

Journal of **Sociology, Psychology & Religious Studies**



Value System dissemination as a Remedy against corruption in Kenya; A Reading of Jeremiah 35:6-10

John Calvin Kamau (Bd, Mth) & Dr. Zebedi Muga, PhD

ISSN: 2706-6622

Value System dissemination as a Remedy against corruption in Kenya; A Reading of Jeremiah 35:6-10

¹*John Calvin Kamau (Bd, Mth) & ²*Dr. Zebedi Muga, PhD.

^{1,2}Department of Theology, St. Paul's University

*Email of corresponding author: john.jk683@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Kamau, C. J., & Muga, Z. (2022). Value System dissemination as a Remedy against corruption in Kenya; A Reading of Jeremiah 35:6-10, 4(1), 61 – 72. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6018>

Abstract

Corruption is a great social problem in Kenya today. Many efforts have been put into place in order to fight and mitigate it. They include the Kenyan constitution review, putting up of laws, anti-corruptions commissions and joining anti-corruption conventions. After all this input, corruption still remains a runaway problem. As a remedy against corruption, the word of God which is the supreme rule of life and doctrine, is presented by this paper. The book of Jeremiah 35:6-10 forms part of the narrative that clearly spells the obedience of father's command from one generation to another of the house of Jonadab son of Rechab. This narrative comes from a context of Judah's disobedience of the word of God spoken by the prophets. The Rechabites on the other hand obeyed their father in all the prohibitions he had given them. They were never to drink wine, never to build houses, not sow seeds or crops or to plant vineyards and to always live in tents. This paper brings out the reality of corruption in Kenya which as a social problem, its effects and impact, and how the exegeted word of God in Jeremiah 35:6-10 is used to address this great vice. The interventions come about by the inculcation of value system proposed by the example of the Rechabites, who stood strong against taking wine, even when persuaded. They followed the instruction of their father, Jonadab son of Rechab and would not go against it. This formed a value system for the Rechabites. The connection of this text with the corruption in Kenya is because corruption is a social evil that is passed on from one generation to another. This paper presents the reality to mitigate corruption through instilling a value system to the future generations. The word of God in this text therefore presents a community that followed their ancestors in whatever they were instructed to do and not to do, as a way of instilling values from a father to their posterity. It will therefore mitigate against the vice of corruption both to individuals and corporately in Kenya.

Keywords: *Values, Rechabites, Corruption, Deuteronomist, Jeremiah*

1.0 Introduction

This paper presents the challenge of corruption in Kenya, a vice that is affecting the lives of the people, social cohesion, economy, governance of the country and is passed on from one generation to another. After the presentation of the facts about corruption, the exegesis of the book of Jeremiah 35:6-10 will be done, to form the background for the remedy against corruption in Kenya.

1.1 Corruption in Kenya

The purpose of this paper is to address corruption using the biblical text above. The runaway corruption greatly impacts the lives of the people of Kenya.

Osoba (1996:372) gives Corruption a definition that fully suits the purpose of this papers, he thus says;

“a form of antisocial behaviour by an individual or social group which confers unjust or fraudulent benefits on its perpetrators is inconsistent with the established legal norms and prevailing moral ethos of the land and is likely to subvert or diminish the capacity of the legitimate authorities to provide fully for the material and spiritual well-being of all members of society in a just and equitable manner.”

With this definition, since corruption is not something one can touch, its reality is shown through the corruption perception index (CPI), a tool by Transparency International (TI). In their perception measurement, number one is the most corrupt and number 100 is the cleanest in terms of corruption, putting Kenya in the year 2020 as number 31/100. In the year 2021, Kenya became 30/100. It is, therefore, a deterioration from the year 2020 with one level. This position is disheartening and a reality that the war against corruption is far from being won. There is, therefore, a need to bring on ways in which this vice can be mitigated against.

