The African Origins of Rhetoric

Cecil Blake

The African Origins of Rhetoric

African Studies
History, Politics, Economics, and Culture

MOLEFI ASANTE, *General Editor*

The African Origins of Rhetoric

Cecil Blake

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

New York   London

This work is dedicated first and foremost to my grandchildren: Andrew, Nettie, Aaron, Imzadi, and David, and my hope in them for Africa; to Africa and all my ancestors; to my wife Hortensia, and my children Candace, Christine, Andrew, and Bernard and all who love Africa.

Contents

Preface

This work comes out at a very defining moment globally, in terms of the near catastrophic economic crisis creating tremors in leading as well as emerging economies of the world. In response to the catastrophe, former conservative President George W. Bush of the United States of America, a leading western nation, responded with intervention strategies that contradict, to a significant extent, *the core values and principles* upon which the economic policies and practices of his regime were grounded: for instance the massive injection of public funds into the private sector as a means of salvaging the economic problem exemplifies intervention programs that have been variously described by many observers as "socialist" strategies, in contravention of the liberal/capitalist doctrine of reliance on the "markets" to find ways of adjusting to market-related economic catastrophes. In essence, there was a convenient and pragmatic decision in the capital of the leading western democracy to accommodate *core principles* outside of its "center" in response to threats that may cause devastating impacts on society at large.

Against the background above of the existence of core principles upon which the governance of a nation is anchored, and a willingness to make adjustments as imperatives demand, the western powers, on the contrary, put heavy pressures on African states to abdicate from their core principles grounded in their traditions and adopt the core principles of western democracies instead of Africans making adjustments to their core principles as imperatives demand in the continent.

This book addresses the issue of *core ethical/moral principles* derived from the foundations of *African rhetorical tradition*, found in an ancient African text titled: *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* (circa 3100 BCE). The central thrust of the text is on instructions on *rhetoric and governance*, with particular emphasis on the moral/ethical aspects, providing the *moral and ethical foundation* upon which Africans could stand as they discuss among themselves and others the issue of fashioning their model of governance.

The African root of rhetoric is not widely known in scholarship and/or in approaches to governance in emerging African countries. In that regard, this work introduces the African origins of rhetoric to communication,

development studies and related disciplines. It locates African core principles found in its rhetorical tradition within the global debate on African national development and models of governance. It challenges Africans and others interested in the amelioration of the conditions in the continent to take bold steps in questioning the wholesale applicability of core "democratic" principles advanced by the West, without regard for core African principles on ethics and governance found for instance in *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* referred to in this work as core *Maatian ethical principles.*

The work is structured along the following: Chapter One—The Prologue introduces the work and establishes the relationship between the core *Maatian ethical principles* and the present day development problematic in Africa. A case is made for the restoration of *Maatian ethical principles* that form the basis for the text: *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep*, the source of the African origins of rhetoric, in the process of fashioning designs and instruments for African national development. The relationship of the African origins of rhetoric to contemporary approaches for the amelioration of the overall condition in Africa through development initiatives at the international and continental levels is established.

Chapter Two discusses the rhetorical construction of the continent and its inhabitants by Europeans and North Americans as well as responses from Africans in Diaspora and in the continent. The rhetorical construction of Africa presents an insight into the massive onslaught on the character of the African and points towards a fundamental anomaly: how could a continent and people so constructed produce work such as Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* with a wealth of information not just on ancient Egyptian life, but belief systems and moral principles that guided every aspect of their lives, including its rhetorical comportment? Of more significance perhaps, this section in the work enhances the appreciation of Ptah-Hotep's work and resilience that Africa has demonstrated notwithstanding the massive onslaught on its character for centuries. There may be many in the discipline (rhetoric) and even in development studies that had no prior exposure to the rhetorical construction of Africa and how Africans in the continent and in Diaspora sought to respond. This void is filled by the discussion of the topic in this section.

Chapter Three provides a discussion on rhetorical theory. In this section of the work, key concepts and constructs that have informed rhetorical scholarship over several years are introduced and analyzed for purposes of placing Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* within the annals of rhetorical theory.

Chapter Four addresses Africa in rhetorical scholarship, the "Darkness" metaphor and its implications for an understanding of the African continent and her place in the annals of human history.

Chapter Five presents a discussion on *Maat*, which represent the ethical grounding for Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric.

Chapter Six provides in full a discussion on the Rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep and investigates its essential tenets. Chapter Seven juxtaposes the essential

tenets of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric against the background of the rhetorical construction of the African.

Chapter Seven provides a transition from the discussion on the nature of the African origins juxtaposed against the background of the rhetorical construction of the African, to a discussion on the quagmire in which the continent finds itself.

Chapter Eight provides a discussion on postcolonial theory as the broader paradigmatic framework for analytical purposes, and as a bridge that links African (Kemetic) rhetorical theory and the present day development challenges and opportunities for the African continent. A critique is made on several elements in the postcolonial paradigm as they apply, or not, to an understanding of the rhetorical imperatives Africans have to satisfy and how to go about handling them.

Chapter Nine is the epilogue. In this section, Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric is discussed within the context of governance in Africa. The discussion centers on the fundamental premise that the invasions, colonialism, and all other forms of assault in the continent had resulted in a major dislocation of *Maatian principles*, affecting the ability of African leaders to govern successfully. Examples of attempts by Africans to fashion corrective governance measures is also presented. Furthermore, an adumbration of a "partnership" forged between the West and Africa in 2000 is used to demonstrate the extent to which the continent continues to manifest tendencies of succumbing to pressures to adopt core principles that may not be conducive for harmonious and successful governance. The section ends with an examination of a construct designed to restore *Maatian principles* as the core value basis for governance in Africa, with the use of the "armed vision" construct derived from Stanley Hyman's work titled: *The Armed Vision* (1955).

An appendix containing a complete excerpt of *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* is followed by five appendices comprising speeches of African leaders presented at international conferences on the subject of African development.

Acknowledgments

1 Prologue

If thou obey these things that I have said unto thee, all thy demeanour shall be of the best; for, verily, the quality of truth is among their excellences. Set the memory of them in the mouths of the people; for their proverbs are good. Nor shall any word [come] out of this land forever, but shall be made a pattern whereby princes shall speak well. They (my words) shall instruct a man how he shall speak, after heard them; yea, he shall become as one skilful in obeying, excellent in speaking, after he hath heard them.

> Ptah-Hotep
> Verse 37c
> *Instruction*

Fair speech is more rare than the emerald that is found by slave maidens on the pebbles.

> Ptah-Hotep
> Verse 1
> *Instruction*

I start this work with a brief autobiographical statement in the hope of establishing up front a *raison d'être* for the task upon which I embark. The work I present on the origins of African rhetoric is deeply rooted in the traditions of Africans, notably in the *moral and ethical foundations* of African societies. It is upon those foundations that Africans from their formative years to their coming of age are expected to assume responsibilities in society.

The responsibilities range from preparations for leadership roles to family and vocational duties. The preparation takes the form of *instructions* from elders in society as well as traditional institutions (at times referred to as "secret societies" in some African states such as the *Poro* and *Bondo* institutions in Sierra Leone), designed to carry out such instructions and socialization. With the advent of evangelization and colonialism, there were

interruptions in the process of socialization. The interruptions created confusion and the dislocation of indigenous normative systems because of the differences and contrasts between traditional African values and morality, and those represented by the intruding powers from outside the continent. As Kesteloot (1972) posits, "From the first moment, colonization always provokes an acculturation: men who had previously lived in the milieu of stable social and moral structures find themselves in a brutal confrontation with other men who are stronger than they are, who profess nothing but contempt for their ancient traditions, and who plan to substitute a new organizational structure" (p.17). The contact was not only brutal in terms of physical violence, but also in terms of the violent nature of the representations, perhaps more appropriately, *misrepresentations* of Africans by outsiders.

The degree of impact on African traditional beliefs, values and mores varied, depending upon the amount of exposure to the alien value orientations, belief systems and mores. The brief autobiographical account that follows contextualizes the dialectic, and sets the stage for a major theme that runs throughout the work: the abdication by Africans notably in the leadership structure in postcolonial Africa, from a rich African value system and mores, articulated brilliantly, for instance, in the ancient text on *African rhetoric* titled *The Instructions of Ptah-Hotep*, and a contemporary resultant troubled African governance structure.

I was born and raised in Sierra Leone during the colonial period and grew up at the dawn of the postcolonial era. My entire primary and secondary education was obtained at Catholic institutions. My family is deeply Catholic, and at least thirty percent of my teachers were Irish. My first exposure to school was at a kindergarten operated by Irish nuns of the order of the Sisters of Clooney. Irish priests belonging to the order of the Holy Ghost Fathers were among my teachers at both the primary and secondary school levels. Our upbringing at home, school and church was strict with a heavy stress on morality and felicitous adherence to conflicting value systems and mores, rooted in Catholicism and traditional African beliefs and practices.

The contradictions I experienced between the two value systems led to the writing of my first short story when I was eighteen years old, in retrospect aptly titled: "The Corkoh Mystery." The basic story line was on a mysterious and catastrophic disaster that befell an African village as a result of questionable allegiances by a resident family, to an African traditional religious practice against the background of their Christian/Catholic beliefs and practice. The poems I wrote as a child also were shrouded in "mystery" largely due to the contradictions of Catholicism and African traditional beliefs. Living in a home that practiced both African and Catholic belief systems was indeed not easy. Going to confessions as a child was in some instances very difficult, particularly after family ceremonies on the occasion of births, deaths, marriages, and commemorative events on anniversaries of the passing of loved ones.

Among the major African traditional practices we faithfully performed were the *awujohs*—elaborate feasts of typically African dishes, followed by invocation and communication with the dead, our ancestors. The medium of communication was verbal, but kola nuts were and still are used as the medium to receive feedback from the dead. Two kola nuts are split open into four pieces and dropped on the ground at the site of the ritual or at the gravesite of the departed. The manner in which they lay on the ground leads to an interpretation as to whether or not the dead agrees with our supplications. The ritual is repeated until the family is satisfied that indeed there was a positive response from the dead.

Thus Saturdays, following awujohs were difficult days for me, since I had to go to confession, and had to determine whether our communicating with our ancestors and the rituals involved contravened the First Commandment that prohibits the worshipping of any other God than the Christian God. There were other major contradictions I had to consistently work on to resolve. The anecdote above relates to the conflict in values grounded in religious beliefs.

Other conflicts were based on socially accepted and/or preferred vocations or professions. An example of this conflict was my decision immediately after graduating from secondary school to establish a band with friends to play popular music. The band was called "The Golden Strings." I was leader of the band and its creation was a devastating contradiction for my family. I belonged to a conservative family that looked down on people who played popular music. My decision created dissension between the family and me. The family eventually accommodated my bold venture.

Besides the religious and social experiences mentioned above, I started my political socialization by becoming an active member and debater at a debating club called *Rodania*. Through debating sessions on Sundays, I became aware and subsequently very conversant with the evils of colonialism and oppression and the need to work towards the total freedom from the grips of the colonial powers. Among the topics we debated was the issue of ideology, given the rivalry that existed between the West and the East—between capitalism/democracy and socialism/communism. We did not debate to any significant degree traditional African systems of governance, because we did not receive "formal" instructions on the subject while attending primary and secondary schools or during story-telling sessions in the evenings at home, at which time we were taught African morals and ethical principles in the form of folk tales.

My socialization was a continuous process of handling and negotiating what I saw as contradictions. There was an appreciation of both aspects of belief systems until I travelled to the United States to live in a western Christian country, with a history I never fully became exposed to firsthand while in Sierra Leone. The contradiction became even more perplexing, resulting in my resistance against the denigration of Africa and African belief systems during class discussions and deliberations in social organi-

zations. The deliberations continue to date, particularly as one discovers more and more, the richness of Africa's resources—its deep moral/ethical values that guided ancient African societies found in the treatise on African rhetoric—*The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep*, some of which continue to influence the day-to-day life of many Africans at the periphery, and not incorporated into the wider body politic.

My discovery of the text on African rhetoric written circa 3100 BCE and translated by Battiscombe Gunn (1918), *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Keg'emni: The Oldest Books in the World*, reaffirmed my belief in the strengths of the African *ethos*. The text is on rhetoric (as a discipline) and governance. I find it the very antithesis of Machiavellis *The Prince*, in the sense that both Machiavelli and Ptah-Hotep are providing instructions for governance.

Upon reading Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* to his son on how to speak well, and the relationship of "good speech"—grounded in a commitment to African moral principles *Maat*—and governance, I became fully persuaded about the need for the African leadership structure to look more into the cultural and ethical/moral resources of the continent as they seek to fashion desirable societies. Some of them may have read Machiavelli, which may probably explain the tyranny they inflict upon their citizens. I doubt, however, how many among the African leadership structure have read *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep*. This lacuna may explain the existing relationship between Africa and the rest of the world: that of a continent which on the whole has failed to use pertinent aspects of its traditional beliefs, values and mores in designing successful systems of governance, and allowed itself to be told by the West how to go about achieving that goal. It is a picture of the gravest contradictions of all, at least in my experiences and my exposure to both African and Western norms: a continent with a rich moral and ethical tradition upon which governance was fashioned and implemented, at a loss for governing models necessary for its regeneration after damaging years of the European and Arabian slave trade, as well as colonialism.

The development environment in the continent is characterized by major political and social problems manifested in conflicts in varying degrees of magnitude: internecine wars; endemic corruption, and a propensity towards dependence on *others* (the West and increasingly East Asia—China and Japan) to define and even provide support for a vision of desirable futures, since decolonization.

The present work introduces the African origins of rhetoric to communication, development studies and related disciplines. There is a lacuna, especially in scholarship on rhetorical theory that needs to be addressed in so far as Africas contribution to the early development of rhetorical theory is concerned. The work also locates African core principles found in its rhetorical tradition within the global debate on African national development and models of governance as the *moral and ethical foundation* upon which Africans could stand as they discuss among themselves and others,

the issue of fashioning their model of governance. It is done against the historical background of a dastardly rhetorical onslaught on the nature and character of Africa and Africans, by the West. Furthermore, I seek to locate Africa's contribution towards rhetorical theory with an emphasis on its moral principles in approaches to governance issues within the wider framework of the development imperatives facing the continent. In essence, one could not write about the African origins of rhetorical theory without engaging the African national development studies problematic.

I attempt, therefore, to redress the lacuna mentioned above, and engage the African development problematic. I do so by making a case for the inclusion of *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep*, that was written in ancient Egypt three thousand years before Corax (circa 478 BCE), and much more before Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintillian and others, into the annals of rhetorical theory. In the process, I expound on ancient Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory, shedding some light on how its main tenet—*a moral theory on rhetoric*—could provide possible answers to extant problems faced by the continent. The problems range from governance and leadership issues within the African leadership structure in tackling development imperatives, to the characterological damage that resulted from abuses suffered by Africans through outside invasions of the continent, slavery, evangelization, colonialism and the current neo-colonial stranglehold on the continent.

The present work, therefore, engages the *African development problematic* like no other text in rhetorical theory has done to date. Traditional texts in rhetorical theory have not attempted to explain or to provide any perspective on the relationship between rhetorical theory and imperatives of African national development. The work is thus influenced by *Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Kegemni: The Oldest Books in the World grounded in core African ethical principles—Maatian principles*. Its central thrust is on instructions on rhetoric and governance, with particular emphasis on the moral/ethical aspects, articulated by a Vizier in Kemet (ancient Egypt). Some may argue, and perhaps correctly so, that a text on rhetorical theory has no bearing on African national development. But this is precisely what makes the text unique.

Thus, I argue that there is an inextricable linkage between rhetoric and development studies, a linkage that had not received the attention it deserves in postcolonial studies with an emphasis on the African development problematic. From the perspective of rhetorical theory and its moral principles, the dominant ethos prevalent in rhetorical communication strategies and messages found in African governance settings at the national and regional levels is decidedly Western, notwithstanding the existence of a clearly articulated set of ethical principles found in ancient writings on rhetoric from Africa. I provide five speeches by African heads of state in this work as a means of adumbrating the apparent absence or lack of recognition and possible use of the core principles found in Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction*.

The spatial nature of the work poses a key challenge in terms of its theoretical rationale paradigmatically, and discipline specific imperatives. Africa as a region has a long and glorious past prior to the following horrific epochs: slavery, evangelization and its negative impact, colonialism and of course neo-colonialism, which is still an albatross on the shoulders of Africans. Post-independent Africa, with its multifarious problems as well as prospects depending on how African leaders handle the latter, has a natural niche within postcolonial studies, an emerging paradigm that provides theoretical and analytical tools. Some may question my characterization of postcolonial studies as an "emerging paradigm." I discuss this issue later.

Initially, my fascination was with the apparent lacuna that is readily discernible—the absence of any aspect of Africa's contribution—in the study of the evolution of rhetorical theory. As the draft expanded, it became clear that a mere presentation of what constitutes the African origins of rhetorical theory was inadequate. This is so particularly when one recognizes the malaise in which the continent finds itself against the background of its rich rhetorical tradition laden with core principles that link rhetoric to governance, that had simply not been visible in the Euro-American annals of rhetorical scholarship.

Furthermore, upon reflection on the horrific epochs referred to earlier in the annals of the history of the continent, coupled with the extant problems and challenges of governance and leadership in postcolonial Africa, I decided to seek ways of linking rhetoric and the African development problematic, thus expanding the scope of the work.

Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* is a treatise on rhetoric, and on preparations for leadership roles in governance. In theoretical terms and against the background of the present world context, the task is to revisit and shed some light on the mission of rhetoric, which, to my mind, should be among other aims, to place it in the service of interrogating those societies that have been marginalized by deliberate acts of oppression in various forms.

Furthermore, still within the context of rhetorical theory, to examine the prospects for ameliorating the condition of Africa and Africans through an understanding of the roots and practices in their rhetorical traditions. Such interrogations may shed light on aspects of rhetorical theory germane to their traditions that may be invoked for the reconstruction of such societies rather than relying on *alien core principles* embedded in rhetorical systems and structures that may not contribute to the amelioration of their condition.

I argue, therefore, that the interrogation of African societies that had undergone thousands of years of oppression, with the aim of unearthing their rhetorical traditions, may be germane for their development, and may help to perform a "restorative" function. One such restorative function is fundamental: understanding how the rhetorical traditions of Africa fashioned "character" and the importance attached to it, in all aspects of human relations—from personal responsibility to institutional, namely governance. Through such interrogation, one may be able to see clearly the

extent to which "African character" has been denigrated and demeaned throughout its history of oppression and even in the post-colonial era, and discuss interventions that may be necessary for its restoration. It would be foolhardy on the part of anyone to argue that "character" formation and how it affects personal and institutional responsibility has nothing to do with culture, tradition and governance.

The issue thus of restoring the *characterological* dimension of the African need not be a point of contention requiring justification. The rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep is firmly rooted in core African principles—*Maatian principles* —that are directly related to moral character formation and subsequent responsibility at the personal and societal/institutional levels. *Maatian principles* prioritize character and integrity, through commitment to truth, justice, rightness, fairness, harmony, and order, just to mention some of the tenets of the principles at this juncture.

For those who may jump to the conclusion that the manner in which the idea of a "restorative" function is articulated above connotes a "blind return" to traditional African core principles as the sole basis for personal comportment and governance without recognition of the dynamic, hence changing nature of culture, let me hasten to say that it would be wrong to arrive at such a conclusion. Societies do go through changes as they come into contact willingly or unwillingly with other cultures, but the "changes" need not result in the loss of character and integrity necessary for good and effective governance.

Thus, the major argument surrounding the idea of restoration is focused on restoring those aspects of cultural mores such as character and integrity grounded in core principles, which guide personal comportment and institutional responsibility with an *African* definition. This idea is far from any claim that Africans should simply go back to what obtained before their contacts with others since antiquity. Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric centers and elevates African core principles. The restorative dimension is to bring back into the fold, so to say, people who have somehow abdicated from those principles or have simply lost them, particularly people in leadership positions.

The interrogation process could not be undertaken without "expanding" the "norm" and engaging rhetoric in a manner that has hitherto not been considered: rhetoric as a discipline germane to development studies in non-western contexts. Furthermore, in order to perform such a task, one has to go beyond the traditional realms of the subject and incorporate other knowledge bases that are required to elucidate the problematic and contribute towards the refinement and enhancement of an aspect of rhetorical theory that has lagged behind in rhetorical scholarship, namely, comparative rhetoric. This aspect of rhetorical theory requires excursions, even if cursory, into regional cosmologies and histories, domains within which materials on ideas about the subject matter of rhetoric are located and grounded. In this instance, the present work goes back to ancient Africa— ancient Egypt or Kemet as its inhabitants called it to be precise, through an

examination of ancient Egyptian rhetoric grounded in its worldview and its overall normative structure. Rhetoric is normative-driven. It could not be understood and appreciated without knowledge of the core principles that constitute its normative structure.

The manner in which the term "core principle," (the ethical bases and grounding for societies) is used in this work connotes a collective. Here, "core principles" means a set of values that mark the nature and character of a given society. Even though one or two elements in the collective may be subject to major modifications, the collective dimension of the core principles remains intact. It is the collective character that makes the core principles of any given society the pillars upon which the given society is buttressed. As such, an invasion of any given society by another with a different set of core principles and their imposition by the invaders on the invaded, result in dislocations of the core principles of the society invaded even though there may be certain elements that are similar but not large in numbers enough to allow for even a marginal symmetry. I hasten to add that approaching a work of this nature on core principles cannot be hurriedly dismissed as "essentialism."

Asante (1998) provides an instructive stance in terms of understanding the significance of such an approach. He argues, "If we have lost anything, it is our cultural centeredness; that is, we have been moved off our platforms. This means that we cannot truly be ourselves or know our potential since we exist in borrowed space." He continues, "But all space is a matter of point of view or interpretation. Our existential relationship to the culture that we have borrowed defines what and who we are at any given moment. By regaining our own platforms, standing in our own cultural spaces, and believing that our way of viewing the universe is just as valid as any, we will achieve the kind of transformation that we need to participate fully in a multicultural society [and a multicultural world]" (p.8, 1998). Asante's stance does not only provide a rationale for the present work, it also demonstrates that the transformation, albeit the restorative resultant dimension of this work, privileges humane interactions among diverse peoples and nations globally.

Like Asante, who anchors and plants his intellectual "persona" in the *source* of all African classical social thought (e.g. 1992), I use ancient Egypt as the entry point for rhetorical scholarship on Africa. The core principles that constitute the normative structure of Kemet serve as the basis for an understanding of the rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep. Several aspects of the fundamental pillars of its worldview and concomitant normative structure, manifested in what is discussed at length in this work as *Maatian principles*, continue to serve as the bases upon which African cultural norms survive (notably in non-urban settings) notwithstanding the massive assault from Europe and the Arabian peninsula since antiquity, and the apparent disarray evident in the various upheavals and social unrest in several parts of the continent.

A close examination of the underlying factors for the instability experienced in several African states may very well be those associated with the crisis in value orientations. The crisis is brought about by the displacement of core African moral principles and their replacement with alien values notably from the West, during the colonial era and unfortunately even after decolonization, resulting in a protracted state of anomie within African normative contexts. Such a resultant society should be anticipated since major aspects of the alien core principles do not fit in well within the overall African ethos. The role of rhetoric, therefore, becomes crucial for restorative purposes, through utterances grounded and guided by rhetorical principles and constructs within African contexts.

Given the contexts established above, this work provides an exegesis of African contributions to the global fund of knowledge on the African origins of rhetorical theory on the one hand, and on the other, on how its seminal contributions became obfuscated. The obfuscation is a result of the assault and destruction of African societies since antiquity following invasions, evangelization (both Christian and Islamic), colonialism; and of utmost important significance, the devastating rhetorical construction of the African and its aftermath, by Europeans and North Americans.

Particular attention is paid to the rhetorical construction of the African by Europeans and North Americans because such construction is at the heart of what I refer to in the first part of the work as the "darkness metaphor," derived from the all too common reference to Africa, by some even today, as "The Dark Continent." This "darkness," I would argue later, made opaque the seminal contributions of Africans in many domains, in this instance in rhetorical theory. As would be seen later, the image of Africa rhetorically constructed by the West is one of an ignoble and barbarous past, unworthy of producing anything substantive; and that whites had the mission to save blacks from themselves and their inhumanity. Such an image creates a fundamental exigency Africans face: rhetorical imperatives that have to be satisfied if they are to succeed in fashioning models of governance that would improve upon their overall quality of life without losing their essence.

It is instructive to note the key point made by James Andrews (1983) in his discussion on "Rhetorical Imperatives: Social and Cultural Values" when he states: "In reconstructing rhetorical imperatives, historical and political events obviously must be considered. Social and cultural values and traditions also must be understood as they pertain to a speaking situation. In the civil rights movement, for example, consider the paternalistic myth of the 'happy Negro.' It was often alleged that Blacks were happy with their lot; they didn't want contact with white society; they were content to move in the circles prescribed for them and in accordance with the traditions of white supremacy . . . ". He continues: "The role of whites was to 'take care of' blacks; and blacks, when they were not interfered with by 'outside agitators,' were docile and satisfied. When one recognizes the

existence of such a cultural conception, one begins to *see the need for black speakers like King to shatter it* (italics mine)." (p.19). In like terms, there is indeed an imperative to illuminate Africa, against the background of its rhetorical construction fashioned by the West, and "shatter" the metaphor that shrouds the continent in "darkness."

The approach towards the handling of the rhetorical imperatives in this work requires an interface with rhetoric, history and development studies. The thread that holds the work together is the *centrality of Maatian principles* framed in ancient Egypt or Kemet, both in its incipiency and subsequent disruption, with a potential for its restorative role in governance in Africa. If the restorative goal is achieved, it may help provide an alternative to the rather murky ethical/cultural/ideological base of governance in present-day Africa.

Andrews again provides a *raison d'etre* for a work of this nature when he argues: "For the critic to understand the rhetorical problems that King had to face, the rhetorical opportunities that were open to him, and the constraints that were placed on him by events in the past and his role in those events and the prevailing attitudes and beliefs, one would have to reconstruct the imperatives that brought King's speech about" (p.20). One cannot write successfully about Africa's contribution to the global fund of knowledge, in this instance, rhetoric, without engaging the crucial task of interrogating the rhetorical construction of Africa and Africans by the West, and responses to that construction by Africans in the continent and in Diaspora.

From the preceding, I argue that in order to understand, and perhaps appreciate the significance of Ptah-Hotep's seminal contribution to the origins of rhetorical theory, there is a need indeed to do the following: explicate the social past against the background of the rhetorical construction of the continent; discuss the core principles upon which Ptah-Hotep's work is grounded, and project prospects for a positive future for a region of the world that has experienced hundreds of years of external and of late internal (by some elements in the African leadership structure) oppression. Furthermore, the projection of a positive future is anchored in the restorative potential of the core *Maatian principles*. These principles provide the theoretical basis for Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric particularly as they pertain to providing the African leadership structure with an alternative model of governance rooted in their social and historical past, and applicable elements in Africa's core principles.

2 The Blackness Without and the Blackness Within
The Rhetorical Construction of the African

Discourses about the "negro" origins of Egypt abound (Diop 1974; Van Sertima 1988; Moktar 1998). The ground-breaking works of Diop (1974; 1976) in particular followed by scholars such as Obenga (1972; 1992) address fully scholarship on issues of race, social organization and other aspects of ancient Egyptian civilization. Karenga (2002) writes, " . . . Egypt was called *Kemet,* Land of the Blacks or the Black Land, and *Ta Meri,* the Beloved Land" (p.94). The pros and cons on the arguments have been strongly advanced by scholars mentioned above, and documented. A more focused discussion on this aspect is provided later.

Commenting on European and North American objections to his television series on Africa, Davidson (1987) aptly recounts: "The objection heard from a number of viewers in Europe and North America, was against a central theme in the series. This theme portrayed Egypt of the Pharaohs, Ancient Egypt before the conquest of the Arabs in the seventh century A.D., as a country of black origins and population whose original ancestors had come from the lands of the great interior, and whose links with inner Africa remained *potent and continuous* (italics mine). To affirm this, of course, is to offend nearly established historiographical orthodoxy" (p.39).

One could not, under the circumstances stated above, present the African origins of rhetorical theory and its significance without some form of introduction and discussion on the "darkness" metaphor, and how it obfuscated African agency in the evolution of rhetorical theory. I use the term "equitable" to suggest some degree of fairness in locating Africa's original contribution to the annals of the evolution of rhetorical theory.

In short, therefore, I seek to contribute to the enrichment of the study of rhetoric, particularly its ethical and moral aspects, by broadening the bases of its foundation to encompass the ideas of non-western thought on the subject from antiquity to the present, with a focus on African agency.

Part of the subtitle above is borrowed from Part One of Winthrop Jordan's classical work, *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550–1812 (*1968). In order to understand the claim: to "illuminate" the continent, mentioned in the opening paragraph of this work, one has to have an insight into that which was "dark" as portrayed in western historiography. A

crucial aspect of the "darkness metaphor" is the manner in which articulate Europeans and Americans historically engaged in the rhetorical construction of Africa and Africans.

The continent and people (of African descent) historically have suffered from a massive onslaught on their character, nature and capabilities, resulting in various actions undertaken by "outsiders," namely Europeans, to ameliorate what they considered to be the "dark," "barbarous" and "uncivilized" conditions of the continent, through various instruments. The notorious trans-Atlantic slave trade epoch and colonialism were instruments of oppression used by Europeans. Evangelization, for the Europeans and even some articulate Blacks in pre- and post-civil-war America, was crucial because "heathenism" presumably has been the norm in Africa, which in turn precluded any conception of "morality" worthy of human beings as part of the dictates of Christianity. The onslaught on Africa and the characterization of Africans by Europeans and Americans created what I referred to in the subtitle of this section as the "rhetorical construction of the African."

The idea of "a rhetorical construction" is advanced predicated on the overwhelming corpus of works by leading European and Americans that focused on providing information and insights into the nature and character of Africans. Some of the ideas by notable figures such as Thomas Jefferson were advanced on the basis of "suspicion" but asserted with an incredible degree of authority that renders "suspicion" as facts. Hegel, Hume and Kant, none of whom ever visited the African continent, also made assertions that were firm but not subject to any form of verification other than secondary sources they consulted. Yet as a collective, their voices were powerful and credible.

Among millions of Europeans and non-Europeans in the nineteenth century, such authors represented the "articulate" and commanded tremendous respect. Their utterances were, therefore, received by readers, as coming from authoritative sources, and regarded as means through which one got to know about and to understand "others" as these authors presented them in their discourses. Hegel, in his *Philosophy of History* (1956), has a chapter with the heading: "Geographical Basis of History," in which he discusses various regions in the world and their inhabitants. Kant (1960), in his *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*, has an entire section with the heading: "Of National Characteristics, so far as They Depend upon the Distinct Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime." He also presents detailed discussions on various regions of the world and their inhabitants.

Their discourses on Africans became what Edwin Black would refer to as "tokens" the authors created and propounded. Black states: "Discourses are, directly or in a transmuted form, the external signs of internal states. In short, we accept it as true that a discourse implies an author, and we mean by that more than the tautology that an act entails an agent" (1970, p.110). There is, however, an important link that ought to be considered:

the link that binds author and auditor. In this instance, the link represents the message from the author to the auditor, and how the absorption of the message creates a consubstantial whole. Europeans and Americans who wrote pejoratively about the nature and character of Africans had auditors who apparently accepted the characterization, exemplified by the deep prejudices that continue even in the twenty-first century, to be so manifested in society that the claim needs no justification.

Edwin Black provides support, however, for the assertion above. He states:

> Actual auditors look to the discourse they are attending for cues that tell them how they are to view the world, even beyond the expressed concerns, the overt propositional sense, of the discourse." He continues, "Let the rhetor, for example, who is talking about school integration use a pejorative term to refer to black people, and the auditor is confronted with more than a decision about school integration. He is confronted with a plexus of attitudes that may not all be discussed in the discourse or even implied in any way other than the use of the single term. The discourse will exert on him the pull of an ideology. It will move, unless he rejects it, to structure his experience on many subjects besides school integration. And more, if the auditor himself begins using the pejorative term, it will be a fallible sign that he has adopted not just a position on school integration, but an ideology. (p.113)

From the preceding, it is comfortable to assert that the nature and character of Africans rhetorically crafted by articulate Europeans and Americans, who will be discussed below, attained the level of an "ideology" in the sense that Black uses the term above. Of significance is the idea of adopting the ideology. The assertion is grounded on a basic reality: Africans, regardless of where they reside in the world, continue to be seen and reacted to generally by people of European descent and even others (in the rest of the world) based by and large on the rhetorical construction provided by authors who I move on to discuss.

