptor was jammed into every power socket, keeping the eleven mobiles on which this information-gathering operation relied constantly charged. There was an East African
Studies programme to be pulled together, in collaboration with St Antony’s existing experts, who included David Anderson, a specialist on Kenya’s Mau Mau, and Paul Collier, who had spent thirty years researching the causes of African poverty. While doing that, John fended off an onslaught of interview requests from journalists, foreign diplomats, NGO workers and Kenyan acquaintances. Many were genuinely concerned to see how he was doing. Others were simply curious, keen to be able to boast that they had met the former anti-corruption chief in his Oxford lair. Some, he knew, would have agreed to serve as the eyes and ears of the Kenyan government. The only entity that showed no intense interest in his presence – what an irony, given the accusations being leveled back home – was the British government... (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn to Eat, p. 232).

However many times John might have noted in his diary that corruption in Kenya went to the top, his heart had never accepted what his brain told him. The Mzee could not be, must not be, the grand spider at the centre of State House’s web of corruption. And now, having examined all the evidence, John knew that scenario made no sense. Kibaki was not out of the loop, deceived by manipulative aides, scattily ignorant of the system of sleaze operating all around him. He was the system. Kibaki and his cronies had played him for a fool, and he – star pupil, plucky former hack and experienced NGO wallah that he was – had kindly obliged. The bitterness choked him.

And with that came another terrifying realisation: ‘This thing will never go away.’ In his mind, up until then, John had managed to balance two parallel, if mutually exclusive, scenarios. Allow Anglo Leasing quietly to fade away, or clear his conscience and become one of the most famous – or infamous – Kenyans in history. What suddenly, struck home was the understanding that it had to be one or the other, he could not have both. And it had to be the latter, with all it would involve in terms of public vilification and media hysteria, because of who he was. Character is destiny. ‘John has the kind of honesty that stems from not being able to live with yourself if you don’t do the right thing,’ Ali Zaidi, his former editor, once told me. As a moral actor and a devout Christian, his route was virtually preordained. ‘Initially, I never saw myself as a whistleblower. I had not thought it through to that point. Maybe part of me hoped all my work, my interactions with government people, would lead to internal changes that would be positive. But in the end I had to do the hard thing, the painful thing.’ Travelling on the Oxford double-deckers, he gazed at other passengers and experienced a fierce pang of envy for their ordinary lives, their mortgages, their prosaic worries about which school to choose and whether they could afford a new car (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 235 - 236).

Questions
1. What are the key messages about corruption in these passages?

2. a) Which factors influenced Githongo’s actions?

   b) What role did his Christian faith and morals play in making those decisions?

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?
a) Has the Christian faith ever influenced how you make difficult decisions in life?

b) Do you have a network of people who keep you updated on what is happening or do you depend on rumours?

Nehemiah Inspects Jerusalem's Walls  Nehemiah 2: 11-20

11 I went to Jerusalem, and after staying there three days 12 I set out during the night with a few men. I had not told anyone what my God had put in my heart to do for Jerusalem. There were no mounts with me except the one I was riding on. 13 By night I went out through the Valley Gate toward the Jackal Well and the Dung Gate, examining the walls of Jerusalem, which had been broken down, and its gates, which had been destroyed by fire. 14 Then I moved on toward the Fountain Gate and the King's Pool, but there was not enough room for my mount to get through; 15 so I went up the valley by night, examining the wall. Finally, I turned back and reentered through the Valley Gate. 16 The officials did not know where I had gone or what I was doing, because as yet I had said nothing to the Jews or the priests or nobles or officials or any others who would be doing the work. 17 Then I said to them, “You see the trouble we are in: Jerusalem lies in ruins, and its gates have been burned with fire. Come, let us rebuild the wall of Jerusalem, and we will no longer be in disgrace.” 18 I also told them about the gracious hand of my God upon me and what the king had said to me. They replied, “Let us start rebuilding.” So they began this good work. 19 But when Sanballat the Horonite, Tobiah the Ammonite official and Geshem the Arab heard about it, they mocked and ridiculed us. “What is this you are doing?” they asked. “Are you rebelling against the king?” 20 I answered them by saying, “The God of heaven will give us success. We his servants will start rebuilding, but as for you, you have no share in Jerusalem or any claim or historic right to it.”