Corruption in Kenya is not just national but has a generational impact. Ryan (2000:332) identifies the fact that corruption is a matter of culture; it permeates the social fabric of a certain society. It subsequently gets culturally induced. This also resonates well with what Warburton (2013:223) argues, that corruption is a social process. There would be no corruption if individuals and others do not plan to gain corporately from this illegal system and process. Therefore, combining these thoughts and arguments, corruption is a culture that is socially transmitted from one person to another and from one generation to another. On the social feature of corruption, Harrison (2007:673) quotes Pardo, who voices that corruption is a socially changing phenomenon in a given society whose features get received morally and culturally and has affects to the personal lives of a society. Further, Lawson (2009:74) sees that the reality of the social norms of a people may bring on corruption vice such that it influences how people behave. An individual though alone, has a cooperate responsibility towards a certain group of people who influence how they behave and live.

Further, Warburton (2013:243) points out the social network approach towards corruption where there is power play as an integral role among people. Those involved in corruption gather around those in position of power so as to gain and maintain their influence. The goal of corruption in such a case is to make money and deals in such operational network where the organisation facilitates them. Money is therefore used towards those in power so as to make more money and generate higher deals.

In Kenya, one would wonder why very wealthy people want to remain in power, this is the answer to the question, it as a means to protect their corrupt deals when they are in parliament and other political positions of power.

Mulinge & Lesetedi (1998:16) restates how social-culturally, there is always danger of passing on of some vices from one generation to another in bad political leadership. This reality passes on vices from one administration of power to another, and it, therefore, becomes very difficult to break the cycle of corruption. This can only be possible by changing the political governance, which is not easy to happen in Kenya today. Leaders are chosen due to their popularity. Much of which seems to be negative publicity.

Concerning corruption negative influence on the young people, Rummyantseva (2005:84) Cites how corruption does kill the culture of hard work while teaching the youth the easier ways that they can attain success in life hence weakening social cohesion. This in the end ruins the societal fabric and demeans the genuinely acquired education because some universities are involved in such vices. This reality discourages the hardworking youth because corruption seems to reward the lazy ones. Generations of young people will therefore have this demoralizing impact in their lives.

To further this argument, Mulinge and Lesetedi (1998:16) highlights how corruption socially increases problems such as theft, crime, ethnic animosity and family conflicts. Ultimately, corruption will degrade human dignity and increase people's misery while those who benefit from it accumulate wealth that makes them elite. There is a great level of the undoing of the social fabric that regrettably makes one acceptable in the said society. It is like doing wrong seems more acceptable than doing what is right, a paradox that requires to be addressed. Corruption money or proceeds become the reward for those who do what is wrong, while the upright people are chastised by delayed service delivery and growth.

1.2 Setbacks in the fight against corruption in Kenya

Having put up this background on the vice of corruption in Kenya, it is important to note that the fight against corruption has undergone many setbacks.

Otieno (2005:75) notes one great setback as Kenyan politicians. They hold on to their ethnic affiliation when there is prosecution or are accused of the vice of corruption. This reality hinders prosecution because of the political stability of the country. The powerful political class hides behind their community to circumvent prosecution, and because of political coalitions in the future, they go scot-free.

Ambreena (2012:473) raises another setback as one is associated with land grabbing. The reason being those involved are the same custodians of public land. This reality brings a serious conflict of interest in times of investigation. There is no way one can investigate themselves or get prosecuted. There is need for the separation of the administration and oversight so that there are checks and balances.

Over and above the abort of justice due to political influence, another setback according to Afrimap (2016:43) is the reality of innocent until proved guilty, which has derailed the judicial process and it joins political scene has halted the wheels of justice so strongly in Kenya and it propels impunity in many ways.

Mutonyi (2002:35) brings on another setback in fighting corruption in what he calls 'cleaning the staircase,' which is making sure that no footprints are there to trace the corruption circuit. Since corruption happens in secrecy, unless the pact goes sour and then the collaborators start differing or fighting, it involves an underground movement. This vice becomes difficult for one to investigate. In Kenya, even the witnesses that should testify in court are either killed or bribed. This leads to multiple cases being thrown out of court for not having enough evidence to build up or meet the threshold for prosecuting. Others is because of having no ground at all.

All the above setbacks become great impediments for the fight against corruption in Kenya. It propels corruption in the country, making it a runaway crime that keeps growing and challenging to overcome. The setbacks have made corruption entrenched in our society and affect the social fabric. There is required a different way to combat corruption and a strategy to mitigate against it in the country.