Thomas Jefferson claims in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* that he had not found "a black who had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration," or even "an elementary trait of painting or sculpture" (Peden 1955, p.140). Others contended that "the animal part of the man gains victory over the *moral;* and consequently prefers sinking down into the listless in glorious repose of the brute creation" (Dew 1970, p.92). Edward Long asserted that Africans' "faculties of smell are not truly bestial, nor less their commerce with the sexes; in these acts they are libidinous and shameless as monkeys, or baboons. The equally hot temperament of their women has given probability to the charge of their admitting these animals frequently to their embrace. An example of this intercourse once happened, I think, in England. Ludicrous as it may seem I do not think that an oran-outang hus-

band would be any dishonor to an Hottentot [African] female" (Pierterse p.41). It is no wonder, therefore, that Jefferson would say with conviction, that Black women prefer sexual intercourse with orangutans, an interesting claim, since he fathered at least a child with an enslaved African woman in his own household. Enthymematically, the conclusion drawn from such a claim by Jefferson could be quite intriguing!

Jefferson observed further: "comparing them [Africans] by their faculties of memory, reason and imagination, it appears to me, that in memory they are equal to whites; in reason much inferior, as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous" (Jordan p.435). In terms of the arts, with specific reference to music, and inconsonance with popular beliefs even today, Jefferson states, "they are more generally gifted than whites with accurate ears for tune and time, and they have been found capable of imaging a small catch" (Jordan p.437). But when it comes to poetry, Jefferson asserts: "Misery is often the parent of the most affecting touches in poetry—Among the blacks misery is enough, God knows, but no poetry. Love is the peculiar oestrum of the poet. Their love is ardent, but it kindles the sense only not the imagination" (Jordan p.437).

Stemming from the above, Jefferson and others who shared similar beliefs suggested that the African's "methods and grounds" of knowledge are deeply located in the brute class. Africans have nothing to proffer in terms of epistemic relevance, hence the Hegelian observation: "We leave Africa not to mention it again. For it is no historical part of the world; it has no movement or development to exhibit . . . What we properly understand by Africa, is the Unhistorical, Underdeveloped Spirit, still involved in conditions of mere nature, and by which had to be presented here only as the threshold of the World's History" (1960, p.99).

The litany continues unabated. Against the background of Hegel's characterization above is a pervasive token in the discourses of Europeans: "African savagery." Hegel contends that: "The Negro, as already observed, exhibits the natural man in his completely wild and untamed state. We must lay aside all thoughts of reverence and morality—all that we call feeling—if we could rightly comprehend him; there is nothing harmonious with humanity to be found in this type of character" (p.93) This stance would lead to his assertion that: "Among the Negroes moral sentiments are quite weak, or more strictly, non-existent" (p.96). Thus he argues further, "In Negro life the characteristic point is that consciousness has not yet attained to the realization of any substantial objective existence—as for example, God, or Law—in which the interest of man's volition is involved and in which he realizes his own being" (p.92).

Hegel's description above places Africans within the community of "men," albeit in their "completely wild and untamed state"—a savage and a heathen. Blacks, however, deserve no "reverence" or respect. On the contrary, being brutes, they have no consciousness of themselves as human

beings. Unlike Hegel an English approach to the issue of "African savagery" could be seen from a perspective of the virtue attributed to the notion of the "noble savage." For them, "African savagery" was ignoble. Jordan states: "Even in the eighteenth century, when the savages of the world were being promoted to "nobility" by Europeans as an aid to self-scrutiny and reform at home, the Negro was not customarily thought of as embodying all the qualities of the noble savage" (p.27). Hence even in the category of so-called "savages" Africans were excluded from any quality of worth. It was a savagery that was marked by distinctive features Europeans ascribed to Africans. Hence, "They [Englishmen] knew perfectly well that Negroes were men, yet they frequently described the Africans as 'brutish' or 'bestial' or 'beastly.'(p.28). Africans characterized thus cannot be compared with races among the human family. Even if one dismisses the predisposition of the English explained by Jordan above, and indeed recognizes blacks as "human," they would perforce be considered "inferior." The "noble savage" and all others in the human race found in the non-white would also fall within the "inferior" category, but Africans more so than other races. White supremacy, being the "superior" race, was assumed to be a given.

Such a classification was reaffirmed by Hume who opined: "I am apt to suspect the negroes, and in general all other species of men (for there are four or five different kinds) to be naturally inferior to whites. There never was a civilized nation of any other complexion than white, nor even any individual eminent either in action or speculation. No ingenious manufacturers amongst them, no arts, no sciences" (Jordan p.253). The cacophony continues at highest pitch. From Hume, to Kant, the latter states: "The Negroes of Africa have by nature no feeling that rises above the trifling. Mr. Hume challenges anyone to cite a single example in which a Negro has shown talents, and asserts that among the hundreds of thousands of blacks who are transported elsewhere from their countries, although many of them have even been set free, still not a single one was ever found who presented anything great in art or science or any other praiseworthy quality, even though among the whites some continually rise aloft from the lowest rabble, and through superior gifts earn respect in the world. So fundamental is the difference between these two races of man, and it appears to be as great in regard to mental capacities as in color." He continues: "The religion of fetishes so widespread among them is perhaps a sort of idolatry that sinks as deeply into the trifling as appears to be possible to human nature . . . The blacks are very vain but in the Negro's way, and so talkative that they must be driven apart from each other with thrashings" (1960, pp.110–111).

Kant's observation about the "fundamental" difference between the two races notwithstanding, Samuel Stanhope Smith argued in favor of monogenesis. He believed that human beings are from a singular species, and that environmental factors both social and physical were responsible for "differences in color, anatomy, intelligence, temperament and morality . . . [in addition to]

contrasting habits of life produced by 'savagery' and 'civilization'" (Frederickson 1971, p.73). As Frederickson observed, "This viewpoint did not make Smith a thoroughgoing racial egalitarian in the twentieth century sense; like most other eighteenth-century advocates of the unity of the human species, he believed that the white race was the superior race, the original human norm from which other races had degenerated. The Negro it was suggested, could become equal to the whites, but only by ceasing to be a negro—i.e., by actually turning white" (p.72).

Besides the postulations above, European writers wrote about "Bantou" philosophy and some talked about the mind of the "savage." Oruka (1987) concluded, "These writers found no reason or philosophy in any meaningful sense in what they saw as the 'Mind of the Savage.' Instead, they detected in it a tendency for traditional unanimity typical of the animal instinct" (p.46). In addressing the issue of classifying such writings, he observed that even the "progressives" such as Placide Tempels, who "unlike his predecessors, found rationality in the irrational . . . For we read him emphasizing that he is not pretending that the Bantu are capable of a philosophical treatise; it is for them (Europeans) to formulate this philosophy on behalf of the Bantu. The Bantu's role is to come to the Europeans after work is done and chorus: You understand and know us completely" (p.46).

Odera Oruka ridicules Mbiti who in his work *African Religions and Philosophy,* according to Oruka, "did not distinguish just like Tempels, between African philosophy and the popular communal-religious outlook of the traditional African communities" pp.46–47). In fact he points out that Mbiti praises "Tempels' book as one which 'opens the way for a sympathetic study of African religions and philosophy" (p.47). Referring to his experience as tutorial assistant and his work under the Rt. Rev. Prof. Bishop Stephen C. Neill, Oruka recollected his boss' stance as having "little time for 'African philosophy' and harboured doubt about the ability of Africans to think logically" (p.46). This was in 1971.

Ellis (1970), in his study of the Yoruba, concluded in his discussion about the beliefs of the ethnic group: "Man, having decided that he possessed an indwelling spirit, would extend the same to possession to animals, then to vegetable life, and finally to inanimate nature . . . He would be led to extend the indwelling spirit theory to all nature, because it would account for many things that would otherwise be incomprehensible, since uncivilized man believes that every occurrence is the result of design and that nothing ever happens by accident. The theory that a man who is drowned has been drawn down and strangled by the water spirit seems to him much more satisfactory than to suppose that the death was the result of chance circumstances" (p.276).

Incidentally, anthropological work done on Africans by "outsiders" focuses on religion, social organization, beliefs, rituals etc. From their writings one can make extrapolations. But if the corpus of writings on Africans tends to show a culture/history that is basically "uncivilized" (some

may not use the word but by inference that is what they mean), then what do these Africans indeed have to offer in terms of their "knowledge" and capacity? How could the well-known contributions of the ancient Egyptians to world civilization be attributed to an "uncivilized" race of people? Indeed how could Africans produce works of the nature of *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* with its fundamental premises grounded in morality and ethics, both antithetical to "savagery?"

Deliberate or not, the rhetorical construction that was crafted during the Jefferson, Hegel, Hume and Kant epochs continued into the twentieth century. One major example from Margery Perham, a British scholar described as an "outstanding authority on African affairs" is adequate, as her exposition falls in line with nineteenth century rhetoric on Africans. Perham wrote her *Lugard: The Years of Adventure* in 1960, during the period of rapid decolonization and armed struggle against European colonialism in Africa. The period is important because one would perhaps believe that the post-World War Two era which heralded the rapid pace of African decolonization provided more than ample opportunity for "authorities" on Africa to write in a more informed manner about the continent and its people. The growing media technology, information flow and trans-continental transportation facilities present at the time would suggest opportunities for Europeans to write more intelligently about Africa. Perham, however, proved otherwise.

In a chapter with the heading "Tropical Africa" in the book referred to above she states: "One use . . . western Europe did find it could make of the African negro and this, in itself, was the most convincing evidence of the intractability and poverty of the continent. Tropical Africa might produce nothing in which Europe could trade but at least it bred men and these could be picked up easily on the coast without the trouble of penetrating and annexing their repellant and unhealthy hinterland. An apparently endless supply of *these strong creatures* (italics mine) was available just as the European discoverers of the western new world, having found that its sparse population was fragile and unserviceable, needed *human animals* (italics mine) to work for it" (p.77). The "bestial," "brutish" and "beastly" character of the African is reechoed. Voices of the past spoke through Perham. Even Kant's reference to "thrashings" required to get Africans away from their talkative episodes also comes to life with Perham's account of "Lugard's first teacher," a "wandering South African gold prospector" who instructed Lugard thusly: "On the first signs of insolence . . . or even of familiarity, kick them [Africans] under the jaw (when sitting) or in the stomach. In worse cases shoot, and shoot straight, *at once*" (p.102). According to Perham, Lugard was not "impressed."

The twentieth century was also a century of tremendous scientific achievements, notably in the discipline of genetics. William Shockley and Arthur Jensen—the former a Nobel Laureate—were dominant figures in the 1960s who, through their work berated the intelligence of people of

African descent. Jensen was a geneticist and Shockley shockingly a physicist yet the more vocal of the two. Jensen advocated anti-poverty government assistance programs that would give priority to the sterilization of African Americans (Byrd and Clayton 2002). In the twenty-first century, yet another Nobel Laureate obliges. James Watson, a British geneticist and winner of the Nobel Prize for his work on the discovery of DNA, contributes to the rhetorical construction, expressing his "inherent" gloom about the "prospect of Africa," the reason being that "all of our social policies are based on the fact that their intelligence is the same as ours—whereas all testing says not really." He asserts further: "Our wanting to reserve equal powers of reason as some universal heritage will not be enough to make it so." (2007). Watson's assertion falls in line with the "tradition" in western rhetorical craftsmanship, when addressing the characterological dimension of Africans.

My intent indeed is not to go through a chronological development of African historiography grounded in western scholarship, but rather to present in caricature form what the historiography depicts and projects *vis a vis* Africans, and the implications for an understanding and appreciation of the significance of the African origins of rhetorical theory. Brutes and "savages" as far as I know, do not write about "good speech," and elaborate upon a moral theory on "good speech."

We have covered in the preceding section Africa and Africans in western historiography fashioned by Europeans and North Americans as they rhetorically constructed the Africans and their continent. It is noteworthy to observe as well that some major authors who have written about the continent within the context of its characterization mentioned above have sought to distinguish between what they refer to as "sub-Saharan" Africa and North Africa. Egypt and the rest of North Africa in such a formulation tend to have no organic linkages, racial and cultural, to "sub-Sahara" Africa. Pieterse (1992) for instance in his *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture,"* states in his introduction: "The term 'Africa' in the subtitle refers to sub-Saharan Africa" (p.10).

Such bifurcation above, if adhered to, may render moot any attempt to discuss, as the present text intends to do, any contribution to rhetorical theory, particularly its ethical bases, from Africa, not to mention the *African origins* of rhetorical theory since Egypt is definitely not in "sub-Sahara" Africa. But as many distinguished authors on Africa such as Diop (1974) and Moktar (1981; 1990) have demonstrated, no such bifurcation is tenable. Egypt and the rest of North Africa could not be separated racially and culturally from the rest of the African continent. So what have been some of the responses by Africans in the continent and Africans in Diaspora, notably by African Americans, to the rhetorical construction of Africa and Africans?

Starting with an example of the continental responses, Oruka provides a succinct discussion on the issue. His response is couched within a context which he refers to as "the debate," from the perspective of African philoso-

phy. After presenting Oruka's discussion on the debate, an example from African Americans exemplified in the work of Adams, who like Oruka, provides a succinct discussion on the "Afrocentric" debate in which he also identifies schools of thought. The section concludes with a discussion on the seminal response from Cheikh Anta Diop with particular emphasis on the debate on the origins of the ancient Egyptians followed by Moktar, who edited the second in the series of volumes on African history commissioned by the United Nations Education, Scientific, Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Oruka identifies three schools of thought in his discussion on the debate, and under each examines the following: the argument; the texts; and objection. The first school he identifies is the Ethnographical School. This school, according to him "has two main theses. The first of this states that in African culture Philosophy has a fundamentally different meaning, logic and content from what is known as philosophy in the west . . . The second thesis is that African philosophy, unlike Western philosophy, is not a matter for mental reflection and rationalized deduction, it is a commitment to unquestionable, personal and collective experience—it is faith" (p.63).

The second school he labels as the Rationalist School. Basically, the dominant thesis in this school is that "African philosophy cannot only be seen as the folk-world views and that it must also be a critical reflection on such views and on problems (and concepts) of universal concern" (p.68). He argues that "basic to philosophy is the use of reason for critical thinking whereas to religion and mythology, faith and commitment precede thought and direct reason . . . There is no good reason to restrict African philosophy (even if traditional) only to the first order level, for we can establish that there are in traditional Africa individuals who engage in philosophy even at the second order level" (pp.66–67).

Oruka, however, adopts an interesting point of view with regard to agency. He rejects any notion of only an "insider," in this sense someone who is African, as having a privileged position in producing work on African philosophy, or one could argue, in a broad sense, African scholarship. He asserts: "I believe there is no good reason to think that 'African Philosophy' is or can be a product only of native Africans. An alien, who has lived and worked in Africa and developed philosophical interest in certain problems within African culture or society, can produce a philosophical work that rightly deserves the adjective 'African'." He continues, "I also believe that we have no good ground to think that African Philosophy need to be *unique* to the Africans" (p.69). This is quite an interesting line of reasoning particularly against the backdrop of the debate on the Egyptians in antiquity, and whether or not they were Africans (Diop, 1974; Davidson, 1989; Moktar, 1998). If, according to Oruka's postulation, non-Africans invaded Egypt and lived for a prolonged period among the indigenous African population, such "outsiders" could produce treatises—philosophical, rhetorical etc., "that rightly deserves the adjective 'African'" (p.69).

The third, he calls the Historical School. Here, we find scholars who are "mostly concerned with collecting and evaluating texts which, in their views, should be seen as important to the subject of African Philosophy" (p.72). He does not do an elaborate explanation of this school but rather presents a set of scholars who have debated the subject matter. There is a special volume (Vol. 5) of *Contemporary Philosophy* edited by Floistad (1987), on African philosophy containing articles by ten writers on the subject matter.

Let us now move to responses from Diaspora, with emphasis on North America. Elsewhere, I examined what I argued to be an African-centered ideology crafted mainly in Diaspora during the nineteenth century that sought to give primacy to African agency, while adopting certain deep-seated tenets of western epistemology and ideology (Blake 2005). The article provided a rebuttal to some of the recurring claims on the nature of Africans found in the works of the likes of Jefferson and Hegel. In the nineteenth century, through treatises that sought to vindicate the African race, writers such as Edward Wilmot Blyden, Alexander Crummell and Martin R. Delany proffered theses on African civilization and history as sources to be consulted in search of knowledge about and by Africans. Russell Adams (1998) provides a perspective that illuminates the North American response to the discourse.

Adams, for instance, reminds us that "epistemology involves the examination of orientation and axiologies of choice in interpretations of the social world" (1998 p.39). In reviewing contributions by blacks in the area of black intellectual experience, he makes reference to the works of Carter G. Woodson, and the Association for the Study of Afro-American Life and History, founded by Woodson.

Adams, however, goes on to say:

> African-American specialists claim that since the traditional disciplines evolved without an accurate awareness of the nature of the subjective, internal communities of persons of African descent, their vaunted "objectivity" is compromised by their practitioners' a) social distance from blacks, b) basically tourist/anthropologist methods of research on blacks, c) lack of intimate familiarity with the negative effects of the actions of larger societies on Black social formation and psyches, and d) deliberate distortion of African-American and African social record, past and present. The emerging black academic research communities reject the intrinsic elitism and cultural ethnocentrism of establishment academics as flawed at best, and degradingly unfair at worst. (p.39)

Yet, he contends, "In their zeal to right ancient errors of perception, some black academics indeed have become somewhat guilty of substituting one exclusivist vision for that of another. But on a balance, Afrocentrists have been seeking to develop their own epistemological versions of social truths"

(p.39). He goes on to trace the works by earlier black writers who sought to reject the positions advocated by Jefferson and others cited in this work. He identifies and names schools of epistemic thought, anchored in Afrocentric thought, without making the distinction that Stewart (1992) contends should be made. According to Stewart, there is a distinction between Afrocentrism and Afrocentricity. For Stewart, "Afrocentrism appears more often in ideological discourse between Afrocentric advocates and critics especially in popular pieces on the subject" (Asante, in Karenga, 2002, p.46). Afrocentricity on the other hand stresses "its intellectual value as distinct from its ideological use [Afrocentrism]" p.46. He continues, "For in the final analysis, it must prove its value as an intellectual category regardless of the ideological use advocates and critics make of it" (p.46).

Notwithstanding the distinction above, Adams claims that there is a "Nile Valley" Afrocentrism that "posits ancient Africa via Egypt as the source of civilizations, especially Western cultures and their most fundamental ideas and inventions" (p.40), ascribing the leadership of this school to Molefi Asante. The next school he identifies as "Continental Afrocentrists" who "hold that the entire African continent is the true source of the culture of black trans-Atlantic communities . . . They hold that a common Afrocentric worldview can be synthesized out of the complex of traditional African life and history through careful study of existing artifacts and print materials. *It is a conviction of this group that African social values are more humanistic than those derived from Europe.* For them, the entire continent of Africa and the sum of African history and culture, constitute the authentic interpretative foundation for understanding the black experience" (p.40). A major conclusion that could be drawn from the two preceding schools is that there exist core African principles, and that such principles have their roots in ancient Egypt/Kemet and Africa as a whole.

Afrocentric infusionists on the other hand seek "close collaboration with public school curriculum specialists," so as to infuse and/or blend "African-based ideas, concepts, values and historical data into the curricula." Such blending or infusion would help to "discern the common humanity of European and African societies" (p.40). The leadership of this school is ascribed to Asa Hillard, who is also identified with the Nile Valley School.

Then there are the Social Afrocentrists, who:

> place great stress on the *use of knowledge and resources in protecting and promoting the best interests of black people as members of the localities in which they live.* They do not use African background data as much as other Afrocentrists. They agree that the heritage of America's black population is insufficiently appreciated, but hold that it is not possible nor desirable to try to reproduce ancient Africa in a world headed toward the year 2000 AD . . . *social Afrocentrists do not see the black experience as so specialized that only blacks may be involved in exploring it* (an apparent rejection of insider epistemology). (p.41)

In terms of its leadership, he states, "In a sense, this conception of Afrocentrism is but a continuation of the integrationist position taken by the first wave of individual black scholars such as W.E.B. Du Bois and E. Franklin Frazier in the era of segregation" (p.41). Thus far we have examined briefly selected examples of the continental and Diaspora responses to the European onslaught on Africa as reflected in orthodox historiography. There are indeed several Africana and Diaspora historians, philosophers etc., who have also provided responses. It is, however, not feasible for all of them to be cited in detail other than making appropriate references to their work.

Moving on to responses from continental Africans, perhaps the most cogent response to the issue of the make up of the population of the ancient Egyptians and their contribution to world civilization could be found in the authoritative and groundbreaking work of Cheikh Anta Diop, (1974 translator Mercer Cook). In explaining the "meaning of [his] work," Diop asserts:

> Our investigations have convinced us that the West has not been calm enough and objective enough to teach us our history correctly, without crude falsifications. Today, what interests me most is to see the formation of teams, not of passive readers, but of honest, bold research workers, allergic to complacency and busy substantiating and exploring ideas expressed in our work such as: Ancient Egypt was a Negro civilization. The history of Black Africa will remain suspended in the air and cannot be written correctly until African historians dare connect it with the history of Egypt. (Diop 1974, p.xiv)

He admonishes further: "The African historian who evades the problem of Egypt [as treated in Western historiography] is neither modest nor objective, nor unruffled; he is ignorant, cowardly, and neurotic. Imagine, if you can, the uncomfortable position of a western historian who was to write the history of Europe without referring to Greco-Latin Antiquity and try to pass that off as a scientific approach" (p.xiv). In short, as Ivan Van Sertima (1989) informs us about the design of his work, *Egypt Revisited,* "This book and its successor . . . are designed to restore Egypt to the fountainhead of African civilization, even as Greece has been placed at the fountainhead of European civilization studies" (p.3).

In a near apotheosis of ancient Egypt, Diop argues: "The ancient Egyptians were Negroes. The *moral* (italics mine) fruit of their civilization is to be counted among the assets of the Black world. Instead of presenting itself to history as an insolvent debtor, that Black world is the very initiator of the "western" civilization flaunted before our eyes today. Pythagorean mathematics, the theory of the four elements of Thales of Miletus, Epicurean materialism, Platonic idealism, Judaism, Islam and modern science are rooted in Egyptian cosmogony and science" (p.xiv).

The projection of Egypt as source for some of the most compelling bases for world religions such as Islam and Christianity, and thus the cradle for

moral education and lifestyle, is seen his narrative: "A visitor to Thebes in the valley of the Kings can view the Moslem inferno in detail (in the tomb of Seti 1, of the Nineteenth Dynasty), 1700 years before the Koran. Osiris at the tribunal of the dead is indeed the "lord" of revealed religions, sitting enthroned on Judgment Day, and we know that certain Biblical passages are practically copies of Egyptian moral texts" (pp.xiv–xv).

It is interesting to note at this juncture that *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* being presented herein as an example of the African contribution to rhetorical theory in antiquity was written nearly three thousand years before Plato, Aristotle and Quintilian. Diop crystallizes his introduction to his seminal work by stating: "Only a loyal, determined struggle to destroy cultural aggression and bring out the truth, whatever it may be, is revolutionary and consonant with real progress; it is the only approach which opens on to the universal . . . Similarly, it is not a matter of looking for the Negro under a magnifying glass as one scans the past; a great people have nothing to do with petty history, nor with ethnographic reflections sorely in need of renovation. It matters little that that some brilliant Black individuals may have existed elsewhere. The essential factor is to retrace the history of the entire nation. The contrary is tantamount to thinking that to be or not to be depends on whether or not one is known in Europe" (p.xvi).

In his chapter titled: "Egyptian Race Seen by Anthropologists," he concludes, " . . . we have seen that anthropology has failed to establish the existence of any white Egyptian race; if anything, it would to establish the opposite. Nevertheless, in current textbooks, the problem is suppressed. Most often they merely take it on themselves to assert categorically that Egyptians are Whites. All honest laymen then get the impression that such an assertion must necessarily be based on solid studies previously conducted. But that, as we have seen, is simply not true" (p.132).

Diop's work presents a lucid and powerful set of arguments in favor of his positions stated above, covering not just the issues surrounding the locus of Egypt in African history and cultural evolution, but also concrete African cultural and political phenomena such as totemism, circumcision, kingship, cosmogony, social organization, matriarchy, kinship, languages etc., demonstrating the organic linkages between such phenomena in ancient Egypt and the rest of Africa. Van Sertima states thus about Diop's work: "The most persuasive arguments marshaled to date in favor of the African claim to Egyptian civilization are those made by Africa's leading cultural historian, the late Cheikh Anta Diop" (1989, p.3).

Besides Diop's seminal work, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) commissioned a worldwide group of leading scholars on Africa to prepare and publish eight major volumes under the rubric *General History of Africa,* with each volume edited by noted and highly regarded scholars on the continent. Volume Two of the series is titled *Ancient Civilizations of Africa,* (1990) edited by G. Mokhtar. Former Director-General of Unesco, Amadou Mahtar M'Mow, who spear-

headed the drive to assemble and publish the eight volumes, says this about the experts who worked on the series: "The experts from many countries working on this project began by laying down the theoretical and method-ological basis for the *History*. They have been at pains to call in question the over-simplification arising from a linear and restrictive conception of world history and to re-establish the true facts wherever necessary and pos-sible" (p.viii).

In Volume Two, scholars addressed, among other subjects, the "Origins of the Ancient Egyptians," "Pharonic Egypt," and "Egypt's relations with the rest of Africa." In a penetrating preface to the edition, Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow states: "For a long time, all kinds of myths and prejudices con-cealed the true history of Africa from the world at large. African societies were looked upon as societies that could have no history . . . In fact there was a refusal to see Africans as the creators of original cultures which flowered and survived over the centuries in patterns of their own making and which historians are unable to grasp unless they forego their prejudices and rethink their approach" (p.vii). On the historical distortion of the locus of Egypt and its people and culture, he asserts: "The Sahara was often presented as an impenetrable space preventing any intermingling of ethnic groups and peoples or any exchange of goods, beliefs, customs and ideas between the societies that had grown up on either side of the desert. Her-metic frontiers were drawn between the civilizations of Ancient Egypt and Nubia and those of the peoples south of the Sahara" (p.vii).

Chapter One in Moktar's volume, titled "*Origin of the Ancient Egyp-tians,*" is consonant with Diop's treatment of the topic, with additional criteria discussed. For instance the following topics are addressed in the chapter in favor of the argument that the origins of the ancient Egyptians were indeed African: "Evidence from physical anthropology:" "Melanin dosage test;" "Osteological measurements;" "The Egyptian race accord-ing to classical [Greek and Roman] antiquity" (among the authors cited are Herodutus, referred to in western history as the "father of history," Aristotle, Lucian, Apollodorus, Aeschylus, Achilles Tatius of Alexandria, Strabo, and Diodorus of Sicily); "The Egyptians as they saw themselves;" "The divine epithets;" "The witness of the Bible:" "Culture data;" and "Linguistic affinity."

The chapter in essence summarizes the various findings of leading schol-ars on the subject and concluded by urging "the rediscovery of the true past of the African peoples should not be a divisive factor, but should contribute to uniting them, each and all, binding them together from the north to the south of the continent so as to enable them to carry out together a new historical mission for the greater good of mankind" (p.32).

In concluding this section, one should bear in mind its fundamental ratio-nale: One cannot understand or appreciate the significance and importance of African contributions to the global fund of knowledge (in this instance to rhetoric) without an exposure to the devastating rhetorical onslaught on the

continent perpetrated by the west. Furthermore, without a discussion on the responses from Africans in Diaspora and the continent, the locus of Egypt/ Kemet, and her role as source of the core African ethical principles become obfuscated. Having thus provided a discussion motivated by the need to debunk the "darkness" metaphor manifested in the assertions from western sources cited as a first step in establishing African agency on the works that emanated from ancient Egypt/Kemet, I move on to a transition away from darkness to light as a prelude to locating *Maatian principles* within the wider framework of postcolonial Africa's development challenges.

3   Rhetorical Theory as Background and Context

The section that follows is a *cursory* interrogation of rhetorical theory, in order to provide a context for a discussion of the rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep, which in some ways may not be entirely in line with rhetorical theoretical orthodoxy, with significant exceptions (Ehninger 1972; Oliver 1995). I argue that the centrality of "persuasion" in rhetorical theory, based on a *rational* (as in emphasis on *logos*) demonstration of "proofs" and the ultimate role of the audience in the process of arriving at a decision—whether to be persuaded—is not the most appropriate approach towards an understanding of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric. In fact, the above contention is what makes the "comparative" aspect of this work a critical dimension. When one takes a closer look at pre-Greco-Roman rhetorical theory, notably the African origins of the subject, core African ethical values are centered in *Maatian principles*. Central to the manifestation and practice of *Maatian principles* is the importance of maintaining balance and harmony. Obedience as a value, for instance, is considered essential within the context of *Maatian principles* for the maintenance of harmony and balance.

Obedience, it would appear, is the very antithesis of "persuasion" in the sense that agreement to comply, or take action, is presumably not based on a "rational" processing and weighing of arguments on a "pro-con" basis, and the subsequent decision to become persuaded. Even if one wants to argue that the Ciceronian importance attached to "*pathos*" (emotional appeals) as a driving force for persuasion reduces to an extent the heavy reliance on "*logos*" (rational appeals), obedience is still not featured as a driving force in persuasion in such a formulation.

The centrality of the act of "obedience" in terms of the above is critical in attempts to explain in theoretical terms why we need to study more closely rhetoric in traditionally non-western regions of the world. By so doing, we may disabuse our minds of hasty judgments on acts that may be viewed in the minds of westerners as "irrational" or "uncivilized." Actions thus defined are carried out by some who *obey* the dictates of religious and/or cultural authorities, without engaging in extensive "rational" debates with such authorities. Such an act should be viewed as intrinsic to the workings of core principles in societies that revere *responsible* hierarchy.

The term "responsible" is used *theoretically* in this context to establish a fundamental characteristic feature. For instance, in terms of *Maatian principles*, those who occupy positions of authority in societal structures predicated on respect and reverence for hierarchy—authority figures—*earn* and maintain their status on a basis of responsible behavior towards people/citizens. Such individuals are believed to be committed to the principles of rightness, justice and all other constituent elements of the core principles of their respective societies. There is no room, therefore, for *abuse* of authority. This phenomenon will be discussed later when a closer examination of *Maatian* principles is undertaken.

I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent upon rhetorical theorists to provide some theoretical explanations about how rhetoric works in ways that tend to defy western tenets of the term in non-western contexts. Bryant (1953) in his seminal work defines rhetoric as " . . . the *rationale for informative and suasory discourse"* (p.404)). Ehninger (1972) however, contends that Bryant's definition is "confining." He argues, "Rather than limiting rhetoric to a consideration of how oral or written language may be used to convey information or effect persuasion, the current practice is to extend it to encompass all of the ways in which, and for all of the ends for which, symbols of any sort may be used to influence or affect another's mind" (p.3). Ehninger's stance provides an avenue for the inclusion of all rhetorical traditions. Failure to approach rhetorical theory outside of the confines of its western tradition makes it difficult to ask questions about, and explore possible answers for the nature of rhetoric in non-western societies.

In terms of focusing the attention of this work on ancient African rhetorical theory, it is instructive to note Robert Oliver's important observation on the non-western rhetorical tradition, with his focus on China and India. He states: "Should we attempt to conceptualize the nature of rhetoric and of public discourse in Asia in terms that have proved appropriate in the West, the results would be biased, inadequate and misleading. The East is not the West" (Covino and Joliffe, 1995, p.355) It is this important distinction that needs to be made at the early stages of presenting any rhetorical treatise outside of the western tradition, where Ptah-Hotep's work is located (not in Asia or the Orient, but in Africa for our purposes).

Oliver notes furthermore that "Cultures differ, and minds, feelings and intentions in differing societies intermesh in differing ways . . . The standards of rhetoric in the West which have had a unitary development since their identification by Aristotle are not universals. They are expressions of Western culture, applicable within the context of Western cultural values" (p.355). Kennedy, in his discussion on comparative rhetoric, states: "I have no intention of trying to impose Western assumptions about rhetoric on exotic cultures" (pp.5–6). It stands to reason, therefore, that rhetoric in ancient Egypt/Kemet must be rooted in her "cultural values"—for our purposes, *Maatian principles*. We cannot thus understand the African origins of rhetorical theory without grounding the theory in *Maatian principles*.

Theoretically, therefore, the work provides a critical introduction to what I refer to as *The Rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep.* His rhetoric, deeply rooted in *Maatian principles,* undoubtedly represents the earliest pronouncements on ethical practices within the context of rhetorical comportment.

