



THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH IN FIGHTING MACHIAVELISM IN KENYAN POLITICS

¹Simon G. Omare and ²Martin K. Tanui

¹Lecturer-Moi University, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, P.O. BOX 3900, ELDORET (30100),
Mobile +254722616761/ +254731616761/+254750632666; TEL +254538005000; FAX.+25405343047

²Kabianga University College (A Constituent College of Moi University), School of Education & Social Sciences, P.
O. Box 2030, KERICHO, (20200) KENYA, Mobile: +254727975427/ +254734635958;
Tel +254202172665/ +254518003970.'

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 7th June, 2011
Received in revised form
9th July, 2011
Accepted 5th August, 2011
Published online 17th September, 2011

Key words:

Machiavellism,
Moribund,
Ineffective,
NCCCK Secretary,
Kenyan politics.

ABSTRACT

When the NCCCK Secretary General described the President as being 'moribund' and the Prime Minister 'ineffective' in the Kenyan coalition government, it meant that in the eyes of the NCCCK there is something wrong in the Kenyan politics. Indeed, a political setup that is 'moribund and ineffective' cannot deliver services to the 'polis' as it ought to. The bane of the Kenyan politics can be viewed from many perspectives. One such perspective is from a religio-ethical point of view. Specifically, Kenyan politics is imbued with Machiavellism. This is a political system where the survival of the political elite surpasses anything else. There is no morality or ethics in politics other than an ethic of perpetuating the interests of the ruler resulting to wanting political leadership. This is at the expense of the ruled, who continues to suffer injustice manifested in such social ills as lack of basic needs. In such a scenario, it seems that the saviour of the populace should come from outside the political class. These writers analyze the problem in Kenyan politics from a religio-ethical perspective with the contention that politics in Kenya is bedevilled with machiavellistic ills. The basic argument presented towards addressing the situation is that the Church in Kenya has a major role to play at least checking the excesses of Machiavellism.

Copy Right, IJCR, 2011, Academic Journals. All rights reserved

*Corresponding author: omarexg@yahoo.com, omarexg@gmail.com,

INTRODUCTION

Politics has occupied the minds of many thinkers over the centuries. Of the problems of politics that are addressed not only by philosophers but ordinary men and women too, is the problem of evil and authority. Among the many questions addressed under this problem are: Why should people obey the law? What are justice, democracy, transparency and accountability in governance? What is the State and how does it differ from other Associations? Are political societies natural or contractual? What is the basis of sovereignty? How far can government be representative? What is meant by 'consent' in politics of governance? What is the relationship between politics and religion.¹ Given the dynamic nature as well as the dialectic tendency of human beings, it is a futile effort to attempt to give a dogmatic solution or answer to such questions in politics. That is why over the centuries there are as many answers provided to these questions as those who have attempted to answer them: starting from the Greek Philosophers of Ancient days through Medieval and Modern History to Contemporary times. One such interested philosopher is the celebrated yet unpopular, modern Humanist, Machiavelli. The paper does not intend to discuss the evilness of the 'Prince' nor the family history of Machiavelli that so

much influenced his political thought; it merely suffices to say that Machiavelli's ideas were based on practical situations of his day. In a way then, he was a practical politician and political philosopher like Aristotle and Plato, as he participated directly in politics. He was a secretary of state and a diplomat.ⁱⁱ Given, therefore, the practical background of 'Machiavellism' (the politics of Machiavelli), it is no surprise that aspects of Machiavellism are prevalent in contemporary political situations all over the world. This then is our subject of discussion: The politics of Machiavelli in a Kenyan situation, and how the Church, specifically the Roman Catholic Church could tackle Machiavellism in the society. The Roman Catholic Church is chosen for purposes of clarity, and consistency of thought and presentation given its Episcopal model of church governance which allows for unity of teaching, response, and action.

MACHIAVELLISM AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY KENYA

Niccolo di Bernardo Machiavelli was born on May 3rd, 1469 to a middle class Italian family of Florence. He died in 1527. His reputation lies on a single treatise, "The Prince", published in 1513. It is a remarkable book, one which both fascinated

and horrified later generations of readers to an extent that some called him the 'very devil' and others have seen him as one with the courage to prescribe poison to Italy's political disease.ⁱⁱⁱ It elicited praises from and inspired unpopular political sadists such as Mussolini, Lenin, Stalin and Hitler. Hitler had it as his bedside reading, while Mussolini selected it as the subject of his doctoral thesis.^{iv} The most important dimension that Machiavelli like Hobbes brings to politics is that he divorces politics from religion and theology. But unlike Hobbes who replaces Christian values and morality in politics with an ethic of secular natural survival and fulfilment,^v Machiavelli separates morality all together from politics. Machiavelli's political theory can be summarized as 'the end justifies the means' where the person in power acts outside the boundaries of traditional ethical or religious codes towards his desired end.. This is more or less Hobbes conception of a monarch who is above the law so that individually and personally, he sets what is right or wrong for the subjects in a social contract.^{vi} Machiavelli thus suggests, like the Sophists, that there is no one morality, instead there are two – political morality and private morality. This of course is radically opposed to previous philosophers, such as Socrates, who view morality as one and universal.

In his conception of double morality Machiavelli argues that what is forbidden in personal morality such as violence, falsehood, murder and other social evils are not only at times allowed but demanded in politics.^{vii} Indeed, the infamous Cesara Borgia who was a murderer, incestuous lover of his own sister and a tyrant, is Machiavelli's model for the new Prince. For him the murders were 'people's justice' and only 'liquidations'. No one was put to death as you would think with your private morality.^{viii} This conception of political morality breeds double standards and hypocrisy on the part of politicians. Machiavelli's understanding of political morality is made clearer with his view of the Church and it's teaching on public morality. He sees a total failure in Savonarola who was a holy and virtuous man. He refers to him as an 'unarmed prophet'.^{ix} More so, the corruption and immorality of the Popes and Cardinals of his time does not bother him in so far as Christian morality is concerned, but only in so far as political success is at stake. The Pope is useless not because of his sins, but because "... the Pope was too weak to unite Italy under his own leadership, but strong enough to stop Italy being united under any other leadership."^x Worse still, Christianity taught wrong virtues – such as humility, resignation, denial of flesh, hopes for joy in the life after death. Machiavelli saw these as the worst signs of weakness. In fact, those people who practiced these virtues were for him politically immoral. Instead, Machiavelli was inspired by:

... the nobility of man and the glory of life on earth; and he believed that this nobility was expressed, not in humility but in pride; not in suffering evil but in avenging it; not in mortification but in courage; not in prayer but in action; not in covering up the body and creeping around in monkish cloisters, but in putting on the proud armour of battle, and rejoicing in the virility, the courage, heroism, magnanimity and glory of man.^{xi}

Indeed Machiavelli is a true humanist when these aspects of the human being are considered from amoral perspective. On human nature, Machiavelli describes man as a selfish animal, an animal who is controlled by insatiable desire for material

gain.. Hence, man is fundamentally evil and corrupt which implies that a prudent politician need not keep promises. He should be one who is good in the art of deception; especially if it is in his interest to do so. He gives an example of Alexander VI, as a prudent ruler and describes him thus: "... did nothing else but deceive men ... no man was more able to give assurances or affirmed things with stronger oaths, and no man observed them less; however he always succeeded in his deception, as he well knew this aspect of things."^{xii} More so, it is well for the ruler to appear merciful, faithful, humane, sincere, honest and even religious; but must have the capacity to change to the opposite qualities when it is necessary to do so. That is, "...he must have a mind disposed to adapt itself according to the wind."^{xiii} Given this corrupt nature of man, Machiavelli, prescribes that man is not to be trusted unless and only if his trust on the ruler is based on fear rather than love. Furthermore, man's nature never changes. It never evolves. It is static, constant and immutable; and therefore can be organised and studied as a basis not only for future prediction but also for political manipulations.^{xiv} This leads us to another aspect of Machiavellism, war and violence.