2.0 The fight against corruption in Kenya.

Great effort has been put in place to fight and combat this vice, though no great gains have been fully achieved. The reason for this argument is the occurrence of the runaway corruption that is experienced in Kenya even after many interventions have taken place

Lawson (2009:74) presents Robert Klitgaard's observation outlined as $D+M-A=C$. The acronym stands for discretion plus monopoly minus accountability equals corruption.

Kelly (2012:160) supports Robert Klitgaard's Formula that deals with monopoly and discretion to combat corruption. He thus proposes a way of reducing government officials' exposure to financial resources. This consist of decreasing the public spending, abolishing some licenses given to traders, and reducing government programs and therefore have fewer opportunities to engage in corruption for the officers. Mutula, Muna & Koma (2013:278) shows how the Kenya new Constitution in 2010 addressed the institution of the presidency to combat corruption. The appointing and composition of the executive should have a balance in reflecting Kenyans' regional and ethnic diversity. This does away with the presidential discretion previously, where the President would select the Cabinet from among his close friends and political affiliates. In addition, State organs put up like independent offices and special commissions were also established to balance the power exercised by the Presidency.

Over and above the promulgation of the new constitution in 2010, Kenya has also entered into international and national agreements in order to form a framework of operation against corruption. Afrimap (2016:7) notes that some of these agreements include ratifying the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) on 9th December 2003. The African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption (AUCPCC) was done on 3rd February 2007. Kenya is also a partner supporting the East African Community Protocol on Preventing and Combating Corruption (EACPPCC). Kenya is also a founding member of the East African Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (EAAACA). Over and above being a member of the mentioned conventions, Kenya has also legislated laws in its national assembly in order to domesticate the said conventions; this includes acts like Leadership and Integrity, Crime and Anti-Money Laundering and Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission Act, respectively.

Otieno (2005:69) recounts how the third Kenyan President, Mwai Kibaki in his mitigation against corruption in 2002 created a Ministry for Justice and Constitutional Affairs. Its mandate was to coordinate the anti-corruption campaign as it spearheads the enactment of laws that would enable or facilitate it. The Anti- Corruption and Economic Crimes Act (ACECA) brought about the Kenya Anti- Corruption Commission (KACC) whose mandate is to investigate the corruption, economic crimes and conduct civil education. In order for the country to start from the top, there was also established the Public Officer Ethics Act (POEA), which was meant to provide code of conduct for public officers and to compel them to declare their wealth, those of their spouses and the dependent children. There was also done a bill of Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets, and Financial Management and Accountability documents put into place in order to strengthen the war against corruption. The government of Kenya endeavored to recover the stolen assets by laying down in the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) in 2003 and commissions to investigate corruption scandals.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6018>

The above shows a great legal and social foundational framework so as to fight corruption. It gave a great hope for Kenyans that corruption would indeed be something of the past. It also gave the citizenship positive anticipation because they saw the government goodwill to fight corruption. However, the results were not forthcoming even after such a great framework of operation. That is the reason for this paper, to seek an alternative that Kenya can employ in order to mitigate against the vice of corruption.

Marquette (2012:5) highlights the great role religion should play to fight against corruption. He points out the part that religion plays in developing ethics, values and rules from living. On the contrary, he mentions to the fact raised by Transparency International. The Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (TICPI) research states that many of most corrupt countries in the world also rank high in being religious. In order to support this painful reality and to give specifics, Latin America and the Philippines are seen as highly religious with the high Roman Catholicism. Yet, they are amongst the most corrupt countries. In comparison to them, the Scandinavian countries are seen more as secular states, but with a low religious influence; they seem to have minimal corruption, and are also among least corrupt according to TICPI analysis.

Therefore, it is not just about the religion, but the emphasis of this paper on value system that is inculcated all facets of life as Marquette stated earlier.

2.1 Corruption in relation to values and vices

This paper is about the inculcation of value systems to future generations in order to address its challenge of corruption in the community and country. Corruption is propelled through a certain culture argues (Ryan 2000:333). This corruption culture in a society, though the actors do not openly do it or is it approved. The actions involved are done without disclosure because they are illegitimate. The practice is done in secret but negatively influences people's lives and behaviours.

An example of this influence is the research among the youth in Kenya by Kajiwa (2018:11), he notes that they have a passion to get rich quickly through and by any means. This is evident how the young people get to copy their older counterparts. They have seen how older people are stealing from public coffers and nothing is done to them at all. Through this system of copying, corruption in Kenya is propelled from the older generation to the young people.