In this regard, *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Ke'gemni: The Oldest Books in the World,* with my emphasis on the former, thanks to the title given by Battiscombe Gunn, is decidedly the precursor to rhetorical principles that flourished during the Greco-Roman age, and which today form some of the basic assumptions, principles and theories that inform the moral/ethical bases of rhetoric. Fundamentally, therefore, the present work advances the idea that the origins of what has been come to be known as "rhetoric" and the various theories and constructs that have emerged could be traced directly to Africa, as manifested in Gunn's title of his work.

Schiappa (1992) in an article that explores the significance and implications of the term/name "rhetoric" aptly titles his work: "What's in a Name? Toward a Revised Study of Early Greek Rhetorical Theory." He presents an elaborate set of arguments surrounding the origins of the term and attempts to punctuate the inception stages of the study of what we refer to as rhetorical theory. His major concern was not with works that pre-dated Greco-Roman rhetoric, but rather a debate within the context of establishing who among the ancients in that tradition introduced the term "rhetoric" in the study of the subject matter. I cite the work of Schiappa above just to set the context within which I use the expression "rhetorical theory" in this work. It is used to place the work within the tradition, context and framework of theories on, and approaches to [rhetorical] discourse, or "speech."

Jebb in his celebrated text *The Attic Orators* (1876) provides an impressive array of works on Greek, Latin (Roman) rhetoric, and we find no reference to the work of precursors such as Ptah-Hotep. One of course, should concede to the clearly established limitations of Jebb's work centering on the "Attic Orators." He informs us early in the work that "The task which I have set before me is to consider the lives, the styles and writings of Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates and Isaeus, with a view to showing how Greek oratory was developed, and thereby how Greek prose was moulded, from the outset of its existence . . . " (p.lxvi). The failure of Jebb and many others after him to mention Ptah-Hotep and his contribution to our study of rhetoric, particularly when one seeks to present a subject from the "outset of its existence" may be due to lack of knowledge about the existence of Ptah-Hotep's work. Jebb in fact claims in his work that "The founder of Rhetoric as an art was Corax of Syracuse" (p.cxvii).

Poulakis and Poulakis (1999) in their introduction to their text, *Classical Rhetorical Theory,* state, "Although rhetoric has existed for as long as language, most scholars agree that its self-conscious practice and study began in classical Greece in the fifth century B.C.E. Its emergence coincided with the advent of the democratic *polis* (city-state), which it helped establish and

strengthen" (p.ix). Two key assumptions are apparent in the postulation above: nothing "self-consciously practical," in terms of rhetorical practice, existed prior to the fifth century and a "democratic *polis*" came about in ancient Greece. As such, all non-western societies prior to the emergence of "democracy" in Greece presumably lacked *all* semblances of its tenets, not to mention an absence of a rhetorical tradition. Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric that predated Greco-Roman rhetoric negates such presumption.

Still in the realm of contextualizing conceptions of rhetoric and its origins, Auer (1959) in his celebrated *An Introduction to Research in Speech,* starts the first chapter of his book thus: "The history of the academic area known today as "speech" may be said to have begun in ancient Greece with Aristotle's (384–322 B.C.) systematic treatises on *Rhetoric* and *Poetics.* Speech was considered then, as now, to be the art and act of man communicating with man, for reasons practical, cultural, and aesthetic" (p.1). What is unclear from the above is what obtained in " . . . man communicating with man . . ." for reasons Auer advances above, prior to Aristotle. He even goes on to state that "To trace the history of speech from its earliest formulations in Athens would require also a review of Roman rhetorical theory, the development of continental and Anglo-Saxon traditions, and the contributions of Americans in the two past centuries" (p.1). Africans, Asians and non-western people in general according to the claim above, do not have a "trace of history of speech." We observe in the assertion above that Auer clearly had no clue of the existence of Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction.*

The apparent "void" that seemed to have existed prior to Aristotle's Athens did appear to be not worthy of any mention, even though Schwartz and Rycenga (1965) in their introduction to their text, *The Province of Rhetoric,* state," [Rhetoric] when it is properly understood as 'the full language of experience' by which men 'govern their relations with one another in the light of truth,' . . . assumes an awesome dimension which can be frighteningly sobering" (p.iii). Schwartz and Rycenga clearly imply that one cannot talk about "research" in speech without a careful review of works of precursors on the subject of "speech." Auer's statements above are troubling, since he definitely uses the term "speech" and not "rhetoric" as such. Ptah-Hotep's "instruction," is on "fair *speech*" [italics mine]. A better conducted research by Auer should have led him to Ptah-Hotep's work, something that Platz (1935) did twenty-nine years earlier. There is no excuse for leaving out a text that was extant by 1959, and that had received the attention in scholarship on "public speaking," albeit *The History of Public Speaking* (Platz, 1935). A book that introduces readers to "Research in Speech," should demonstrate as did Platz's, *research* indeed, on the subject matter.

Platz, in her introduction to her work *The History of Public Speaking* states, " . . . oratory flourished *first* [italics mine] among the ancient Greeks . . . " (p.3). But to her credit, we find reference to Ptah-Hotep. Platz writes: "The precepts of *Ptah-Hotep,* the oldest book of the world from about 2500 B.C., reveals the sayings of a man who spoke with deep seriousness

and authority and was by no means crude or uncultivated" (p.10). Platz's work is of major interest because she actually presents an historical context of oratory that makes it clear as to how one should understand the influences, be they cultural or ideological, of prevailing practices that shape oratorical expressions.

She is correct in her observations that the prevailing ideology in Egypt during the days of Ptah-Hotep is what the west refers to as "despotic," even though those who live in such societies may not classify themselves as such. In such societies, Platz argues, "the people were led or driven, not persuaded, and so the refinements of society which make for public speech were not introduced in these civilizations" (p.10). What western scholars tend to omit is the notion that "persuasion" does take place and work even in so-called "despotic" societies, grounded in value systems that place reverence for authority and hierarchy, coupled with the centrality of obeisance as driving cultural forces that dictate communication and rhetorical processes. Hierarchy and authority are held in reverence to a point of being treated as sacred—both are grounded in ecclesiastical warrants. Reference has been made earlier to the centrality of "obedience" as a basic value that guides interactions particularly between those who govern and the governed.

In terms of the characterization of ancient Egypt as being "despotic," Obenga, a leading authority on Pharaonic Egypt, aptly explains the nature of governance in ancient Egypt thus: "The Pharaonic royalty was sacred because it was led by a being that transcended corruption, the need to accumulate personal fortune, immortality, political lies, or mediocrity. No verifiable archeological, textual or historical document can demonstrate the idea of a Pharoe that was a 'tyrant, a despot, and a slave owner.'"(4b2, 2004). The challenge for the leadership in such socio-cultural or ideological contexts that inform the dynamics of societies such as ancient Egypt, and quite a few African nations even today, is for the leaders to ascertain that the behavioral pattern of the hierarchy at all times is *worthy of respect and obedience.*   Accordingly, Ptah-Hotep introduces his work by a prayer followed by the following: "Here begin the proverbs of fair speech, spoken by the Hereditary Chief, the Holy Father, Beloved of the God, the Eldest son of the King, of his body, the Governor of his City, the Vezier, Ptah-Hotep, when instructing the ignorant in the knowledge of exactness in fair-speaking; the glory of him that *obeyeth,* [italics mine] the shame of him that transgresseth them" (Gunn 1918 p.42). As we shall see when we take a closer look at Ptah-Hotep's work, the opening verses clearly posit the need to be fair; to respect everyone regardless of his/her office in life or level of intelligence, all of which points to a cohesive rather than a despotic predisposition of the society within which Ptah-Hotep functioned.

Duhamel (1965) notes that " . . . rhetoric occupies a peculiar position among the arts, and that it cannot be adequately interpreted *apart from the ideological context in which it occurs* [italics mine]" (p.37). I would

add to Duhamel's stance that rhetoric as postulated by early writers on the subject dating back to Ptah-Hotep could not be understood or interpreted outside the context of the core value/moral basis upon which the given society, from which the work emanates, is anchored, for our purposes, *Maatian principles*. Ehninger (1968) advances the idea of viewing "rhetorical systems as systems" (p.253) He explains what he means by the above by stating: "An organized, consistent, coherent way of talking about something . . . I call a system" (p.131). Both Duhamel and Ehninger provide a basis for us to examine further, the systemic environment within which one should seek to understand the perspectives on rhetorical practice and conduct, as articulated by rhetoricians. The opening verses of Ptah-Hotep's instruction establish him clearly as a rhetorician. There is absolutely no need to get into an involved and intricate discussion on whether or not he could be considered thus.

In terms of Duhamel's observation on the importance of interpreting "the ideological context within which it [rhetoric] occurs," Shillington (1995) explains the grounds on which the Pharaohs of Egypt justified their rule, providing an insight into the prevailing ideological context of the times. He states, "The rulers of ancient Egypt were known as 'pharaohs'. They claimed to be the earthly incarnation of their gods. How exactly the idea of divine kingship originated is not known for sure, but it seems to have come from 'inner Africa' to the south" (pp.19–20). Mokhtar (1990) concludes his discussion on the "Origin of the Ancient Egyptians" that "The structure of African royalty, with the king put to death, either really or symbolically, after a reign which varied but was in the region of eight years, recalls the ceremony of the Pharaoh's regeneration through the Sed feast . . . Egyptian antiquity is to African culture what Greco-Roman antiquity is to Western culture" (p.31).

"Egyptian antiquity" is thus the grounding for the African origins of rhetorical theory. The cultural, ideological and religious tenets of ancient Egypt are the pillars upon which the Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric is constructed. The pillars in turn rest on the foundation referred to as *Maat,* the source of *Maatian principles*. Karenga (1989) defines *Maat* in part, as a "path to righteousness" (p.373). Parkinson (2003) states: "The order 'pronounced' by the creator evokes the ideas of creation through utterance and also of speech as embodying Maat" (p.132). From the foregoing, the African origins of rhetorical theory are deeply lodged in theological contexts. Against such a background, one could deduce the centrality of obedience in such a theoretical formulation, and the significance of morality.

In essence, one could argue that the essence of African rhetoric in ancient Egypt is to use speech to promote and sustain a moral life grounded in core *Maatian principles*. Theoretically, all speech acts in this sense revolve around morality, and as Karenga would argue, "Righteousness." What is instructive in this formulation is that regardless of speech *contexts*, the primacy of devotion to *Maatian principles* supersedes all other concerns.

It should be noted that the emphasis on "rightness" or "righteousness," though cast within a "religious" context, does not necessarily mean that "holiness" as in being "prayerful" is the essence. It is "rightness," "truth" and "justice" for instance, in the totality of our dealings with one another, particularly as we communicate with each other, as far as rhetoric is concerned. It is understandable, therefore, that *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* begins with "fair" or "good" (in the moral sense) speech. Thousands of yeas later, in Rome, Quintillian would also center rhetoric within the context of "the good man speaking well." One could argue without much need for an elaborate justification, that Ptah-Hotep should indeed be regarded as the precursor of centering morality in rhetorical utterances.

4 Africa in Rhetorical Scholarship

The issue of "tradition" in rhetorical scholarship has engaged the academy with scholars raising serious questions regarding the existence of a "rhetorical tradition" in Western scholarship. Graff et al., (2005) in their publication aptly titled: *The Viability of the Rhetorical Tradition,* provide a detailed set of essays that addressed the subject matter—tradition. Graff and Leff state in the opening essay of the book: "At one time, not so long ago, people in our line of academic work used to talk about something called the "rhetorical tradition." It is unlikely that many of us could give a precise definition of the phrase, but we invoked it with unreflective confidence and assumed that our colleagues would understand what we meant. In fact, the term *rhetorical tradition* represented something more than an elegant synonym for "the history of rhetoric . . . Such confidence, however, is no longer possible in respect to either the meaning of the rhetorical tradition or the sentiment attached to it" (p.11). They also state, however, that "Over the course of several decades, one prominent group of scholars has argued that the 'tradition' is excessively narrow and largely irrelevant to contemporary circumstances, and they have attempted to displace 'tradition' with the terms *theory* or *system" (p.11)*. And they add: "Some of the same scholars also maintain that it is an error to think of *a* tradition and, under the banner of pluralism, insist on recognition of multiple traditions" (p.11). In essence, there is no grand narrative as the postmodernist would argue. The preceding quotation above provides intellectual space for the introduction and interrogation of "smaller" narratives in the forms of contributions to rhetorical from the non-western world. This work on the African origins of rhetorical theory occupies part of the intellectual space referred to above.

Shome (1996) provides yet an "other" view on rhetoric, in terms of its "tradition." In his "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An "Other" View," he begins his essay thus: "In recent times, the discipline of rhetorical studies—a discipline that for years has celebrated the public voices of white men in power and has derived most of its theories from such foci—is being challenged in various ways"(p.40). He cites many works of rhetoricians who have issued such a challenge—"(McGee, 1990; McKer-

row, 1989, 1991; Ono & Sloop, 1992, 1994; Pollack and Cox, 1991," in addition to naming several feminist scholars (p.40). He says of the scholars who have challenged the "tradition," so to say: "Arguing that the aim of contemporary rhetorical studies should be to "escape from the trivializing influence of universalist approaches" (McKerrow, 1989, p.91) and that the canons of rhetorical studies "[are] overwhelmingly biased towards men, especially towards white men of the Western tradition" (Conduit, 1993, p.214), these incursions into the field have begun to question and problematize some of the criteria . . . on which rhetorical scholarship has rested" (p.40).

Gross (2005), in his critique of Bizzel and Herzberg's *The Rhetorical Tradition* raises a relevant question but one with a caveat: "What field of study is it that can comfortably accommodate Ciero, Nietze, and Bakhtin?" He asks further: "There is the problem of balance as well: in what discipline would Francis Bacon and Thomas Sheridan be given equal treatment, as measured by the number of pages devoted to each?" Still apparently perplexed, he attacks the authors thus: "In their definition, the authors also make the dubious assertion that rhetorical theory has a long history. This assertion, assumes a continuity that their selections do not exemplify." He then goes on to attempt a rationale for his skepticism thus: "There are between Aristotle and Cicero and between Quintillian and Augustine gaps of nearly three centuries; between Boethius and Erasmus, the gap is a thousand years. Two centuries separate Thomas Wilson and George Campbell; one separates Richard Whately and Kenneth Burke. A history with such lacunae seems no history at all" (p.32). To compound Gross's skepticism, he would be amazed to read about this work that dates the African origins of rhetoric to circa 3000 B.C.E.!

Gross' skepticism could be understood in terms of what he himself later identifies as "discontinuities." But the caveat to which I refer is this: Does one have to establish "continuities" in the sense of contiguous uninterrupted epochs when one interrogates "history" or "tradition" particularly in the realm of social thought on theories on rhetorical processes from different parts of the world? The "rhetorical tradition" as discussed in the compendium of Graff et al. cuts across different western geographical locations, not contiguous or even coming from identical philosophical or cultural histories unique to the respective geographic locations—ancient Greece and Rome for instance. There is no mention of the rhetorical "traditions" of China or India, not to mention Africa.

On a more intriguing note, if one takes the critique of Gross as valid, and a point of departure in any attempt to write and/or discuss what he questions as "history," would contributions such as the one I present in this work be considered as part of history, in the form of the lacunae ("discontinuities" and lack of "coherence") he identifies? Would writings about rhetoric in ancient China, India, and Mesopotamia or elsewhere before the days of Corax, Isocrates etc. be considered as valid in terms of tracing and

punctuating a history of the discipline? Would it be possible to even fashion a notion of *comparative rhetoric* given the obvious "lacunae" in the works from the non-west that predates Corax and all of those after him in the western "tradition?"

To his credit, Gross proffers a solution. He suggests "an alternate reconstruction of the intellectual strand of the tradition, one that accepts historical discontinuity and centers on coherence" (p.33). He states: "This reconstruction sees the tradition as a succession of theorists, each of whom makes a contribution, one that is, at the same time, unique and dependent on past theorist; in other words, its focus is theory and theoretical refinement." He goes on to present the advantages of his reconstruction thus: "This [his reconstruction] has two advantages. First, it brings into the forefront the problematic nature of the classical heritage, the fact that it creates at least as many problems as it solves. The second advantage is political. By providing rhetoric with an intellectual core, my reconstruction provides interested scholars with a legitimation they might not otherwise have. In a time when academic prestige is so implacably a matter of intellectual status relative to other disciplines, my reconstruction is not only defensible but prudential, a necessary condition of disciplinary flourishing" (p.33).

Perhaps Gross is a bit too hasty in claiming prudence for what he proffers. First of all there is a major problem with his proposed reconstruction. The first is the clearly implied requirement of the need to demonstrate prior exposure and understanding of precursors (his "theorists"), as each contributed towards the "theoretical refinement." If we accept that premise, then there is justification for a wholesale condemnation of rhetoricians particularly in ancient Greece who fail to mention or lay claim to a "refinement" of ancient African texts on rhetoric that have as their core an ethical theory for rhetoric, as will be discussed later in this work. For Gross, not only are theorists required to show evidence of such knowledge, their refinement has to be "unique" yet "dependent" on "theoretical" contributions of precursors. What we teach as "Classical Rhetoric" in the academy show no such rigor.

The preceding leads yet to another issue one could take with regard to the claim by Gross that his reconstruction is defensible and prudent. The issue is "academic prestige" to which he refers. Judging from his approach, "academic prestige" is posited as a competitive edge among disciplines. "Competition" drives and determines "academic prestige" among disciplines. We are not provided with typologies or categories of the numerous disciplines that exist and what places them all on a level playing field, in order for them to compete. I would leave Gross at this juncture.

The preceding section was necessary to explain the complexities indeed of chronicling "history" and "tradition" in the discipline, and particularly so when one seeks to establish that there were writings about rhetoric in Africa long before the Greeks. Furthermore, when one glances at the works of Bizzel and Herzberg, as well as Graff et al., one cannot help but reflect

on Shome's and Conduit's claim about what the "province of rhetoric" had been all about "historically"—the history of white men on the subject.

In fact the issue becomes even more perplexing when it comes to bringing to the fore African contributions that pre-dated Greco-Roman rhetoric, because such contributions have been lacking in what has been referred to as "classical rhetoric" in the dominant Eurocentric paradigm. Would the African contributions that pre-dated Greco-Roman rhetoric circa three thousand years be referred to as "non-classical," crystallizing the Eurocentric hegemony on dating or punctuating epochs as "Classical," "Modern," "Contemporary," etc.? Strictly considered in terms of "epochs," the African contribution which this work presents could be deemed "pre-classical," within the context of the Eurocentric paradigm, and "classical" within the context of human history.

Africa, both in its historical and contemporary contexts, has not featured prominently in rhetorical scholarship across the spectrum. One could not even talk about a "dearth" of literature in African rhetorical/ethical theory or criticism. There simply has not been any significant contribution in rhetorical scholarship, on African contributions to rhetorical theory, not to mention the African origins of rhetorical theory. Africa, in terms of rhetorical scholarship remains the "dark continent." This condition would arguably be rectified by the publication of the present work, as it seeks to literally "illuminate" the continent in terms of its rhetorical past. This is done against the background of its tortured rhetorical construction by Europeans and North Americans and its core ethical principles and potential for their utilization in systems of governance, as the continent struggles to get a grip and handle on its governance imperatives.

David Hutto (2002) makes a couple of observations that need to be considered at this juncture. He states: "As far as we know from what has survived, the Egyptians never explicitly discussed language to the extent that the Greeks did. There are thus no ancient Egyptian treatises on rhetoric" (p.214). His observation above suggests that a discussion on rhetoric has to be a discussion on "language." I am afraid that his observation does an injustice to the work of Ptah-Hotep. Indeed Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* does not discuss "language" per se but the opening sentences of his work explicitly state: "Here begins the proverbs of fair speech, spoken by the Hereditary Chief . . . when instructing the ignorant in knowledge of exactness in fair-speaking." Hutto, perhaps, understands an instruction in "fair speaking" as one that requires as well a detailed "discussion on 'language'." Such a stance is not tenable against the background of the many advances in rhetorical scholarship, manifested in works such as Bitzer and Black's *Prospect of Rhetoric* (1970) that revisited the province of rhetorical scholarship that was thoroughly discussed at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin.

Hutto's other observation on ancient Egyptian writings being treated as "Literature" by many scholars such as Lichtheim (1973) and Parkinson

(2004) is cogent. Interestingly, he does state: "Detailed examinations of Egyptian rhetoric have not been extensive," which provides a justification for my work. He continues: "In the introduction to her book of readings, Miriam Lichtheim makes a brief reference to Egyptian rhetoric, writing, that 'To the Egyptians eloquence came from straight thinking. It was left to the Greeks to discover that rhetoric could also promote an unworthy cause'" (p.216). Clearly, the Egyptians, in this instance, Ptah-Hotep engaged in discourses on "eloquence" or rhetoric. Kennedy (1998) in his discussion on Ptah-Hotep confirms the rhetorical status of Ptah-Hotep's *Instructions.* He states: "The most important of these texts [ancient Egyptian/kemetic] for the history of rhetoric is what is known as *The Instructions (or Maxims) of Ptah-Hotep,* a vizier under King Isesi in the Old Kingdom" (p.128). Fox much earlier (1983) states: "The English word "rhetoric" has an equivalent in an Egyptian phrase that means literally "The principle of fine speech," which Ptah-Hotep, the teacher in the earliest well-preserved wisdom text, lists this as one of the main virtues he will teach in his wisdom instruction" (pp.11–12). Fox continues, "Ptah-Hotep sees himself as presenting not just a variety of counsels about good speech, but as offering instruction that *together* for (sic) "the principle of fine speech" (p.12). A detailed discussion on Ptah-Hotep is provided later in the text.

As mentioned in the opening paragraphs of this work, the "dark continent" metaphor, for all practical purposes remains intact as far as rhetorical scholarship is concerned. The idea of "darkness" within African historical contexts is not just confined to being "opaque." It connotes a complex of issues: race, color, culture, mores, morality and so on. Even in theatrical (as in drama) contexts, we read and hear about "dark" or "Black" humor when actions/words in such contexts involve "filth," "immorality" etc. Against such a background, one cannot engage in a discourse on the African origins of rhetorical theory without a cursory examination of discourses on the nature of the continent and its people, which have made a nearly indelible imprint on the minds of readers of history of western social thought. More importantly, western historiography had variously reflected patterns of locating Egypt outside of the territorial confines of the African continent with dubious claims at times, that Egypt was not peopled by Africans during its dynastic period.

The research phase for this work was indeed quite revealing. In the first instance, information on the writings of Ptah-Hotep and Ke'gemni brought to us by Battiscombe Gunn (1909; 1918) is available, but somehow located in the "east/orient" sections of some libraries that carry the text. The work falls under the title: "The Wisdom of the East Series," edited by L. Cranmer-Byng and Dr. S.A. Kapadia, and translated by Battiscombe Gunn. Its African origin, other than the fact that Egypt is geographically located in Africa, is not readily discernible. The perennial dislocation of Egypt in particular from its spatial locus makes the text fall under the "Wisdom of the East Series."

Secondly, upon opening the text, the editorial notes that introduce the book state: " . . . a deeper knowledge of the great ideals and lofty philosophy of *Oriental thought* [italics mine] may help . . ." (1918, p.10). Why start with the above observations on the research phase? The answer is simple: the ever present crisis of *location* when it comes to African realities in history. In this regard, the texts Battiscombe Gunn himself refers to as the "Oldest Books in the World" are ascribed to *oriental* roots even though the country of origin is clearly mentioned as *Egypt*. Egypt is undeniably located in Africa and was peopled by populations of African descent long before its current Arab population, and others before them, Greeks, Romans, and Turks, occupied parts of the country during the long history of this nation. I move on next to a more detailed discussion on *Maat,* the source of *Maatian principles,* and the foundation upon which Ptah-Hotep's moral rhetorical theory is grounded.

5   *Maat*

The Ethical Grounding of the Rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep

During a visit to the Cairo Museum in the final stages of the research for this work in 2007, I held discussions with two leading Egyptian scholars centered primarily on *Maat*. We engaged in a critical examination of *Maatian* dogma and how it represented the fulcrum for practically all aspects of life in ancient Egypt. Professor Mamdouh El Domaty is a former Curator of the Cairo Museum and professor at Ain Shams University, Cairo. Professor Salah El Kholy teaches at the University of Cairo. They provided interesting and useful insights into *Maat*. Professors Domaty and El Kholy's contribution towards the elucidation on *Maat* is consistent with those provided by other highly respected researchers on ancient Egypt with specific reference to *Maat* (Obenga, 2004; Karenga, 1989; Parkinson, 2003). In fact, as a result of the discussions I decided to refer to *Maat* as a "dogma" in the sense in which the term is used in Christianity.

Based on my discussions with the two experts I arrived at the following conclusions: *Maat* is the Goddess of Truth and all that encompasses the integrity of "truth." Since *Maat* is at the level of the divine, its permanence gives it an unchanging character. *Maat* cannot be made malleable. Given such a characteristic feature, commitment to tradition and its collective mores ensures smoothness and continuity in society. The Pharaoh's legitimacy is derived from his devotion and commitment to *Maat*. It is the interface between God and the governed, lodged in the person/office of the Pharaoh. It gives the Pharaohs a "divine" status. Its components are the following: truth, justice, order, fairness, balance/harmony, hierarchy/authority, rightness, righteousness, and hope for life after death. These components were to be used as the guiding principles of every aspect of the pharaohs' behavior as leaders, as well as that of ordinary citizens. Being derived from God, obedience is essential. In fact obeisance is a given.

Obenga provides an excellent treatment on *Maat*. On *Maat* he writes, ascribing it to Budge (1920): "Maat a goddess, the personification of law, order, rule, truth, right, righteousness, canon, justice, straightness, integrity, uprightness, and the highest conception of physical and moral law" (1996, p.3.). This formulation *is* further amplified thus: "Because *Maat* establishes and maintains harmony and order both in Kemet [ancient

Egypt] and the cosmos, the king presents her as a supreme gift of the Gods. Kings of Kemet upheld the laws of the universe and human society which *Maat* embodied . . . " (p.17).

Not since the seminal publication of *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality* by Cheik Anta Diop (1958), has any scholar carried the mantle of scholarship on the period as Obenga has done. In a presentation (2004) made at Dakar, Senegal, (interestingly the home of Cheikh Anta Diop) during the "First Conference of Intellectuals from Africa and the Diaspora" organized by the African Union with several African heads of state present in the audience, Obenga provides a comprehensive review of his contributions to scholarship on Kemet, dealing with issues such as *Maat*, and "cultural unity" among Africans. Of particular interest in his paper entitled "Africa's Place in the World: African Renaissance in the Twenty First Century," is his treatment of Africa's "cultural unity," a concept advanced by Cheik Anta Diop, and upon which his celebrated work, *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa* (1976) was grounded.

Ferkiss (1967), for instance, argues that unlike China and India where one can find (even at present) the dominant position of Buddhism/Confucianism and Hinduism respectively, Africa does not seem to have that overarching normative ethos along the lines of a Confucian ethos. This argument is not defensible. Even though one can recognize that even though both China and India do have Muslims, the point of a dominant unifying normative ethos is not quite lost even with religious diversity in the respective countries, Diop correctly advances an argument for the existence of a "cultural unity" among Africans. *Maat* could and should be regarded at the same level of significance for Africans, as Confucianism is for that part of Asia that adheres to its core principles.

Why refer to the idea of Africa's "cultural unity" in examining the foundational bases of *Maat* as we seek to understand Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric? Obenga argues that "Treatises existing since the ancient empires around 2600 B.C. enjoined clans and families not to have any political ambitions other than solidarity, unity and sense of duty and responsibility. These educational philosophical treatises are called Sebayit, from the verb Seba, 'to teach, to instruct, to learn.' These sebait are distilled into *Maat*, a higher concept for 'truth-justice' in all social strata . . ." (4b). Furthermore, he continues, "In society to talk well . . . is to talk with dignity, i.e. divinely. Respect is given to anybody one talks to, be the person young or old, noble or peasant, man or woman. Conversation must be held in peace, dignity, with love, even if the viewpoints are different, contradictory or antagonistic" (4b1.). It is self-evident through the exposition above that rhetoric, and in fact all human communication from the perspective of African culture, is grounded in *Maatian principles*.

Obenga's treatment of yet another aspect of African culture—the "Cult of Social Happiness" in which some core values are presented, creates a context for an understanding of all aspects of Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction*. Obenga notes

that "All Egyptian social forces were required to attain the maximum level of social happiness consisting of the following: important place for women in society . . . education of the children, the family, the village school based on the teaching of the virtues of loyalty, courteousness and civility (politeness) . . . Daily exercise of social justice" (4b3). What is clearly evident from the foregoing is that adherence to *Maatian principles* is necessary in order to achieve peaceful co-existence. Rhetoric, therefore, should not be used in any manner that would create disequilibrium in human relations.

Karenga (1989) argues that "*Maat* has interrelated meanings. It is the right way, or path of righteousness. In addition to being the Right and true way, early in the Old Kingdom (2750–2180 B.C.E.) Maat acquired the sense of being the cosmic, natural and social order, established by Ra, God, at the time of creation" (p.375). He also asserts, and consistent with others cited so far, that "*Maat* means many things, including truth, justice, propriety, harmony, balance, reciprocity and order—in a word, rightness in the divine, natural and social realms (2002, p.95). He cites a quote attributed to Queen Hatsheput regarding the god Amen Ra, thus: "I have exalted Maat which he loves, for I know he lives by it. Also, it is my bread and I drink from its dew. I am of one body with him" (2002, p.244).

On *Maat* Parkinson states: "Maat can transcend the state and society, and perhaps the cosmos. Just as Maat survives an individual's death, as in *Ptah-Hotep's* assertion that 'When the end comes, Maat endures' (p.97), so Maat in this reading continues as 'eternal', though this need not mean beyond the eventual end of the created cosmos" (p.135). What is significant about the preceding observation is that *Maat* is all enduring and ever present. It is "the standard by which humanity is judged after death, when unjust suffering will be made good . . . Maat is able to guarantee a man's survival and will 'descend' with him into the necropolis" (Parkinson, p.135). Parkinson's treatment of *Maat* brings into context not just the centrality of *Maat* during one's lifetime, but in death as well. This all encompassing "theology" upon which "good speech" is predicated undoubtedly centers on the primacy of morality and rightness. Parkinson in explicating further on *Maat,* citing the work by Jan Assmann, writes: "Maat was, however, not merely the actual social order of the created world, but a generative principle . . . Order is thus required to be continually imposed and sustained by god and his deputy the King, whom he appointed . . . " (p.130).

For Lichtheim (1973) *Maat* and "magic" were "intertwined." She asserts, "In the Egyptian's relation to the gods morality and magic were ever intertwined. The catalogue of virtues was both a serious commitment to ethical values and a magical means for winning entry into the beyond" (p.4). Such depictions of African value orientations and practices based on faulty understanding by some western scholars and probably grounded in their normative stances tend to lead them to negative conclusions (as in reliance on "magic") about concepts, beliefs, and values outside of their normative contexts.

If Lichtheim's claim that ethical values and magic are intertwined, could one then regard the entire liturgical practice involved in prayers and rituals that precede the consecration of the bread and wine, and transubstantiation subsequently leading to the "communion" in Christian worship as being a magical act? Rather than being defined as "magical," the Christian liturgical practice is accepted as one grounded in "faith," thus an uncontested belief. "Communion" resulting from the liturgical practice described above is so crucial in Christian doctrine that it is an integral part of the anointing of the sick, and even more importantly, the anointing of sick people about to die, as a way of preparing that sick person to enter heaven if he or she is in the state of grace.

The respect extended to "mysteries" in Christian dogma is not evident when scholars cloak non-Christian dogma and beliefs in magical garbs. Karenga correctly observes: "One might wonder, as a matter of intellectual curiosity, why in comparison with an established and developing literature on religions of other great classical civilizations, i.e., China and India, that the systematic and critical study of Maat is a neglected or ill-treated field in sociology, phenomenology and history of religion. In fact, it is usually relegated to the less-than-academically-respectable area of the occult . . . " (p.352). It is no wonder, therefore, that Lichtheim could comfortably make such associations (with African belief systems and "magic") as is evident in her postulation above. Undoubtedly, Lichtheim is considered among the leading scholars who have done important work on Ptah-Hotep. But even such a figure demonstrates the erroneous characterization of African life and customs reminiscent of western historiography on Africa discussed earlier. Nonetheless, the present work would not be considered thorough without recognizing Lichtheim's important contribution even if controversial.