Questions

1. What are the main events in this passage?

2. Compare and contrast the problems that Nehemiah seeks to solve and the problems that face Kenya. What are the differences and similarities? Discuss.

3. What lessons do we learn from this passage?
Introduction
Most Kenyans express the feeling that our values have declined. The moral decadence, corruption and impunity has percolated deeper and deeper into the social strata. However, even in such times, God raises for himself certain individuals who can stand for the truth - even when it means putting their life and reputation on the line. Will you stand up for the truth or would you rather yield to lies and deceit?

Quote from the Book
“It always seems impossible until it is done”. Nelson Mandela

The reaction was not overwhelmingly approving, however. ‘The image of a traitor who fled to enemy territory to abuse his motherland can’t quite leave my mind. I could feel something clogging my throat,’ wrote one Nation reader. ‘No matter how useless we are as a country, can’t we be spared this international embarrassment?’ Columnist Edith Macharia warned John in the same newspaper not to ‘expect any laurels for airing the country’s dirty laundry’. ‘I fear he will go the way of all informers and snitches – ignominiously,’ she sniffed. It was noticeable that the angriest attacks on John came from Kenyans with Kikuyu names, like
Macharia, appalled that a kinsman should have exposed the House of Mumbi to such ridicule. The real vitriol was reserved for the Kikuyu websites, where members of the community tore into one another. While some hailed John as ‘God’s gift from heaven’, others accused him of running into the arms of the 
mzungu. ‘Enjoy your BBC moment, 'cos you’re done for, Githongo,’ wrote one. 'May you rot in hell.' Wycliffe 
Muga was not alone in offering me some quiet advice. ‘If you are one of John’s friends, tell him not to come 
back. If the Kikuyus found him they would kill him without even waiting for instructions from above. They 
are very, very bitter’ (Michela Wrong, It’s our Turn To Eat, p. 253)

Questions
1. From the passages above, what was the reaction when Githongo revealed details about corruption in 
Kenya?

2. Why do you think people reacted in that manner?

3. What lessons do you learn from this passage?

What can a Man Give in Exchange for his Soul  Mark 8: 36-38
36What good is it for a man to gain the whole world, yet forfeit his soul? 37Or what can a man give in 
exchange for his soul? 38If anyone is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, 
the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when he comes in his Father’s glory with the holy angels.”

Questions
1. From this passage, what was Jesus telling the crowd and His disciples?

2. What do you understand by the statement: "What good is it for a man to gain the whole world, yet forfeit 
his soul?"

3. Describe a situation in which you had to be bold and not ashamed of the truth. What were the 
consequences?
Chapter 15

Backlash

Introduction
Freedom of expression is a major pillar in the fight against corruption and impunity. The President Moi era was characterised by gross violations of the fundamental freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. That made Kenya a country in the dark, gagged by sedition laws and police harassment. On its part, the NARC administration presented itself as a darling of the media. However, to hide its sins and greed, it appears to have caved in to the devious habit of despotic administrations - violating press freedoms. Can one evil deed be covered with another?

Quote from the Book
A seventy-year-old grandfather stunned a Nyeri court yesterday when he admitted that he wanted to commit suicide, following disappointments caused by the political turmoil in the country. Stephen Nyamu Ngari said he wanted to escape the political wrangles witnessed since the introduction of multi-party politics. He caused laughter when he said that he was tired of life under the current political order. The magistrate ordered that he be taken for a mental check-up and be produced in court on Friday. East African Standard, 19 April 2006