According to Machiavellism, military strength is a very decisive criterion in evaluating a state's independence. Machiavelli thus places great importance on good armies because "...there cannot exist good laws where there are no good armies and where there are good armies there must be good laws."^{xv} He does not only advocate for a national army but also local militias. An army of local militia could serve as an educational force and instil the values of citizenship in the soldiers, something very close to the 'youth-wings' of political parties, the home guards, local militia and armed gangs. Machiavelli proposes the need and reliance in politics on the sword as well as the word; the need of violence. He even dismisses those who condemn violent acts openly performed as being hypocritical. The Prince should therefore be ready to do evil, more so, violence and murder to safeguard the state. The distribution of wealth has valuable political significance for the ruler, and the struggle between the rich and the poor can and should be used by the ruler without delay to manipulate both classes for the ruler's benefit.^{xvi} However, the ruler should not appear to favour one side. To the rich he should appear to be protective of their wealth; while on the other hand, to the poor, appear to be really concerned with their welfare. Under no circumstance, should the ruler allow a classless society. If it happens, he will be signing his own political death sentence. Consequently, unlike Aristotle who advocates for the education of the citizens in the spirit of the polis, Machiavelli is not concerned with the education of the citizens. He regards it as inert and unnecessary.^{xvii} The ignorance of the citizens is far much more preferable than their education, as it is easy to manipulate an uneducated group. The citizenry should be ignorant if the Prince has to rule them.

Machiavelli draws his political philosophy from practical political events of ancient Greece, Rome and especially that of Renaissance Italy. It is not that such political behaviour could only be found in this part of the world. To show the practicability and almost universal nature of 'Machiavellism', Chinese political scientists in their book 'The Chinese Machiavelli; 3,000 Years of Chinese State-Craft' (1976), show

Chinese leaders and people practised Machiavellism with their opponents; the Huns, Mongols, British, Russians, Japanese and the Americans. In all the cases the Chinese came out more stronger and successful than before.^{xviii} Machiavellism therefore is a practical political theory that entails a radical break from Christian tradition and teachings. It is a system of government that resembles apartheid in pre-independent South Africa, where Mandela describes the system of justice thus: “... this system of justice may enable the guilty to drag the innocent before the courts. It enables the unjust to prosecute and demand vengeance against the just.”^{xix} In South Africa then, there was a double morality, one for the whites the other for Africans, and of course one other for the coloureds.

In Kenya, aspects of Machiavellism in politics are quite evident. The most significant impact of Western politics on Africa was the effect of the Berlin Conference of 1884-5 called by the German statesman, Bismarck. The conference resulted in the partitioning of Africa and subsequent scramble by different European nationalities. Among the objectives of the conference was to spread “European civilisation” regardless of what the African natives thought and felt; and preventing imminent war among the then European super-powers. This conference with its devious agenda led automatically to the colonisation of Africa, which snatched from Africans the basic rights of self-determination and political liberty. Soon, the Africans started fighting for political emancipation from the European colonisers only to find themselves deeply immersed in neo-colonialism and new forms of evils such as coups, poor leadership, corruption, ethnic strife, civil war among others. Thus the Machiavellism introduced by Western colonisers has taken a new look with the African leaders who have colonised their own people.^{xx} Kenya has not been left behind in this trend of affairs.

It is difficult to identify sufficiently Kenya’s political system as it is an amalgamation of different political ideologies and systems courtesy of the Western colonisers, the diverse cultural backgrounds of Kenyan peoples and the popular nationalistic movements, which earned Kenya political independence. One will therefore find aspects of African socialism, of communism and of American type of capitalism that segregates people along economic lines. Generally, however, Kenya has what Joel D. Barnakan refers to as ‘Patron-Client Capitalism’ political set up.^{xxi} This political set-up was clearly evident before 2002 and especially before the introduction of Constituency Development Fund (CDF).

The foremost feature, of ‘patron-client capitalism’ is that the National Assembly (Legislature) loses its authentic meaning as public policy-making institution to the Executive, the most powerful arm of the government. Public policy here is understood as the process by which the state allocates its resources. In this scenario the importance of the National Assembly lies not in the collective activities of the members, such as deliberations and passing of bills during parliamentary sessions, but rather in the individual behaviour of each member outside parliament. The Legislative institution of importance is not the Legislature (parliament) but the Legislator (Member of Parliament). A Member of Parliament (M.P) therefore, has to develop a mechanism of linking the central agencies of the state to the population. The MP’s role

State to implement government policy in their locality. The agents of the State and those who strictly implement government policy are government Ministers, Senior Administrators in charge of ministries (especially Permanent Secretaries, Managing Directors, and Executive chairmen), and the Provincial Administrators (PCs, DCs, DOs, and Chiefs) all of who are constitutionally appointed by the Executive (President). The DC for instance is the chairman of the District Development Committee (DDC), whose main task is to identify and supervise the implementation of all development projects within the district. The mandate and prerogative to appoint these civil servants has been used by the President for his political gain. An officer for instance, who appears to undermine the status of the President is immediately relieved of his duties. The success of the MP in delivering goods and services to his constituents is entirely dependent on his relationship with the Executive. The implication is that an MP who is not in good terms with the Executive will not deliver goods and services to his/her constituents and will eventually be voted out. The net effect is that the Executive rather than being checked by the Legislature, controls the Legislature. The President becomes Machiavelli’s Prince. He uses all means possible to remain in power. The agents of this Patron have also to play their cards well to make sure that all is well with the Patron in order that they too survive. Machiavelli’s game of double standards and political morality divorced from private morality finds its most comfortable home here.

Another dimension of Kenya’s political system created by Patron-client structure is a situation where MPs organise members of their community for purposes of self-help projects and activities. Such activities receive official and well-publicised blessings, provided these legislators do not make such projects and activities into independent bases that might threaten the regime in power but rather provide en masse support to the Executive through their MPs. Thus an MP “...must create a political base that is large enough for the regime to value and co-opt, but not so large for the regime to fear.”^{xxii} Different constituencies within the same region then come together as ethnic communities to compete for attention and favour of the Executive in order to access national resources. Such state of affairs has brought a lot of difficulties since the advent of multi-party politics in 1992. Initially, the difficulties were to opposition politicians who could not organise development projects in their localities as they were denied licences by the local administration and yet they (the opposition) could not unite against the government because of the prevailing ethnic rivalries. Prior to 2002, whole communities could be discriminated against in the distribution of resources merely because their political leaders were in the opposition. It took Kenyans ten years to circumvent these rivalries and forge a united opposition against a dictatorial Executive. However, given that the Patron-client structure did not change, thanks to the old Kenya Constitution and the unwillingness of the Executive then to share power, the scenario was yet to change.