In treating *Maat* as dogma, the clear apotheosis of Pharaonic rule compels a degree of unquestionable obedience to authority, practically ordained by the divine: the ruler is one with god. Such obedience is grounded on the basis of faith, reminiscent generally of Christians who believe in the Immaculate Conception and particularly of Catholics who are expected to obey the pronouncements of the Pope on all aspects regarding Christian doctrine in the Catholic faith. The same could be said about the acceptance, purely on the basis of faith, of belief in the assumption of Mary, the mother of Christ. The only difference discernible with the position of the Pope in terms of doctrinal affairs vis a vis the Pharaohs as discussed above is that the Pope is not one with God, but is used by God to make proclamations on the doctrine of the faith, hence his infallibility on issues of Catholic dogma. Faith and obedience thus represent two key factors in ancient Egyptian tradition. They are essential for rhetorical expression and concomitant training in rhetorical comportment through "instruction."

From the preceding, it is incumbent upon all to constantly keep in mind the admonitions of Oliver, referred to earlier: scholars should not seek to

discover what may turn out to be simplistic comparisons/contrasts between western and non-western societies and traditions, just for the sake of making comparisons/contrasts or seeking to denigrate societies that they may not fully understand. By the same token, however, scholars should not be precluded from examining some common features of phenomena that guide "speech" from both western and non-western societies, since phenomena such as the moral and ethical obligations of speakers, particularly those in leadership positions, may cut across cultural and ideological boundaries. It is precisely because one could discern a trans-cultural/ideological phenomenon that informs the praxis of *Maatian principles* on which Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric is grounded that makes it necessary for his work to be included in the annals of scholarship on ancient rhetorical theory. In that sense, it provides a basis for comparative studies in rhetoric that would include studies of rhetorical systems and approaches in both western and non-western societies.

6 The Rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep

Before delving into the intricate dimensions of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, it is necessary for me to address issues on the provenance of his text as translated by Battiscombe Gunn and limitations that need to be considered. The section concludes with a discussion on the essential elements of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric.

THE PROVENANCE OF THE TEXT

The English translation used for this work is the one done by Battiscombe Gunn published by John Murray in 1918. It is one of two translated texts from ancient Egypt that Gunn published with the title: *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and The Instruction of Ke'gemni: The Oldest Books in the World*. There are other translations of ancient Egyptian texts contained in the book as well. Lichtheim (1973) correctly notes that there is a more recent translation (Zaba, 1956). I examined closely, also, the translation used by Lichtheim (1973), in her discussion on Ptah-Hotep, to determine whether or not there are significant variations particularly as they may pertain to the number of maxims and their content. I discovered no variations significant enough to warrant a switch from Battiscombe Gunn's translation. Lichtheim does acknowledge Gunn's work and presents no criticism or objection against any aspect of Gunn's translation. She provides in her introduction of her work information about the various translations, recognizing that the "text is exceedingly difficult and the translations differ widely" (p.62). She prefers the Zaba (1956) translation and does cite Gunn's as among the extant translations. Upon close scrutiny, the translation she presents does not differ significantly other than in the style of Gunn's translation (old English phraseology) that was consistent with the date of his publication. The essential substance of the text is consistent with the set of values enunciated and celebrated in hers' and Gunn's.

I decided deliberately to use the Gunn translation because of its tenor and the nature of Ptah-Hotep's work: an instruction by the use of verses, on "good" or "fair" speech, and other aspects of moral and ethical com-

portment against the background of the core principles of his time. Gunn's translation is from the same papyrus used by Lichtheim (Papyrus Prisse) that contains the most complete version of Ptah-Hotep's *Instructions*. The major point of differences between Gunn's work and Lichtheim's are the following: the date of the writing of the original text, and variations in translations of a couple of the maxims but not significant enough to warrant any adjustments to the overall themes of the maxims (for example maxims 22 and 23). Battiscombe Gunn dates the text the Old Kingdom. Lichtheim on the other hand dates the text later Old Kingdom to the Middle Kingdom. Lichtheim presents thirty-eight maxims and an "epilogue," bringing the number of verses to forty-three. In the Gunn translation, there are forty one verses/maxims. The content of both, however—maxims thirty-eight to forty-three in the Gunn translation and the epilogue in Lichtheim's— are not significantly different besides the two distinct language styles. In his introduction Gunn stated: "For if the datings and ascriptions in them be accepted as trustworthy (there is no reason why they should not be so accepted), they were composed about four thousand years before Christ [*The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep*], and three thousand and five hundred and fifty years before Christ [*The Instruction of Ke'gemni*], respectively" (p.18). Of the two texts, *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* is the most complete. It is definitely stated that it was written during the reign of King Isosi, known to be the last ruler of the fifth dynasty.

Gunn notes that precursors of the translated text of Ptah-Hotep and Ke'gemni's instructions date back to the mid-eighteen hundreds. According to Gunn, in 1856, the Reverend D.I. Heath made a translation of the texts which he (Gunn) dismisses as "full of absurdities and gratuitous mistakes and extremely worthless" (pp.37–38). M. Chabas did a translation in 1857 and was described again by Gunn as a "more accurate version." In 1869, Herr Lauth, according to Gunn, translated the texts partially into Latin, followed in 1884 by a translation by M. Phillipe Virey, who did a complete translation of both books. The English version of Virey's work was published in 1890, which represented the only complete translation into English prior to Gunn's publication. Its accuracy, however, is challenged as well by Gunn. Of his own version, he says, "it has been done with considerable care, without prejudice, and it is thought, in accordance with scientific methods of translations; and that it has been compared [by whom he does not mention] and will be found to be, on the whole, the most accurate that has yet appeared." (pp.38–39).

On another note, Gunn's title of translation, *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Ke'gemni: The Oldest Books in the World* also provides some basis for the claim of the African origins of rhetorical, since the theory is derived from "The Oldest" book in the world. On this aspect of the title of Gunn's work, nobody has challenged his claim that the two "*Instructions*" (of Ptah-Hotep and of Ke'gemni) represent the oldest books in the world.

Stemming from the above a discussion on the provenance of the texts cannot be done without reference to archaeology. In a glowing tribute to archaeology, the means by which such texts are brought to our attention, Gunn states:

> She, archaeology, is, for those who know her, full of such emotion; garbed in an imperishable glamour, she is raised far above the turmoil of the present on the wings of Imagination. Her eyes are somber with the memory of the wisdom driven from her scattered sanctuaries; and at her lips wonderful things strive for utterance . . . and by her we are shown all the elemental and terrible passions of the unchanging soul of man, to which all cultures and philosophies are but garments to hide its nakedness; and thus in her, as Art, some of us may realize ourselves . . . (p.13)

Gunn, in his introduction, made reference to the difficulties and prejudices that were paramount on topics, claims, and archaeological findings on ancient and far-removed lands from what was considered the center of civilization—Europe. Gunn laments that " . . . knowledge concerning them [ancient and far-removed lands], not the blank ignorance regarding them that almost everywhere obtains, is a thing of which to be rather ashamed, a detrimental possession; in a word, that the subject is not only unprofitable (a grave offence), but also uninteresting, and therefore contemptible" (1918, p.12). The texts under review were written, according to Gunn, three hundred years before the highly acclaimed codes of Hammurabi, and thousands of years before Moses.

In establishing the provenance of the texts, an important element—the pattern of writing and presentation—is of critical significance. Gunn informs us that the texts were representative of the class of extant, though sparse, Egyptian writings of the dates attributed to the texts. Thus, one observes a "great uniformity in the arrangement of most of them . . ." (p.21). Some sections contained the "tiresome torture of words . . . [and] exaggeration of puns . . ." (P.58 n). Among the salient features of such texts are that they "are written by a father for the advantage of his son; they are very poetic in their arrangement of words and phrases, and are usually divided into short sections or paragraphs by the use of red ink for the first sentence of each" (p.21).

According to Obenga, "These educational treatises are called Sebayit, from the verb Seba, 'to teach, to instruct, to learn" (2004 4b). Karenga discusses in his work (200) " . . . the evolution of the *Sebait* or *Books of Wise Instruction* which contained Egyptian moral philosophy. In the oldest complete Sebait the Book of Ptah-Hotep, we are introduced to the concept of *Maat,* the central moral and spiritual concept in Kemetic society" (p.95). Simpson (1973) explains, "The one genre for which Egyptians had a specific term, *sboyet,* is the *instruction* or *teaching.* In almost every case these compositions begin with the heading, 'the instruction which X made for Y.' The practicality and pragmaticism of the advice given by Ptah-hotep

and the author of the *Instruction for Ke'gemni* are frequently contrasted with the piety expressed in the later Instruction of Amenemope" (p.6). The citations above are consistent with Gunn's characterization of the stylistic pattern of *Instructions* under which his translation falls.

Still on the crucial aspect of provenance, the particular material on which the books were written—papyrus—was of remarkable quality. The material is referred to as the Prisse Papyrus, named after the French archaeologist who bought it in Egypt. Perhaps it is best that we hear from Gunn himself about this aspect of the provenance of the texts:

> Spread out flat, it measures about 23 ft. 7 in., with an average height of 5 (and seven eighth) in., which is about the usual height of papyri of the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties. It contains at present eighteen pages of heavy and bold black and red writing, in the so-called hieratic character . . . it appears to be in perfect preservation, being entirely free from the cracks and decay which mar many fine manuscripts of far later date; but an examination of the content shows that an unknown quantity has torn off from the commencement. Originally, the roll contained at least two books, of which we have the latter part of one and the whole of the other. (p.23)

In concluding this section on the provenance of the text, it is important that we point out a basic problem that even Gunn himself does not resolve: who really wrote the text? We know that it was written during the period of King Isosi, and that its style and content were consistent with the approach of the age—instructions on moral issues and other aspects of appropriate comportment (Obenga 1992; Karenga 2002). We know that two tombs with the names of Ptah-Hotep have inscriptions that place them during the reign of King Isosi, who is mentioned in the *Instruction* of Ptah-Hotep. Among all the leading authorities consulted and cited in this work, there is no disagreement about the name of the author or the content—the maxims—of the work. From the above, one can make a relatively safe assumption that one of the two authored the *Instruction* of Ptah-Hotep. It can be asserted without reservation that the *Instruction* was written by an Egyptian, in Egyptian and consistent with Egyptian style, mythology of the age, and mode of governance.

Another aspect of the provenance of the text and its content for that matter is the aspect of what I would refer to as the preponderant African tokens that are readily discernible at the very beginning of Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction*. The opening sentences of Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* reveal a decidedly African custom, an invocation to God and reference to ancestors: "Command me, thy servant, therefore, to make over my princely authority. Let me speak unto him the words of them that hearken to the counsel of the men of old time; those that once hearkened unto the Gods. I pray thee, let this thing be done . . . " (V. A, p.41).

Besides the common practice of invocation and reference to the ancestors, another distinct African practice is observed as he introduces the purpose of his instruction and reaffirming his status in society. He states: "Here begin the proverbs of *fair speech spoken by the Hereditary Chief, the Holy Father, Beloved of God, the Eldest Son of the King, of his body, the Governor of his city, the Vezier, Ptah-Hotep" (*italics mine)(V. B, p.41). The rendition of titles enunciated by the speaker himself rather than someone introducing him, is a very common practice in some African societies presently. Commenting on the practice, Lichtheim observes: "On first acquaintance, Egyptian autobiographies [referring to the self proclaimed statements by Ptah-Hotep in his opening sentences] strike the modern reader as excessively self-laudatory, until he realizes that the autobiography grew up in the shape of an epitaph and in the quest for immortality" (p.4).

I argue, however, that Lichtheim misses the point. It is neither an epitaph nor a quest for immortality. Such self-laudatory comments are commonplace with dignitaries or those who consider themselves thus. "Chief Zebrudiah," a Nigerian lead character in a comedy series titled the "The Professionals," always began his utterances with a rendition of his many titles. Lichtheim even goes further to assert that "the quest for immortality had a magical as well as moral side. Statues, food offerings, and other rituals would magically ensure revivification and eternal life." She brings *Maat* into play by stating, "But a good moral character, a life lived in harmony with the divine order (*Maat)* was equally essential. Thus the affirmation of moral worth, in the shape of a catalogue of virtues practiced and wrongs not committed, became an integral part of the autobiography" (p.4). She is indeed correct in her assertion that it is indeed this "catalogue" and its content that represents *Maat* upon which Ptah-Hotep's moral nexus is grounded. Any association with "magic," however, is dubious, to say the least. This concludes the discussion on the provenance of the text. I now move on to a brief discussion on limitations.

LIMITATIONS

The first major limitation that has to be noted is that the text being presented as the Rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep is an extant English translation from ancient Egyptian by Battiscombe Gunn. His translation of the content of Ptah-Hotep's *Instructions* is unchallenged thus far. Secondly, before delving into the detailed treatment of Ptah-Hotep, I hasten to state that Ke'gemni receives no treatment in this work. Remnants of his writings do not justify an elaborate treatment in terms of rhetorical theory. His name warrants mention only to the extent that the works translated by Gunn include a couple of pages attributed to Ke'gemni. On the other hand, Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* is more detailed with a significant contribution to rhetorical theory. His *Instructions* though not written exquisitely for rhetorical *train-*

ing, contains a large enough reference to rhetorical practice and morals that warrant specific attention and a claim to him being the precursor of a focused instruction on the ethical/moral aspects of rhetoric.

Thirdly, even though Gunn presents a careful and thorough discussion and analysis of the *Instructions,* I do not include verbatim his introduction to *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Ke'gemni: The Oldest Books in the World*. His analysis does not directly focus on the rhetorical dimension of Ptah-Hotep's work. This is understandable because there was no stated purpose on his part to carry out such a task, since he was not a scholar in rhetorical studies.

Gun's analysis, however, sheds an interesting light on the environment within which the *Instructions* were written and how it influenced Ptah-Hotep's work. Additionally, Gunn provides plausible connections between the *Instructions,* and what he refers to as "the resemblance . . . to the Jewish didactic books (*Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* in the *Old Testament*, *Wisdom of Solomon* and *Ecclesiasticus* in the Apocrypha" (p.37). His analysis comprises the following sections, headings of which are reproduced in full in the present work: "Introduction"; "Memorials of the Past"; "The Land of Darkness"; "The Time of Ptah-Hotep"; 'Concerning the Book'; "The treatise of Ke'gemni" (which I omitted in this work for reasons explained earlier); "Date of the Manuscript"; "An Egyptian Chesterfield"; "Who Was Ptah-Hotep?"; 'His Teaching'; "Views on Women"; "The God's of Egypt"; "Previous Translations"; and the "Oldest Book Known." My task is decidedly focused on the rhetorical dimension of the *Instructions,* and the place of the work in the rhetorical tradition, emphasizing Ptah-Hotep's contribution to rhetorical theory.

The above provides a smooth transition to an examination of Ptah-Hotep. His contribution, as will be seen, is mainly centered on the moral aspects of rhetoric and the implications for an ethics that stresses *Maat* and serves as the basis for the foundation of the ethical and moral aspects of rhetorical theory and rhetorical comportment.

THE ETHICAL BASES OF PTAH-HOTEP'S RHETORICAL THEORY

This section of the work, as its heading suggests, seeks to locate Ptah-Hotep's work at the inception stage of theorizing about rhetoric in ancient Egypt. There are interesting publications on Ptah-Hotep by some of the leading translators of his maxims, namely Lichtheim (1973) and Parkinson (2003), which require further discussion in this section, as they make reference to the ethical aspects of his work. I examined Lichtheim's publication with the aim in view of identifying any significant discussion on the rhetorical dimension of Ptah-Hotep's work, with particular reference to its ethical grounding for rhetorical utterances and praxis. In a very brief

introduction to her translation from the same papyrus that Gunn used—
the Prisse Papyrus, Lichtheim observed the following: "Taken together,
the thirty-seven maxims do not amount to a comprehensive moral code,
nor are they strung together in any logical order. But they touch upon the
most important aspects of human relations and they focus on basic virtues.
The cardinal virtues are self-control, moderation, kindness, generosity, jus-
tice, and truthfulness tempered by discretion" (p.62). Clearly, Lichtheim's
chronicling of the virtues depicts the centrality of *Maat*. Her discussion in
the rest of her work, however, did not engage any aspect of the rhetorical
dimension of Ptah-Hotep's work.

    Parkinson grounds his treatment of Ptah-Hotep's work under the rubric
"teachings." He begins his work by asserting "*The teaching of Ptahhotep*
presents a vision of elite social experience, spoken by a vizier in an ideal-
ized world of the old Kingdom in which virtue is rewarded." He continues,
"The teaching is bipartite: a sequence of maxims with a lengthy epilogue
of a more reflective nature" (p.257). He contends, however, that "Despite
the subject matter, the teaching is not a convincing manual about courtly
etiquette of the kind attested from early modern Europe . . . " (p.258). His
contention is spurious. The purpose of the text as clearly stated by Ptah-
Hotep is not for "courtly etiquette," albeit, in line with "modern" Europe.

    Ptah-Hotep's fundamental ethical premise is based on instructing his
son "in the words of old time; [and] may he be a wonder unto children of
princes that may enter and hearken with him. Make straight their hearts;
and discourse with him, without causing weariness." He then introduces
his work thus: "Here begin the proverbs of fair speech . . . " (V. 1, p.42).
From the above it is difficult to fathom how Parkinson could even arrive
at his judgment. Parkinson contends further: " . . . however, the specific
instructions on ethical etiquette are often the given points of departure of
the maxims, rather than what they propound, and in ethical terms it teaches
generalized banalities" (p.258). It is amazing that *Maat*, of which he says in
an earlier citation "is wide-ranging, including the world order established
at creation and the social order as a microcosm of the created cosmos" is
dismissed as "banalities." Overall, Parkinson provides a provocative lit-
erary analysis of Ptah-Hotep's work while reaffirming the centrality and
importance of *Maat*, which I argue, is the precursor to any discourses on
the ethical dimensions of rhetorical theory.

    There is, however, an interesting corpus of publications though limited
in number that discuss Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* from a rhetorical perspec-
tive. William Hallo's work, titled: "The Birth of Rhetoric," is a chapter in a
book with an exciting title, *Rhetoric before and beyond the Greeks,* edited
by Lipson and Binkley (2004). The title of the book is quite exciting! The
source of the excitement is that it deviates from the tradition in rhetori-
cal scholarship that locates the "birthplace" of rhetoric to ancient Greece,
albeit around 478 B.C. Hallo's work sparked even more excitement, when
he asserts that rhetoric indeed existed in Israel long before Greece. He goes

on to note the "slow" reaction to the challenge posed by rhetorical scholarship on Egyptologists and Assyriologists. Indeed it is this challenge that Hallo mentions that motivates, in part, the production of this work, not as an Egyptologist but rather as one concerned with rhetorical scholarship, and its roots in Africa.

On the back cover of Lipson and Binkley's text is written: "Focusing on ancient rhetoric outside of the dominant Western tradition, this collection examines rhetorical practices in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Israel and China." When I read the foregoing, I quickly took a close look at the table of contents and then the index, in search of *direct* references to Ptah-Hotep's *Instructions*. Chillingly absent was any reference to Ptah-Hotep. Then I read Lipson's chapter titled: "Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric: It All Comes Down to *Maat*" hoping that it was just a case of omission. Indeed it was a case of omission in terms of the absence of the name of Ptah-Hotep in the index.

Missed in Lipson's chapter, however, is an emphasis on the centrality of "speech," albeit "fair speech" in the totality of Ptah-Hotep's *Instructions*. Lipson, nonetheless, presents a fine and helpful analysis of *Maat*, against a wider and deeper context of ancient Egyptian culture. Much earlier than Lipson's work were two publications of note: Giles Gray's "The 'Precepts' of Kegemni and Ptah-Hotep," (1946), and Michael Fox's "Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric" (1983). Of the two, the latter provides a more in-depth treatment of Ptah-Hotep. Fox identifies what he refers to interchangeably as "canons" or "types" in Egyptian rhetoric. They are: "Silence," "right moment," "restraint," "fluently [fluency]," and "truth." His also makes a brief reference to *Maat*. Kelley (2002) also provides an interesting insight into Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction*, in her work that addresses African American rhetoric and African American studies.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE MORAL THEORY IN PTAH-HOTEP'S RHETORIC

I have discussed at length the pillars upon which the rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep is grounded—the *Maatian principles*, and the foundation upon which the pillars are buttressed—*Maat*. I now present the basic essentials of his rhetoric against the background of *Maatian principles*. Before getting into the presentation of the specific elements of the principles, it is important to bear in mind that the elements as they pertain to rhetorical theory are discernible in various sections of Ptah-Hotep's instruction to his son. The *Instruction* contains many topics ranging from old age to the treatment of women as clearly reflected in the sub-topics referred to earlier, in Gunn's introduction to his translation. Ptah-Hotep does not provide us with distinct "genres" as such but identifies speech/rhetorical contexts and provides insights into how rhetorical tasks should be performed within the given context. I discuss two such contexts in this section of the work.

The task undertaken in this section, therefore, is to identify examples of relevant maxims scattered throughout the *Instruction* that have significant implications in support of the claim that in Ptah-Hotep's work, we discover the earliest formulation of an ethical theory on rhetoric. It is noteworthy to establish at this juncture that the opening maxims do have a direct relationship to rhetoric and that the author himself announces that it is a treatise on "speech," even though he discusses several topics that fall outside of the domain of rhetoric, but directly related to the practice of *Maat*. Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* essentially demonstrates the centrality of Maat in all aspects of life.

Ptah-Hotep starts his instruction by admonishing his son about the importance of modesty as he prepares to impart knowledge that the son would require in order to succeed in life and to function appropriately in society when embarking upon his tasks, rhetorical and otherwise. Hence "Be not proud because thou art learned; but discourse with the ignorant man as with the sage. For no limit can be set to skill, neither is there any craftsman that possesseth full advantages. Fair speech is more rare than emerald that is found by the slave maidens on the pebbles" (V. 1, p.42).

Another aspect that is quickly established at the beginning of his instruction on "fair speech" is that of the existence of varying levels of competence in speaking contexts, particularly in terms of the nature of a *technical skill*—argumentation. He identifies three types of "arguers" at different levels of competency: Superior to us; those at par with ourselves, and those below our level of competency.   The setting and context are thus quickly established regarding what we might refer to as the environment within which "fair speech" takes place and the qualities that ought to be recognized within such contexts.

He then goes on to identify an important rhetorical context: The deliberative. When entrusted with the responsibility of serving in the "chamber of council," the incumbent is advised not to be absent because that may result in expulsion; that punctuality is an absolute necessity, and one should be prepared to speak. The rules of behavior in council are strict and need to be followed closely because the mere presence of the incumbent is pre-ordained by God (V. 13, p.47). The truth factor comes to play significantly in council deliberations. Hence, one should "Report thine actions without concealment" (V. 15, p.48). Furthermore, one should strive to master every aspect of his/responsibility. Hence, "If thou would be a wise man, and one sitting in council with his overlord, apply thine heart unto perfection" (V. 24, p.51). By the same token, one should know what to speak about and when. Thus, "Silence is more profitable unto thee than abundance of speech. Consider how thou may be opposed by an expert that speaketh in council. It is a foolish thing to speak on every kind of work, for he that disputeth thy words shall put them into proof" (V. 24, p.52). Modesty again is the measure. His admonition above is consistent with his identification of the categories of "arguers' and how

one should behave when one encounters his/her superior or inferior in the art of argumentation. A remarkable teaching that persists till date and the failure to adhere to such counsel has resulted in the disgrace of many politicians in our time.

Another important rhetorical context that could be discerned in Ptah-Hotep's work could be classified as "diplomatic." I argue the above because of the following: "If thou be an emissary sent from one noble to another, be exact after the manner of him that sent thee, give his message even as he hath said it. Beware of enmity by thy words, setting one noble against the other by perverting truth" (V. 8, p.45). From the foregoing, performing the function of an emissary requires training and commitment to truth—truth being one of the core *Maatian principles*. The importance of acquiring training in the praxis of *Maat* is exemplified not just within the context of adhering to the truth, but also ensuring that harmony and balance would always be maintained and sustained, particularly when entrusted with the responsibility of performing diplomatic functions. I now discuss the elements that present a more holistic approach to his ethical theory of rhetoric.

RESPECT FOR HIERARCHY

The implications for identification of the levels of competency in argumentation mentioned earlier apply here. Thus "If thou find an arguer talking, one that is well disposed and wiser than thou, let thine arms fall, bend thy back, be not angry with him if he agree not with thee. Refrain from speaking evilly; oppose him not at any time when he speaketh" (V. 2, p.43). Whereas one can not depart from the practice of respect for hierarchy and authority, one can also not neglect his duty among his cohorts. Thus, "If thou find an arguer talking, thy fellow, one that is within thy reach, keep not silence when he saith aught that is evil; so shalt thou be wiser than he. Great will be the applause of the listeners, and thy name shall be good in the knowledge of princes" (V. 3, p.43). Contained in the preceding quotation is a reaffirmation of moral responsibility to oneself and one's superiors in the hierarchy. The appreciation of listeners is critical in being perceived as an effective speaker/arguer in one's own rank. Not only is the appreciation of the listeners important, the perceptions of those higher in the hierarchy are of significance as well.

In this hierarchical environment, one still has a moral responsibility as a speaker when arguing with a person who is not his equal. Ptah-Hotep explicitly states: "If thou find an arguer, a poor man, that is to say not thine equal, be not scornful toward him because he is lowly; let him alone then shall he confound himself . . . " (V. 4, p.43). The idea of being "unequal" does not warrant a moral sanction in this instance, because such inequality is a *sine qua non* in hierarchical societal structures. Hence, a guest who is in the lower end of the hierarchy should not speak until he or she is addressed by his supe-

rior. Furthermore, "If thou look at him that is before thee (thine host), pierce him not with many glances. It is abhorrent of the soul to stare him" (V. 7, pp.44–45). (Upon reading this section I recollected the manner in which children are raised in several African countries up the present: children should not look in the eye of their elders or others considered "superior" until they are told to do so. Otherwise making direct contact with elders, parents for example, is considered impolite and even rude). Ptah-Hotep continues in his instruction about guests, particularly those at the lower end of the hierarchy when interacting with their superiors, "Speak not till he addresses thee; . . . "Speak when he questioneth thee; so shall thy speech be good" in the opinion of the superior (V. 7, p.45). The divine is invoked to stress the significance of hierarchy: "If thou be lowly, serve a wise man, that all thine actions may be good before the God" (V. 10, p.46).

TRUTH

Truth features also as moral virtue. As the son prepares himself to rise to the highest level of the hierarchy—eventually becoming a leader, he has to "endeavor always to be gracious, that thine own conduct be without deceit. Great is Truth, appointing a straight path; . . . " In these lines, we observe the basic tenets of morality that should guide the actions and speech of a leader. Truth and deceit do not go together. So important is the role attached to "truth" that one should be careful not to use speech to create animosity among people. There is no room for compromising oneself. Since the moral imperative is so strongly advocated and enforced, the student is informed that as a leader, "One that oversteppeth the laws shall be punished (V. 5, p.44). Such caution emphasizes the centrality of morality and responsibility even for the one at leader at the top.

   Adherence to the truth makes one famous through his actions. This virtue is a fundamental requirement for fathers instructing their sons and daughters. "Let that which thou speakest implant *true* [italics mine] things and *just* [italics mine] in the life of thy children. Such training pays off eventually, because when people listen to them, they will say 'Surely, that man hath spoken to good purpose,' and they shall do likewise . . . " The children thus trained "shall direct the multitude" (V. 41, p.59). Adherence to the truth not only helps in being perceived in a positive light, but serves also as an example to others who will do likewise.

   Truth also features when one has to address issues on which he or she claims expertise. Hence, "If thou have entered as an expert, speak with exact lips, that thy conduct may be seemly" (V. 41, p.60). Furthermore, "Be wary of speech when a learned man hearkeneth unto thee; desire to be stablished for good in the mouth of those that hear thee speaking" (V. 41, p.60). Clearly from the above, one can discern the importance attached to what we will come to hear about as *ethos* in Aristotelian rhetoric. Truth also features in

the need to be fair/just in speech contexts. For instance: "If thou be the son of a man of the priesthood, and an envoy to conciliate the multitude, . . . speak thou without favouring one side. Let it not be said 'His conduct is that of the nobles, favouring one side in the speech. Turn thine aim towards *exact judgments* [italics mine]" (V. 28, p.53). Truth must prevail.

OBEDIENCE/RIGHTEOUSNESS

Within the moral nexus, obedience is an essential virtue. Furthermore, given the strong presence of a religious dimension in *Maat*, a bifurcation of obedience and righteousness is not feasible, as shall be seen in the discussion that follows. Obedience in this context, however, goes beyond the mere act of being obedient. In a very interesting manner, it involves the critical factor of listening. In all communication processes, listening is central not only for the intake, adoption and application of content, but also to demonstrate interest in what is being communicated and show respect to the speaker. In the *Instruction,* we are told to obey, of which listening is expected. Given the didactic style of the work, Ptah-Hotep builds the fundamental pillars for training in effective speech by emphasizing the ability to listen and subsequently obey. On the importance of obeying, he states: "They (my words) shall instruct a man how he shall speak, after he hath heard thee; yea, he shall become as one skillful in obeying, excellent in speaking, after he hath heard them" (V. 37c, p.56). Good speech clearly involves not only the *spoken word* but also the ability to listen. What is quite instructive here is that Ptah-Hotep's ethical principles for speaking are not just speaker centered but audience centered as well. The speaker becomes effective not just because he can speak well, but because he is able to perform the function of a listener. This combination makes someone a fair speaker.

Obedience as a moral characteristic feature is extended beyond the realm of man. It is a quality desirous of God as well. We read: "That which is desired by God is obedience; disobedience is abhorred of the God" (V. 38, p.57). As for human beings, "He that obeyeth becomes one obeyed . . . If he direct his mouth [speaks] by what had been enjoined him, watchful and obedient . . . [he] shall be wise, and his goings seemly" (V. 38, p.58). Observe, however, that failings in this moral virtue affect speech and its appreciation. Thus, "As for the fool, devoid of obedience . . . at the chattering of speech he marvelleth . . . " (V. 40, pp.58–59).

The teaching above prepares the would-be leader to rule well. Recall that the instructions being given by Ptah-Hotep is to his son. He admonishes: "A splendid thing is the obedience of an obedient son; he cometh in and listeneth obediently. Excellent in hearing, excellent in speaking, is every man that obeyeth what is noble; and the obedience of an obeyer is a noble thing. Obedience is better than all things that are; it maketh good-

will" (V. 38, p.57). The element of "goodwill" becomes salient. Obedience is thus not just an issue of character, in the sense of being respectful of others and in particular of parents, and acting propitiously. One also has to have the well-being of others at heart.

The emphasis on the ability to listen is again evident, particularly when one considers the fact that Ptah-Hotep is grooming his son for the mantle of leadership. He elevates the significance of the ability to listen to the realms of the divine and casts it as essential element for progress in life, both in terms of aging and status. The ability to listen is also necessary for transmitting knowledge from one generation to the next; the underlying assumption here is that only through effective listening could one acquire the knowledge required to function as a leader in addition to being able to transmit knowledge accurately and effectively to the next generation. Thus: "A son that hearkeneth is as a Follower of Horus [a highly revered demigod]. He is good after he hearkeneth; he groweth old, he reacheth honour and reverence. He repeateth in like manner to his sons and daughters, so renewing the instruction of his father. Each man instructeth as did his begetter, repeating it unto his children. Let them [in turn] speak with their sons and daughters, that they may be famous in their deeds. Let that which thou speakest implant true things and just in the life of they children." (V. 41, p.59). The foregoing also manifests the overall significance of *Maat*. At the end of the day, all the efforts to instruct have to be geared towards truth and justice.

Listening is also to be done in a manner that creates a comfortable environment for someone speaking to an authority figure so to let person feel at ease and speak freely. Hence, "If thou be a leader," he advises, "be gracious when thou hearkenest unto the speech of the suppliant . . . " (V. 17, V. 17, p.49). A speaker should not be restricted in his or her efforts to communicate. We observe, further, Ptah-Hotep's position on freedom of speech when he emphasizes that a person should be allowed to "speak freely" in order to be able to listen well, and "that the thing for which he hath come to thee may be done" (V. 17, p.49). Reference to the term "suppliant" implies also the leader's role as an adjudicator. In this regard, the teachings of Ptah-Hotep include the moral responsibility of one who sits in judgment of others to be a good listener. Of interest also is the fact that though the instructions were given to someone who will be at the top of the hierarchy when he assumes leadership, he is taught at the formative stages of growth to respect freedom of speech and expression. This posture is consonant with the dictum of "fair speech" that Ptah-Hotep announces at the beginning of the book.