The Standard Raid
Smarting from weeks of merciless media attack, the Mount Kenya Mafia had struck back. If the Standard, Kenya’s second-biggest newspaper, had not led domestic coverage of the Anglo Leasing affair, it had joined in with relish. While a certain amount could be forgiven the Nation, in light of past friendships,
Moi’s ownership of the Standard meant any criticism from that quarter was viewed as politically charged. 'Your newspaper is dangling by a thread,' Alfred Mutua, the government spokesman, warned Pamela Makotsi, the Standard’s editor, the day before the raid. 'The government is looking for the smallest excuse to slam down on the Standard. They can raid you, you know, just like they did in the past.' She had been incredulous. 'What, this new government, raid us? Come on, that’s what happened in the old days.' It took a while for the government to admit responsibility for an operation whose brute thuggery seemed more typical of Mugabe’s Zimbabwe than of Kenya. But when it finally did, there was no apology. The Standard had been planning a story that posed a threat to national security, the government claimed. 'If you rattle a snake, you must be prepared to be bitten,' said John Michuki, minister for internal security. The raid, which came as John was preparing to give testimony to the KACC, had several curious characteristics. One was that it had been staged without the prior knowledge of police commissioner Major General Hussein Ali. The other was that the technicians ordered to the floor had noticed, despite the balaclavas and hoods, that several of the commandos were white. It was the first, but not the last, controversial appearance of the ‘Artur brothers’ – two guntoting, rule-flouting, medallion-sporting, party-throwing, bling braggarts whose sojourn in Nairobi would deliver a sharp kick in the groin to what little remained of NARC credibility. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 256).

Questions
1. Who are the main actors and what are their roles in the passage?

2. a) What do you think was the meaning of the statement: ‘If you rattle a snake, you must be prepared to be bitten”?

   b) In your view, why was the government incapable of handling the truth Standard wanted to publish?

3. What should we do to ensure that the government does not violate the freedom of expression and the freedom of the press?

Exploring Canaan

Exodus 13:1-33
1 The LORD said to Moses, 2 “Send some men to explore the land of Canaan, which I am giving to the Israelites. From each ancestral tribe send one of its leaders.”

3 So at the LORD’s command Moses sent them out from the Desert of Paran. All of them were leaders of the Israelites. 4 These are their names:
from the tribe of Reuben, Shammua son of Zakkur;
5 from the tribe of Simeon, Shaphat son of Hori;
6 from the tribe of Judah, Caleb son of Jephunneh;
from the tribe of Issachar, Igal son of Joseph;
from the tribe of Ephraim, Hoshea son of Nun;
from the tribe of Benjamin, Palti son of Raphu;
from the tribe of Zebulun, Gaddiel son of Sodi;
from the tribe of Manasseh (a tribe of Joseph), Gaddi son of Susi;
from the tribe of Dan, Ammiel son of Gemalli;
from the tribe of Asher, Sethur son of Michael;
from the tribe of Naphtali, Nahbi son of Vophsi;
from the tribe of Gad, Geuel son of Maki.
These are the names of the men Moses sent to explore the land. (Moses gave Hoshea son of Nun the name Joshua.)

When Moses sent them to explore Canaan, he said, “Go up through the Negev and on into the hill country. See what the land is like and whether the people who live there are strong or weak, few or many. What kind of land do they live in? Is it good or bad? What kind of towns do they live in? Are they unwalled or fortified? How is the soil? Is it fertile or poor? Are there trees in it or not? Do your best to bring back some of the fruit of the land.” (It was the season for the first ripe grapes.)

So they went up and explored the land from the Desert of Zin as far as Rehob, toward Lebo Hamath. They went up through the Negev and came to Hebron, where Ahiman, Sheshai and Talmai, the descendants of Anak, lived. (Hebron had been built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.) When they reached the Valley of Eshkol, they cut off a branch bearing a single cluster of grapes. Two of them carried it on a pole between them, along with some pomegranates and figs. That place was called the Valley of Eshkol because of the cluster of grapes the Israelites cut off there. At the end of forty days they returned from exploring the land.

They came back to Moses and Aaron and the whole Israelite community at Kadesh in the Desert of Paran. There they reported to them and to the whole assembly and showed them the fruit of the land. They gave Moses this account: “We went into the land to which you sent us, and it does flow with milk and honey! Here is its fruit. But the people who live there are powerful, and the cities are fortified and very large. We even saw descendants of Anak there. The Amalekites live in the Negev; the Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites live in the hill country; and the Canaanites live near the sea and along the Jordan.” Then Caleb silenced the people before Moses and said, “We should go up and take possession of the land, for we can certainly do it.” But the men who had gone up with him said, “We can’t attack those people; they are stronger than we are.” And they spread among the Israelites a bad report about the land they had explored. They said, “The land we explored devours those living in it. All the people we saw there are of great size. We saw the Nephilim there (the descendants of Anak come from the Nephilim). We seemed like grasshoppers in our own eyes, and we looked the same to them.”