Machiavelli in the ‘Prince’ gives very little attention to other government institutions, except for the army and the ruler’s closest advisers, the so called ‘kitchen cabinet’, who even the Prince need not take their advice. The Kenyan political arena

Machiavellism setting. All attention was directed not even to the institution of the Presidency but to the person of the President. The president as an individual was the centre of all State activities. The President's convoy is the largest, he contributed the highest amount in public Harambees, apart from sending contributions to nearly all fund-raising activities country-wide; he is this and that number one; he was featured everyday in the news more so has to be the first item, even if there are other more important ones; businesses and institutions have to be closed when he visited a district; everybody had to associate or appear close to him. For all intent and purpose he is omnipresent. This indeed was Machiavelli's African Prince.

Kenyan Machiavellism vis a vis double standards is a sort of contradictory unevenness of dichotomy. Elections co-existed with preventive detentions though described with polite terms such as time barred, technicalities; Christian charity co-exist with capitalist greed; freedom with repression; equality with racism; policies of tribes co-exist with dictates of the state; and indeed the tragedy of the existence of Public Security Act, a draconian law which is a remnant of the colonial administration used to subdue Africans during the state of emergency. Wealth is in the hands of the privileged few who know how to turn aid from the government or foreign institutions for their own benefit. They in fact prevent decisive social reforms.^{xxiii} The so called privileged few are 'far sighted' and so they "...build up saving accounts for their old age in Swiss banks and their wives buy villas on the shores of Lake Geneva."^{xxiv} A new type of bourgeoisie is forming, the bourgeoisie of the civil service who are there to protect their interests and their president. Meanwhile the masses lie around passively mute and apathetic; or worse still, they wait along the street and trading centres or frequently visit the 'privileged group's' offices to receive handouts. It is the same politicians who in one way or another get hold of public money, and bank them 'safely' abroad. Senior government employees, parastatal and foreign firms charge exorbitant prices for their 'services'. Corruption is so prevalent but because it is good for politics nothing much is done; but for things to appear in control, occasionally anti-corruption campaigns are conducted, this and that commission of inquiry is set up which if lucky to finish work before being suspended, its findings are seldom published, laws are passed and never implemented, police detachment are directed against a crime and investigations are made only to be covered up. From time to time, some functionary usually a subordinate is prosecuted and punished; and more often than not a minister or a high level functionary is merely transferred to an equally important or even more important office, depending on which action is more favourable and to the advantage of the Chief Patron.

In conclusion then, the Machiavelli Prince, who in our case is the Chief Patron; uses Machiavellistic sophistic rhetoric to persuade the people that they are electing the right people; by of course denying them civic education so that they remain ignorant. These Machiavellistic leaders who are 'elected' form a parliament and government which is Machiavellistic, and given this nature, makes Machiavellistic laws, which in turn are enforced by a Machiavellistic judiciary and police force on the populace, who in turn again elect the same Machiavellistic government. The cycle continues 'ad

more informed. The Church has to get involved if this cycle of Machiavellism has to be broken and Machiavellistic ills in Kenya politics has to be checked or eradicated altogether.

THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH IN CONTROLLING MACHIAVELLISM IN KENYA

Suffice to begin with a brief section on the relationship between Christianity and politics in Kenya

Christianity was planted in Kenya by European missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant for spiritual and limited secular social affairs. This favoured colonialism as colonialists needed all resources available to subdue Africans. The Christian doctrine of humility, especially, that one must be obedient to his superiors, was most welcome by the British colonialists. Soon this hypocrisy of the missionaries coupled by the oppressive tendency of the colonialists made the Africans revolt against both. The missionaries were seen not only as collaborators and sympathizers of the 'mzungu' but also as a tool for colonialism. To counteract this, the Africans formed African Independent Churches against the missionaries and popular nationalistic political movements like Mau mau against the colonialists. Personalities such as Harry Thuku and Jomo Kenyatta, were a product of this mutual relationship between African Independent Churches and Political movements with their African Independent Schools.^{xxv}

At independence, the Kenya Government adopted a policy of secular government, where all religions were treated the same and freedom of worship granted. President Jomo Kenyatta while addressing the Association of Member Churches in Eastern Africa (AMECEA) conference in Nairobi in 1976, told the Catholic Bishops that they are the 'conscience of society' and further warned them that if they abdicate this responsibility by being silent, they will answer for evils committed by the government in general and the politicians in particular.^{xxvi} Two years later, Mr Daniel Arap Moi, then Vice-President while opening the SECAM conference had this to say, "... Kenya firmly believes in human rights and other basic freedoms such as freedom of worship. Christianity takes away nothing that is good ... but instead strengthens ... African life." True to the 'Nyayo' of his predecessor, Kenyatta; Moi several years later as President has given the same sentiments in his book 'Kenya African Nationalism: Nyayo Philosophy and Principles', that Nyayoism which professes, love, peace and unity is "... fired by the eternal concepts of a living Christian faith."^{xxvii} Furthermore, Kenya is a signatory to the Human Rights Charter, and in Kenya's constitution is enshrined the freedom of worship, conscience and association; of course so long as this freedoms do not infringe on the common good. The Kenyan state therefore recognizes the functions, importance and autonomy of religion in general and Christianity in particular. At every public gathering meetings are preceded and concluded with prayers; important public functions, such as public holidays and opening of parliament, have church leaders officially invited and present. One would therefore easily conclude that the Church – State relationship in Kenya is excellent. Far from it. Established churches especially the Roman Catholic and Anglican Church, as well as the ecumenical movement of the National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCCK) have from time to time found themselves at loggerhead with the

Machiavellism is, have no problem understanding this sore relationship between the Church and the State. The official view of the government is vivid - 'the Church is the conscience of the nation' but only as far as private morality is concerned. With regard to political morality there is an unofficial view, which incidentally and unfortunately in Kenya seem to carry more weight - 'the Church should not meddle in politics'. This reality notwithstanding, the Church has the mandate to "bring good news to the poor" by controlling social evils in society. In the context of politics in Kenya, this necessarily involves controlling Machiavellism. In the proceeding paragraphs, we focus on the Roman Catholic Church to present the role of the clergy and the laity in controlling Machiavellism in Kenya. In so doing, we do not pretend that the Church is perfect or without fault. Indeed, almost as much as the political establishments have abused human rights, the Church has too. 'Christian political fanaticism' like in the days of the crusades and inquisitions remind us to be wary of the Church. Accurately, Fr Cesar Jerez in Nicaragua at the height of political turmoil and persecution of the Church there admits that they [Church] too made mistakes at particular moments.^{xxviii} Indeed, it should not only be the State that should be controlled, Church leaders as well need control. However, this paper now focuses on the role of the Church as one of the major institutions with the direct mandate of addressing social evils as well as one of the institutions with the potential to effectively control Machiavellism.