Murunga & Nasongo (2006:1) relates how short-lived goodwill is seen in countries when they change a political regime. They all promise to fight corruption but only to bring disappointment shortly. An example is Ukraine in November 2004 under the leadership of Mr. Viktor Yushchenko of the Orange Revolution after ousting the corrupt Prime Minister Mr. Viktor Yanukovich. Within a year, President Yushchenko had sacked his prime minister, Mr. Yulia Tymoshenko, because accusing him of tolerating corruption in the country. In the same way, Zambian Fredrick Chiluba, came in using the slogan, "The Hour Has Come", after ousting President Kaunda. By the time he left office in 2001, he had a disgraced himself as a leader whose regime had impelled corruption more than Kaunda did. Closure home, the Kenyan President Kibaki took over from the then President Moi, with a great euphoria that Yote yawezekana bila Moi (that everything is possible without Moi). Within a leadership period of two years his National Alliance Rainbow Coalition's (NARC) government had lost its national popularity and goodwill due to the numerous corruption scandals that had come up.

The question one would ask themselves is; if a government that has all the machinery required cannot fight corruption, then what will happen to the ordinary citizenship they lead? There is evidence of helplessness.

There seems the removal of long-term-reigning dictators from power in Africa does not achieve the true transformational change envisioned, the question that one would arise as to why there no growth in good democracy that would intern help fighting corruption?

Murunga and Nasongo (2006:4) in an endeavour to answer this question, cite for example in Kenya where there are the same politicians recycled to power, through there is a new party regime; the same people who were in the previous government still take up leadership. The few new politicians feel it is their “turn to eat” (a looting slogan) the country shared cake. The same politicians will in turn form new coalitions so that they get back to power, their political parties or coalitions have no ideology, just a common purpose vehicle used to get them into power. In this case then, they would not bring about the change required in leadership against corruption.

Having dealt with corruption in Kenya, the interventions above leave a lot to be desired for the sake of the impact required to mitigate against corruption. The vice still remains a great challenge to the country's lives and social health. In this case, what follows it the remedy to mitigate against it through exegesis of Jer 35:6-10.

3.0 Exegesis of Jeremiah 35:6-10

The book of Jeremiah comes from a Deuteronomist tradition according to Breuggeman (1998:3). He observes that the theological significance of this book rotates around obedience. It is about the covenant between God and Judah following the given Sinaitic covenant. If not obeyed, there are consequences of banishment into exile. It is therefore not more about the political Babylonian Empire but the breaking of the covenant which brings about the punishment. The renewal of the covenant after its violation, brings about the Deuteronomist (covenantal) tradition for a people who require newness of the covenant for the sake of obedience.

The Deuteronomist tradition is a writing that spread across 150 years, from 650-500 BCE as stated by Weinfeld (1992:1,2). It started with the book of Deuteronomy, right into the historical books and then finally into the prophetic literature, specifically the book of Jeremiah. It takes a style of rhetoric's, idioms, and full of great phrases. The Theology behind it has a lot to do with monotheism, against idolatry, election in Davidic dynasty, cult of obedience to law and loyalty to the covenant. With that foundation, the exegesis of the said key phrases in verses below as follows;

This narrative comes from a background of Jeremiah taking to sons of Rechab into a room, so that they may take wine. The reaction was that they would not take wine because our father Jonadab's son Rechab, prohibited them.

“For Jonadab the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us” (Jer 35:6 RSV)

Brown, David, Briggs (1979:220) does analyse Yonadab ben Rekab as a proper name of a person, which means liberal or noble to imply the son of Rechab is the chief of the Rechabites as a people or a community. The father who instructed them was but Yonadab son of Recab. This text brings out of the name Rechabites. In principle they should be called Yonadabites, because this was their father's name. Though Brown, David, Briggs (1979:220) do not necessarily qualify it in the text, the two proper nouns stated out together brings on the qualification. Rechabites are already seen as the accepted proper noun used for this family. It is, therefore, the name that carries their identity that required obedience.

The origin of the Rechabites according to Oglivie (1988:231) is about a sect located in the uplands of Judah. This sect of community was founded three hundred years earlier from the text of Jeremiah by their father, Jonadab son of Rechab.