The People Rebel
That night all the members of the community raised their voices and wept aloud. All the Israelites grumbled against Moses and Aaron, and the whole assembly said to them, “If only we had died in Egypt! Or in this wilderness! Why is the LORD bringing us to this land only to let us fall by the sword? Our wives and
children will be taken as plunder. Wouldn’t it be better for us to go back to Egypt?” 4 And they said to each other, “We should choose a leader and go back to Egypt.”

5 Then Moses and Aaron fell facedown in front of the whole Israelite assembly gathered there. 6 Joshua son of Nun and Caleb son of Jephunneh, who were among those who had explored the land, tore their clothes 7 and said to the entire Israelite assembly, “The land we passed through and explored is exceedingly good. 8 If the LORD is pleased with us, he will lead us into that land, a land flowing with milk and honey, and will give it to us. 9 Only do not rebel against the LORD. And do not be afraid of the people of the land, because we will devour them. Their protection is gone, but the LORD is with us. Do not be afraid of them.”

10 But the whole assembly talked about stoning them. Then the glory of the LORD appeared at the tent of meeting to all the Israelites. 11 The LORD said to Moses, “How long will these people treat me with contempt? How long will they refuse to believe in me, in spite of all the signs I have performed among them? 12 I will strike them down with a plague and destroy them, but I will make you into a nation greater and stronger than they.”

Questions
1. Who are the main actors and what are their roles in the passage?

2. What is the significance of verses 25 - 33? In your view, were the ten spies justified in giving a report that spread fear and despair among the people? Discuss.

3. What lessons can we learn from the passage? How should we handle truth if it is information that can bring strife and hatred among people?

Asa’s Last Years 2 - Chronicles 16:1-10
1 In the thirty-sixth year of Asa’s reign Baasha king of Israel went up against Judah and fortified Ramah to prevent anyone from leaving or entering the territory of Asa king of Judah. 2 Asa then took the silver and gold out of the treasuries of the LORD’s temple and of his own palace and sent it to Ben-Hadad king of Aram, who was ruling in Damascus. 3 “Let there be a treaty between me and you,” he said, “as there was between my father and your father. See, I am sending you silver and gold. Now break your treaty with Baasha king of Israel so he will withdraw from me.” 4 Ben-Hadad agreed with King Asa and sent the commanders of his forces against the towns of Israel. They conquered Ijon, Dan, Abel Maim and all the store cities of Naphtali. 5 When Baasha heard this, he stopped building Ramah and abandoned his work. 6 Then King Asa brought all the men of Judah, and they carried away from Ramah the stones and timber Baasha had been using. With them he built up Geba and Mizpah. 7 At that time Hanani the seer came to Asa king of Judah and said to him: “Because you relied on the king of Aram and not on the LORD your God, the army of the king of Aram has escaped from your hand. 8 Were not the Cushites and Libyans a mighty army with great numbers of chariots and horsemen? Yet when you relied on the LORD, he delivered them into
your hand. 9 For the eyes of the LORD range throughout the earth to strengthen those whose hearts are fully committed to him. You have done a foolish thing, and from now on you will be at war.” 10 Asa was angry with the seer because of this; he was so enraged that he put him in prison. At the same time Asa brutally oppressed some of the people.

Questions
1. Briefly highlight the main events in this passage?

2. What is the significance of verse 10? Why was the Asa angry with the seer?

3. What do we learn from this passage?
   a) Is possible to tell the truth and be accepted? Explain.
   b) How do you react when someone tells you an inconvenient truth? Share an experience.
Chapter 16

A Plaza Paradise

Introduction
Kenya presents a case of sheer greed and devious absolute capitalism. The desire of many people to acquire money and property is insatiable. Each person thrives whether from honest gain or from the proceeds of crime and corruption. At the end of the day, all Kenyans want to be rich and influential. It is difficult to point at what the root cause of this shared desire is. However, there is not doubt that many people identify with it and practice it in life. Amidst this treasure hunting are over 10 million Kenyans who are living in abject poverty. They reel in ignorance, illiteracy, disease and poverty. Even those who condemn corruption, once in an influential position, they become experts in pilfering public fund to their pockets. What will be the antidote for this disease?