The Role of the Clergy as a Model in Controlling Machiavellism

The clergy, more so priests, play a pivotal role in our society, not because of the legacy of the institution of priesthood or the grace of ordination, but because of their presence in society. Like a politician, a priest's ministry is that of a shepherd, but a shepherd with a difference. A shepherd who practices concern, personal care of the flock, warm understanding, loving and willing to go out at and despite risk to reach to those put under his charge. A priest is one who does not seek his own good but the good of others. Given these features, a priest is a key element in fighting Machiavellism in society both directly as a shepherd and indirectly by example of his life. Probably the aspect of example is more important than any other method. Apart from being a well informed person, therefore, a priest should be first and foremost available to his people. He should be courageous too yet humble. The clergy should not then see a dichotomy of preaching and service, the vertical and horizontal, or evangelisation and humanisation in their ministry. Instead, the two dimensions should be embraced by the priest as merely different aspects of one reality. If however, he neglects either dimension, he is, whether he likes it or not rejecting the cross, in essence that which he was ordained for.^{xxix} Priests should dialogue with their parishioners, and encourage them to discuss issues that affect their day to day they allow them to participate in running parish affairs. It is unfortunate and sad that some of our clergy argue that, "... our people are not yet mature enough for it. They should not be dictating to us. We must not make the same mistake as the Protestants."^{xxx} A priest is on record saying: " I keep my nose out of Jim Ryan's Union, and he keeps his nose out of the affairs of the parish". Note that this

trade union has been implicated in the murder of three officials of the union.^{xxxi} If our Christians have to be motivated to take an active role in politics, it should start from the local Churches, which incidentally fall under the jurisdiction of the local priest. The clergy need therefore, to renounce their formerly undisputed power to rule. How for instance, do the clergy expect politicians to share power, and yet they themselves hold so tightly to theirs. It is necessary to redefine the authoritarian understanding of priesthood, an understanding of the ruler and the ruled, so that it is not about the interest of the ruler but that of the ruled that takes precedence. The modern understanding of the institution of priesthood generally unfortunately does not come from Christ's description of the Christian community. Instead it comes from the Jewish paternalistic culture, the Graeco-Roman western world and the Eastern Byzantine traditions. "The monarchical Bishop, prince of the church patriarch and papal titles of Pontifex Maximus [taken directly from the Roman Emperor] are titles and concepts which hardly reflect the simplicity of the servant mentality of Jesus of Nazareth."^{xxxii} A priest is not only a man of God, but is also a man for men. Jesus taught that consecration to God was expressed in a life of selfless service to fellow human beings, a perfect combination of the vertical and the horizontal, a life lived according to God's will. This should be a priest's life and view of his priesthood. It is therefore sad that those priests, "...who attempted to rouse their fellow Catholics to an awareness of the social dimension of the gospel, ... were either tolerated as mavericks and eccentrics or vilified as having sold out to materialism, communism, or perhaps even to the devil himself."^{xxxiii} Priesthood should be seen as St. Augustine felt when he said: "... when I tremble at what I am for you, I am consoled by what I am with you. For you I am a Bishop, but with you I am a Christian. I am a Bishop by virtue of my office, a Christian through grace. The former is a source of danger, the later of salvation."^{xxxiv}

The clergy have an insight in Nyerere's words; "You priests have great power. Every Sunday, you have many people in Church. Tell them they must pray but tell them they must also educate their children well and work in the fields. I do not think it wrong to speak in Church about working in the fields. If we are made in God's image, must we live in mud huts?"^{xxxv} It is disturbing in the Kenyan context to see a priest standing by the roadside with students of a Catholic sponsored school waiting for the president to pass by on a Tuesday morning.

The clergy in order to be effective fighters of Machiavellism especially with the assistance of the laity, need to reassess their way of life as priests. Indeed the lay people are challenging with a lot more vigour, the pattern and mode of priests' life, which hitherto has been hidden by the beautiful fences of the well-trimmed cypress hedge or wall around the parish compounds. They want to know what really happens there especially after mass. As many of their sons, brothers and friends become priests; parents, siblings and friends who have lived and grown with them know them; they know these priests are as human as they themselves are yet of course given the priests' calling, they expect a lot more of divinity in the priests. The question then is, will these priests who are part and parcel of them and their way of life, disappoint them as the politicians of Machiavelli's brand have done?. The entire

conscience of the state; the clergy must indeed be the refuge of the oppressed, voice of the voiceless and the weak. They must not be silent when people are tortured, political opponents imprisoned, relief food stolen, elections rigged, and public funds, resources and utilities blundered. The Synod in Rome in 1971 categorically "... confirmed that it is not possible to remain silent on the cries of those who suffer violence and are oppressed by systems and mechanism which are unjust; we may not ignore the challenges of a world which by its perversity, contradict the creators plan."^{xxxvi} As has been the case in Kenya the past few years, the Kenya Episcopal Conference (KEC) must make itself be heard even more, not as external observers and commentators; but as sons, brothers and fathers of our society, not only as citizens of this country but also as men inspired by the Holy Spirit, men with the fullness of priesthood, like those fearless and courageous men on the day of Pentecost.^{xxxvii} In doing this, they need to be united and speak with one voice. Then the Machiavellistic government would not dare go against a united Church, the best it can do is to threaten the Church with its Machiavellian repressive and unpopular laws. The formative years in the Seminary are therefore crucial for a priest. Seminarians ought to be formed in a spirit of openness, freedom, responsibility and brotherly love. They should be more exposed to the finer aspects of communities' life, such as politics during their pastoral formation and experiences. With this, truly honest, responsible, a mature and hardworking, and a true Kenyan priest would emerge; a priest who would face Machiavellism in his society with determination.

The religious brothers and sisters have equally a role to play in temporal matters. It is sad that the vocation of a religious brother has been misunderstood. "This vocation does not appear as a real fulfilment but as a substitute for a failed priestly vocation, a reaction to a frustration."^{xxxviii} The perception is that Religious Brothers and Sisters have lost identity. They have been overshadowed by the priestly vocation. Despite these, brothers and sisters should engage themselves in community projects, if they have to rediscover their identity. Their involvement in community activities - social, economical and religious ones, will help uplift the living standards of people and alleviate poverty and ignorance which are the worst impediments to real political awareness.

In India for instance, there are nuns who have shortened their teaching work in regular schools to have time to be in the villages especially in the afternoons, others of the same congregation, like the Banyateresa in Uganda have devoted their whole time in the villages living in modest houses. These sisters "... are sisters in the fullest sense and mothers to the villagers ... where formerly they lived in their institutions and worked as teachers or nurses, now they work in a way more appropriate for women, in a comprehensive approach where they are at one and the same time nurses, teachers, social workers, catechists ... and generally good neighbours to each and every one of the villagers in all their cares and aspirations."^{xxxix}

Finally, we should congratulate and encourage the priests, religious brothers and nuns who are deeply committed in creating a better life, inspiring a new confidence and establishing a communion of practical love for the people.

kingdom of God truly visible on earth.

The Role of the Laity

The lay Christian in order to tackle Machiavellism must first and foremost look at him/herself as an integral part of the Church. To do this the laity must erase clericalism from their understanding of the Church. Clericalism, that is the tendency to turn everything in religion over to the clergy, seems to be one of the most stubborn problems facing the church today.^{xi} It has made Christians stand aloof in Church matters. Such Christians think the church consists of the Bishops and their retinue of priests. It is the duty of the clergy and laity alike to eradicate this erroneous view of the Church, if the laity has to play a decisive role in the Church matters in general and fighting Machiavellism in particular. Through baptism all Christians share in the threefold aspects of Christ – prophet, priest and king. Thus, the laity, "... in a specific and practical way... goes forth to be witnesses of God in the home, at work and in social life. His witness is far more than verbal; his witness translates into all of daily living the inspiration and ideals he has gained through study, worship and prayer."^{xii} Canon Law clearly provides that:

Each lay person in accord with hi/her condition is bound by special duty to imbue and perfect the order of temporal affairs with the spirit of the gospel, they thus give witness to Christ in a special way in carrying out those affairs and in exercising secular duties; the laity ... has a divine duty not only to evangelise but also to sanctify the Christian community by purifying the temporal order, which at its helm is politics.^{xiii}

Those Christians who stand aloof in nation building as well as in spiritual affairs have brought untold discredit to the Church. The laity's task should not simply consist in running traditional 'societies and associations' but should be much more exercising positive critical function, creating a genuine living unity, being outgoing and making courageous efforts in both Church and state affairs.^{xiiii} Lay Catholics should not shy away from taking positions of responsibility in the government. A living example of a remarkable involvement of the laity in politics is that of St. Egidio community, a community or organisation started by a lay Christian from Italy. This strictly lay Public Association of the Laity, helped broker the accord that ended the 16 year civil war in Mozambique. In Burundi, they assisted the moderates to prevent further conflict there. They also assisted to open dialogue between the north and the south in Sudan.^{xliv} Indeed Christians are members of different groups and associations, and Non-governmental organisations; they can use such fora to demand for their rights and press for change of bad government policies and decisions.