HUMILITY

Being armed with the truth and willing to listen and obey should not let one be boastful. Humility, as a virtue, augments truth as well, and is a sound

quality for effective listening. Such humility should restrain one from being excessive in speech. We are cautioned, therefore: "Repeat not extravagant speech, neither listen thereto; . . . look to the ground [When one hears such speech]. Speak not regarding it, that he before thee may know wisdom" (V. 23, p.51).

The instruction continues on this subject with what one may call speech lessons for good leadership. The following are the key tenets of that lesson: Be honored by knowledge and gentleness; when one does speak, he should speak with authority. This in turn requires being properly prepared. One has to know, however, where to draw the line on the issue of humility if one is highly placed. Hence, "If thou be powerful . . . Speak with authority, that is, not as if following injunctions, for he that is humble (when highly placed) falleth into errors" (V. 25, p.52). This warning is understandable because in order to get thus highly placed, one would have had to go through appropriate training for leadership which will make him or her knowledgeable, avoiding embarrassing errors.

RIGHTNESS AND JUSTICE

Rhetorical comportment within the context of the *Maatian principles* above is essential in all aspects of life in ancient Egypt. For instance in legislative contexts, Ptah-Hotep states: "The council-chamber acteth by strict rule; and all its plans are in accordance with method. It is *God* (italics mine) that advanceth one to a seat therein . . . " (V. 13, pp.47–48). The idea about the centrality of "method" to ensure that things are done "right," and supremacy of the rule of law implied in the quote above demonstrate how *Maat* dominates all aspects of life. As one speaks, therefore, in the council chamber the speech should be guided by adherence to things that are right.

Rightness is also required in everyday speech. For instance, "Repeat not extravagant speech, neither listen thereto; for it is the utterance of a body heated by wrath" (V. 23, p.51). Wrathfulness is antithetical to rightness. Thus, "When such speech is repeated to thee, hearken not thereto, look to the ground. Speak not regarding it, that he that is before thee may know wisdom" (V.23, p.51). From the foregoing, rightness as a guide for speaking also demonstrates one's degree of wisdom. So when one hears "extravagant" speech, one should react to it in a manner that would be beneficial to the speaker—he would learn from the reaction that what he is doing is not right.

Rightness is also closely associated with justice, "For if thou be the son of a man of the priesthood, and an envoy to conciliate the multitude . . . speak thou without favouring one side. Let it not be said, 'His conduct is that of the nobles, favouring one side in his speech. Turn thine aim toward *exact judgments* (italics mine)" (V. 28, p.53). The principle of justice is

firmly rooted in Kemetic society. Adherence to the principle of justice is a sign of good character, and recognition of one's status and responsibility in society. Thus, "One that oversteppeth the laws shall be punished. Overstepping is by the covetous man . . . Never hath evil-doing brought its venture safe to port. For he saith, 'I will obtain by myself for myself,' and saith not, 'I will obtain because I am allowed.' But the limits of justice are steadfast; it is that which a man repeateth from his father" (V. 5, p.44).

Adherence to the laws makes a person behave prudently. The individual recognizes that he can act only "because he is allowed to" by law, not because he wants to. A child becomes socialized to recognize and abide by the rule of law in terms of upbringing, by the behavior of his father. Ancient Egypt was a patriarchy, hence the heavy emphasis on the role of the father in the household.

HARMONY, BALANCE AND ORDER

The three *Maatian principles* above serve as key pillars in holding society together. The maintenance of all of them is not just the responsibility of those in authority. An unethical use of rhetoric could easily lead to breakdown in society with serious consequences. He states: " . . . beware of interruption and of answering words with heat. Put it far from thee; control thyself. The wrathful heart speaketh fiery words . . . " (V. 25, p.52), and even if our hearts are overflowing with emotions, "refrain thy mouth" (V. 42, p.60). The admonition to refrain from using "fiery words" and maintain overall restraint in dealing with others even if one is filled with emotions must be understood within the context of the centrality of *Maat*. Order and balance are constituent elements of *Maat*. Fiery words and excessive display of emotions could create disorder and disequilibrium. Good speech maintains balance which in turn sustains harmony.

The principles discussed above encapsulate *Maat*, and represent the ethical theory of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric. His rhetoric represents the earliest discussion known so far in human history on ethics and rhetoric. With such a resource it is difficult to fathom and justify the "darkness" metaphor, pervasive in the African historiography of the West. A more detailed discussion follows on the rhetorical construction of the African, and how the image constructed and presented in western representations of Africans is discredited given the firm requirements for moral comportment found in Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric. Some may wish to argue that the representation of Africans in western historiography may not include ancient Kemet because Europeans did not consider ancient Egyptians as Africans. But as the discussion that follows would reveal, such an argument is not tenable.

7   From Darkness to Light

From the foregoing discussions, how could one integrate all aspects discussed thus far into the fashioning of Ptah-Hotep's work as constituting the African origins of rhetorical theory and its relationship to the search for African agency in the development quagmire in which the continent presently finds itself?

The significance of bringing into this work a discussion of western historiography on Africa with a focus of the darkness metaphor is critical at this juncture. Amadu Yulisa Maddy, playwright, theatre director, performing artist, choreographer and novelist, provides the perfect rationale for bringing into works of this nature the significance and impact of western historiography on any discipline that addresses Africa and its contribution to the global fund of knowledge.

I will quote liberally from him, because he captures the essence of it. He states, in response to a question posed to him by a member of staff at the *Wilson Library Bulletin,* on the need to establish a frame of reference about Africa when one engages on a works dealing with Africa:

> Perhaps we need to establish a frame of reference about Africa, perhaps not. My premise here is that the West (Euro-Americans) must stop treating Africa as if it is in or belongs to another planet. The continent of Africa, like any of the other five continents, has as great a physical and cultural variety. Africa is a continent of nations and not (just) warring tribes and clansmen as portrayed by the Western media. For well over five hundred years, Africa has remained a disturbing phenomenon to the Western mind. It is not surprising that Westerners created barbaric images about Africa and Africans; images that go back about five hundred years *are still there refusing to go away(italics mine).* Out of these false and distorted images have evolved stereotypes that have been preserved and institutionalized. (p.124)

He goes on say:

> The image of backwardness carries with it innuendoes that are hidden in some ways of these texts [referring to children's story books] in very

subtle ways. Western missionaries, in their earliest contacts with Africa, ventured into the interior of Africa, thereby coming sometimes face to face with African traditions and customary practices which they could not fathom or understand. They then found it useful to speak of the "savage heathen," and the less adventurous colonial administrators emphasized the same theme, adding the "dark continent" myth. (p.125)

Thus when we recall the precepts of Ptah-Hotep that have direct reference to rhetorical utterances and comportment, we begin to realize that a continent that was considered and described not just as "dark" but "savage" and "uncivilized" in western social thought and historiography was, on the contrary, the source of a tremendous wealth in terms of ethical/moral thought and practice in all aspects of life, with particular emphasis on governance.

Juxtapose the following from Hegel against what has been revealed so far in terms of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric: "*Negroes* are to be considered as a nation of children who remain immersed in their uninterested and indifferent naïveté." With disdain, he continues: "There religion has something childlike about it. They sense a higher being, but they do not keep a firm hold on it; it passes only fleetingly through their heads. This higher being they transfer to the first stone they come across, thus making it their fetish and they discard this fetish if it fails to help them" (p.41). If we were to go with Hegel's claim, how then should we view *Maat*? He states further: "Entirely good-matured and harmless when in a state of calm, they can become suddenly agitated and then commit the most frightful cruelties . . . they do not show an inner impulse towards culture. In their native country the most striking despotism prevails." The issue of despotism was addressed earlier in this work, and Hegel's assertion here reconfirms the collective objectification in western historiography of African capabilities in organizing and governing themselves. In terms of the nature and quality of the minds that produced *Maat,* Hegel asserts: "They do no not attain to the feeling of man's personality—their mind is entirely dormant, it remains sunk within itself, it makes no progress, and thus corresponds to the compact, *undifferentiated* mass of the African land" (p.41).

It is precisely because of the stranglehold such characterizations of Africans have on the historiography of the continent and its people, that one could not engage in any serious work on the contributions from that part of the world without engaging the historical dimension. In that vein, how could one discuss *Maat* if the people who created it do not "show an inner impulse towards culture," and even worse, having minds that are "entirely dormant?" Should it not indeed be the responsibility of the West to tell Africans how to govern themselves in a postcolonial context?

Furthermore, as we review the historiography on rhetorical theory, the western focus has been dominant, leaving out the rhetorical traditions of non-western societies. Oliver, and Ehninger to an extent, reigns in the importance of expanding the parameters of the dominant Eurocentric rhe-

torical paradigm as discussed earlier. Such an expansion would provide room for an examination of non-western rhetorical traditions that place more emphasis on their respective cultural and ethical dictates that may in fact run counter to popular western beliefs, yet serve as theoretical bases for their rhetorical practices, utterances and governance.

From a theoretical perspective based on *Maat,* rhetoric functions as serving truth, fairness, rightness, justice, harmony, balance and order in all human affairs, and in the process, shape and nurture good character. Additionally, rather than viewing hierarchy, and the emphasis on obedience as aspects of despotism, and thus impediments to free rhetorical expression, they are manifestations of accountability on the part of those who govern and the governed. One could not, within the context of *Maat,* theorize about rhetoric without centering good character, morality and ethics as its fountainhead and the foundation for *good* (as in ethical/moral) governance. Ptah-Hotep thus advances a theory of rhetoric that requires commitment to *Maatian principles* on the part of the speaker and governor, as well as the audience and the governed, with responsibility for the speaker/governor to have good character, knowledge and recognition of his or her weaknesses.

It is against the background above and the fact that Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* pre-dates all known writings in Greco-Roman history on rhetoric, that I advance the argument that in the core elements of *Maatian principles* could be found the earliest formulation of an ethical theory on rhetoric, thus representing the African origins of rhetorical theory, and its relationship to good governance.

8   Paradigmatic Framework
Postcolonial Theory

It is at this juncture that a discussion grounded in a wider paradigmatic framework is warranted. The discussion up to this point could be conveniently situated within the context of postcolonial discourse. Postcolonial theory provides, to some extent, a theoretical rationale as well as analytical tools for addressing the relationship between Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory from antiquity, and the present day development quagmire faced by the continent after colonialism. In short, postcolonial theory represents the bridge that links Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory and good governance to its postcolonial challenges as the continent seeks to fashion a design for governance. Inasmuch as postcolonial theory provides a theoretical base, I do not subscribe to all of its constituent elements, as I would show later.

Shome and Hegde (2002), in their discussion on what post-colonial studies as an interdisciplinary field does, state: "It attempts to undo (and redo) the historical structures of knowledge production that are rooted in various histories and geographies of modernity. This means that the questions and problematics of colonialism that postcolonial scholarship concerns itself with emerge from larger social contexts—contemporary or past—of modernity."

They continue, "[P]ostcolonialism often finds itself colliding with the limits of knowledge structures . . . In the process it tries to redo such epistemic structures [within the Anglo-Euro academy] by writing against them, over them, and from below them by inviting reconnections to obliterated pasts and forgotten presents that never made their way into the history of knowledge" (p.250). The last sentence in the preceding quote aptly contributes to the justification of and significance of this work. Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory is non-existent in the discipline.

Taken from the perspective of "annals" in any discipline, rhetoric in this instance, this work on Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory, is the "invitation" to "reconnect" to (not to an "obliterated" past as such but rather) an unknown or neglected past on the part of those who had written and others who continue to write on the history of rhetorical theory. A crucial aspect of the neglected past is how the ethical/moral dimension of

rhetoric articulated by Ptah-Hotep fails to feature in governance discourses and designs in post-independent Africa.

Postcolonial theory thus provides some bases that require close scrutiny as the theory applies to this work, but with some concerns that need to be addressed. Childs, et al. (2000) provide the following breakdown in the form of questions that help in getting a grip on the theory: "When is the post-colonial?" "Where is the post-colonial?" "Who is the post-colonial?" "What is the post-colonial?" I would add: What is the anatomy of the postcolonial?—which I address between my discussion on the first two questions raised by Childs, et al.

The question of the "when" is mainly an issue of punctuating the "post-colonial" epoch, upon which the theory is grounded. So how does one establish the "when" in postcolonial theory raised by Childs, et al.? They write: "The obvious implication of the term post-colonial is that it refers to a period coming after the end of colonialism. Such a commonsense under-standing has much to commend it (the term would otherwise risk being completely meaningless), but that sense of an ending, of the completion of one period of history and the emergence of another, is, as we shall see, hard to maintain in any simple and unproblematic fashion" (p.3, 2006).

They went on to postulate: "Post-colonialism may then refer in part to the period after colonialism, but the question arises: After whose colonial-ism? after the end of which colonial empire? Isn't it unacceptably Anglocen-tric or Eurocentric to be foregrounding the mid-twentieth century and the end particularly of the British and French empires? What about, for exam-ple, early nineteenth century Latin America and the end of Spanish and Portuguese control? or the late eighteenth century and the independence of the United States of America? . . . [T]here are problems with broadening the historical or conceptual frame too far . . . " (p.3).

Said (1978) also faced a similar task in punctuating the emergence of "Orientalism," in terms of the dominant colonial presence of Britain and France in the Orient. He writes: "To speak of Orientalism . . . is to speak mainly, although not exclusively, of a British and French cultural enterprise, a project whose dimensions take in such disparate realms as the imagination itself, the whole of India, the Levant, the Biblical texts and Biblical lands, the spice trade, colonial armies and a long tradition of colonial administra-tors, a formidable scholarly corpus, innumerable Oriental "experts" and "hands," an Oriental professorate, a complex array of "Oriental" ideas (Oriental despotism, Oriental splendor, cruelty, sensuality), many Eastern sects, philosophies, and wisdom domesticated for local European use—the list can be extended more or less indefinitely" (p.4).

The undisputable European influence in dating, shaping, defining and explaining regions and phenomena therein, far removed from their respec-tive centers, is also captured as well by Mudimbe (1994), who writes: "Africa was discovered in the fifteenth century. That, at least, is what most history books say. Professors teach it, students accept it as truth. In any

case, why doubt? The media propagate the veracity of the fact in the sagas of European explorers" (pp.16–17). But he interjects, "Yet, one might very seriously wonder, is it really historically true that the continent was discovered in the fifteenth century? We do know what is inscribed in this discovery, the new cultural orders it allowed, and, in terms of knowledge, the texts that its discourses built and whose achievement is to be found in what I term the 'colonial library.' Looking again, however, it becomes apparent that indeed the fifteenth-century discovery was not the first contact of the continent with foreigners. Hence that discovery spells out only one viewpoint, the European" (p.17). It is this Eurocentric dominance that calls into question problems and issues surrounding the "when" of the postcolonial, and through whose agency the theory is channeled. Furthermore, it enhances the significance of Childs, et al. contention of "broadening the historical and conceptual frame too far."

Besides the issue of "broadening the concept too far" in terms of history, one has to deal with the anatomy of the postcolonial. Anatomically, one cannot leave out its "colonial" elements, given its pervasive presence even in the period referred to as the "post-colonial." The "colonial" manifestation is rampant as evidenced by the presence of major colonial institutions such as the civil service and the judiciary in many "post-colonial" countries in Africa. By that I mean, historically, one can indeed discuss eras, epochs, etc. But could one really talk about the "post" in the term post-colonial when we take into consideration institutions such as the civil service and the judiciary in many former British colonies in Africa that are remnants of the colonial past but still in operation?

Boehmer (2005) cogently describes the situation in some presumably independent/postcolonial countries: "Since the early 1970s, as is widely known, post-independence nations have been increasingly plagued by neo-colonial ills: economic disorders and social malaise, government corruption, state repression, various carry-overs from the prebendal and command structures of the colonial period. In much of the once colonized world, decolonization in fact produced few changes: power hierarchies were maintained, the values of the former colonizer remained influential" (pp.230–231). Julius Nyerere in a speech delivered in Kampala, Uganda (1992) also noted: "Even when you have administrative capacity (perhaps the few referred to by Boehmer), how many African countries have the critical mass of personnel for development? The capacity to deal with an immense heritage from slavery and colonialism. In Tanzania at independence, I was given by the Germans and the British combined two university trained engineers and twelve doctors. That was the type of inheritance we had at the time" (p.256). He continued, "We tried to build democracies without democrats . . . We tried to build socialism without socialists!"(p.256).

The anatomical metaphor of the postcolonial provides intricate insights into what obtains. Julius Nyerere again: "We look to Europe, for example, for democracy, we also like to be democratic. There was private enterprise,

and we said we also like private enterprise. There was something called socialism, especially in Eastern Europe, and we were told, we also wanted to be socialists. I joked with President Neto in Luanda [Angola] when I saw big posters of Lenin and Marx in the rooms. And I joked, "Do you eat cassava here?" He said yes, and I said to the late President Samora Machel, "Samora do you eat cassava in Mozambique?" He said yes. Have you ever heard of a Marxist-Leninist country which eats cassava?" (p.256). The resultant postcolonial society, at least in Africa, could not be more appropriately characterized. There is added dimension to the characterization that fits into the imagery provided by Nyerere. After the disastrous experiences by Africa and Africans during the eras of slavery, colonialism, evangelization (this is still in progress) and neocolonialism, one could safely say "Africans are claiming to be Africans but without their essence."

I recognize fully the potential for an attack on my use of the term "essence" above. It is beyond the usual association for some, with the devil term "essentialism." "Essence" within the context of the anatomical metaphor is used in a civilizational sense. It is the "story" about being African. Achebe (1987), through one of his characters in his novel *Anthills of the Savannah*, shows how "essence" has to be understood. In a speech delivered by an "elder" from his fictional country, Abazon, the elder tells the audience "To some of us the Owner of the World has apportioned the gift to tell their fellows that the time to get up has finally come. To others He gives the eagerness to rise when they hear the call; to rise with racing blood and put on their garbs of war and go to the boundary of their town to engage the invading enemy boldly in battle. And then there are those others whose part is to wait and when the struggle is ended, to take over and recount the story" (p.113). Having articulated the differentiated roles of people in society, the speaker goes on to place at the fulcrum the pivotal role of the story.

He continues, "The sounding of the battle-drum is important; the fierce waging of the war itself is important; and the telling of the story afterwards—each is important in its own way. I tell you there is not one of them we could do without. *But if you ask me which of them takes the eagle-feather I will say boldly: the story (*italics mine)" (p.113).

So what is it about the "story" that gives it such a central and powerful locus? The Elder provides an answer: "It is the story that outlives the sound of war drums and the exploits of brave fighters. It is the story, not the others, that saves our progeny from blundering like blind beggars into the spikes of the cactus fence. The story is our escort; without it, we are blind. Does the blind man own his escort? No, neither do we the story; rather it is the story that owns us and directs us. It is the thing that makes us different from cattle; it is the mark on the face that sets one people apart from their neighbors. [The] story is everlasting . . . Like the fire, when it is not blazing it is smouldering under its own ashes or sleeping and resting inside its flint house" (p.114). It is indeed the story of *Maat,* found in Ptah-Hotep's

Instruction, that needs to be told and its morals inculcated in Africans at all levels of society. It is an understanding and appreciation of the "story" of *Maat* that would consequently contribute towards the restoration of character and integrity. Through Ptah-Hotep, we do not only get a glimpse of what constituted in significant ways the moral/ethical dimension of African civilization, but also instructions on good governance.

It is the lack of an awareness of the African essence in its "smoldering form or dormancy" by Africans in the leadership structure that leads them to blunder "like beggars" when they deal with the "international community." Beggary is one of the most visible actions undertaken by the African leadership structure partly because of their loss of "essence." Anatomically, beggary is a critical element among others, of the neocolonial component in postcolonial contexts, when one takes a critical look at the relationship between former African colonies and their European colonizers, revealing a shameless cadre, reliant on handouts from their former colonizers.

Ghandi as early as 1909 during the colonial era in India provides an insightful explanation that sheds light on the civilizational dimension of "essence." He writes: "I believe that the civilization India has evolved is not to be beaten in the world. Nothing can equal the seeds sown by our ancestors . . . Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty. Performance of duty and observance of morality are convertible terms." With a very poignant and confident stance, he asserts: "If this definition be correct, then India, as so many writers have shown, has nothing to learn from anybody else, and that is as it should be" (p.113, Sigmund, 1972). When one compares Ghandi's pronouncement with Nyerere's lamentations cited above, the issue of "essence" anatomically considered becomes germane to any discussion of this nature. Ghandi in 1909 raised issues, expressed concerns and rejected what he perceived to be an unnecessary introduction of western modes of life in India, including technological innovations from the West. Even though he adopted a strong stance in his opposition to modern modes of transportation, for instance, he recognized as well that the civilization he reveres is not perfect. He acknowledged certain ills in society. My referencing Ghandi does not necessarily mean that I support, for instance, his rejection of "modern" means of transportation. I refer to his stance on civilization as a means of understanding its *defining* nature, and how all-encompassing it could be viewed notwithstanding the existence of certain ills in such civilizations. The key point, to my mind, is that there are core principles and values that represent distinctive markers of a given civilization, among which is its moral/ethical dimension. There may exist problematic aspects of the moral dimension, issues of which I addressed elsewhere (2004). A value, for example, such as respect for elders, which is expected of all in African societies, could be abused by those in leadership positions. As we have seen when I discussed in depth the concept of *Maat*, ancient Africans did provide answers as to how to deal with such abuses.

The anatomy of the postcolonial, however, is not just one that presents its parts in political and administrative settings—governance contexts. One could also see clearly its near diabolical part—its religion—that part of it which still dominates belief systems particularly in African countries. Christianity, its religion, is deeply entrenched in several African countries and has denigrated and replaced indigenous religions and belief systems, and in the process, negatively affected whatever is left of her civilization. Africans and their indigenous religious beliefs and practices were demonized (and even today some Africans, mainly Christians, continue to denigrate and demonize their indigenous belief systems with labels such as "heathenism" and "paganism").

If such an anatomy is to be accepted as evident, then could one really discuss the "post" in postcolonial contexts? Isn't that part of its anatomy—its religion—still evident and even deeply implanted in the form of the massive proliferation of charismatic churches in Africa? When one takes a look at the other parts—the political/ideological in particular—is it not evident that the African leadership structure is deeply enmeshed in an ideological quagmire that manifests the brutal pressures seen and experienced in the democratization agenda of the West? These are among some of the issues that are problematic when one adopts the postcolonial paradigm without modification as a theoretical base.

Moving on to the next question, "Where is the post-colonial?" there is a linkage with the question of the "when" in the sense that European colonial powers extended their hegemony to Africa, Asia, the Levant, Latin America and parts of the South Pacific. In addition to colonial rule, there are areas in the world, notably Australia, New Zealand, North America, that had European settler communities that forcibly or through dubious treaties occupied lands far removed from Europe.

Childs et al. capture the complexity of the issue of the where thus: "If the colonialist moment brought about particular spatial and geographical configurations—for instance, the core and/versus periphery, within the same imperial economy, or empire versus empire as competing power blocs, as bitter rivals warring for control of the same territory (as in eighteenth century India), or collaborating colleagues calmly sharing out a continent (as with Africa in the nineteenth century)—the postcolonial period is even more complex, with connections with the colonial era remaining(for example, in the shape of the British Commonwealth, or the network sustained by the French system of 'Cooperation'), and new relations being constituted" (p.12). From the above, not only is there an organic linkage with the question of the "when" in terms of the dominant European actors in the colonial power scheme, one could also see the relevance of the idea of the anatomy of the postcolonial. Furthermore, I see the explanation provided by Childs et.al as providing a basis for the argument I advance on the issue of restoring Africa's characterological dimension grounded in *Maatian principles,* well articulated in Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction*. Maintaining the ties with the

former colonial powers through the various "cooperation" modalities—the Commonwealth (Britain) or *Francophonie* (France)—is a manifestation of privileging western values, and even continued control of presumably "independent" African states, as well as other commonwealth or Francophone nations that were dependencies of Britain and France respectively.

On the question of "who is the postcolonial?", it stands to reason that the colonized in various parts of the world that came under colonial rule represents such a population. But Childs et al. raise an issue that is hard to refute. They argue, "The unevenness and incompleteness of the process of decolonization is one factor in that: if territories cannot be considered postcolonial (in the sense of being free from colonial control), can their inhabitants?" (p.12) This question brings to mind vivid memories of my youth, when Sierra Leone was negotiating for its independence from Britain.

The Settles Descendants Union (descendants of freed slaves, who were repatriated to Sierra Leone from Britain and Canada (Nova Scotia) mounted a litigation against independence, based on the constitutional instruments that were to formalize the transition from a dependency to an independent entity (Wyse, 1989). Among the reasons for the litigation was the status of the Krios—the Settlers—many of whom considered themselves Black English (Spitzer 1974), and who were granted a special status as residents of the "colony" (Freetown, the capital). The other ethnic groups, consisting of about ninety-eight percent of the population of Sierra Leone though under the jurisdiction of the British, were inhabitants technically of the "Protectorate." To compound the problem of division as in "Colony" and "Protectorate," non-Krios were considered "aliens" in the "Colony" even when residing in Freetown.

This was a case where in one country called Sierra Leone, before independence, there were two separate entities under one colonial jurisdiction, but separated by classification. The descendants of slaves, and recaptives or "Liberated Africans" (those captured along the west coast of Africa and en route to be enslaved in the Americas, but freed on the high seas by the British as a result of the banning of the slave trade by Britain, and repatriated to Freetown). Residents of Bonthe Island, off the coast of the mainland, were also considered part of the "colony." The indigenous population that resided in the Protectorate—outside of the confines of the capital and Bonthe Island—comprised the other entity colonized by Britain but residing in the "Protectorate." I provide the Sierra Leone example to elucidate further on the complexities of the "who," since "decolonization" was not and is still not just a physical phenomenon. One still wonders about the extent to which claims could be made of having decolonized minds not just in Sierra Leone, but in Africa as a whole, when one examines closely the development problematic of the continent. The "who" is indeed a valid question from an analytical perspective informed by postcolonial theory. Furthermore, an argument that advances a proposition to restore the characterological dimension in Africa based on *Maatian principles* becomes

even more germane when given the problems of "definition" exemplified in the Sierra Leone example given above. In some quarters in decolonized Sierra Leone, there are those who still maintain a mental predisposition of the Krio/indigene mentality and its concomitant prejudices, a firm remnant of British colonialism. Now to the last question raised by Childs et al.— "What is the postcolonial?"

The manner in which the authors address this question demonstrates, perhaps, the more banal aspects of the theory. They discuss the "what" question from the standpoint of criticisms levied against the term "postcolonial." For example, they cite Spivak who finds the word postcolonialism "totally bogus," and prefers the term "postcoloniality" because the latter represents "neo-colonialism" which for Spivak is "not simply the continuation of colonialism" (p.15). It is interesting to note that Childs et al. venture an explanation for the distinction between the two terms that they assert Spivak does not provide. They state: " . . . we can perhaps assume that her [Spivak] objection is to the implication of an achieved state beyond colonialism," which I read as a state free from the shackles of colonialism (p.15). Critics such as Ahmadchides those who proffer postcolonialism as suffering from "historical amnesia, a forgetting or ignoring of the fact that the term had emerged in political theory, in debates about the composition of states after decolonization" (p.16) Along the same lines of "amnesia," but with a twist, Childes et al. cite Dirlik for whom "postcolonial, in other words, is applicable not to all of the post-*colonial* period, but only to that period after colonialism when, among other things, a forgetting of its effects has begun to set in." They continue, "In this perspective, postcolonialism appears almost as a pathology, a diseased sign of the times" (p.16). Childs et al. describes Dirlik's perspective as "disturbing." I concur wholeheartedly.

Another perspective on the "what" of the postcolonial is found in Shome (1996), who presents "three broad perspectives of postcolonialism and the theoretical and critical issues they raise for the critical scholar: discursive imperialism, hybrid and diasporic cultural identities, and postcolonial academic self-reflexivity" (p.42). I discuss below the first and third perspectives, followed by the second, because it is the second perspective that gives me a lot of discomfort, and the reason I mentioned earlier the need for some "modification" (at least on my part) in my use of the theory.

Shome's "perspectives" explain postcolonial theory as it relates to rhetoric as a discipline, with an emphasis on rhetorical analysis. On his first perspective he explains: "Postcolonialism primarily challenges the colonizing and imperialistic tendencies manifest in discursive practices of 'first world' countries in their constructions and representations of the subjects of 'third world' countries and/or racially oppressed people of the world" (p.42). This perspective is grounded in Said's works, mainly *Orientalism* (1978), in which he discusses in detail the problems with western representations of "others"—as in non-western people.

There is a lot of merit in this perspective and is very much in line with what I discuss earlier in this work, on the rhetorical construction of Africa and Africans by the West. Indeed, the negative representation fashioned by the West is indeed challenged in works that are grounded in postcolonial theory (Said 1978; Bhabha 1994; Achebe; 1987, and others cited thus far in this work). However, such challenges are not unique to the twentieth century post-independent Africa. In fact Senghor and Cesaire retorted brilliantly during the colonial era. Furthermore, articulate Africans in Diaspora and the continent (Blyden 1887; Douglas 1854) had challenged several aspects of the rhetorical construction manifested in negative representations of Africans by the West, of which I discuss later. I find this "perspective" by Shome useful and relevant, with the reservation expressed above.

On his third perspective, "postcolonial academic self-reflexivity," he explains: "This means that in examining our academic discourses, the postcolonial question to ask is: To what extent do our scholarly practices—whether they be the kind of issues we explore in our research, the themes around which we organize our teaching syllabi, or the way we structure our conferences and decide who speaks (and does not speak), about what, in the name of intellectual practices—legitimize the hegemony of Western power structures?" (p.45). This perspective definitely characterizes writings in some disciplines, for example, literature and history, by Africans, Asians, and others whose works fall within the postcolonial paradigmatic framework. This perspective is relevant particularly for the enrichment of rhetorical theory and analysis within the context of comparative rhetoric. The perspective gives an added degree of justification for the study and inclusion of Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* in courses that deal with the history of rhetorical theory, comparative rhetoric, as well as rhetoric and governance.

On the second "perspective" he refers to as "hybrid and diasporic cultural identities," he states: "Postcolonialism is about borderlands and hybridity. It is about cultural indeterminacy and spaces in between.. Resisting attempts at any totalizing forms of cultural understanding (whether imperialistic or nationalistic), the postcolonial perspective argues for a recognition of the "hybrid location of cultural value[s]" (p.44). He grounds this perspective in the works of Bhabha (1992) and Anzaldúa (1987). He concludes his discussion on the perspective thus: "The postcolonial individual is thus cultureless (as we normally perceive culture) and yet cultured because she or he exists in a culture of borderlands (Anzaldúa, 1987). It is this that bestows on the postcolonial subject's position an (sic) unique ambivalence. I emphasize this ambivalence not to delineate it as a weakness; rather, this ambivalence is what makes the postcolonial perspective so significant in deconstructing grand cultural master narratives." He continues, "Being a part of two or more cultures, and yet not belonging to either one, the postcolonial subject is equipped to see that national and cultural identities cannot be essentialized, that they are protean, that they cross bor-

ders, and that they are transnational" (p.45). I find this perspective naïve and shallow, particularly on the issue of "borderlands."

I pose a series of rhetorical questions on the "perspective," above. Should one read Shome's "ambivalence" as being in a state of anomie or Pyrrhonic *ataraxia*? Could this perspective be regarded as selfish elitism since it tends to privilege, I presume, elite "Diasporans" at the "borderlands" who do not "belong" to cultures on either side of the "border as a result of their disloca- tion from their ancestral homeland probably by choice?" Are we to assume that only the "Diasporans" qualify as being "postcolonials?" What about the huge numbers of "untouchables" and lower caste members in India and the disfavored in Africa and the rest of the former colonial territories (now presumably decolonized)? If "ambivalence" is such a revered and preferred stage, why the "third perspective" (postcolonial self-reflexivity), risking a resultant disequilibrium? Is the postcolonial paradigm solely for those who have managed to migrate and thus find themselves at the "borderlands" with its presumed virtue of "ambivalence?"

The questions above, though rhetorical, point out some of the difficulties in the use of emerging paradigms. Curious about the characterization of the postcolonial individual described by Shomes, referencing and/or predicating his characterization on the work of Anzaldúa, it is instructive to have a first- hand exposure to Anzaldúa's (2007) approach to culture. Under a subheading, "Cultural Tyranny," in her work, she writes thus about culture: "Culture forms our beliefs. We perceive the version of reality that it communicates. Dominant paradigms, predefined concepts that exist as unquestionable, unchallenge- able, are transmitted to us through culture" (p.38). Readily evident in such a definition is a linear and non-changing view of culture, which is definitely not the way, as Shome claims, "we normally perceive culture" (p.45). (See my dis- cussion on culture in chapter 9). Anzaldúa goes on to state: "Culture is made by those in power—men. Males make the rules and laws; women transmit them" (p.38). Anzaldúa's work is engaging as she articulates the problems and challenges she faced as a Chicana activist and lesbian. She finds herself on the borderlands, where inhabitants become *cultural Mestizas*.