Quote from the Book
"People in this country are like meat for hyenas. The only question is which hyena do you prefer to be eaten by: Hyena Raila, Hyena Kibaki or Hyena Musyoka? Whichever it is, it’s still a hyena coming to eat you". Nairobi kiosk owner

In September 2007, huge billboards went up across Nairobi, looming over its busy roundabouts and honking junctions. ‘Hummer is here,’ ran the ominous message. ‘Maybe you felt the tremors.’ And so we had.

General Motors’ Kenyan launch of the Hummer H3, one of the most macho 4x4s on the market, was one of those small events which combine with a host of other details to send out a signal about where a country is heading. It came as no surprise that Raila Odinga, always a flamboyant performer, beat everyone else to it by importing one of the gas-guzzling behemoths, dubbed ‘The King of Bling’ by motoring fans, months
ahead of the launch. But what took the breath away was the announcement by General Motors' local
director that he expected to take a hundred orders for the car, priced at a sobering six million shillings
(£47,000), in the first year.

Did one hundred people really have that kind of cash in a land where the average citizen earned just $460
a year? Had J.M. Kariuki, the leftleaning populist who warned Kenyatta of the dangers of creating a Kenya
of 'ten millionaires and ten million beggars' shortly before his assassination, only got his figures slightly
wrong. (Michela Wrong, It's our Turn To eat, p. 279)

Once Nairobi had been known as the Garden City, where your breakfast could be stolen by light-fingered
vervet monkeys sneaking in through an open kitchen window. Now it seemed a City in Permanent
Construction, its birdsong drowned out by the sound of constant drilling, greenery thinning amid the high-
pitched whine of electric saws. The self-confidence and technological nous of the Kenyan diaspora, which
had brought its savings back and was investing at home, were reshaping the city. Cynics pointed out that
construction had always been the easiest way of laundering illicitly acquired funds, but the sense of
gathering momentum was beguiling. Across the capital, empty plots of land evaporated with the speed of
puddles in the African sun. No street corner was now complete without a new apartment block in the local
blue-grey Nairobi stone, and at the end of many of those streets the traditional two-storey shopping
centre, with rows of small metal-grilled Asian shops, was dwarfed by a giant plaza offering seven-day
shopping, twenty-four-hour service, beauty parlour, cinema, ATM banking, internet access and a branch of
the Java café chain, the venue of choice for the city’s late-drinking, Black Berry wielding, laptop-addicted
young professionals. You could measure prosperity levels in a new phenomenon: the Nairobi traffic jam.
Once an exclusively rush-hour feature, it now seemed to last all day. Why, these days Nairobi even boasted
an ice-rink – one of only three in Africa – where squealing Kenyan boys and girls tottered across the ice and
thumped against the wooden barriers.... Were there really enough 'aspirational' people in Kenya, I
wondered, to keep all these malls busy? Or, to put it slightly differently, weren’t all these thrusting
entrepreneurs in danger of forgetting that the most genuinely 'aspirational' segment of Kenyan society
was not in fact its small middle class, but the millions of exasperated inhabitants of Korogocho, Dandora,
Mathare Valley and Kibera? And what would happen when those Kenyans finally registered that while a
tiny elite was ‘eating’ as never before, their own, more modest aspirations were doomed to go forever
ignored? (Michela Wrong, It's Our Turn To Eat, p. 280)

Nothing better illustrated Kenyan society’s acceptance of its own glaring faults than the rehabilitation of
Kamlesh Pattni, architect of the Goldenberg scandal. By 2006, the man who had nearly destroyed Kenya’s
economy had renounced his Hindu faith, embraced Christianity and been reborn as 'Brother Paul', preaching
from a hall inside a casino complex. When journalist Kwamchetsi Makokha was assigned to interview the
sleek former jailbird on live television, he was taken aback by what followed. ‘All these young people who
had been manning the lights and cameras suddenly rushed up and mobbed Pattni like groupies. They were
all excited, asking for his autograph, one even held out his sleeve for Pattni to sign.’ Salim Lone, spokesman
for Raila Odinga’s Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) opposition party, was attending a funeral for a
group of MPs killed in a plane crash in north-eastern Kenya in April when he heard a storm of applause. ‘I
assumed some celebrity had arrived. But no, it was Pattni. They were applauding him like some kind of
hero.’ Far from earning society’s opprobrium, one of Kenya’s most outrageous conmen had acquired the
glamorous aura of a rock star. He had done what so many dreamed about but did not dare attempt. (Michela
Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 282)
Questions
1. Describe the events in these passages.