We should not forget the crucial task of the Catechists as part of the Laity. An unfortunate legacy of the missionaries, has been, that the place of the catechist has been the last link in the chain of the clergy to the congregation. He was paid and poorly so. He was accountable to the priest and no other person. His tasks were preparing catechumens, running errands, occasionally being the parish watchman and more often than not admonished errant Christians on behalf of the priest. In most cases they are poorly educated and have a very

the catechist has a lot of potential of very desirable qualities that can help the Christian community, especially in the political arena. With Vatican Council 2 emphasis on communitarian character of the Church as a living community, the catechist's role becomes that of an animator or facilitator of the local church which steers its own life. The catechist thus, needs to work more closely with the community as with the priest. He should be identified, chosen, educated and employed by the Christian community. In this way the Christian community can have its own helping it grow to maturity and meet its political challenges among other challenges effectively. Being at the grassroots, the catechist will be able to identify relevant and practical solutions with the community he/she is part of. With this, the priest's supervisory and shepherd work will be more effective and fruitful. The catechist then, is an indispensable asset in fighting Machiavellism.

In conclusion, while the laity works hand in hand with the clergy, they should not expect ready made answers from each other. Currently, there is a tendency for the clergy on the one hand, to conduct themselves in a manner suggesting that they have all the answers, and the laity on the other hand to expect the clergy to have all the answers. Both clergy and laity should shoulder the responsibility under the guidance of Christian wisdom. All Christians, clergy and laity alike, are called to search among alternatives. They should not wait for ready made answers from any group.^{xiv} The common and right understanding after Vatican Council 2 is that both the clergy and the laity are pushing and pulling the cart, not as before when the clergy pulled the cart full of the laity comfortably seated, some dozing, others snoring and fast asleep while others conversing in low tones not the least bothered as to where they were going. You would rightly imagine the impossibility of the clergy's task given the fact that the bulk of the Church is the laity. The Church is challenged that alongside her preaching mission, it should carry out concrete tasks in temporal matters by broadening its sight. It is ironic that peoples 'without religion' like Japan and China have developed a community spirit and unimagined economic success. Japan instance has developed a very conducive political system, yet the 'religious' peoples of Africa still languish not only in economic and social woes but have untold political turmoil as well. The Church, the clergy and the laity, have a duty they cannot abdicate whatsoever, if indeed they are and deserve to be followers of Christ. They can do well to apply the following practical approaches in fighting Machiavellism. These approaches are the concern of the next session.

Some Practical Approaches

i) Civic Education and the Constitution

With poor or no civic education, the populace will be ignorant of their basic right and duty to participate fully in the political affairs of their society. For instance they will see politics not as part and parcel of their existence in society, but as a domain of some few individuals. More particularly such ignorant people will either not participate in voting exercise as they see no value in it or they will use their votes as a commodity to be sold to the highest bidder, who might not be a good leader. A

status quo is maintained; as he/she is sure that his position is secure. It is unfortunate that aspects of the above scenario are evident in Kenyan politics.

Civic education is therefore necessary to counter political apathy and make people aware of their rights and duties in participating fully and actively in politics and in decision making process in their political set up, at least at grassroots levels. Here we acknowledge and appreciate civic education activity by the Roman Catholic Church popularly known as Lenten campaign such as the 2007 which had the theme 'Kenya our Home'.^{xlvi} Christians are educated on areas such as leadership and authority, the process of elections, political toleration and reconciliation, their rights and duties in a civic society among other areas. Individual Christians can and should participate actively in civic education in many ways. They can avail themselves for civic education lessons, and contribute materially and morally to civic education activities. Those Christians who are specialists in civic education could tithe their time to assist their fellow Christians in teaching them and or in producing civic education teaching materials.

The main task of the church is to evangelise. It is the vocation proper to the church.^{xlvii} A vocation given by Christ himself when he told his disciples: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations ... and teach them to observe all the commands I gave you."^{xlviii} It is in this ministry that the Church has the duty to bring up an integral and whole human person. In its document, *Gravissimum Educationis*, Declaration on Christian Education, Vatican Council 2, strongly observes:

All men of whatever race, condition or age in virtue of their dignity as human persons, have an inalienable right to education. This education should be suitable to the particular destiny of the individual, adapted to their ability, sex and national cultural and traditions and should be conducive to fraternal relations with other nations in order to promote true unity and peace in world.^{xlix}

The document further elaborated: "True education is directed towards the formation of the human person in view of his final and the good of that society to which he belongs and in the duties of which he will, as an adult have a share."¹ Civic education no doubt is part of such an education that Christians need to receive, so that they can be effective and productive members of their communities.

Civic education is important in the sense that: "... informed men and women will help accelerate the growth of democracy by making informed choices on elections and informed participation in national policies and all spheres of leadership."ⁱⁱ Indeed without civic education there will be no real democracy. Civic education creates a competent civic society. A society where people develop their gifts of initiative, take responsibilities, express opinions and take part in group decisions, thus fostering good governance.ⁱⁱⁱ Such societies have checks and balance role to the Machiavellistic governments. The value and necessity of civic education that eventually forms a civil society, is immense in any civilised democratic nation state. One very important area of civic

education that needs special attention is that of the Constitution is. They therefore do not appreciate its value. Yet it is through the constitution that the citizens allow a few individuals to rule them. Logically then it is through the Constitution that citizens can take back that mandate from the rulers when they feel oppressed by the rulers. The ignorance of the constitution by the majority of the populace has been used as expected, by the Machiavellistic politicians for their own gain. It is no wonder then that politicians will try to discredit any form of civic education or encourage a distorted one. They know that with proper civic education the people will know what is rightly due to them, and demand it appropriately. Political Machiavellism needs a political solution from outside the political elite. The Church at all levels - family, Small Christian Communities, Out Station, Parish, Diocese, Nationally, and Universally – with their associations, special groups and devotions; is the school of civic education. It is through this school that citizens can claim their rights.

ii) Contestation and Dialectics

With proper civic education there will gradually develop another set of useful methodologies against Machiavellism: contestation and dialectics. Contestation here should not be taken to mean the disobedience. It should rather be seen as: "...a community effort to change by legitimate means a status quo which is out of date."^{liii} Contestation therefore goes beyond face-to-face dialogue, and especially when such dialogue has proved futile and unproductive. A public contestation is more effective than a private one, the so-called 'diplomatic means'. Private contestation is ineffective especially when one faces a Machiavelli who would do everything to discredit and disown the opponent. Such would break a promise or contract made in private. Politicians have been known to say one thing today, only to contradict themselves the next day and accusing others for misquoting them and threatening to sue for libel.