Further, Frick (1971:281) talks about the Rechabites as a social group with no parallel to the tribes in Ancient Near East (ANE). Although the Mari were also such a tribal-urban group, they seem not related to them. Keown (2002:195) notes that this group is under the succession of the children of Jonadab ben-Rechab. In the Old Testament, Jehu is linked in the destruction of the Omrides in 2 Kgs 10:15.

Etymologically, Holladay (1979:340) follows Rechabites from the root word *racab* which means to ride upon a chariot. Further the word *rekeb* which means to carry one who is chariotry or group of chariots, particularly war-chariots. Further the word *ricebah* means the act of riding or driving and to lastly the word *recabim*, which is Rechabites, the sect we deal with in this paper. The etymology of this word does not bring change to the meaning of the word to mean chariotry since there is no evidence of Rechabites being fighters hence use of chariots. The only notion seen in the text is joining Jehu in war and the chariot they ride is not theirs, but it belonged to Jehu in 2 Kgs 10:15-17. The etymology does not therefore qualify their origin as chariot makers rather than a name with the same root letters *rcb* but with a different meaning altogether. It is, therefore, simply a name of a people and not necessarily their use of chariots to fight, as the etymology of the words suggests.

To continue with the word study in this text, Holladay (1988:1) states that the addition of *'abinu* as a noun with a plural suffix meaning our father, shows one which is a tribe or ancestry, nation, a forefather or more metaphorically a begetter. It means a founder or an originator of group of people and finally one who gives a fatherly protection. The combination of the two words *'abinu* (our-father) qualifies not only stand for the name of the person but also the reality of being a patriarch of a future generation of people. The reality or 'our father' presents a corporate unity of people under one descent. The use of our father may also bring oneness of decision, when they all hold each other accountable of their lives as a people. The mentioned blessings in Jer 35:19 of lacking not a person from this family to serve presents a communal obedience and consequently common blessings.

The one key matter in this text is the prohibitions that the Rechabites were given by their father. This is what brought about the reaction when they were given wine by prophet Jeremiah. The prohibitions are as a result of the Hebrew word *tsiwah* from their father, Jonadab son of Rechab, which they were to follow. Brown, David, Briggs (1979:845) in analysis sees *tsiwah* as verb in Piel meaning to lay charge upon a person, to command, give a general charge or give an order. The feature of this being a Piel verb make Waltke & O'Connor (1990:400) argue that it is factitive and resultative because it designates with no regard to the process. The bringing about of the factitive state portrays an indirect action as it is compared to an actual action. Therefore, it is a result of an additional action, and in this case the deeds of the Rechabites are an indirect reference to the command of their respected ancestor. The command is not an imperative but Peil verb that is drawn from command culminating into a result of obedience hence, resultative.

This certainty brought out by Waltke and O'Connor (1990:400) is strange, how a command becomes resultative rather than an imperative as what is common in Hebrew. This however conveys the Deuteronomist tradition where the blessing for obedience comes into play in the grammar. The resultative Peil verb also forms the ground for the consequences that comes because of disobedience and benefits that accrues because of obedience.

Breuggeman (1998:331) gives the impression about the Rechabites as a sect that does not need to be entangled with the collective life of the ordinary citizens. As the sect recites, as it would be catechetical instruction with dos and don'ts, and rejected the urban society in which they were living in order for them not to be defiled by that life. The Rechabites had to live an alternative or a different life that showed they were set apart, under the imperative of their

patriarch, Jonadab son of Rechab. And as it is stated in the book of Jeremiah 35: 8, were proud to have obeyed as a zealous community. This verse brings on a key Theological issue being pursued in this paper, of ancestral authority of a father to his community and the resolve to follow it after many days and being carried on from generation to generation.

In order to understand the text, phrases will be examined exegetically

“We have obeyed the voice of Jonadab the son of Rechab, our father, in all that he commanded us”, (Jer 35:8 RSV)

As it was stated above by Breuggeman (1998:332) it was in the joy and pride of the Rechabites to obey, in the past and future, to follow the command. And as a community they upheld a tradition to listen to a command. The verb used is here is *shema* ‘which means harkening or listening to instructions, therefore they became a community of obedience, not just listeners, but those who follow and do according to what is instructed. The notion of obeying the voice is the same as following the command. They had a surety of having obeyed there before and had no reason to change this stand. They were persuaded to obey their father despite the pressure by prophet Jeremiah to take wine.