In Chapter 7 of her work, under the subheading, "A Tolerance for Ambi- guity," she writes: "These numerous possibilities leave *la mestiza* floundering in uncharted seas. In perceiving conflicting information and points of view, she is subjected to a swamping of her psychological borders. She has discov- ered that she can't hold concepts or ideas in rigid boundaries . . . Rigidity means death. Only by remaining flexible is she able to stretch the psyche horizontally and vertically" (p.101). One can clearly discern her influence in Shome's second perspective—hybrid and diasporic cultural identities. But could one conclude, based on Anzaldúa's postulation above, that celebrating what she refers to as "developing a tolerance for contradictions, a tolerance for ambiguity," as "cultureless" as claimed by Shome? What is discernible thus far from Anzaldúa's postulations, however, is the need to be culturally "flexible" rather than being "cultureless".

If one were to adopt Shome's stance on Anzaldúa, it would render moot the proposition for Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* to have relevance for governance issues in Africa since *Maat* would be considered "essentialist" as well as a "grand cultural master" narrative. On the issue of the "grand cultural narrative," those who would argue against the proposition that calls for the restoration of *Maat,* upon which Ptah-Hotep's moral theory on rhetoric is based, fail to recognize or simply decide not to accept the fact that the western democratization blitzkrieg is the most dangerous, damaging and imposing grand narrative because it comes with the threat, and in some instances use, of force to achieve its goals.

In addition to Anzaldúa's work, Shome, as mentioned earlier, also grounds his second perspective in the work of Bhabha (1998). The celebration of hybridity carefully articulated by Bhabha is indeed fascinating, but not a strand that, for my purposes, would serve a useful analytical function. My work highlights, among other issues, the representation and discussion on "race" by colonialists and how some colonial scholars used it in their rhetorical construction of Africans. Bhabha's work presents what he claims to be "theoretically innovative and politically crucial" (p.1).

His approach creates what he describes as the "need to think beyond narratives of originary and initial subjectivities and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences" (p.1). I need not restate my contention earlier regarding the democratization blitzkrieg to dismiss the appeal above. I understand those "moments" and "processes" to result in the hybridity that he proffers, and presumably prefers. This hybridity places people "in between spaces." It is hard not to admire this prose: "For the demography of the new internationalism is the history of postcolonial migration, the narratives of cultural and political diaspora, the major social displacements of peasant and aboriginal communities, the poetics of exile, the grim prose of political and economic refugees" (p.5). Indeed, but how much of this "internationalism" really touches the wretched in India and Africa and the rest of the postcolonial world? There are clear-cut disparities. Diasporas reaching across borders into the territories of the colonial powers enjoy to an extent economic privileges that the wretched in the postcolonial world, displaced by wars, subjected to abject poverty and migrating into horrid refugee camps across borders (indeed!) do not enjoy. Many in Africa's leadership structure suffer from the delusions of desirable societies defined in the democratization blitzkrieg, with taunting bribes and other forms of corrupting influences as sales pitches for "democracy," where force is not employed, either through external aggression or internal internecine civil conflicts spawned and sourced by the West.

These disparities in terms of quality of life factors make hybridity, based on the framework provided by Bhabha and Anzaldúa, a bit difficult to use as an analytical tool in seeking to theorize on means of ameliorating the condition of a continent that is unnecessarily wretched because it places

itself "in between spaces"—neither in Europe nor in Africa, in terms of her essence and ethos. The foundation of Africa's contribution to rhetorical theory is based on its moral/ethical elements. It is the restoration of this moral/ethical fabric, I argue, that would set Africa on track towards its amelioration even in partnership with others who respect their moral principles based on *Maat*. Bhabha and Anzaldúa's "who" in the postcolonial thus become a hindrance in invoking Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric to become an essential component of African amelioration as the continent wrestles with its development quagmire.

From the preceding, the questions on the "when" and the "who" in postcolonial theory present analytical challenges, particularly that of the "who," based on Shome's formulation. It obfuscates the "postcolonial theory" as far as Africa is concerned, to my mind, and restricts its power to explain at the level of resistance and reactions to representations, culminating with a resounding crescendo celebrating universalism (or really, 'democracy'?) and abhorring nativism.

There are indeed postcolonial African writers whose work fit well into the hybridity construct. For example, Ngugi Wa Thiongo, (a leading African postcolonial literary giant), asserts: "Moving the centre in the two senses—between nations and within nations—will contribute to freeing of world cultures from the restrictive walls of nationalism, class, race and gender. In this sense, I am an unrepentant Universalist. For I believe that while retaining its roots in regional and national individuality, true humanism with its universal reaching out can flower among the peoples of the earth" (Moving the Centre, p.xvii in Childs, p.51). Thiongo has a contradiction in his assertion above. He claims a "freeing of the world cultures from nationalism" etc., yet calls for "retention" of "roots" in "regional and national individuality . . . " Maybe I see a contradiction that he may not agree exists. But the idea of retaining one's roots comes close to the idea of re-rooting Africans in *Maat* in order to rediscover their character and integrity. The process and outcome of re-rooting Africans in *Maat* do not connote an abdication from the world community. On the contrary, it inculcates pride and confidence in self and history, enabling Africans to interact with the world community not as perpetual beggars, but as respectable people. This leads to a question that should be answered by those who proffer the form of universalism expressed by Ngugi Wa Thiongo: What universalism or "true humanism" and for whom?

Universalism is indeed a noble goal, but there was the transatlantic and Indian Ocean slave trade and system of bondage, evangelization, colonialism, brutal oppression, racism, and dehumanization not just in the form of European representations of the African, but more importantly in the present global context and where Africa finds itself within the global environment. Many of the elements referred to above remain ever present when looking literally at practical realities and interactions between Africa as a continent and the rest of the world.

Is "true humanism" really an instrument during the "postcolonial" in terms of its "universal reaching" against the backdrop of an objective reality that depicts the massive chasm between Africa and the West? Some may disagree. But the chasm has deep roots in the era of slavery that created a major dislocation of Africans; evangelization continues to perform disruptive functions in many African countries as evident in the dubious and even criminal activities of some charismatic churches and their partners in the West.

Universalism and "true humanism," one would expect, should be predicated on the basis of mutual respect for all that is different in human communities in terms of their belief systems, mores and worldviews. Arguably, Africa, over the past twenty years, has been the only continent that has been placed under close scrutiny by the international system because of the apparent intractability of its development problems and the failures of various interventions designed mainly by the West, in collaboration with the African leadership structure, to improve upon the quality of life of the inhabitants of the continent (addressed in more detail in chapter 9 of this work). Until Africa establishes its ethos, grounded in its core principles, it would not be in a position to attain the level of respect that should let the continent participate in a form of universalism that celebrates human cultural diversity, centering on *respect* for common values shared by various cultures in the world.

Postcolonial studies represent an important development paradigmatically in addressing the African development problematic. Taken together with *Maat,* the moral/ethical theory on rhetoric, upon which *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep* is predicated, a case is advanced in this work not just for the inclusion of Ptah-Hotep's contribution to the annals of rhetoric as a discipline, but as a method through which one could discuss and analyze the African development problematic. The paradigm is still emerging, and more disciplines may engage it as I do, with regard to rhetoric and African development studies. The best that has been done in terms of the evolution and utilization of this theory, to my mind, is the convenience it provides through its various constructs for an analysis and a way of explaining the tyranny of the colonial era as discussed earlier by Childs, and the opportunity for the non-West to demonstrate its own exegesis of the "colonial" as it fashions its own representation(s).

In that vein, African literature has a head start as far as postcolonial studies and the humanities are concerned. Through the many novels by African writers who have engaged the colonial problematic and the struggles against western domination during and after independence, there is a clear pattern of a genre in African literature. Communication, notably rhetoric, as a field/discipline, is yet to develop a corpus of works that would elevate it to the status enjoyed by African literature within the context of studies in African national development. Leading writers such as Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, Buchi Emecheta and others

have all, through their writings, contributed towards a significant corpus of works that fall within the realm of postcolonial studies/theory.

Ngugi stands out and comes closest to any notion of "restoration" as would be addressed later in this work, notwithstanding his claim of being a Universalist. His stance on writing in his indigenous language, Gikuyu, rather than English may seem to negate his Universalist claim. Such a stance—use of indigenous languages for writing literature—valorizes what some may call nativism.

Finally, on the subject of hybridity, Diasporan Africans dating back to the 1800s articulately argued for recognition of the significance of Africa's history and the contribution of the continent towards human civilization, while calling as well for the adoption of aspects of western culture and religious tradition, especially Christianity. Some notable Africans in Diaspora during the eighteen hundreds, long before any notion of "postcolonial theory," such as Edward Wilmot Blyden, Martin R. Delany, Archbishop McNeal Turner, Africanus Horton, forcefully engaged and debunked the rationale for the claims by the West of inherent white superiority. They embraced and celebrated their African ancestry and called for hybridity—adoption of Western values and religious beliefs that they knew and understood. They were not born and raised in Africa, but studied Africa's history and contributions to human civilization. Edward Wilmot Blyden, a firm believer in the repatriation of freed Africans in America to Africa, was in favor of the European plan for the colonial rule in Africa during the Berlin Conference of 1888. In 1905, he wrote a book, *African Life and Customs,* cataloguing aspects of African traditions such as polygamy and making a case in favor of the practice, one that is antithetical to fundamental western norms on marriage.

Black Atlanticists, such as C.L.R. James and Paul Gilroy, in the nineteen hundreds had no qualms with a variant form of hybridity—the resultant Diaspora community that encapsulates the transatlantic experiences markedly different from Africans who were not removed from the continent during the slavocracy epoch. They advance an interesting argument that promotes an undisputable nexus: the linkage binding Africa, the slave trading and/or holding European countries, the United States and the Caribbean and the resultant African Diaspora communities.

Outside of Diaspora during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, among descendants of slaves—the Krios residing in Freetown, in a former colonial territory, Sierra Leone, were Africans, but the "elite" among them manifested a near total rejection of anything culturally African. Even though they lived on African soil, indigenous Sierra Leoneans were considered barbaric and uncivilized and they saw themselves as having the responsibility to "civilize" non-Krios through Christianization and the proselytization of European (British in this instance) values.

But there are also, among the Krios, those who may fall into the category of hybrids, but with a different resultant status. Syl Cheney-Coker, a well-

respected poet from Sierra Leone, exemplifies the status of such "hybrids."
A poem titled "Freetown," in his *Concerto for an Exile: Poems,* reveals the
malaise of hybridity.
He writes:

> My creation haunts me behind the mythical dream
> My river dammed by the poisonous weeds in its bed
> And I think of my brothers with 'black skin and white masks'(I
> myself am one *heh heh heh)*
> my sisters who plaster their skins with white cosmetics
> to look whiter than the snows of Europe
> but listen to the sufferings of our hearts
>
> there are those who when they come to plead
> say make us Black Englismen decorated Anglo-Saxons
> Creole masters leading native races
> But we African wandering urchins
> Who will return one day
> Say oh listen Africa
> The tomtoms of the revolution
> Beat in our hearts at night (p.12)

If one associates the above with a marauding "exile," confused by cre-
olization—a hybridity in itself—imagine the tortured "hybrid" who finds
himself as a hybrid in his native land. Again Cheney-Coker:

> I am the beginning the running image
> And the foul progeny of my race
> These strange Afro-Saxons negroes
> And for deceiving the world
> About our absurdity
> Behold my negralised head in flames!
>   "Absurdity" (p.13)

Finally:

> I think of Sierra Leone
> And my madness torments me
> All my strange traditions
> The plantation blood in my veins
> My foul genealogy!
> I laugh at this Creole ancestry
> Which gave me my negralised head
> All my polluted streams
> Not one river shedding its pain

To cleanse me behind this bush of thorns
Then seeing me clean scars off my cheeks
Or this lewd head hydropathy and soiled
Not screaming in delirium about my rape
                        "Hydropathy" (p.3)

Syl Cheney-Coker compounds the hybridity construct with his introduction of "rape," an act that also resulted in hybridity at a major scale in slaveholding countries in the Americas, and in colonized territories under European rule and/or occupation.

In conclusion, postcolonial studies provide a means of explaining in part the nature of discourses that interrogate the various elements that constitute the corpus of works following the decolonization process across several disciplines, including rhetoric upon which the present work is grounded. I state "in part" because postcolonial colonial theory does not fully explain or have within its ambit the analytical tools to deal with the works of erudite nineteenth century writers such as Edward Wilmot Blyden (whose work extended into the twentieth century), or anti-slavery writers and activists such as Frederick Douglas, Alexander Crumell or Archbishop McNeal Turner, all of whom through the writings and speeches at one time or another sought to vindicate the African past portrayed in representations of Africa and Africans by contemporaneous European and American writers.

Among the constructs that are the constituent elements of the theory, hybridity presents for me the most intriguing aspect. It is blurry at best and does not capture or explain the depth and complexity of the idea of the "borderlands," for example, for all who find themselves in such contexts. I refer to refugees in Africa, the Middle East and Asia who are literally and culturally at the "borders" of neighboring states as well as states that are not contiguous with their respective nations. They are not in the type of borderlands that Anzaldúa, Bhabha and others write about.

The preceding discussion and critique of the postcolonial paradigm demonstrates the tremors that are normal in a process of constructing a paradigm (Kuhn 1962) as complex and difficult as postcolonial studies/theory with questions raised about a construct such as hybridity that does not provide adequate basis for analysis, yet useful to a degree in some contexts. It is precisely this utility that I find in postcolonial studies and discourses that provide a paradigmatic rationale for this work, in addition to the rich tradition on the evolution of rhetorical theory, as a disciplinary base. As mentioned earlier, postcolonial theory provides the linkage between the seminal contributions found in the African origins of rhetoric—*Maatian principles*—and the present day development imperatives faced by the continent.

A major proposition advanced in this work is for Africans to rediscover, restore, adopt, adapt and use Maatian principles as the ethical basis for the development of the continent, and as a point of departure in their deliberations with others interested in working with them. *Maatian prin-*

ciples center ethics and discourse over non-discursive means of dealing with issues. Heavy pressure by the West on Africa to adopt Western values and ideology could be mitigated non-violently by a morally armed African leadership structure with a restored characterological dimension grounded in *Maatian principles*. It would, therefore, be superfluous and patently wrong to characterize the proposition as "essentialist," given the recognition of the need to make adaptations against the backdrop of the exigencies to be resolved within the overall framework of the African development problematic.

9 Epilogue

In the introduction of this work, I explained that I was motivated to engage in this work because I believed that there is a need to "revisit the mission of rhetorical scholarship." The need to do so is predicated on the existing world context that manifests tensions and even wars over issues ranging from preferred forms of governance (the democratization agenda of the West), and resistance against perceived assaults on the normative systems and structures of non-western societies (Al Qaeda and its adherents). Both camps ground their campaigns on the "supremacy" of their core values and visions of desirable society.

Against the background above, Africa is being courted mainly by the West, to adopt its democratization agenda after hundreds of years of oppression and denigration ironically by the West. The resultant society in Africa is one that is replete with chaos and indirection. It is because of the nature of such a resultant society that I asserted in the introduction that the mission of rhetoric has to be revisited and expanded so as to include among its goals, the "[interrogation] of those societies that have been marginalized by deliberate acts of oppression in various forms, with the prospect for ameliorating their condition through an understanding of the roots and practices in their rhetorical traditions."

In this concluding section of the work, I discuss the rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep as an aspect of the "interrogation" referred to above with the aim in view of contributing towards the search for strategies required for the amelioration of the condition of the continent and its people. The restoration of the characterological dimension, hence *Maat*, within the African leadership structure is the key to any process of amelioration. The search, in this instance, therefore, is for an ethical rhetorical theory that would facilitate the identification and use of rhetorical strategies as the African continent embarks upon the task of ameliorating a fractured normative system upon which a workable system of governance could be fashioned. All systems of governance are ideologically driven, and grounded in the normative system of the society in which the ideology functions.

The interrogation commences with a discussion on the restorative role and function of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric. I then discuss a core principle directly

related to issues of governance—hierarchy and leadership within African "monarchical" contexts. This is followed by an examination of historical examples of initiatives undertaken by Africans to ameliorate the condition of the continent and her people. An adumbration of a more recent example of such initiatives is presented, using the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). The work concludes with a review and discussion on a construct—the armed vision construct—as a means of salvaging the chaotic situation that exists within the extant African normative system within the wider framework of the restorative potential of Ptah-Hotep's ethical rhetorical theory, as far as the characterological dimension is concerned.

The rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep is instructive not only in terms of its seminal locus in the origins of rhetorical theory but also with regard to its potential *restorative* role and function in the overall context of the governance problematic in post-colonial African societies. The characterological dimension is central within the overall context of governance. It is grounded in the ethical traditions of any given society. The principles that guide its formation may be disrupted by external intrusions in various forms but not necessarily obliterated. It is the characterological dimension in Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric grounded in *Maat* that is the primary object of restoration.

As the continent struggles with fashioning visions of a desirable society after hundreds of years of bondage and suffering, with a tremendously devastating impact on the characterological dimension, African leaders in particular in their search for "development assistance" tend to surrender themselves to the mercy of what has been variously referred to as the "international community," a community that represents and proselytizes increasingly the ethos of the dominant West. The resultant behavior of the African leadership structure under the influence of the dominant ethos has so far resulted in divisiveness (e.g. intensification of ethnic and regional rivalries); massive poverty, corruption and civil strife in some countries. In short, there has been a crisis in the characterological dimension in African societies and a dislocation of their indigenous warrants (Blake, 1994; 2004a; 2004b), presenting a "rhetorical situation" in Bitzer's sense (1968), with exigencies that call for an urgent resolution.

Presently, the dominant ethos that guides rhetorical utterances in the articulation of a desirable society is strongly influenced by western pressures on African countries to adopt "democracy" as the sole means of resolving extant exigencies through the fashioning of its governance structure as if the continent lacked any semblance of its own ethos. The restorative aspects discussed here suggests the need for Africans to manifest a strong character by bringing into full view, the essential aspects of *Maatian principles* and their foundation *Maat*, as *African inputs* in the deliberative processes among themselves and with others, as they fashion models of African governance.

The above is not far-fetched because *Maatian principles* continue to be pervasive in several parts of the African continent, exemplified in novels

such as Seydou's Badian's *Caught in the Storm (1998, Translator Marie-Therese Noiset),* laden with proverbial expressions that are deeply grounded in *Maatian principles*. The story is set in pre-independent Mali, within socio-cultural contexts that still constitute a significant area of the African land mass. A major character in the novel, Old Djigui, captures the disruptive impact of European (French) colonialism during a conversation with his young niece and nephew Kany and Birama, urban dwellers visiting their ancestral village. Old Djigui explains, "The white chief comes to the village with his guards. He wants us to salute him, with our hand to our head. We are old, it makes us tired, doesn't he know it? In the next village, he put a chief who is not from here; nobody wants him except the white people. Our people are afraid, they tremble. Doesn't the white man know that when you tremble in front of a chief, you secretly hope to see him tremble too?" (p.63). What is instructive in that explanation is not just the cultural disruption that Old Djigui articulates, but also the pervasive presence of **Maat** in African societies.

The chief/ruler is expected to be responsive and accountable in terms of the feelings of the governed, as explained earlier by Obenga. The chief is a "natural" extension of his/her subjects and should "tremble" when his/her subjects "tremble." The subjects expect that of their chief, and he/she risks serious consequences, because as Djigui explains further, "A chief who makes his people tremble is like a stone which bars a trail. The travelers avoid it, they walk around it, but one day they realize the way would be shorter if the stone was not there. Then they come, many of then together, and they move it. Force does not make a chief but an enemy to destroy" (pp.63–64).

There are significant implications for the explanation of the consequences mentioned above by Old Djigui. First of all the restorative function *Maatian principles* could perform in terms of contemporary African governance problems is evident. Recognition of the role and responsibilities of those in governing positions to the governed are evident: good character, justice, fairness and the need to sustain harmony. There is no room for repression or oppression. The rhetorical imperative is for those in governing positions to let the governed understand and appreciate the commitment of the leadership to Maat and *its principles* or else the given ruler risks being removed. Secondly, the "despotic" characterization of African societies governed by commitment to **Maat** as far back as ancient Egypt/Kemet by Europeans is not only unfounded but refuted. Thirdly, the position of "chief" or "ruler" is hereditary in traditional African society, yet the "white man" removed a chief without due respect for tradition, a major consequence of colonialism.

The issue of the hereditary nature of traditional African systems of governance and the disruptions visited upon it during the colonial era continue to have an impact on the crisis of governance in post-colonial Africa. The disruptions, as should be expected, created *dislocations* of and *abdications* from *Maatian principles* that emphasized and centered good character

and responsibility of leaders to their citizens. The interference of colonial powers with the "monarchical" structure with arbitrary appointments and removal of "chiefs" also had a corrupting influence on incumbents, resulting in abuses of power and authority. Mazrui identifies, among other elements, one that he describes—"sacralization of authority," as a means of explaining the "monarchical tendency in African political culture. He states: "This [sacralization] is sometimes linked to the process of personalizing authority, but it need not be. The glorification of a leader could be on non-religious terms. On the other hand, what is being sacralized need not be a person but could be an office or institution" (p.18).

Mazrui's observation is consistent with the political ethos of Ptah-Hotep's era, and interestingly continues to be the case in some African states. I have referred elsewhere to such a tendency as "Paism and Piety" (Blake 2004). Mazrui continues: "A traditional chief was not always an instance of personalized power . . . In fact, as often as not it was the *institution* [read as well Pharaonic in *Maatian* terms] rather than the personality of an incumbent that commanded the authority. But although the personalization of power in traditional Africa was thus by no means universal, the sacralization of authority virtually was. There was always a spiritual basis to legitimate rule in traditional Africa" (p.19). From the above, when juxtaposed against the background of *Maat,* one could argue that Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric based on *Maatian principles* and grounded in *Maat* clearly exemplifies the approach to governance in traditional African societies, significant elements of which still obtain.

It is entirely justifiable, therefore, to characterize what obtains in the African world as "rhetorical" in the sense that whatever strategies are developed to combat the overall malaise pervasive in the development environment of the continent, would manifest rhetorical strategies that would facilitate a significant degree of change: a movement away from a bruised and damaged past, to a restoration of African ethos as leaders discuss among themselves and others issues on societal governance and human relations. I argue, therefore, that the task, among others, is rhetorical, and for Africans to adopt rhetorical theories based on *Maatian principles* as the first step towards the restorative process. Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric provides a basis for Africans to rediscover and restore characterological aspects of their past that are applicable in the present.

An important concession on my part, however, needs to be made with regard to the issue of restoring the governance structure addressed by Mazrui—that of the chieftaincy. It is definitely feasible at the level of local governance, but infeasible at the state, regional or continental levels. What is being argued here, therefore, is a restoration of the "principle"—good character, hence the characterological dimension, as it pertains to those in governance positions at the state, regional and continental levels.

The position above is advocated with the assumption that governance in Africa, influenced primarily but not necessarily exclusively by ethics embedded in *Maat*, could form the basis for an African renaissance in terms of

"good" governance. *Maat* provides the unifying theme around which core African principles and values are centered and celebrated. It thus functions as Confucianism does, within the overall Asian (Oriental) ethos. The argument is advanced with the recognition that there may be misunderstandings particularly with regard to the principle of the centrality of authority/hierarchy in *Maat*. Such misunderstandings should be clarified at this juncture: respect for hierarchy/authority does not preclude the recognition of the fundamental rights of citizens to express themselves freely (Ptah-Hotep clearly advocates such a fundamental right in his rhetoric). Besides the obvious room provided for free expression in the rhetoric of Ptah-Hotep, *Maat*, if viewed as the unifying ethos, need not be an obstacle for bilateral and multilateral partnerships with other nations. Asian countries with Confucianism as the unifying ethos effectively establish bilateral and multilateral relationships without relinquishing their Confucian ethical roots, notwithstanding the accommodation of some values of their non-Confucian partners.

The challenge is for Africans to demonstrate strong character influenced by *Maat* as they interact with others, notwithstanding their history of invasion, colonialism and all other forms of assault on the core principles. Granted, the assault resulted in the dislocation and transformation of some of the principles that explain in part the quagmire the continent and its people find themselves presently. The strategy of dislocation of core principles of a given society by means of conquest or other forms of aggression is not unique to the African experience. For instance, at the end of the Second World War, the occupation of Japan by the United States was conducted in a manner that sought first and foremost to demystify the aura around Emperor Hirohito, who many Japanese revered at the level of a deity. It was thus necessary as a first step by the occupying power to demystify and embarrass the Emperor, as he publicly surrendered, and in the process, denigrate the core principles and values that he represented. It was a powerful rhetorical strategy used by the United States.

Had the demystification process become entrenched to a point of replacing entirely a governance structure that eliminated the Emperor completely from any structure of governance for post-war Japan, and denigrated wholesale Japanese culture and mores, it would have been difficult for Japan to maintain several aspects of its core values and principles that define them as Japanese. Fortunately for them, the restructured system of governance that emerged in post World War Two Japan created space for the Emperor even though demystified to an extent, and maintained its essential principles.

The same did not apply in the conquest of Africa during hundreds of years of colonialism and evangelization. Colonialism entrenched a system of governance after its eventual end in the twentieth century that relegated African systems of governance, together with its core principles, to the periphery. The governance structures and core principles created for the center of post-colonial African states remain western. The national legal systems are western and remain in many African jurisdictions, over and

above traditional African legal systems. In order to extricate itself from its quagmire, looking at applicable aspects of Ptah-Hotep's ethical theory of rhetoric may be helpful in relocating to the center, its core principles, thus rendering manageable the challenge referred to earlier. But such a review has not been evident thus far. The litany of woes that have befallen and continue to manifest itself in the continent need not be rendered. Africans in Diaspora and in the continent have tried, nonetheless, to grapple with the challenge, just as how they sought to debunk the rhetorical construction of the Africans discussed in an earlier section of this work.

It may be useful at this juncture, therefore, to engage in adumbrations to amplify the initiatives undertaken in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries by Africans in Diaspora and the continent to deal with the challenge. I begin the adumbration by examining briefly some benchmark events in the recent history of the continent and the present state of affairs in which the continent finds itself. I then discuss the seemingly intractable problems that pervade the African leadership structure in terms of handling the challenge of extricating the continent from its development quagmire, through a "partnership" with the West, but framed outside of the parameters of Africa's normative structure.

Among Africans both at home and in Diaspora, various means were examined and some implemented aimed at rectifying the condition of Africans in the early twentieth century. Marcus Garvey, a Jamaican residing in the United States, set up an organizational structure—the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) to facilitate the process of extricating the continent and its Diaspora from its development quagmire through his back to Africa movement. His rhetorical strategy was to celebrate "blackness" and in the process, restore African pride. His rhetoric, though restorative, was not predicated on *Maat*. The themes that informed his rhetoric of blackness were mainly centered on highlighting a great and proud African past, and advocating for a free and an independent Africa led and controlled by Africans. He was vilified by Black leaders, notably W.E.B Dubois, and the dominant system. He was subsequently incarcerated and deported to his native home, Jamaica.

Sylvester Williams and W.E.B. Dubois pioneered the various Pan African Congresses in their efforts to face the challenges and handle the quagmire Africans found themselves under colonial rule. Participants in the Congresses issued resolutions that proffered ways and means through which Africa could extricate itself from the grips of a European colonial structure. For instance, the resolution at the end of the Second Pan-African Congress in 1921 read in part: "The natives of Africa must have the right to participate in the Government (Colonial) as fast as their development permits, in conformity with the principle that the Government exists for the natives, and not the natives for the Government. They shall at once be allowed to participate in local and tribal government, according to ancient usage [read African core principles], and this participation shall gradually extend, as

education and experience proceed to the higher offices of state; to that end, in time, Africa is ruled by consent of the Africans . . . " (Padmore, 1971 p.103). The rhetoric in this instance centered on the rights of Africans within the colonial system. It was rhetoric of restoration because the resolution called for participation by Africans in local governance "according to ancient usage"—applying African principles of governance.

The resolution adopted at the Fifth Pan-African Congress in Manchester, England in 1945 read in part: "That since the advent of British, French, Belgian and other European nations in West Africa, [read the continent] there has been regression instead of progress as a result of systematic exploitation by these alien imperialist powers. The claims of 'partnership,' 'trusteeship', guardianship,' and the 'mandate system,' do not serve the political wishes of the people of West Africa [read Africa]. "That the democratic nature of the indigenous institutions of the peoples of West Africa have been crushed by obnoxious and oppressive laws and regulations, and replaced by autocratic systems of government which are inimical to the wishes of the peoples of West Africa." (Padmore, p.142). The rhetoric evident in this resolution lambastes the imperial powers for the disruption and destruction of African agency, and points out that African agency was not devoid of democratic principles. This rhetorical stance is interesting because traditional African governing structures variously described as "despotic" are portrayed as having democratic features which, could be argued, is in line with Ptah-Hotep's call for free expression. One could thus characterize the rhetoric of the fifth Pan-African Congress as restorative. Though restorative, the rhetoric did not result directly in the decolonization of Africa, even though one could advance an argument that the Pan-African congresses did contribute towards the structuring of resistance against colonial rule in Africa.

The observation made about the destruction of indigenous systems of governance and its replacement by an autocratic system of government in the resolution of the Fifth Pan-African Congress is intriguing, since the era of colonialism was an era of "extreme totalitarianism," according to Chinua Achebe (2003). The observation is also cogent against the background of the present ironical promulgation of western democracy as the only ideological framework for development. Achebe in fact correctly asserts that Africans were not taught democracy (western), during the colonial era (2003). From the preceding we can discern the environment that had characterized the African condition over the past one hundred years and how difficult it has been to handle the challenge of extricating the continent from its troubled quagmire and restore its character, even with the advent of independence.

Essentially, the colonial era rendered ineffective the uses and applications of African core principles at the level of the state, in order to enhance the well being of the colonized. Otherwise there would have no basis for delegates at the second Pan-African Congress to argue for the participation of the colonized Africans "according to ancient usage." The rhetorical

implications are readily discernible: free expression as advocated in Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric was muted. Values that Africans revered and invoked during ceremonial occasions were denigrated by the colonial powers, rendering practices informed by African values as "barbaric" or "devilish." The pervasive rhetoric of the colonial era was thus antithetical to the normative system of Africans.

In terms of the denigration of African religious values and practices within the context of "ancient usage," it is instructive to note the manner in which Mark Mathabane recounted his first encounter with Christian missionaries in his home in South Africa who used converted African evangelicals to preach the gospel. He cited the African evangelist as saying: "We are here as part of the covenant we made with Him [Christ], to spread his word to all corners of Alexandra [a Black township] and save you from the tentacles of paganism" (1986, p.58). He went on: "Belief in ancestral spirits is sheer nonsense and hogwash. Those dead people you revere and worship are impotent and wouldn't hurt a fly. I repeat: Christ is the only true god. So let all those with pagan hearts accept Him tonight and be saved" (p.60). Mathabane was writing about apartheid South Africa. The mantra, however, was continental—Africa-wide. The appeal by the delegates at the Second Pan-African Congress to the colonial powers to allow Africans to participate "according to ancient usage" becomes moot if articulate Africans, like the evangelists, denigrate their traditions, in the same language of their colonial oppressors. The challenge remains unabated.

In 1986, in search of means to handle the challenge under discussion, Africa set a world record by becoming the first continent whose seemingly protracted problems became globalized. The United Nations was persuaded by some countries, notably Canada, to hold a special meeting of the world community to examine the problems of the continent and come up with solutions and resources to extricate Africa from its development quagmire. The international body came out with what it called "*Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery* (APPER), and was to be implemented within a time frame of four years—1986–1990. Rich as well as poor member nations of the UN deliberated and pledged to save Africa from the wretched decade of the nineteen eighties. But as with all pledges, nothing came out of the lofty ideals and promises. APPER did not work. Instead, the situation in the continent worsened, and sparked civil wars across Africa.

Because of its "international" character, presumably involving *all* nations in the international system, I presented the APPER initiative above as a preface to the discussion that follows on yet another "international initiative on Africa to assist in its "recovery": the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD 2000), with a sharp focus on the normative dimensions (or lack thereof) of the initiative. This final adumbration sheds light on the most recent comprehensive attempt at the continental level, by the African leadership structure, to deal with the challenges of extricating the

continent from its quagmire, ***without*** addressing the crisis of dislocation of several elements of *Maat*.