We can turn to Jesus in order to understand this concept of contestation especially from a Christian perspective. First and foremost, Jesus in the gospels did not mince words with the Pharisees, scribes and other Jewish leaders who were the legitimate leaders of the time. He hurled condemnation after another at their misdoings, hypocrisy and self-righteousness. He does what is right, for instance curing on a Sabbath day knowing for sure that he will provoke the wrath of the authorities. He evicts money changers and businessmen from the precinct of the temple. This is Jesus in contestation. Many a times, the Church points at the humility of Jesus in contestation and forget his courage. Contestation will only be complete when humility is coupled with courage as Christians condemn laws, structures, and institutions that are opposed to Christian values. Though as Christ did, Christians too need to engage in contestation in its true sense; it is important to set prudent limits on its exercise. Pope Paul VI rightly said, "We do not contest the need of contestation ... but it should be done with moderation ... the Church is the object of contestation but must be done with love."^{liiv} The most common form of contestation is criticism. Contestation would work best with dialectics. One of the most important contributions of the Greek Socratic Philosophy is the so-called 'Socratic

dialogue'. It is as useful today as during the times of society where truth seem to be loosing value very fast. Socratic dialogues are more of dialectics at work. It is "... a principle method of attaining truth and particularly a method of attaining moral and political truth".^{liv} Aristotle in his 'Topic' notes that this is the "... the ability to raise searching difficulties on both sides of a subject of will, make us detect more easily truth and error about the several points that arise."^{lvii} Criticism as intended by Aristotle was meant as a standard of judging well. It formed part of his 'Organon', a tool that was to check subtle truths or falsity of sophism. It was not created nor invented by Aristotle, but was part of man's rational faculty that enables him to pronounce judgments and come to conclusions that are not only valid but necessarily true as well.

Human beings are dialectical by nature; one even converses with oneself in form of reflection, just as one would do with another person. It is therefore absurd for political authorities to suppress freedom of speech. Heraclitus with his problem of change had already seen the conflict of opposites as the innermost essence of reality. Hegel, a German idealist developed this concept further. Hegel observes that the real is essentially becoming, and moves from stage to stage in the threefold phase of – THESIS – ANTITHESIS – SYNTHESIS.^{lvii} Our thinking must proceed in the same way. Just as this dialectics has been applied to discussions on matter and economics, it should find a place in politics, as it confronts ideas so that the dispute leads to true ideas.

In Socratic dialogue or dialectics, the interlocutors or disputants are arguing co-operatively in order to acquire more wisdom than either had before the dialogue. While in a sophist argument which is typical Machiavellian, the sophists are out to win using rhetoric; they are not interested with truth or wisdom. Whereas dialectics is a process of criticism wherein lies the path of all inquiries; rhetoric is concerned with the modes of persuasion and not inquiry. Dialectics being concerned with truth that is so much lacking in machiavellistic politics, need to be employed by Christians as they fight Machiavellism. Where there is no dialectics or genuine debate, the Machiavelli politician is left free to practice his trade or propaganda and sophistry. The only better way to get out of politician's lobbying, propaganda and sophism, is to subject any of their utterances to criticism, challenge and debate. Simply practice dialectics or Socratic dialogue. Jesus did it with the Samaritan woman at the well, those who wanted him to condemn the woman caught in the act of adultery among others occasions.

Finally, dialectics and freedom of speech go hand in hand, one cannot divorce one from the other without destroying both. Because dialectics lacks in most of our disputes, freedom of speech as it should be also lacks. Here freedom of speech has to be understood well. It does not mean unrestricted right to say anything at any time. For instance, someone shouting 'fire, fire, fire!' in an auditorium full of people yet there is no fire, can never be justified as freedom of speech. This is what the sophist politicians do when they exploit the ignorance and passions of the people. Freedom of speech is the responsible utterances made for the good of both the speaker and the audience. Dialectics thus coupled with contestation in an

sophistry of machiavellistic politicians. Christians must therefore attempt to cultivate dialectics and contestation in their societies.

iii) The Possibility of a Revolution

The Oxford English Dictionary defines 'Revolution' as a "... complete overthrow of the established government in any country or state by those who were previously subject to it; a forcible substitution of a new ruler or form of government."^{lviii} From this definition, it is not very explicit that violence need be there in a revolution, but the idea of 'forcible' in general sense may mean or imply violence; but it can also mean strong, effective or powerful. Despite some scholars arguing that there can be revolution without violence as the case of the ouster of Marcos in the Philippines and the so called bloodless coups it is difficult to rule out the use of violence entirely. For instance, the case of apartheid in South Africa would make one to understand the awkward position that citizens often find themselves in the struggle for human rights whereby circumstances force them into violence. During the Rivonia trial that Mandela and co-accused were found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment for sabotage and conspiracy to overthrow the government by revolution and by assisting an armed invasion of South Africa by foreign troops; Mandela said:

I do not however deny that I planned sabotage. I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness nor because I have any love for violence. I planned it as a result of calm and sober assessment of the political situation that had arisen after many years of tyranny, exploitation and oppression of my people by the whites.

While Mandela and the ANC were strongly opposed to civil war, they did not rule out a possibility of war; "...but when we decided to adopt violence as part of our policy we realised that we might one day have to face the prospect of such a war".

Is it possible then to talk of a 'just' violent revolution? The answer is clearly negative. The kind of revolution that Christ preached and lived had nothing to do with violence. Thus, prophet Isaiah refers to the suffering servant of Yahweh who is humble like a lamb led to slaughter.^{lix} In his life, Christ is true to the spirit of non-violence so remarkably yet simply shown in the beatitudes and his passion.^{lx} A Christian following the example of Jesus has to put an end in the rising levels of violence especially in politics as there is no justification of violence in the gospels. As Christians it is not proper to fight terrorism with terror. The obligation of Christian charity that must be embraced by all Christians when faced with seemingly a violent revolution rests at the very heart of Augustine's rejection of self-defence. Aquinas on his part demands for stiff restraints on the exercise of double effect. While Suarez searches for the most 'loving' means of legitimate war-time goals. This concept is clearly summarised in one of the tenets of Christian ethics 'It is never right to do, or to intend to do evil that good may come of it'.^{lxi} Christ tells his followers to love the neighbour as one would love oneself. The Latin American Theology of Liberation could be a good example, especially with its fundamental principle of revolution "... born not of hatred but of love towards the

proceed with moderation and prudence..."^{lxii} In order then, to admit the possibility of a revolution, a clear understanding of Christian prudence is necessary for all Christians. However, the essentially protectionist view of prudence that leads to non-action will not do for Christians fighting Machiavellism. Indeed, non-action for fear of violence is probably as evil as violent revolution. Rather prudence should be understood as St Thomas Aquinas taught: "...a virtue which inclines us to behaviour appropriate to the circumstances we are."^{lxiii} Political prudence as Aquinas calls it, "... regards not only the private good of the individual, but also the common good of the multitude."^{lxiv} Indeed prudence not only helps Christian to weigh the possibility, measure the ambiguities and clear self-deception, it also makes Christians see themselves as they really are with their weaknesses and strengths within specific contexts.