2. Why do you think Kenyans applaud and celebrate wealthy people irrespective of how they acquired it?

3. How should we deal with people who have been involved in corrupt practices?

Their Eyes and Hearts are set on Dishonest Gain

Jeremiah 22:13-17

13 “Woe to him who builds his palace by unrighteousness, his upper rooms by injustice, making his countrymen work for nothing, not paying them for their labor. 14 He says, ‘I will build myself a great palace with spacious upper rooms.’ So he makes large windows in it, panels it with cedar and decorates it in red. 15 “Does it make you a king to have more and more cedar? Did not your father have food and drink? He did what was right and just, so all went well with him. 16 He defended the cause of the poor and needy, and so all went well. Is that not what it means to know me?” declares the LORD. 17 “But your eyes and your heart are set only on dishonest gain, on shedding innocent blood and on oppression and extortion.”

Questions
1. What are the vices condemned in this passage?

2. What is the meaning of verse 17? Compare and contrast the situation in the passage and the one that is in Kenya.

3. What lessons do we learn from the passage?
Introduction
Kenyans generally view elections as a tribal wrestling match. The tribe that wins the contest takes up the coveted prize - the power to loot the Treasury. It is believed that if “one of your own” is in State House, your tribe will be eating, that the Big Man and his cronies will eat to their fill while the other members of the tribe will eat through osmosis. The tribes that are not in power are told in a condescending language to wait for their turn to eat. This is the reason the elections held on 27th December 2007 were too close to call. The stakes for the tribes that felt alienated from power and those that wanted to keep holding onto power were just too high. The need to get or to keep the power overrode other needs. At the end of process, unfortunately, it was not clear in many people’s minds which tribe had won. So a runoff was necessary. The runoff, sadly, did not have ballots, it had bullets and matches, tears and blood, death and destruction. Did anyone really win the violent contest?

Sad Note: The Post Election Violence triggered by a dispute on the Presidential elections results left in its wake a death toll of over 1,333 people and over 500,000 people internally displaced. Hundreds of men, women and children were killed, tortured, raped, sodomised, battered, lacerated, burnt and shot in a wave of violence that swept the country like a tsunami. Property estimated to be worth billion of shillings was looted, plundered, destroyed, burnt and squandered as tribal animosities continued to build. The violence took an ethnic dimension, with ethnic backgrounds being deemed to be synonymous with political cleavage. It disrupted relationships and deeply polarized communities. It is sad that the root causes of the violence are yet to be addressed leaving room for recurrence in future. Will Kenyans fix their roof before the next storm?
As the Swahili proverb warns, Usipozimba ufa, utanjenga ukuta (If you don’t fix the crack, you will have to build the entire wall).

Quote from the Book
“Why worry, it’s only an election, not the end of the world”. Campaign billboard for Brother Paul Kamlesh Pattini

Kenya is Burning!

But in December 2007, all that looked set to change. Finally, Kenya’s game of musical chairs was about to turn in Kisumu’s favour. The opinion polls agreed: Raila was heading straight for State House. Four decades of calculated neglect were about to end, and it would all be thanks to ‘Agwambo’ (‘Man of Mystery’), ‘the Hammer’, ‘the Bulldozer’, ‘Mr Chairman’, a local hero who enjoyed near-god-like status in his own fiefdom. Given Kenya’s political tradition of ethnic patronage, a Raila presidency would surely mean new jobs, fresh investment, new roads, hospitals and schools for the Luos, just as it had for the Kikuyu under Kenyatta and the Kalenjin under Moi. On the podium, Raila might insist on presenting himself as a national unity candidate representing all Kenyans. As they queued to cast their ballots on 27 December, Kisumu’s residents had a clear sense of what was their due. ‘We’re voting for change,’ was the politically-correct mantra. But many quietly added: ‘It’s our time....’ (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 300)