I begin the discussion with some form of an anomaly. Cartey and Kilson observe in their introduction to their text, *The African Reader: Independent Africa* (1970), "To validate one's heritage, to explore one's culture, to examine thoroughly those institutions which have persisted through centuries is perhaps the first step in a people's search for independence, in their quest for freedom from foreign domination" (p.3). Yet NEPAD reflects what the African leadership structure calls a "partnership," not independently African. Africa did not as a continent "validate" its "heritage" or "explore" its "culture" in any degree, not to mention an examination of "those institutions which have persisted through centuries." On the contrary, NEPAD is driven by the West as could be discerned from its objective which states in part: "The objective of the New Partnership for African Development is to *consolidate democracy [western]* (italics mine)" (Paragraph 204 of the NEPAD (2001) document).

The stated objective does not make reference to any aspect of the African normative system. In essence, African core principles had no place in terms of their potential role in handling the challenges of ameliorating the condition of the continent. The stated objective of NEPAD centers alien rather than African interests. From a rhetorical perspective, with specific emphasis on Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, the tasks involved in fashioning rhetorical strategies grounded in *Maatian principles* become an exigency: Even though the majority of Africans living in rural communities are guided in their daily lives with *Maatian principles,* such principles could not be used to communicate with them because they are deemed antithetical to "democracy" as proselytized by the West. As such, African "character' is to be replaced by Western characterological features, without adequate preparation to practice democracy, not to talk of "consolidating" it.

The normative aspect is crucial because any society that seeks to extricate itself from a quagmire of the nature of the African problematic has to start with an examination of its normative system—its core principles as appropriately stated by Cartey and Kilson. For it is only after such an examination that rhetorical strategies needed to mount campaigns could be fashioned. Even as far back as 1921 in excerpts of the resolutions of the Second Pan-African Congress, the participants recognized the centrality of *"ancient usage"* in reference to indigenous systems of governance. So let us now take a look at NEPAD, claimed to be an "African initiative" but with a western cloak, and a huge normative challenge for the development of rhetorical strategies and message development.

The NEPAD partnership reflects "partners" with ideological and normative influences and practices that differ in terms of culture, *but grounded in the dominant western normative structure,* setting the stage for a potentially protracted normative crisis affecting the quality of the outcomes of the initiative. This is so stated because the dominant ideology upon which

the partnership is predicated contains tenets which in so many ways are antithetical to the core African principles. For example: the centrality of authority, evident in *Maat*; the primacy of harmony and balance in society rather than adversarial and divisive rhetoric and politics characteristic of "democratic" systems, and finally the interest of the collective within traditional African norms, rather than that of the individual.

Bill Moyers captures a major aspect of these contradictions in his interview with the Nigerian novelist, Chinua Achebe. He states: "It was a great gamble that Nigeria and other new nations in Africa took when leaving colonialism, they embraced democracy because democracy offers the possibility of infinite corruption [–] leaders promising benefits to the electorate if they are only returned to power again." He continues, "It takes a great deal of discipline, institutional building and tradition to make a democracy incorruptible. Of course no democracy is incorruptible" (Moyers, 2003).

From the preceding, one could discern a fundamental contradiction in terms of normative standards: corruption is an integral element in democracies, fueled by personal/individual greed, whereas in *Maatian* context, corrupt practices negate its core principles. The normative dimension is thus an essential entry point into any attempt to formulate policies for "economic recovery" (as in APPER, 1986) or to forge "partnerships" for development as in NEPAD, and of significance in developing rhetorical strategies to promulgate such policies or partnerships. That said the argument is not that the entire normative bases for democracy are antithetical to African traditional values, but rather that in designing a program to deal with the challenges of extricating a continent from its development quagmire, the normative systems of all parties should be carefully examined and taken into consideration. The NEPAD document contains indeed references to culture. In fact there is a "culture" sub-heading (2001 p.34, paragraphs 143–144) that mentions African arts etc. What is really mind-boggling is the absence in those paragraphs of any reference to the *normative* dimension of culture, so essential for an understanding of worldview, and how it influences perceptions, interpersonal and group relations as well as behaviors with significant implications for message development in fulfilling rhetorical obligations.

For instance, the normative characteristic NEPAD espouses could be summarized by the following tenets: commitment to the consolidation of western notions of democracy, including the adoption of western values; relative peace and political stability; the rule of law; freedom of expression; an enabling environment for foreign investors; "good governance;" *reduction* (italics mine) of chronic corruption; political pluralism and respect for human rights. On face value, it would be difficult to defend an argument that would postulate that African societies before the advent of colonialism did not have respect for the rule of law or good governance, or relative peace and political stability and even freedom of expression (recall that Ptah-Hotep advocated freedom of expression), for that matter. There are

elements of convergence between the two normative systems, upon which the partnership could be strengthened rather than declaring at the outset that the objective is "to consolidate democracy." When one examines the manner in which African traditional systems function, however, contradictions other than the issue of corruption emerge, pointing out the need for a mutual exploration and examination of traditions and institutions before solidifying the partnership.

For instance, a basic value that is in crisis in African contexts today, but deeply embedded in its historical ethos, can best be explained by the following: "I am, because we are; and since we are therefore I am" (Ojaide, 1992, p.45.). The "I" cannot exist without the "we." The obvious responsibility is to the collective. Thus engagement in corrupt practices hurt the collective. And as Sarvan rhetorically asks in his discussion on issues of feminism in African literature: "How can one alter an element and not affect the traditional African whole?" (1988, p.464). Kortenaar, in his discussion on the issue of "information" in traditional African contexts, asserts: "Information in the tribal model does not come from the top down; nor does it travel from the bottom up to the leaders. Instead, the leadership embodies the will of the citizens, and information is always shared because it is never divided" (p.61). The preceding captures succinctly the characterological dimension in African contexts. The first step in dealing with challenges of extricating the continent from its quagmire is to address indeed the extent to which the characterological dimension could be restored and utilized as both a frame of reference and a point of departure in fashioning any partnership, and even of more significance, formulating models for development.

The major implication for the role of rhetoric within the context above is in fashioning and promulgating messages against the background of what has been described above as the characterological dimension in African societies. In designing such rhetoric, particularly within the context of a "partnership" that involves opposing perceptions of national character, there has to be a conscious effort to negotiate among the differing principles within the normative systems of interested parties. But as is evident in NEPAD, Africans demonstrate no sense of pride since there is a clear absence of any normative component indicative of African character in the NEPAD document, other than some mutually shared beliefs/values upon which one could discern convergence as mentioned earlier. The entire document is predicated on western values and character. It is precisely the anomaly above that calls for a restorative rhetoric, along the lines being argued in this work. Even though significant changes are taking place in terms of traditional norms in rural Africa, one perhaps can successfully argue that the expectation by the majority of rural Africans, who to a significant extent do maintain allegiance to traditional values, are frustrated by their political leaders who seem to have abandoned basic cultural norms emblematic of *Maat*, that reflect good character.

It is interesting to note that Blaise Campaore, president of the Republic of Burkina Faso, who hosted a UNESCO conference that addressed the concerns of NEPAD, said, according to *The Accra Mail Website,* that "development could not be viable without taking into consideration the cultural values of people and urged UNESCO to help NEPAD to promote Africa's cultural heritage" (10/3/03). It is difficult to discern, however, how Campoare's request could be met. There is nothing African in terms of "cultural heritage" that could be promoted, other than the "arts." The rhetoric of NEPAD's spokespeople in the leadership structure, such as Campoare, should reflect Africa's "rich cultural heritage." But as it presently stands the ordinary African and even many in civil society organizations cannot readily identify culturally with this so-called partnership. Indeed some scholars and journalists have pointed out this rhetorical lacuna: There is no effective dissemination of information by NEPAD to inform Africans across the spectrum what it stands for and how Africans should identify with it (De Waal, 2002; *This Day* 2003).

Furthermore, what obtains in the NEPAD initiative does not reflect how Diop's "cultural unity," or *Maat* for that matter, serves as a basis upon which Africa predicates its normative ethos, particularly as its leadership structure makes claims to NEPAD as its *own* initiative to handle the many challenges of the complex African malaise. Even if the leadership structure does not buy the Diopian postulation, it is incumbent upon the leadership to at least demonstrate a more sophisticated understanding of the centrality of culture and norms derived therefrom, and evident in the daily lives of the vast marginalized majority of Africans. It may very well be "blindness," a lack of knowledge about *Maat*, or about Diop's concept of "cultural unity" which in so many ways demonstrate the significance of texts like these that contribute towards bringing to the fore information about Africa's contribution to the global fund of knowledge across the spectrum.

In short, African leaders have not seriously retreated and considered fully the extent to which the pervasive characterological problems that are evident—rampant corruption, etc.—have their roots in the dislocation of core African principles, embodied in *Maat*, as a result of the massive physical and social onslaught in the forms of invasions, the transatlantic slave trade, evangelization and colonialism. In the process of formulating initiatives for the amelioration of the continent, it is not far-fetched to argue that centering the ethical elements that constitute *Maat* could provide an entry point into handling characterological issues such as *integrity and personal responsibility* in governance and accountability. This postulation is made with the full realization that not all elements of the normative ethos of the African past would provide a source for guidelines and answers as Africans search for norms, be they social or political.

Moreover, the postulation is made bearing in mind the multifarious normative transitions that have occurred in the African past during which alien cultures and norms of invaders did make an impact on then traditional

African values, and have somewhat become hybrids. Culture is not static. However, the collective ethos that the core principles represent, including hybrids, remains dominantly African, particularly in non-urban settings where the majority of Africans still live. To argue that African core values evident in *Maat* are antiquated and thus should be replaced by western norms would be equivalent to denying that the "democratic" ideal that Africans are pressured to espouse vigorously are not rooted in the *western past*. Its warrants are deeply rooted in the western normative structure, anchored in western traditions.

From all of the adumbrations thus far, one could conclude thus: (1) Africans still have a major rhetorical task to perform, among which is arming their vision with core principles—*Maatian*—that are derived first and foremost from their cultural heritage. (2) Lessons from their historical past are crucial in the process of molding the character of *all* citizens. The molding process would serve as a prelude to debunking the myths contained in the rhetorical construction of the African discussed in the earlier part of this work, fashioned by Europeans such as Hegel and Hume, and Americans such as Jefferson, and scholars such as Perham. (3) A key myth that tends to be resistant to change is that Africans have to be to be told what to do all the time: that they have no value systems or core principles of their own worthy of preservation and celebration, or for serving as the basis for their own governance and overall social comportment. According to that myth, no "character" seems to be discernible among Africans, that is worthy of respect or consideration. (4) The final lesson that is evident from the adumbrations is that even at the continental level*, there is a crisis in African character and a lack of faith in African core principles, as the core principles advocated by the Western democracies are those that form the basis for what is considered "good governance,"* and should be adopted by all African states.

The basic rhetorical challenge stemming from all of the above is the resolution of the perceived exigency as demonstrated in the adumbrations discussed in this section of the work: the crisis in the African normative system and its impact on character and behavior, and how to go about fashioning rhetorical strategies for the restoration of what I have referred to as the characterological dimension. Since character is inextricably linked with normative systems and their impact on the development of individuals, the resolution of the crisis mentioned above is feasible through a carefully developed process that would facilitate the restoration of faith and confidence in desirable core African principles, grounded in *Maat*, while dealing with the pressures emanating from the competing western normative system.

In the final section of this work, to which I now proceed, a construct is advanced as a means of facilitating the restoration referred to above by calling Ptah-Hotep to the rescue in efforts to arm the vision of Africans and fashion appropriate rhetorical strategies to restore the characterological dimension.

ARMING THE VISION WITH MAATIAN PRINCIPLES: PTAH-HOTEP TO THE RESCUE

I stated in the preceding section that Africans had a major rhetorical task to perform in terms of extricating the continent from its quagmire, and handling the normative crisis that pervades Africa through the design and promulgation of rhetoric aimed at restoring the characterological dimension, hence the call above to Ptah-Hotep to come to the rescue. The rhetorical task could be accomplished by "*arming*" the vision of Africans in a manner that would illuminate *Maat* as the grounding of core African/*Maatian principles* in efforts to restore faith and confidence in their normative system, and its eventual impact on the characterological dimension. Centering *Maat* as grounding for the rhetorical task through the arming process referred to above could, for example, facilitate the formulation of "recovery" programs as discussed in APPER (1986), or in fashioning "partnerships" as with the case of NEPAD, in the sense that the initiatives would have aspects of an "African character" rather than what obtains—a wholesome western character.

The arming process being fostered is systemic in nature: inculcating *Maat* as the collective African ethos, starting from the basic family unit to the nation/continent as a whole. The rationale for the above is that restorative dimension of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, one that centers *Maat* as the source of all aspects of development—individual and societal. *Maat* as a collective of principles is not dead, since principles embedded in culture do not "die" as such. They could become denigrated, repressed, or even displaced. Approached in that manner, the emphasis is not so much on the *discrete* elements of the *core Maatian principles,* but rather on the *resultant status of their collective* impact on human behavior and societal relations. In order for such a restoration to occur, the arming process has to be systemic as stated above. The task is mainly rhetorical in the sense that it would take a considerable amount of work to fashion the type of messages and rhetorical campaigns required for the restoration to take place on the one hand, and on the other, to hold.

In 1955, Stanley Edgar Hyman published an abridged version of his important work titled: *The Armed Vision: A Study in the Methods of Modern Literary Criticism.* What is striking about the text in addition to its brilliant content is the title of the work. The notion of an "Armed Vision" evokes a lot of sensations in the mind's eye as well as the recognition of the need to be "armed" in order to "see" and *know* enough as we construct, deconstruct, appreciate and evaluate. In short, in order to act and behave "appropriately" within a given cultural milieu, one has to be armed with a vision that facilitates ready recognition and use of all elements in society, embedded in the given culture, that guide and regulate our behavior, as well as understanding images of self and others, or even fashioning such images. The arming process thus has a direct impact on character formation and behavior.

The acquired vision also facilitates our evaluation of images constructed outside of our cultural milieu. It is thus critical for a nation to ascertain that the vision of its citizens is adequately armed through its own institutions, embedded as much as possible in its core principles. Otherwise contending visions and images constructed outside of one's environment could co-opt that function surreptitiously or overtly, as is clearly evident in the NEPAD initiative. The idea of "Instruction" along the lines of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric becomes germane. The rhetorical dimension of instructing to arm is even more challenging. The task involves image construction, manipulation and projection informed by core principles of African societies, as articulated in *Maat*.

Why the "armed vision" construct and why Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric? The rationale is based on my belief that one does not become automatically "armed" (innately) in the sense the term is used here, with a vision that allows one to function and behave "appropriately" within his or her given cultural milieu or even outside of one's cultural context. In order to achieve the status of being "armed," one must go through the process in three settings of instruction—all interdependent.

The first setting is in the home. But there are also requirements for that home. The home should be so structured that it has the necessary tools and materials to instruct its household about the societal rules of the game, values, and fundamental cultural mores and expectations that guide individual and collective behavior. The home develops, nurtures, and shapes character by inculcating in children fundamental core principles, assuming it has such capability and stability. Within African contexts, parents, older siblings, members of the extended family, the communities in which we live in represent the purveyors of the elements—knowledge—that are transmitted in various formats, including daily disciplinary actions, convivial settings and dyadic contexts, in the arming process.

A reward and punishment mechanism is established in the home as a means of encouraging absorption of the core principles, or discouraging deviation from the norms being inculcated. The process of arming the vision in the home is *deliberate,* or should be in order for the process to be successful. This is why the emphasis on the approach used by Ptah-Hotep is important: *instruction*. The children of the home should be instructed about their core African principles and values. There are, of course, homes that are dysfunctional, which creates a problem at the inception stage of socialization, that is hard at times to recover from and placed back on track. The key characteristic feature of this stage is the quality of the environment in the home that facilitates rather than obstructs the learning and subsequently arming process.

The second setting in the arming process is in secular institutions, such as schools and social organizations that package and transmit knowledge about the core principles of a given society as they arm their citizens and mould their character. This is done in order for citizens to function produc-

tively and to have a sense of duty to self, others and the nation. The knowledge generated and packaged is based first and foremost on the history and culture of the given society—including, *inter alia,* values, beliefs, religion, philosophy, social organization, ideology etc. This stage is critical because the required capacity of the institutions to aggregate and deliver is more complex and ought to be better organized than the regular family units, given the size of people they have to deal with on a regular basis. Furthermore, such institutions do not only transmit knowledge required to achieve an armed vision, they also *test* people who attend or participate in such institutions to determine the degree and quality of knowledge acquired in order to be considered "armed."

So crucial is the quality of the institutions in this stage that some countries, even at the level of local administrations, regulate their behaviors and practices to ensure that they keep within the parameters of the core principles and norms that govern them. The United States, for example, openly rejects any outside sources that seek to influence the functioning of such institutions, particularly primary and secondary educational institutions which represent the formative stages of preparation for becoming a good and productive citizen. *The packaging and delivery of core principles in the form of educational/learning materials* take place in these institutions. Inculcating the packaged content effectively contributes tremendously to character formation, the shaping of images of self, country and the rest of the world. The debunking of myths and injurious content rhetorically fashioned from outside takes place in such institutions. For instance, texts such as Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction* and others that explain and celebrate the core principles and mores of society would be *required* readings in order to debunk the rhetorical construction of the African fashioned by the West.

Besides schools, social or cultural organizations should identify specific aspects of the core principles that they wish to celebrate, share, and even inculcate in their membership. Invariably, such organizations develop instruments that guide their routines and ensure adherence to the fundamental principles and beliefs of the given social organization. The rules are usually consistent with the normative values of the society as a whole. There may be exceptions to such a claim, particularly in social organizations that tend to challenge the status quo and have among their objectives "reforming" extant norms that they may deem anachronistic or antithetical to the wellbeing of the society as a whole, but not to the extent of obliterating the essential pillars of their culture. In short, all depend on arming the vision of their membership or clients as to how to behave, perceive, shape and interpret phenomena, and function in society. The arming process seen from the perspective above clearly deals with characterological dimension.

The third setting is in religious organizations, namely mosques, churches, temples and other bodies in which normative elements in society dealing with the deity and ethical rules are taught. African countries are severely

constrained in terms of the centrality of indigenous religious organizations and sources for religious instruction, such as the Koran and the Bible and other such religious documents, because of the dominant position of Christianity and Islam. African religions, denigrated by Christian evangelization and the spread of Islam, have no central locus in African states as does Shintoism, for instance, in Japan. This void represents a huge rhetorical challenge in African societies, necessitating a serious move to embark upon the codification, dissemination and restoration of *Maat*, through various forms of rhetorical strategies, and instruction in secular settings. Religion, within the context of the arming process, presents the most difficult exigency to resolve in Africa because of the continuing and in fact pervasive influence of Pentecostalism and extremism in both Christianity and Islam.

It is interesting to observe, however, that African Americans, notably Karenga, created the ritual *Kwanza* that encapsulates not just the cultural aspects of a rediscovered African ethos, but carries an aura of *religiosity* as it performs the function of ethical instruction and the importance of moral character reminiscent of such functions in churches, mosques etc. Even though one cannot make a claim that *Kwanza* is a "religion" as such, it nonetheless provides ethical instruction as religions do, for African Americans who recognize it and engage in the rituals it conducts. African countries on the other hand have not *elevated to a national status* any indigenous religious set of rituals informed by a unifying religious theme, such as is found in Christianity and Islam, for the practice and celebration of core ethical principles, supported by a given text (such as the Bible or Koran). Africans may wish to have a collected set of texts among which will be selected texts from ancient Egypt/Kemet that deal with ethical behavior so well captured in Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction,* and accompanying rituals. In addition to Ptah-Hotep's *Instruction,* there are several texts from Kemet (ancient Egypt) such as *The Book of the Dead* that could represent a body of information for all Africans, on core principles and values as those found in revered texts such as the Bible, the Koran, the Torah and the writings of Confucius.

One thing that is evident is that religious practices, in societies where they exist and are permitted to function, more than the two previous settings discussed, constitute the pillars of moral education, a critical element in the process of arming one's vision and character formation. This is not to say that societies where religious institutions do not exist or are not allowed to function have no moral education.

From the identification and discussion of the three settings mentioned above, it is useful to provide at least an example as to how secular institutions, including African governments, could develop rhetorical strategies and promulgate messages aimed restoring pride in African core principles and the process addressing the imperatives of the characterological dimension. Among rhetorical strategies that could be considered would be the creation and use of commemorative events celebrating the life and achieve-

ments of African heroes and events, from antiquity to the present. Convivial settings provide perfect opportunities for *epidiectic* speeches. As Steve Biko argues in making a case for the "Black Consciousness" movement in then apartheid South Africa: "No doubt . . . part of the approach envisaged in bringing about "black consciousness" has to be directed to the past, to seek to rewrite the history of the black man [rather than relying on the Europeans' history about Africans] and to produce in it heroes who form the core of the African background . . . A people without a positive history is like a vehicle without an engine . . . Hence in a country like ours [South Africa] Heroes' day, Republic day etc.,—all of which are occasions during which the humiliation of defeat [in wars with Africans and others] is at once revived" (1978, p.30). Biko's argument is quite cogent. The emphasis is not just on the celebration of heroes, but the celebration and appreciation of African heroes who, for example, resisted European oppression or even oppression by indigenous leaders who deviated from *Maatian principles* during their period of governance. In terms of the celebration of heroes, in the Republic of Sierra Leone, Independence Day is celebrated but there are no days dedicated to the celebration of Sierra Leonean heroes such as Bai Bureh, who fought against British colonialism for example, or heroes who contributed to the overall well being of the nation culturally or politically. Sierra Leone may not be the only country with such an anomaly.

I provide the discussion above to establish the context within which we should understand the centrality of the notion of an armed vision and its important role in character formation, and how it influences our daily lives. One aspect that is readily discernible in the process of arming as discussed within the settings above is the centrality of culture/social lore. One cannot but agree with Michael Polanyi (1962) who in his discussion on "the transmission of social lore" (which I regard as a process of arming one's vision), states, "The transmission of . . . intellectual artifacts takes place from one generation to another by a process of communication which flows from adults to young people. This kind of communication can be received only when one person places an exceptional degree of confidence in another, the apprentice in the master, the student in the teacher . . . " (p.207).

The preceding quote encapsulates all stages of the process of arming the vision, through the transmission of social–cultural lore. A key term used by Polanyi is "confidence." The adumbrations conducted earlier on point to a crisis not only in self-confidence within the African leadership structure, but a lack of confidence in their traditions as sources worthy of consultation in fashioning desirable societies and for personal comportment. A key issue that requires serious attention is the extent to which Africans succeed in developing rhetorical content and strategies with the objective among others of nurturing character particularly for aspiring leaders, and transmitting such content throughout the three "settings"

identified—the home, secular institutions and religious bodies. Furthermore, the rhetorical tasks if properly organized and carried out would contribute as well to arming the vision of their citizens as they face the heavy rhetorical onslaught on their normative system, covertly or overtly, through various media forms.

There is an underlying assumption stemming from the above discussion that may seem to project culture as some form of stable and static phenomenon; that culture contains only core principles; that *all* aspects of culture are good and should be unquestionably transmitted, and that culture could be defined within certain territorial limits. I recognize fully, however, that against the background of the tortured African past—invasions, slavery, colonialism, and evangelization—"African culture" would encapsulate more than the core African principles. Furthermore, I recognize the impact of the information explosion that characterized the last quarter of the twentieth century and continues to manifest itself. As Hoijer argues, "cultural anthropologists . . . have gradually moved from an atomistic definition of culture, describing it as a more or less haphazard collection of traits, to one which emphasizes pattern and configuration" (Hoijer 1962, p.258).

He goes on to present Kluckman and Kelly's definition, observing that they express the "modern concept of culture when they define it as 'all those historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational, and non-rational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behavior of men.' Traits, elements, or, better patterns of culture in this definition are organized or structured into a system or set of systems, which, because it is historically created, is therefore open and subject to constant change" (p.258). Hoijer's position makes it clear that culture is dynamic.

I would contend, however, that even though dynamic, there are elements within the given universe of any culture under investigation, that I refer to as core principles, found in *Maat*, that remain rather constant and unshakeable. These core principles cannot be eradicated, and as clearly discernible in Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, require *instruction* particularly for those who govern their respective societies. It is instructive to recall the position advanced by Obenga on the Pharaoh's character and responsibilities: "The Pharaonic royalty was sacred because it was led by a being that transcended corruption, the need to accumulate personal fortune, immortality, political lies, or mediocrity. No verifiable archeological, textual or historical document can demonstrate the idea of a Pharoe that was a 'tyrant, a despot, and a slave owner'"(4b2, 2004).

It is at this juncture I bring to a nexus culture (read *Maat*), image construction and promulgation in the arming and restorative process. Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric represents the *package* being promulgated. Nick Lacey (1998) in his discussion on image analysis within the context of media studies observes:

> In image analysis what we have to be most aware of are two inter-related facts:
> All images are cultural artifacts and are therefore the products of a particular society at a particular time; Both the sender and receiver of any image have their own cultural backgrounds (though they may be the same) which have influenced, respectively, the creation and reading of the image. (p.86)

Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric is a cultural as well as a rhetorical artifact. In his rhetoric we see culture in its broadest sense at work. We see also an image of what it was like to be a "good," "fair" and just" leader in Kemetic society. The image of Kemetic society is one that exhorts good character and good citizenship. Kenneth Boulding (1968) argued much earlier that "THE IMAGE NOT ONLY MAKES SOCIETY, society continually remakes the image . . . The basic bond of any society, culture, subculture, or organization is a "public image" that is an image the essential characteristics of which are shared by the individuals participating in the group." (p.64). He notes further that " . . . an enormous part of the activity of each society is concerned with the transmission and protection of its public image; that set of images regarding space, time relation, evaluation, etc., which is shared by the mass of the people." (p.64).

From the two perspectives above—Lacey and Boulding—one could quickly arrive at a few internal conclusions before progressing further. The first is the centrality of an armed vision, in terms of understanding the "bond of any society . . . " to which Boulding refers above. Secondly, images, particularly public images, require not just *transmission* but *protection*. In transmitting their images about what constitutes a "civilized" society, Europeans imposed via various means—superior weapons, enslavement, Christianization etc., what they argued were beliefs and values superior to those Africans held. They also "protected" their mediated messages through stringent and oppressive laws during the colonial era, and in the process, denigrated the image of the African. Chinua Achebe correctly observed in his interview with Bill Moyers (2003) that Europeans did not teach Africans "democracy" during the days of colonialism, but on the contrary had in place the most extreme "totalitarian" form of governance.

African countries have a Herculean task to perform in terms of countering negative public images about their respective cultures, traditions, and mores. It is precisely because of the situation described above that I use the armed vision construct as the *raison d'etre* for Africans, particularly those at the helm of the ship of state, to take up the rhetorical task seriously and work hard on having the upper hand on the arming process and the molding of character. If one's is thoroughly armed and grounded, it makes it easier for the individual to discern difficulties that may arise should they consider adopting behaviors that are proselytized externally, with the aim of presenting injurious counter or contradicting elements and information

about one's culture, beliefs, and practices, and in the process dislocating the individual from his or her cultural milieu. The old adage "know thyself" applies here.

From the above, it is instructive to note what Boulding says about the nature of public image. He states, "A public image almost invariably produces a "transcript"; that is, a record in more or less permanent form which can be handed down from generation to generation. In primitive nonliterate societies the transcript takes the form of verbal rituals, legends, poems, ceremonials, and the like, the transmission of which from generation to generation is always one of the principal activities of the group" (pp.64–65). The key term is "transcript." It is written—literally or metaphorically. From the perspective above, the rhetorical performance expected of Africans cannot be done successfully if they do not write their own scripts grounded in their core principles, predicated on good character. It is a "character" that should be shared by the "mass of the people." Defective character among members of the African leadership structure manifested by rampant corruption, greed, avarice and obsession with personal aggrandizement could be adopted and shared by the "mass of the people." The resultant society would reflect an endemically corrupt society—which unfortunately is unfolding in huge urban settings in several African countries.

The bottom line regarding the task of arming visions and projecting and promulgating images of good character is the extent to which one is indigenously armed enough characterologically and otherwise, to make discerning judgments about elements in the external transcripts that may be useful for overall societal and human development without significant detrimental impact on indigenous visions. Since culture is dynamic, it is not a far-fetched notion to believe that it is feasible for certain elements deemed useful from external transcripts to be incorporated locally. As Boulding states, "society continually remakes the image," (p.64) making it possible to incorporate desirable external transcripts that may accelerate growth and development, but not to the detriment of the collective African ethos found in *Maat*. Approached in the manner above, there may be room for a reconceived NEPAD-like initiative. The African partners would contribute towards the writing of a script that would include their core principles together with external principles that may be incorporated into their strategies for extricating the continent from its development quagmire, assuming their character is well-grounded in *Maat* with the least probability of being corrupted.

A challenge Africans face collectively is: how they would rhetorically construct effective means of disseminating images containing essential and useful elements of their cultural norms and practices, as they prepare their young to govern with a high degree of self-confidence, *impeccable character* and less reliance on external transcripts solely, for the functioning of their respective societies? Africans may need to take a comprehensive look particularly at their secular institutions both educational (at all levels—pri-

mary, secondary and tertiary) as well as social organizations that perform important functions in the socialization process. To my mind, Africans writing their scripts, arming the vision of their populace, constructing desirable images based on core principles *along with others they may have adopted from external partners*, and developing rhetorical strategies to improve upon the quality of life of their citizens would be the prescription for success.

In conclusion, the essential *Maatian principles* presented and discussed throughout this work represent the ethical theory of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, grounded in *Maat*. A dominant theme that surfaces is that of good character. The instruction as articulated by Ptah-Hotep is centered in character formation and praxis. It is one thing to be schooled—as in arming the vision—in all aspects of fairness, rightness, goodness, justice and the rest of the principles discussed in this section of the work. But the real test comes when one has to apply himself or herself in the performance of various functions, ranging from governance to day-to-day relations with individuals and groups. It is thus at the level of *praxis* that ethical theories on rhetoric become critical, and the characterological dimension even more so.

The idea, therefore, of arming the vision as a means of facilitating the restorative potential of Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric in terms of the overall comportment of Africans in all contexts—from the family to legislative/governance settings—should be understood against the backdrop of the pervasive crisis African countries have been experiencing throughout the struggles against colonialism to the granting of independence from the colonial powers. The crisis covers a wide range of issues—from pervasive poverty among a significant cross-section of African families to inept performance at the level of governance, driven by corruption, greed and the pursuit of selfish interests, punctuated by civil strife that rises at times to the level of internecine and inter-state wars.

From the above, an argument in favor of a willed process of arming the visions of Africans would call for rhetorical strategies that would, among other factors, appeal to Africans to recognize the importance of the need for a major characterological shift. Ptah-Hotep says it best: "Correct chiefly; instruct conformably . . . Vice must be drawn out, that virtue may remain. Nor is this a matter of misfortune, for one that is a gainsayer becometh a strife-maker" (V. 36). The rhetoric of restoration within the context of the argument above could be further grounded in the question raised in a biblical source, and partially germane to the issue: "You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt has lost its taste, how shall its saltiness be restored? It is no longer good for anything except to be thrown out and trodden under the foot by men "(Matthew 5:13).

I use the word "partially" because the issue under discussion is not the locus of Africans on earth among people—as in "You are the salt of the earth," but rather the significance of the analogy of the salt (read Africans) losing its taste (read character) and the consequence of not doing something

to *restore* it. NEPAD, without any bases in African normative systems, is a manifestation of the collective African ethos being "thrown out and trodden under the foot by men." For some the above may be regarded as a harsh judgment on the initiative. But the fact remains that Africans have to be in a position to at least have their "partners" in development recognize that there is an African normative base that is worthy of consultation as they develop the objectives of the partnership. Furthermore it is important to stress that what requires "consolidation" is not just "democracy," as clearly stated in the NEPAD document, but good character grounded in African core principles, on the part of African leaders so as to serve as worthy examples for the citizenry. The consolidation thus becomes one that centers the interests of all partners to the extent that all such interests are mutually respected and accommodated.

The rhetoric of restoration, therefore, is not one that calls for *a return to the "old days"* but rather one that is guided by the *collective* ethos of *Maat*. It is a rhetoric that exhorts Africans to have confidence in their ethical past, in the building and shaping of character and the subsequent impact on individual and societal behavior. Perhaps of utmost significance, the rhetoric of restoration posits *Maat* in a tremendously enviable position: *Maat* is the absolute antitheses of injustice, and unfairness. Justice and fairness are among the core *Maatian principles*. A rhetoric that successfully restores *Maat* would place Africans as vanguards of justice; as vanguards of fairness in all relations among citizens and external partners; as vanguards that lead the battle against corruption, greed, obsession with personal aggrandizement and oppression in all of its forms.