The gist of the matter in this discussion is that between the extreme use of violence and absolute non-violence is an intermediate or moderate solution. Otherwise force will be left in the irresponsible hands of the politicians, who as observed will do anything to remain in oppressive authority. History has great examples of successful non-violent responses to political oppression. Mahatma Gandhi of India and Martin Luther King of the United States of America are exemplary. Christians should however note that both Gandhi and Luther paid dearly with their lives. But then, what is the highest expression of Christian love and charity than the risk and willingness to give one's life for others? Such:

Non-violence is so creative that, more often than not, it takes us further than violence. It protects man from temptation of pursuing certain ... worldly aspirations towards a better future only attainable through such violence as will constitute a cruel sacrifice of this generation of favour to another, and will make the future into a moloch to whom real man is sacrificed in favour of a man who is not real but always on the point of becoming real.^{lxv}

Thus, whereas revolution in the violent sense as is passivity is inadmissible for Christians; a prudent revolution actuated by love of justice and Christian charity ought to be the norm.

iv) The Sin of Commission and Omission

The efforts of Christians faced with the evils of a Machiavelli government could more or less be as frustrating as when one finds himself lost in the corridors of large prison. In a desperate attempt to get out, one may ask an inmate; How do I get out of here? The inmate with all humility would answer the stranger : 'That is exactly what I wanted to ask you, How do I get out of here?' Found in such a predicament one would either try to find means and ways of getting out, or merely resign and wait for fortune or fate to take its course. Similarly, when Christians come to find out that they are trapped in a Machiavelli type state or nation, they will behave as our unfortunate person above. They will attempt to pull resources at their disposal and assist each other get out of the mess; or give up. The second alternative would not take long as those who take that option will not survive longer either. As a Christian, one should dedicate one's life in every area of life. Occasionally however, it might be necessary and the only

Machiavellian establishment. For instance as a government Minister or Senior Civil Servant, if by working with such a government adversely contradicts and is a violation of one's Christian basic values and principles, one ought to resign. However, dissociating oneself from an evil group is not the best alternative there is for a Christian. It may amount to the sin of omission, which is equally as bad as that of commission. Indeed, while to absent one is sometimes necessary, it must be done with care, humility and prudence.^{lxvi} Of course, Christian ethics require that one should 'avoid evil and do good'. However, negative goodness should not be equated with Christian way of life. The parable of the Publican and the Pharisee as they went to pray would clarify this point, and so would the parable of the Good Samaritan, especially the attitudes of the Priest and Levite.^{lxvii} Like the Pharisee who says he is not unjust, adulterous and does what is required of him unlike the Publican; Christians may find themselves saying; 'look we are good, we are not like those politicians who steal public money, buy votes, organise clashes and grab public land. In fact the other day we resigned en mass and never voted.'

As Christians, we should penetrate, infiltrate and be part of the society we find ourselves in. A Christian should be active, creative, participate and transform the social structures of the society that he/she is part of to reflect the Christian values and ideals. This does not mean to water down the ascetic principles and ways of life of some religious congregations especially those with the charism of 'being away' from the world. They had and have an unequalled part to play in the growth not only of the church but secular society as well. The point really is that, our world has become a 'global village', that it will not be realistic 'not to belong' to this world. Christians, need to understand that while they can leave a particular situation that they find not fit to the Christian way of life; they cannot leave the whole system in which they live in. Non-participation or apathy in the world is tantamount to the sin of omission, yet also participating in the evils of the world is sin of commission. A Christian while in the world should always avoid sin, and make it a better world by being proactive in a Christian sense. Christ became human in order to save human beings. Christians too ought not to run away from social evils or turn a deaf ear to the plight of the poor and the oppressed at the hands of Machiavellistic leaders. Christians are called to exercise positive good, to become the 'salt and the light' of the world. They should know that docility in the face of Machiavellism nurtures it. Christians must rise up against Machiavellism in society by being pro-active.

v) The Power of Prayer

When all is said and done, a serious and true Christian has to retreat to as quiet place a Jesus did, to pray. Probably, prayer is the most important and effective tool in the hands of Christians against Machiavellism. Prayer is a form of communication between the faithful and the deity; between human beings and God. Even in primitive societies, it was common for the community to plead with the supernatural to come to the aid of the mortals, when they were faced with calamities. In the Old Testament the Jews had different forms of prayer. Through these prayers they entreated their God practically for everything, even asking God to crush and

that they shower God with more prayers of praise and thanksgiving. In the New Testament, prayer takes a new, practical and revolutionary dimension. As in the Old Testament prayer cover all areas of life, from petition to thanks giving. God will provide that which is asked and more so the best; for if parents who are evil provide good things to their children's requests, how many good things would God who is good give to His children, the Christians.^{lxviii} In the Lord's prayer, the model of all prayer, God is petitioned to make His Kingdom come and His will be done as it is in heaven. The most revolutionary concept of Christian prayer in the New Testament is a call for God to forgive those who hurt others. Paul urges Timothy that Christians have a duty to pray for kings and those others in authority.^{lxix} The biggest challenge to the use of prayer is that Machiavelli politicians make fun of prayer. For a Machiavelli, if by appearing prayerful his/her objectives are realised, then the better. If by going to Church to pray makes one cover considerable political mileage over and above one's opponents; Machiavelli advocates that the Prince should do so. This poses a double tragedy to a Christian who is trying to fight Machiavellism. With all honesty it is difficult to prescribe a dose to this machiavellistic tactic. Probably the remedy lies in the power of prayer itself. Prayer for Christians is communicating with God in a very intimate and fulfilling way. It involves speaking to and listening as well as responding to God as God speaks to Christians. It not only affirms the unity between God and Christians but also between Christians themselves as a community of believers. Whether personal or communal, private or public, prayer enriches Christian's personality and enables them co-operate with God's will for them. Prayer therefore enables Christians to contribute positively in the transformation of their societies. In prayer, Christian struggles, are not aimless, they have a purpose. "Like the Indian brave who knows how to interpret the most on the tree and can listen for sounds in the ground, and can smell scent on the winds, the man who prays is able to read the signs of the times, and reading the signs of times, he knows where to go."^{lxx}

In prayer, God enters into human being's existential situation, by creating new relationships, between God self and human beings, and between human being and his fellow human being. It is through prayer that Christ gives meaning to human existence as St Thomas expresses: "... although Christ's passion is corporal, from its unity with the divinity it posses a spiritual power. And therefore it obtains its efficacy through spiritual contact i.e. through faith and sacraments of faith."^{lxxi} These sacraments of faith are actually liturgical prayer, Personal prayer is essentially an aspect of faith. Human being's personal encounter with a living God becomes therefore the reason of prayer. A living God who is concerned with human's welfare and situation of life. Liturgy is the prayer of Christ through the lips of the Church; it is the public and official prayer of the whole church, the head which is Christ himself and the body who are the Christians. This prayer of course is expressed by individual Christians who make up that Church. Liturgy and especially mass, is as Pope Pius X said; "... the Primary and indispensable source of true Christian spirit."^{lxxii} It is what gives life and activity to that body of Christ, the Church. Thus in participating fully in liturgy or public prayer as well as personal or private prayer; all Christians make more intense the theological virtues of

carum virtues of temperance, fortitude, humility and prudence. All these virtues make society a real Christian society. Such a society would never be a bedfellow to Machiavellism.

CONCLUSION

Machiavellism no doubt is as active in our society today as it was during the days of Machiavelli in Renaissance Europe. The only difference is that the setting and the personalities involved have changed. It cannot be disputed that Machiavellism is evil and in contrast to Christian ethics. One only needs to see the suffering that has swept most parts of Africa because of political intolerance. Kenya on its part has its share and type of Machiavellism despite attempts from different quarters to check its practice.