When the prophet Jeremiah commanded the Rechabites to take wine, it did not stop at that point. Breuggeman (1991:331) raises the other prohibitions that they were given. It was a way of underlining of the Pentologue. It borders on warning in the direction of accommodating the values of the common society to undertaking what was instructed by their ancestor. Therefore, it is not about performance of right or wrong but was a call to obedience. This phase is in third person, in order to report their tradition to the prophet, so as to report to him of their stand. It presents their past, and what they resolved for the future.

After this command, then Jeremiah 35 verse 6 and 7 presents the other prohibitions so as in total they make five that were rather not what was been tested in the narrative. The prophet only influenced the Rechabites to drink wine, and together with their declaration not to drink wine, they offered to give the prophet the other prohibitions that their father gave them, which is outlined as follows;

“You shall not take wine” (Jer 35:6 RSV)

This is the first prohibition that the Rechabites narrative brought out. It starts with the particle *לֹא* in Brown, David, Briggs (1979:518) combined with *tish e tu* the tense is imperfect verb above which is 2-person singular, often expresses the meaning not, like or a deprecation, let not, do not. Holladay (1989:170) sees this particle as an ordinary, declarative negation but sometimes can mean not only: not (only) and in this context as with Brown, David, Briggs (1979:518) above when used with the imperfect 2nd person express unconditional prohibition meaning you shall not. It is therefore a prohibition which is futuristic, where Rechabites are reporting the prohibition for their future. The Rechabites start to narrate the prohibition with not drinking wine, since this is what was offered. It is confession with the expression of fidelity to instruction.

This imperfect verb *tish e tu* comes from the root word *shatah* in qal perfect according to Brown, David, Briggs (1979:1054) meaning drink. The verb as it is an imperfect consequently has a future prohibition not to drink *yayin* (wine). It does not give room for any change of mind at all, shows a resolve, decision or a declaration of what the Rechabites stood for in life.

“You shall not build a house” (Jer 35:7 RSV)

This is the second prohibition that the Rechabites reported. It is fascinating the way Calvin (1989:314) raises the fact the Rechabites would only build houses for others to earn a living, but they would not themselves live there. Henry (1991:1298) identifies the reason for not building houses as the fact that they were real strangers in the land and with no inheritance and therefore their livelihoods would only be for employment or occupation purpose. This would only warrant them a tough lodging system and not lives that are full of plenty and fun. This argument does not necessarily bring out sense because one can still live a luxurious life while living in tents. It may instead look more flamboyant for it breeds in one way the non-permanency of life therefore spending all you have in luxury. Looking further at Henry (1998:1298) the more convincing actuality would be the advice to conformity for discipline and edification in order for them to right away preserve their ancient family character. This way, their identity would therefore be preserved.

Even though there is no proof that Calvin (1989:314) advances that the Rechabites never lived in the houses that they did for others, what is crucial in this verse the simplicity of the community. Henry (1998: 1299) presents this as he cites lack of their conformity to common life. The Rechabites may have had a connection to a Nazarite lifestyle of a people who are set apart. The tent lifestyle is a proof to show simplicity in order to avoid the test of excessive and flamboyant living.

“You shall not sow seed” Jer 35:6

In this third prohibition, Fretheim (2002:493) narrates about the challenge of giving an identity for the Rechabites. There are seen as close to the Yahwists sect. however there is no proof of that fact. They were only dedicated to a radical way of separating themselves fully from what the natives of Canaan culture had. The Rechabites preferred the wilderness life; it is a kind of sojourners way of life. They were a nomadic people without a place to permanently live in.

This could be the reason they did not sow seed and wait for the germination; they chose to have separated lifestyle. The difficulty with this kind of lifestyle is not just sowing seed but the risk of them becoming dependent. They needed to depend on the other farmers in Canaan for their livelihood. This would no doubt bring temptation to compromise their very stand in life. It would further make their lifestyle more expensive, subsequently they would have to buy their food instead of having to grow it for themselves.