By the morning of Saturday, 29 December, Raila’s advantage had been whittled away to the slimmest of leads. Worried guests, gathered around the TV sets, nodded approvingly as ODM leaders in Nairobi angrily demanded to know why ECK was announcing parliamentary and civic results from the Mount Kenya area, while omitting the presidential. By this stage of the game in 2002, the losing candidate had already been preparing to concede defeat. Why, this time, was everything taking so long? Kisumu’s poor did not wait to hear the answer. To them, it was obvious: once again, the Luos were being royally screwed. The government in Nairobi had conspired to rob their community of its rightful turn at the trough. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 314)

In the space of only two months, Kenya had changed beyond recognition. Rolling back the migration trends of half a century, a process of self-segregation was under way. ‘You have a right to reside anywhere in Kenya,’ shouted the red headline on a government statement published in the newspapers. But no one believed that now. Kikuyus, Merus and Embus flooded back towards Mount Kenya, Luos, Luhyas and Kisii streamed westwards, Kambas headed east. Teachers abandoned their schools and moved to areas where they felt safe, only to find many of their pupils had beaten them to it. University students and their professors applied for course swaps and transfers. Landlords gave tenants notice on the basis of ethnicity – ‘Oh, we just can’t trust them any more’ – flower farmers fired pickers to open up jobs for kinsmen, and kiosk-owners asked customers for ID before handing over groceries. Even the health system showed signs of Balkanisation, with ODM supporters checking into hospitals where they were sure not to be treated by Kikuyu staff. The voluntary zoning, first symptom of national disintegration, took place to begin with irrespective of class and income... The irony was that, combined with undertakings to review the constitution and discuss sweeping electoral, parliamentary and judicial reform, the deal brokered by (HE Koffi) Annan and Tanzanian president Jakaya Kikwete contained most of the elements of NARC’s pre-2002 programme. Had the regime only delivered on its original promises, Kenya could have been spared a multitude of horrors. (Michela Wrong, It’s Our Turn To Eat, p. 300)
Questions
1. Describe the series of events that takes place in the passage?

2.  
   a) What are the events that happened, before, during and after the election?

   b) What are the implications of the massive displacement and migration of people to their ancestral homes to peace and prosperity in Kenya?

3. Do you think Kenya is vulnerable to another spate of violence? Give reasons for your answer. How can we prevent the recurrence of such violence?

Division of the Rest of the Land - Joshua 18:1-10

The whole assembly of the Israelites gathered at Shiloh and set up the Tent of Meeting there. The country was brought under their control, but there were still seven Israelite tribes who had not yet received their inheritance. So Joshua said to the Israelites: “How long will you wait before you begin to take possession of the land that the LORD, the God of your fathers, has given you? Appoint three men from each tribe. I will send them out to make a survey of the land and to write a description of it, according to the inheritance of each. Then they will return to me. You are to divide the land into seven parts. Judah is to remain in its territory on the south and the house of Joseph in its territory on the north. After you have written descriptions of the seven parts of the land, bring them here to me and I will cast lots for you in the presence of the LORD our God. The Levites, however, do not get a portion among you, because the priestly service of the LORD is their inheritance. And Gad, Reuben and the half-tribe of Manasseh have already received their inheritance on the east side of the Jordan. Moses the servant of the LORD gave it to them.” As the men started on their way to map out the land, Joshua instructed them, “Go and make a survey of the land and write a description of it. Then return to me, and I will cast lots for you here at Shiloh in the presence of the LORD.” So the men left and went through the land. They wrote its description on a scroll, town by town, in seven parts, and returned to Joshua in the camp at Shiloh. Joshua then cast lots for them in Shiloh in the presence of the LORD, and there he distributed the land to the Israelites according to their tribal divisions.

Questions
1. Describe the main events in the passage?

2. In your view, did Joshua address the issue of land among the tribes of Israel fairly? Discuss.

3. Do you think that the land in Kenya is distributed fairly and equitably among all the tribes in Kenya? How can we ensure equitable distribution of land in Kenya?