Despite its malignancy, Machiavellism can be contained to reasonable levels if not eradicated. The so called civilised first worlds, like America and some Western European countries can be said to have managed Machiavellism in their societies through various checks and balances in their political systems. African society can contain Machiavellism if it goes back to its roots and philosophy of life, more especially the philosophy of 'I am because we are'. For Africans, the fact that I am part and parcel of a community of my fellow human beings is enough assurance for my comfortable existence. Existence indeed is a communal affair not an individualistic one. This is indeed what Christ told his followers 'love your neighbour as you love yourself'. However utopic some people might claim it to be, the Christian dream of a better world where all would be 'brothers and sisters' in the real sense of the phrase; no more prejudice, a time that all human beings are equal and free, is possible. This was the teaching of Jesus Christ, of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King. This is the aim of Christians, as they fight Machiavellism.^{lxxiii} Christians must not loose their identity as believers even when persecuted by Machiavellism as it truly happens; instead Christians must endeavour to change their society through their truly Christian insight, way of life and prayer. For the die hard Machiavelli mavericks, the only advice we can give them is what Mandela told the apartheid South Africa government: "... no power on earth can stop an oppressed people determined to win their freedom. History punishes those who resort to force and fraud to suppress the claims and legitimate aspirations ... of the country's citizens".^{lxxiv}

REFERENCES

- i Maurice Cranston, 'Introduction' in *The Western Political Philosophers*, Maurice Cranston, ed., (London: The Bodley Head Ltd. 1964, 1996), 9 – 10.
- ii Maurice Cranston, 8.
- iii Ching Ping Bloodworth, *The Chinese Machiavelli : 3,000 Years of Chinese Statecraft* (New York: Farra, Staus & Giroux, 1976), XI. Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 7.
- iv Ching Ping Bloodworth, 8.
- v Sanford A. Lakoff, *Equality in Political Philosophy* (Massachusetes: Harvard University Press, 1964), 71 – 72

- vi Peter Bondanella, *et al., The Portable Machiavelli* (New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1985), 23.
- vii Ernesto Landi, 'Machiavelli' in *Western Political Philosophy*, 43.
- viii Ernesto Landi, 43
- ix Ernesto Landi, 38.
- x Ernesto Landi, 39.
- xi Ernesto Landi, 39.
- xii Niccolo Machiavelli, 93.
- xiii Niccolo Machiavelli, 93.
- xiv Peter Bondanella, 24 – 26.
- xv Niccolo Machiavelli, 12.
- xvi Agnes Heller, *The Renaissance Man* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 128.
- xvii Niccolo Machiavelli, 16.
- xviii Ching Ping Bloodworth, 8
- xix Nelson Mandela, *No Easy Walk to Freedom* (Nairobi: Heinemann Educationa Books, 1965), 128.
- xx Ali A. Mazurui & Macahel Tidy, *Nationalism and New States in Africa* (Nairobi: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1984), X.
- xxi Joel D. Barnakan, 'Legislation, Educations and Political Linkage' in *Politics and Public Policy in Kenya and Tanzania*, Joel D. Barnakan, ed., (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984), 71 – 100.
- xxii Joel D. Barnakan, 78.
- xxiii Walbert Buhlman, *The Coming of The Third Church* (Slough: St. Paul Publication, 1976), 60 – 61.
- xxiv Rene Dumont, *False Start in Africa* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1968), 68.
- xxv Erasto Muga, *African Response to Western Christian Religion* (Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau, 1975), 187- 98.
- xxvi R.N. Mwana 'a Nzeki, 'Church and State in the Present Situation of Kenya in *Mwananchi*, Ndikaru wa Teresia, ed., No.. 193, Aug. 1991, (Nairobi: Kenya Catholic Episcopal Conference, 1991), 3.
- xxvii Daniel T. Moi, *Kenya African Nationalism: Nyayo Philosophy and Principles* (Nairobi: Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 1986), 24.
- xxviii Ceasar Jerez, S.J., *The Church and The Nicaraguan Revolution*, CIIR Justice Papers. No. 5. (London: Catholic Institute For International Relations, 1984), 18.
- xxix John Jay Hughes, *Man For Others: Reflectiojs on Christian Priesthood* (London: Sheed and Ward Ltd., 1970), 66.
- xxx Warlbert Buhlman, 262.
- xxxi John Jay Hughes, 60.
- xxxii Vincent J. Donovan, *Christianity Rediscovered*, Chicago: Fides / Clarentian, 1978), 150.
- xxxiii John Hay Hughes, 48.
- xxxiv John Hay Hughes, 46.
- xxxv Walbert Buhlman, 108.
- xxxvi Walbert Buhlman, 100.
- xxxvii Acts 2.
- xxxviii Walbert Buhlman, 100.
- xxxix Walbert Buhlman, 269.
- xl Vincent J. Donovan, 132.
- xli Vincent J. Donovan, 138.
- xliii Code of Canon Law 225 par. 2.
- xliv Warlbert Buhlman, 263 – 64.

xliv Fabio Riccardi, 'Modern Lay Christians' in *New People*, Julius Albanese, ed., No. 45, Nov. – Dec. 1996, (Nairobi: New People Media Centre, Comboni Missionaries, 1996), 29.

xlv Oswald Hirmer, *The Gospel and The Social Systems* (Nairobi: St. Pauls Publications, Africa, 1981), 163 – 4.

xlvi Kenya Episcopal Conference, *Kenya Our Home* (Nairobi: A Catholic Justice & Peace Commission Publication, 1997).

xlvii AMECEA Pastoral Department, *The African Synod Comes Home: A Simplified Text* (Nairobi: Pauline Publications Africa, 1995), 15.

xlviii Mathew 28: 19 – 20.

xlx Austin Flannery, *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar & Post-Conciliar Documents* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1975), 726 – 727.

l Austin Flannery, 726-727.

li Sylvia Mudasia & George Munene, 'Clerics Back Voter Education'. *Sunday Nation*, No.2220, Feb. 23, 1997, (Nairobi: Nation Newspaper Ltd., 1997), 42.

lii Mudasia, Sylvia & Munene, George, 42.

liii Walbert Buhlman, 209 – 210.

liv Walbert Buhlman, 212.

lv W. Lipmann, *Public Philosophy* (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1956), 96.

lvi Richard McKeon, ed., *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: Random House Inc., 1941), 188.

lvii Walter Brugger & Keneth Baker, eds., *Philosophical Dictionary* (Washington: Gonzaga University Press, 1972), 94.

lviii William Little, et al., eds., *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary: On Historical Principles* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1980).

lix Isaiah 15:53.

lx Luke 6: 20-38, 22:1-24:50.

lxi Timothy Renick, 'Charity Lost: The Secularization of the Principle of Double Effect in the Just – war Tradition' in *The Thomista: A Speculative Quarterly Review*, DiNoia, J. A., et al., eds., VOL. 58, NO. 3., (Baltimore: The Thomist Press. Dominican Fathers Province of St. Joseph, 1994), 457 – 59.

lxii Walbert Buhlman, 114.

lxiii Andrew M. Greeley, 81.

lxiv St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, V. 3. (Maryland: Christian Classics, 1981), 1389.

lxv Walbert Buhlman, 119 –20.

lxvi Carl W. Franke, *Christian, Be a Real Person* (New York: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1974), 30.

lxvii Luke 10:29-37, 18:9-14.

lxviii Luke 11: 9-13.

lxix Matthew 6: 7-13, Luke 23: 24, 1Timothy 2: 2.

lxx Andrew M. Greeley, 144

lxxi William McNamara, *The Art of Being Human* (New York: Bruce Publishing Comp., 1962), 78

lxxii William McNamara, 78

lxxiii Oswald Hirmer, 144.

lxxiv Nelson Mandela, 137.