“You shall not plant or have a vineyard” (Jer 35:7 RSV)

The conviction of not planting vineyard according to Calvin (1989:315) was like a way of cushioning themselves, not to experience the loss of their harvest. This resulted to their lifestyles as sojourners. Breuggeman (1998:331) puts it across as a people seeking for an alternative lifestyle which is not common to their contemporary citizens. Further, Clements (1988:209) presents the Rechabites as a conservative nomadic community, who decided not mix themselves with the most contemporary popular culture among the Canaanite urban farming and agrarian life. The Canaanite’s farming practice was associated to their religious and ritualistic life of the Baal worship. They entangled farming and Baal worship as the lord as life giver of the land. Therefore, the Rechabites found it hard to get engrossed into the farming economy for fear of getting caught up in the immoral rituals of Baal and the goddess Anat. That is why planting of vineyard turned out hard for them.

Both third prohibition for not sowing seed and the fourth one for not planting vineyard raises a concern to the link to Baal worship. There is question however on how a person can do the two without ritual connection to the idol worship. The truth however is there is ultimate temptation that can arise in the farming, so should be avoided by the letting go of the said

farming activity. There is no mention that Judah had become in any way idolatrous through farming, so as to use it as a precaution for the Rechabites in that case. Clement (1988:209) raises a pertinent issue of dependency for those who does not farm, which might ultimately bring about influence to sin. The two prohibitions mentioned above are then hard to resonate with in the question of obedience vis-a-vis the independent livelihood. The reality then is a matter of obedience of the Rechabites, against the disobedience of Judah.

“But you shall live in tents all your days” (Jer 55:7) RSV

This comes out as the fifth prohibition. Calvin (1989:314) presents an idea that their fathers saw it as a benefit for the Rechabites to stay simple lives, so that in case they are exiled, they would not suffer much because they would have been used to living in tents and a temporal life. This is however not substantiated; it is seen as a nomadic life instead.

Henry (1991:1298) sees the life in tents as a characteristic of a dwelling to teach them to live humbly. They would suffer in the cold in order to become more hardened, in order to endure and learn resistance so as not to indulge their bodies. Their dwelling in tents which were movable was to remove in them the notion of settling down in this world but be sojourners.

In his conclusion Mckane (1986:897) sees a hidden reason in the narration of all the above prohibitions. They serve as explanation of their refusal what they were not asked, theirs was about taking of wine. The whole narration was a way of firming up their choice not to compromise their stand at all.

Why did the Rechabites launch a long account of the rules about their community in vv. 7–10, while the matter at hand was the invitation to take wine against their wish?

The reason was to show their nomadic life and how they upheld their traditional tenets, although living in Jerusalem, among people in an urban setting. There is probability that they wanted their contemporary citizens to understand their lifestyle. After the Rechabites obeyed, there was a promise from the life of obedience, and what followed was a demonstration of the Deuteronomist Theology in the book of Jeremiah.

The text above forms the foundation for dealing with the challenge of corruption in Kenya. In this regard, the social-cultural, and environment factors that influence the challenge of corruption in Kenya will take centre stage.

The influence seen in this text is generational. It is from a father to their future generations. It is Jonadab of Rechab prohibiting his children, and asked them to follow the prohibitions with their generations to come. They obeyed him despite the influence from the Canaanite community and act of giving them of wine through prophet Jeremiah. There is the power of generational value system inculcation. This forms a foundation for addressing corruption in Kenya that is passed on from one generation to another.

4.0 Synthesis and Conclusion

This paper brings to light facts about corruption Kenya. The numerous efforts as stated above in the areas of the law, the international conventions, change of the constitution, change of government leadership have all being geared towards addressing the vice of corruption. The effort is not commensurate to the results realised. There are hidden issues that thwart plans to mitigate against corruption. Those who come to power are so enthusiastic, but their energy only goes down with time. The government official who promise zero tolerance to corruption become the ones promoting the vice. The nation of Kenya seems so helpless on fighting the vice. It is with this truth that the approach must be different.

This paper presents the inculcating of a value system from one generation to another using the paradigm of Jeremiah 35:6-10. The Rechabites, though enticed to take wine, they narrate as shown above the way they would not, despite the persuasion. In their rejection to take wine, they cite other prohibitions that their father, Jonadab son of Rechab prohibited them. The stand forms a great inspiration to the forming of a values system that is inbuilt, from one generation to another. The text as exegeted above, presents an imperative to follow what is instructed. The verb *nishma* ‘(we have obeyed)’ verb from the root *shema* ‘which means to harken or listen to instructions, therefore the aspect obeying the voice is also as shown above the same as the command. The room to disobey is not there. This is the parental instilling of values that even after many years when the parent who gave the command is long dead, the impact to obey is as fresh as yesterday.

This therefore becomes the foundation for the fight of the vice in Kenya. A premise of generational instructing that prohibits one from disobedience, and also giving of instructions on the way to be followed in life. Value system is thus inculcated, from within the hearts of the people, so that anyone who comes to power of governance, although influenced to be corrupt, like the way the Rechabites were tempted to take wine, they would stand firm and say no to it.

As we noted above, corruption has been passed down from one generation to another, the uprooting of the vice requires the word of God, transmitted down from a generation to another in order for virtues to be passed down. There is therefore required a discipleship of the word from the parents to their children, and then to their children’s children.

In support for mitigation of corruption, Marquette (2012:10) cites the World Values Survey (WVS) stating that; the family values and church attendance have been associated with aversion of corruption. In that case then, this study brings on value system inculcation through family ties and on the basis of the biblical teaching to bring an impact for mitigating against corruption in Kenya. The word of God in Jeremiah 35:6-10 and the story of the Rechabites then becomes the foundation as paradigm for instruction to the inculcation of a value system. This will mitigate against corruption in Kenya.

REFERENCES

- Arie, K., Michele, J., Gelfand, A. S., Maxim, B., Malkanthi, H., Michele, N. & Rohan, G. (2016). ‘What a difference two years make: Patterns of radicalization in a Philippine jail.’ *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict*, 9, 1, 13-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17467586.2016.1198042>
- Ellis A. (2003). *Anger. How to live with and without it*. New York: Citadel Press Books.
- Erin. M, (2018). "Global Terrorism. https://www.start.umd.edu/pubs/START_GTD_
- Gallimore, T. (2002). “Unresolved Trauma: Fuel for the Cycle of Violence and Terrorism” in Stout. *Psychology of Terrorism*, vol. 2, 143-164.
- Garry, M. & Halcli, A. (2000). *The wealth of Nations, Understanding Contemporary society: Theories of the present*. London: Sage Publications
- Gilbert, G. (1997). Adam Smith on the nature and causes of poverty. *Review of Social Economy*, 55(3), 273-291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346769700000001>
- Goldman, D. & Wade, N. (2012). Comparison of forgiveness and anger-reduction group treatments: A randomized controlled trial. *Psychotherapy research: Journal of the* <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t6018>

Society for Psychotherapy Research. 22 (1)604-620.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2012.692954>

- Iannaccone, R. (2016). Rethinking Religious Social Action: What is "Rational" About Rational-Choice Theory? *Sociology of Religion*, Volume 59, Issue 2, Pages 99–115, University of Redlands. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3712075>
- McCullough, M.E. (2009). Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement, and Links to well-being *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*; 1(19), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.43>
- McMullen, J. (2017). Delivering and evaluating interventions in war-affected, low-income countries. *Research Intelligence (BERA)*. Issue 133, 8-10.
- Moghaddam F. (2005). The staircase to terrorism; a psychological exploration. *Am. Psychol.* 60, 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.9.1039>
- Norlander, B., & Eckhardt, C. (2005). Anger, hostility, and male perpetrators of intimate violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 25, 119152
- Pillay, Jerry (2017). Faith and reality: The role and contributions of the ecumenical church to the realities and development of South Africa since the advent of democracy in 1994. *Journal of theological studies. Vol 73*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i4.4519>
- Salifu. U & Ndungu I. (2012). The role of women in violent extremism in Kenya. Institute Security Studies. UON. Nairobi
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 23-45.
- Straus, M. A. (2011). Gender symmetry and mutuality in perpetration of clinical-level partner violence: Empirical evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.010>
- Worthington, E.L. Jr., & Wade, N.G. (1999). The social psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 358415. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1999.18.4.385>
- Young L. A. (2016). *Rational Choice Theory and Religion: Summary and Assessment*. Brigham Young University. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315538877>