It is also a rhetoric that would accomplish an uncanny reversal in terms of political comportment and the protection of the interests and rights of citizens: *Maat* emphasizes the importance of "rightness." Within the context of the "reversal" mentioned above corruption, for instance, at the expense of the public well being and interest would not be considered the norm as is the case, *de facto*, in many African countries notwithstanding the existence of Anti-Corruption Commissions. Another manifestation that would be evident in terms of the "reversal" would be the primacy of the rule of law. Viewed from that perspective of a reversal, Africans need not be told by the West that the rule of law is an essential ingredient for good governance: it is a concept that is deeply in embedded in *Maat*. Finally, it is a rhetoric that would exhort and prepare Africans to discuss and negotiate with others armed with self-confidence and demonstrating strong character. Ptah-Hotep's rhetoric, in principle, provides the basis for such a preparation, and provides a basis for an analysis of the rhetorical utterances and subsequent behavior of Africans within domestic and international contexts.

APPENDIX 1

Excerpted from: Battiscombe Gunn(1918). *The Instruction of Ptah-Hotep and the Instruction of Ke'gemni: The Oldest Books in the World. (Translated from the Egyptian with an introduction and Appendix)* London: John Murray, Albemarie Street,W. pp.41–61.

THE Instruction of the Governor of his City, the Vizier, Ptah-Hotep, in the Reign of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Isôsi, living for ever, to the end of Time.

A. The Governor of his City, the Vizier, Ptah-Hotep, he said: '0 Prince, my Lord, the end of life is at hand; old age descendeth [upon me]; feebleness cometh, and childishness is renewed. He [that is old] lieth down in misery every day. The eyes are small; the ears are deaf. Energy is diminished, the heart hath no rest. The mouth is silent, and he speaketh no word; the heart stoppeth, and he remembereth not yesterday. The bones are painful throughout the body; good turneth unto evil. All taste departeth. These things doeth old age for mankind, being evil in all things. The nose is stopped, and he breatheth not for weakness (?), whether standing or sitting.

'Command me, thy servant, therefore, to make over my princely authority [to my son]. Let me speak unto him the words of them that hearken to the counsel of the men of old time; those that once hearkened unto the gods. I pray thee, let this thing be done, that sin may be banished from among persons of understanding, that thou may enlighten the lands.'

Said the Majesty, of this God:[1] 'Instruct him, then, in the words of old time; may he be a wonder unto the children of princes, that- *they* may enter and hearken with him. Make straight all their hearts; and discourse with him, without causing weariness.'

B. Here begin the proverbs of fair speech, spoken by the Hereditary Chief, the Holy Father, Beloved of the God, the Eldest Son of the King, of his body, the Governor of his City, the Vezier, Ptah-Hotep, when instructing the ignorant in the knowledge of exactness in fair-speaking; the glory of him that obeyeth, the shame of him that transgresseth them.
He said unto his son:

1. Be not proud because thou art learned; but discourse with the ignorant man, as with the sage. For no limit can be set to skill, neither is there any craftsman that possesseth full advantages. Fair speech is more rare than the emerald that is found by slave-maidens on the pebbles.
2. If thou find an arguer talking, one that is well disposed and wiser than thou, let thine arms fall, bend thy back[2] be not angry with him if he

agree (?) not with thee. Refrain from speaking evilly; oppose him not at any time when he speaketh. If he address thee as one ignorant of the matter, thine humbleness shall bear away his contentions.

3. If thou find an arguer talking, thy fellow, one that is within thy reach, keep not silence when he saith aught that is evil; so shalt thou be wiser than he. Great will be the applause on the part of the listeners, and thy name shall be good in the knowledge of princes.

4. If thou find an arguer talking, a poor man, that is to say not thine equal, be not scornful toward him because he is lowly. Let him alone; then shall he confound himself. Question him not to please thine heart, neither pour out thy wrath upon him that is before thee; it is shameful to confuse a mean mind. If thou be about to do that which is in thine heart, overcome it as a thing rejected of princes.

5. If thou be a leader, as one directing the conduct of the multitude, endeavour always to be gracious, that thine own conduct be without defect. Great is Truth, appointing a straight path; never hath it been overthrown since the reign of Osiris[3] One that oversteppeth the laws shall be punished. Overstepping is by the covetous man; but degradations (?) bear off his riches. Never hath evil-doing brought its venture safe to port. For he saith, 'I will obtain by myself for myself,' and saith not, 'I will obtain because I am allowed.' But the limits of justice are steadfast; it is that which a man repeateth from his father.

6. Cause not fear among men; for [this] the God punisheth likewise. For there is a man that saith, 'Therein is life '; and he is bereft of the bread of his mouth. There is a man that, saith, 'Power [is therein] '; and he saith, ' I seize for myself that which I perceive.' Thus a man speaketh, and he is smitten down. It is another that attaineth by giving unto him that hath not. Never hath that which men have prepared for come to pass; for what the God hath commanded, even that thing cometh to pass. Live, therefore, in the house of kindliness, and men shall come and give gifts of themselves.

7. If thou be among the guests of a man that is greater than thou, accept that which he giveth thee, putting it to thy lips. If thou look at him that is before thee (thine host), pierce him not with many glances. It is abhorred of the soul[4] to stare at him. Speak not till he address thee; one knoweth not what may be evil in his opinion. Speak when he questioneth thee; so shall thy speech be good in his opinion. The noble who sitteth before food divideth it as his soul moveth him; he giveth unto him that he would favour— it is the custom of the evening meal. It is his soul that guideth his hand. It is the noble that bestoweth, not the underling that attaineth. Thus the eating of bread is under the providence of the God; he is an ignorant man that disputeth it.

8. If thou be an emissary sent from one noble to another, be exact after the manner of him that sent thee, give his message even as he hath said it. Beware of making enmity by thy words, setting one noble against the

other by perverting truth. Overstep it not, neither repeat that which any man, be he prince or peasant, saith in opening the heart; it is abhorrent to the soul.

9. If thou have ploughed, gather thine harvest in the field, and the God shall make it great under thine hand. Fill not thy mouth at thy neighbours' table. . . . If a crafty man be the possessor of wealth, he stealeth like a crocodile from the priests. Let not a man be envious that hath no children; let him be neither downcast nor quarrelsome on account of it. For a father, though great, may be grieved; as to the mother of children, she hath less peace than another. Verily, each man is created [to his destiny] by the God, Who is the chief of a tribe, trustful in following him.

10. If thou be lowly, serve a wise man, that all thine actions may be good before the God. If thou have known a man of none account that hath been advanced in rank, be not haughty toward him on account of that which thou knowest concerning him; but honour him that hath been advanced, according to that which he hath become. Behold, riches come not of themselves; it is their rule for him that desireth them. If he bestir him and, collect them himself, the God shall make him prosperous; but He shall punish him, if he be slothful.

11. Follow thine heart during thy lifetime; do not more than is commanded thee. Diminish not the time of following the heart; it is abhorred of the soul, that its time [of ease] be taken away. Shorten not the day-time more than is needful to maintain thine house. When riches are gained, follow the heart; for riches are of no avail if one be weary.

12. If thou wouldest be a wise man, beget a son for the pleasing of the God. If he make straight his course after thine example, if he arrange thine affairs in due order, do unto him all that is good, for thy son is he, begotten of thine own soul. Sunder not thine heart from him, or thine own begotten shall curse [thee]. If he be heedless and trespass thy rules of conduct, and is violent; if every speech that cometh from his mouth be a vile word; then beat thou him, that his talk may be fitting. Keep him from those that make light of that which is commanded, for it is they that make him rebellious.[6] And they that are guided go not astray, but they that lose their bearings cannot find a straight course.

13. If thou be in the chamber of council, act always according to the steps enjoined on thee at the beginning of the day. Be not absent, or thou shalt be expelled; but be ready in entering and making report. Wide is the seat of one that hath made address. The council-chamber acteth by strict rule; and all its plans are in accordance with method. It is the God that advanceth one to a seat therein; the like is not done for elbowers.

14. If thou be among people, make for thyself love, the beginning and end of the heart. One that knoweth not his course shall say in himself (seeing thee),[7] He that ordereth himself duly becometh the owner of wealth; I shall copy his conduct.' Thy name shall be good, though thou speak

not; thy body shall be fed; thy face shall be [seen] among thy neighbours; thou shalt be provided with what thou lackest. As to the man "whose heart obeyeth his belly, he causeth disgust in place of love. His heart is wretched (?), his body is gross (?), he is insolent toward those endowed of the God. He that obeyeth his belly hath an enemy.[9]

15. Report thine actions without concealment; discover thy conduct when in council with thine overlord. It is not evil for the envoy that his report be not answered, 'Yea, I know it,' by the prince; for that which he knoweth includeth not [this]. If he (the prince) think that he will oppose him on account of it, [he thinketh] 'He will be silent because I have spoken.'

16. If thou be a leader, cause that the rules that thou hast enjoined be carried out; and do all things as one that remembereth the days coming after, when speech availeth not. Be not lavish of favours; it leadeth to servility (?), producing slackness.

17. If thou be a leader, be gracious when thou hearkenest unto the speech of a suppliant. Let him not hesitate to deliver himself of that which he hath thought to tell thee; but be desirous of removing his injury. Let him speak freely, that the thing for which he hath come to thee may be done. If he hesitate to open his heart, it is said, ' Is it because he (the judge) doeth the wrong that no entreaties are made to him concerning it by those to whom it happeneth ? 'But a well-taught heart hearkeneth readily.

18. If thou desire to continue friendship in any abode wherein thou enterest, be it as master, as brother, or as friend; wheresoever thou goest, beware of consorting with women. No place prospereth wherein that is done. Nor is it prudent to take part in it; a thousand men have been ruined for the pleasure of a little time short as a dream. Even death is reached thereby; it is a wretched thing. As for the evil liver, one leaveth him for what he doeth, he is avoided. If his desires be not gratified, he regardeth (?) no laws.

19. If thou desire that thine actions may be good, save thyself from all malice, and beware of the quality of covetousness, which is a grievous inner (?) malady. Let it not chance that thou fall thereinto. It setteth at variance fathers-in-law and the kinsmen of the daughter-in-law; it sundereth the wife and the husband. It gathereth unto itself all evils; it is the girdle of all wickedness.[10] But the man that is just flourisheth; truth goeth in his footsteps, and he maketh habitations therein, not in the dwelling of covetousness.

20. Be not covetous as touching shares, in seizing that which is not thine own property. Be not covetous toward thy neighbours; for with a gentle man praise availeth more than might. He [that is covetous] cometh empty from among his neighbours, being void of the persuasion of speech. One hath remorse for even a little covetousness when his belly cooleth.

21. If thou wouldest be wise, provide for thine house, and love thy wife that is in thine arms. Fill her stomach, clothe her back; oil is the remedy of her limbs. Gladden her heart during thy lifetime, for she is an estate profitable unto its lord. Be not harsh, for gentleness mastereth her more than strength. Give (?) to her that for which she sigheth and that toward which her eye looketh; so shalt thou keep her in thine Louse . . .

22. Satisfy thine hired servants out of such things as thou hast; it is the duty of one that hath been favoured of the God. In sooth, it is hard to satisfy hired servants. For one[11] saith, ' He is a lavish person; one knoweth not that which may come [from him].' But on the morrow he thinketh, ' He is a person of exactitude (parsimony), content therein.' And when favours have been shown unto servants, they say, 'We go.' Peace dwelleth not in that town wherein dwell servants that are wretched.

23. Repeat not extravagant speech, neither listen thereto; for it is the utterance of a body heated by wrath. When such speech is repeated to thee, hearken not thereto, look to the ground. Speak not regarding it, that he that is before thee may know wisdom. If thou be commanded to do a theft, bring it to pass that the command be taken off thee, for it is a thing hateful according to law. That which destroyeth a vision is the veil over it.

24. If thou wouldest be a wise man, and one sitting hi council with his overlord, apply thine heart unto perfection. Silence is more profitable unto thee than abundance of speech. Consider how thou may be opposed by an expert that speaketh in council. It is a foolish thing to speak on every kind of work, for he that disputeth thy words shall put them unto proof.

25. If thou be powerful, make thyself to be honoured for knowledge and for gentleness. Speak with authority, that is, not as if following injunctions, for he that is humble (when highly placed) falleth into errors. Exalt not thine heart, that it be not brought low.[12] Be not silent, but beware of interruption and of answering words with heat. Put it far from thee; control thyself. The wrathful heart speaketh fiery words; it darteth out at the man of peace, that approacheth, stopping his path. One that reckoneth accounts all the day passeth not an happy moment. One that gladdeneth his heart all the day provideth not for his house. The bowman hitteth the mark, as the steersman reacheth land, by diversity of aim. He that obeyeth his heart shall command.[13]

26. Let not a prince be hindered when he is occupied; neither oppress the heart of him that is already laden. For he shall be hostile toward one that delayeth him, but shall bare his soul unto one that loveth him. The disposal of souls is with the God, and that which He loveth is His creation. Set out, therefore, after a violent quarrel; be at peace with him that is hostile unto [thee] his opponent. It is such souls that make love to grow.

27. Instruct a noble in such things as be profitable unto him; cause that he be received among men. Let his satisfaction fall on his master, for thy provision dependeth upon his will. By reason of it thy belly shall be satisfied; thy back will be clothed thereby. Let him receive thine heart, that thine house may flourish and thine honour—if thou wish it to flourish— thereby. He shall extend thee a kindly hand. Further, he shall implant the love of thee in the bodies of thy friends. Forsooth, it is a soul loving to hearken.[14]

28. If thou be the son of a man of the priesthood, and an envoy to conciliate the multitude, ...[15] speak thou without favouring one side. Let it not be said, 'His conduct is that of the nobles, favouring one side in his speech.' Turn thine aim toward exact judgments.

29. If thou have been gracious at a former time, having forgiven a man to guide him aright, shun him, remind him not after the first day that he hath been silent to thee [concerning it].

30. If thou be great, after being of none account, and hast gotten riches after squalor, being foremost in these in the city, and hast knowledge concerning useful matters, so that promotion is come unto thee; then swathe not thine heart in thine hoard, for thou art become the steward of the endowments of the God. Thou art not the last; another shall be thine equal, and to him shall come the like [fortune and station].

31. Bend thy back unto thy chief, thine overseer in the King's palace, for thine house dependeth upon his wealth, and thy wages in their season. How foolish is one that quarrelleth with his chief, for one liveth only while he is gracious. . . . Plunder not the houses of tenants; neither steal the things of a friend, lest he accuse thee in thine hearing, which thrusteth back the heart.[16] If he know of it, he will do thee an injury. Quarrelling in place of friendship is a foolish thing.

32. [Concerning unnatural sin].

33. If thou wouldest seek out the nature of a friend, ask it not of any companion of his; but pass a time with him alone, that thou injure not his affairs. Debate with him after a season; test his heart in an occasion of speech. When he hath told thee his past life, he hath made an opportunity that thou may either be ashamed for him or be familiar with him. Be not reserved with him when he openeth speech, neither answer him after a scornful manner. Withdraw not thyself from him, neither interrupt (?) him whose matter is not yet ended, whom it is possible to benefit.

34. Let thy face be bright what time thou livest. That which goeth into the storehouse must come out therefrom; and bread is to be shared. He that is grasping in entertainment shall himself have an empty belly; he that causeth strife cometh himself to sorrow. Take not such an one for thy companion. It is a man's kindly acts that are remembered of him in the years after his life.[16]

35. Know well thy merchants; for when thine affairs are in evil case, thy good repute among thy friends is a channel (?) which is filled. It is more important than the dignities of a man; and the wealth of one passeth to another. The good repute of a man's son is a glory unto him; and a good character is for remembrance.

36. Correct chiefly; instruct conformably [therewith]. Vice must be drawn out, that virtue may remain. Nor is this a matter of misfortune, for one that is a gainsayer becometh a strifemaker.

37. If thou make a woman to be ashamed, wanton of heart, one known by her townsfolk to be falsely placed, be kind unto her for a space, send her not away, give her to eat. The wantonness of her heart shall esteem thy guidance.

C. If thou obey these things that I have said unto thee, all thy demeanour shall be of the best; for, verily, the quality of truth is among their excellences. Set the memory of them in the mouths of the people; for their proverbs are good. Nor shall any word that hath here been set down cease out of this land for ever, but shall be made a pattern whereby princes shall speak well. They (my words) shall instruct a man. How he shall speak, after he hath heard them; yea, he shall become as one skilful in obeying, excellent in speaking, after he hath heard them. Good fortune shall befall him, for he shall be of the highest rank.

He shall be gracious to the end of his life; he shall be contented always. His knowledge shall be his guide (?) into a place of security, wherein he shall prosper while on earth. The scholar[18] shall be content in his knowledge. As to the prince, in his turn, forsooth, his heart shall be happy, his tongue made straight. And [in these proverbs] his lips shall speak, his eyes shall see, and his ears shall hear, that which is profitable for his son, so that he deal justly, void of deceit.

38. A splendid thing is the obedience of an obedient son; he cometh in and listeneth obediently. Excellent in hearing, excellent in speaking, is every man that obeyeth what is noble; and the obedience of an obeyer is a noble thing. Obedience is better than all things that are it maketh good-will. How good it is that a son should take that from his father by which he hath reached old age (Obedience). That which is desired by the God is obedience; disobedience is abhorred of the God. Verily, it is the heart that maketh its master to obey or to disobey; for the safe and sound life of a man are his heart. It is the obedient man that obeyeth what is said; he that loveth to obey, the same shall carry out commands. He that obeyeth becometh one obeyed. It is good indeed when a son obeyeth his father; and he (his father) that hath spoken hath great joy of it. Such a son shall be mild as a master, and he that heareth him shall obey him that hath spoken. He shall be comely in

body and honoured by his father. His memory shall be in the mouths of the living, those upon earth, as long as they exist.[19]

39. Let a son receive the word of his father, not being heedless of any rule of his. Instruct thy son [thus]; for the obedient man is one that is perfect in the opinion of princes. If he direct his mouth by what hath been enjoined him, watchful and obedient, thy son shall be wise, and his goings seemly. Heedlessness leadeth unto disobedience on the morrow; but understanding shall stablish him. As for the fool, he shall be crushed.

40. As for the fool, devoid of obedience, he doeth nothing. Knowledge he regardeth as ignorance, profitable things as hurtful things. He doeth all kind of errors, so that he is rebuked therefor every day. He liveth in death therewith; it is his food. At chattering speech he marvelleth, as at the wisdom of princes, living in death every day. He is shunned because of his misfortunes, by reason of the multitude of afflictions that cometh upon him every day.

41. A son that hearkeneth is as a Follower of Horus.[20] He is good after he hearkeneth; he groweth old, he reacheth honour and reverence. He repeateth in like manner to his sons and daughters, so renewing the instruction of his father. Each man instructeth as did his begetter, repeating it unto his children. Let them [in turn] speak with their sons and daughters, that they may be famous in their deeds. Let that which thou speakest implant true things and just in the life of thy children. Then the highest authority shall arrive, and sins depart [from them]. And such men as see these things shall say, ' Surely that man hath spoken to good purpose, and they shall do likewise; or, 'But surely that man was experienced.' And all people shall declare, ' It is they that shall direct the multitude; dignities are not complete without them.' Take not any word away, neither add one; set not one in the place of another. Beware of opening . . .[21] in thyself. Be wary of speech when a learned man hearkeneth unto thee; desire to be stablished for good in the mouth of those that hear thee speaking. If thou have entered as an expert, speak with exact (?) lips, that thy conduct may be seemly.

42. Be thine heart overflowing; but refrain thy mouth. Let thy conduct be exact while amongst nobles, and seemly before thy lord, doing that which he hath commanded. Such a son shall speak unto them that hearken to him; moreover, his begetter shall be favoured. Apply thine heart, what time thou speakest, to saying things such that the nobles who listen declare, 'How excellent is that which cometh out of his mouth!'

43. Carry out the behest of thy lord to thee. How good is the teaching of a man's father, for he hath come from him, who hath spoken of his son while he was yet unborn; and that which is done for him (the son) is more than that which is commanded him. Forsooth, a good son is of

the gift of the God; he doeth more than is enjoined on him, he doeth right, and putteth his heart into all his goings.

D. If now thou attain my position, thy body shall flourish, the King shall be content in all that thou doest, and thou shalt gather years of life not fewer than I have passed upon earth. I have gathered even fivescore and ten years of life, for the King hath bestowed upon me favours more than upon my forefathers; this because I wrought truth and justice for the King unto mine old age.

<div align="center">

IT IS FINISHED
FROM ITS BEGINNING TO ITS END
EVEN AS FOUND IN WRITING.

</div>

APPENDIX 2

AFRICA'S RENDEZVOUS WITH HISTORY

By
General Olusegun Obasanjo
Statement at the Kampala Forum on Security, Stability, Development and Cooperation in Africa
18 May 1991

Let me start by thanking President Museveni, the government and People of Uganda for hosting us and for the splendid arrangement made for this Forum. President Museveni's effort in turning things around in Uganda is worthy of commendation. We salute you and the people of Uganda. Let me also thank the Chairman, President Nyerere, for his enthusiastic support. His support is a pillar of sustenance of our interest. Let me quickly give thanks to Presidents Kaunda, Masire, Chissano, El Bashir and Aristides Pereira for their encouragement, their presence and participation and their involvement with us, men and women of Africa. We had hoped that President Senghor would be able to join us, but he was regrettably not able to. We welcome the special representative of President Chadli Benjadid of Algeria. We also specially welcome the Vice-President of Guinea-Bissau. My thanks and appreciation also goes to our friends and well-wishers from outside Africa who are here because they have made our concern their concern. I thank you all brothers and sisters as representatives of the people of Africa on whose behalf we are meeting here today. I would like to give on your behalf our thankful appreciation to organizations which have contributed to make possible our meeting here. In this regard, I must mention the UNDP, the government of

Finland, MacArthur Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation and Carnegie Corporation. Finally, I want to thank my colleagues on the Steering Committee, the Technical Committee and the Planning Committee who have worked unceasingly for us to get to this point.

Africa proudly took its place in the international arena, and for a while, seized the initiative for the transformation of the continent. Africa did not only record a 7% annual growth rate in the 1960s, but its leaders were consulted and viewed as important actors on world issues. In a tragic twist of fate, a walloping decline of Africa's fortunes reversed Africa's socio-economic advance in which the achievements could no longer underwrite the failures. The declining fortunes of Africa, has however, become grossly inadequate to sustain the forces and the momentum for internalized initiative and change.

Africa and the majority of its people bear the sad status of being historically the most exploited, the most dependent, the most vulnerable, and now increasingly, the most internationally isolated, marginalized and the least well-governed. The under-pinning of this tragic phenomenon of the world underdog status for Africa is the dehumanizing poverty in the African continent.

We are here in Kampala today to have a rendezvous with history. You are all part of history and witnesses to history in the making. We have a sense of where history has brought us and we must also have a sense of where history is taking us.

The situation in Africa is generally depressing. Whichever direction we look and whatever indicators we use, Africa is in severe crisis. Africa is the continent today where the largest number of wars are being fought. We have over five millions refugees, the largest number on the globe. We have the highest infant mortality rate in the world and the shortest life expectancy. We have the highest rate of population increase, negative economic growth, with the thirty-two of forty-two least developed countries of the world on our continent. We have more illiterates in Africa today than we had in 1960.

The persistence of this situation with seeming helplessness on our part and the apparent reluctance of the international community to give enough assistance to redress the situation make the future uncertain and unclear. The image of Africa portrayed by the outside media is one of endless disasters, diseases, senseless wars, corruption and mismanagement. It is essentially the image we presented. Our situation is now treated more by silence and neglect than by effective response. And yet, all things taken together, we should not have been in this situation. We are here in Kampala today not so much to lament the past, or moan at the present and mope bleakly at the future, but to set our sight high in hope, optimism and achievable goals for tomorrow. At the end of the bipolar division of the world into nuclear-weapon-fortified ideological camps and with the coalition victory in the Gulf, "new thinking" seems to be emerging about different aspects of the organisation of man's affairs in the world. Africa must be part of such new thinking for her own and within the world. We have to project positive thinking and positive image of Africa.

The time has come for the fundamental obstacles facing the African continent to be grasped in their priority context for a continental consensus and a collective systematic action. It is important that we should all firmly believe in our capacity to redress the situation of our continent and set Africa on an unmistakable trajectory, not only for the achievement of our basic necessities and progress, but also, in the process, for the restoration of our dignity and honour. Mr. Chairman, distinguished ladies and gentlemen, we will deliberate on four elements of our existence and living in Africa, namely, security, stability, development and cooperation. Let us take security as a fundamental base of social existence.

The concept of security must be transcendental of orthodox definition and perception of security in military terms. Security must be all-embracing and all-encompassing and ramifying. It must include personal security, food security, economic security and social security.

An urgent aspect of security need is a re-definition of the concept of security and sovereignty. For instance, we must ask why does sovereignty seem to confer absolute immunity on any government who commits genocide and monumental crimes of destruction and elimination of a particular section of its population for political, religious, cultural or social reasons? In an inter-dependent world, is there no minimum standard of decent behaviour to be expected and demanded from every government in the interest of common humanity?

In Africa, the governor in most cases tends to equate security with his personal and political survival under the guise of state security. This usually leads to inordinate military expenditure. Quite often, providing military security for the governor leads to the economic and social pauperization and insecurity of the governed. Discontent is thereby deepened.

We need a regional security based on common and collective security rather than one-sided national security. There is a growing opportunity for us to have a breakthrough into a new way of ordering relationships on our continent. There is also a growing interest and desire for such order. It should not be impossible that in the last decade of the twentieth century, we can settle conflicts through mediation, negotiation and the rule of law, without the use of violence. Our sub-regional organisations must have peace-making capability and process built into them. Our regional organisation, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), must have effective conflict prevention and conflict resolution capability, including mediation, peace-making, peace-keeping and reconciliation. Peace-keeping must involve structure of command and control, logistic support and effective political direction at the apex. Conflict prevention and conflict control could also make use of the good offices and counselling of a Council of Elders whose neutrality, independence, experience, contact and exposure can be harnessed.

History and experience have shown that military solutions to conflicts in most parts of Africa are not achievable or, if achievable, are not durable, without removing the underlying causes of discontent and conflict. And yet

millions of our people living with the daily reality of war are caught in a cycle of violence and famine while the real causes of the conflicts are not addressed. Where dialogue fails, whatever succeeds leaves a sour taste in somebody's mouth!!

Without peace and security, stability, development and cooperation would be an unattainable goal. But the nexus is in both directions. Stability does not connote stagnation and maintenance of status quo. Rather, it allows for progress through the resolution of issues in an atmosphere of discussion, debate, dialogue, negotiation and agreement. It does not connote oppression, imposition or confrontation. It accommodates the expression of divergent views, opinions and interests and amicably reconciles and resolves them. Nobody is the perpetual gainer or loser. There is give and take. These are the embodiments of democratic practice, democratic principles, democratic spirit and popular participation in the political process. Resolving conflicting interests and issues in a democratic process may be slow, tedious and time consuming; but it is durable and wholesome. It recognizes and satisfies the innate desire of man to have a say in his own affairs. And, therefore, becomes an important pre-condition of socio-economic transformation. But then, our democratic arrangement must not alienate our culture. There must be harmony of culture and democracy and development for endurance and durability. Stability achieved through participatory governance, democracy, accountability and protection of fundamental human rights must be a means to an end. The end must be the overall development and wholesomeness of the society.

If our hearts are free and unfettered, our minds must not remain occupied territories with almost total dependence. We must remove the shackles of dependency and borrowed garment in our development orientation. First, there should be a clear-eyed view about the nature and theory of our economic transformation that will consist of the underpinning of future strategy. Otherwise, there is danger of making a series of ad hoc decisions, externally imposed or internally induced, each seeming to be at the time a practical answer to a practical problem, only to find ourselves later far down the road we never intended to travel. Why is there no correlation between the accident of nature's endowment and our rates of improvement in material level of living? Did we have the critical mass of knowledge and capacity within our societies to bring about the needed improvement? We need to increase and take advantage of the stock of knowledge and creativity which we do not have in sufficient quantity. The next stage is to allow the new that is better to displace the old. Let the competition be open, fair and free within our societies.

No doubt, we have become more aware of our shortcomings and impediments to development than we were decades ago, but we must move from awareness to achievement. Our development must be all round and balanced, in education, health, agriculture, food and nutrition, manufacturing, science and technology. For the elimination of poverty and for sustainabil-

ity, population stabilization, protection of the environment, capacity building and capacity retention must form essential parts of our development strategy. The strengthening of the private sector and the role of women in development must be given special attention and a pride of place.

The critical factor of development for all our communities and societies in Africa is co-operation and integration. Integration must be driven and be single-mindedly pursued. It must not be seen as a zero-sum game. There will always be something in it for everyone in the short-, medium- and long-term. There must be one or two nations with the necessary commitment and the clout to lead the crusade and bring to fruition the process of integration in each sub-region. Similarly, there must be a sub-region with the endowment, the commitment and the vision to lead the continental integration to fruition, no matter the cost or sacrifice. The road to development, prosperity and elimination of poverty is the road of integration. While integration cannot be a one-day achievement, it should not take a lifetime, even though I know that life expectancy in Africa is short. There should be a realistic programme but steadily and resolutely pursued for sub-regional integration and African integration.

There is no substitute for intra-African co-operation and integration to lead to maximization of output, pooling of resources and elimination of conflicts. To me, African integration should not be the end of the road. Africa cannot and should not be an island to itself. We live on the planet Earth and we must be part and parcel of the world we live in. Although we know that the world will not do for us what we should do for ourselves, we must not detach or marginalise ourselves from the world. It is our God-given right to live, to enjoy the bounties with which nature endowed us.

Throughout history no society had developed unaided. By the same token, no society had been developed entirely by the charity of another society. What we should demand is positive and constructive engagement with our "development partners" not on the basis of charity, condescension and low esteem but on the basis of mutual compact interest and common humanity.

Most of these powers were engaged in Africa during the cold war era albeit essentially negatively. With the end of the cold war, we must design new measures and new arrangement that will keep them positively engaged with us. The end of the cold war and the allied victory in the Gulf made it incumbent on us to devise the appropriate programme to hold the international community increasingly engaged. Self-reliance must be in the context of partnership and inter-dependence. Unkept promises from our "development partners" had in the past led to frustrations in Africa. But there had been excuses on the other side. Let us put frustration and excuses aside and move forward on a new even playing ground.

Another reason why we must hold our partners increasingly engaged is that it is insufficient, if not futile, to adjust without matching or corresponding adjustment in the rest of the world, especially in the world of "our

development partners." Africa has to bite the bullet, accept hard political choices and restructure. Our partners must adjust in order to encourage foreign private investments in Africa, allow us access to their markets, abolish subsidies and protectionism. In local parlance, "we must make head" with our partners—open their eyes and minds and influence their thinking. We cannot do that successfully if we slam the door or they slam the door against us. Otherwise, we stand the chance of suffering an affliction worse than marginalisation—being passed into oblivion. For success we need solidarity, co-ordinated painstaking efforts, unalloyed commitment and correct and appropriate external relations. We should not, however, despise the beneficial involvement of others in seeking solution to our problems, especially those with valid experience from which we could learn and benefit. In such cooperation, we must always remain the main determinants of our fortune and our future.

In the past, decisions were taken about us, without us, against us and in the interest of others. We are asking that decisions about us should be taken together with us, in our interest and for our benefit.

Our survival depends not on military security but on continental integration and global co-operation. What do we expect from this Forum? We expect a Kampala Document which will probably be in three parts, namely, the declarative part, the principles-and-policy-measures part and the process part. The process which we hope will start with government-to-government negotiation at the level of plenipotentiaries will be continuous and implementation will be phased. We see a catalyst role for a consultative committee emanating from this Forum in the continuation of the process. Such a committee will assist in mobilizing and sensitizing relevant domestic and external groups.

The Kampala Document will arm our host sufficiently to present your concerns and appeals to the summit of our continental organisation, the OAU, for the endorsement and promotion of the process of a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation in Africa.

I have a very strong conviction that with the right admixture of strategy, commitment and leadership, Africa should get out of the doldrums within a generation and regain a place of honour and respect within the international community and move into the mainstream of the world. This is not a dream, it is an achievable objective. It is practical and practicable. It is an African initiative to satisfy essentially the needs and desires of Africa. The uniqueness of this process lies in the three envisaged aspects of the negotiation. The first is that the package will be negotiated by all participating governments to the point of consensus and agreement. Secondly, self-enforcement and monitoring will also be negotiated, agreed and be made part of the process of implementation. It is meant to be a peaceful self-induced change rather than an explosive outside-imposed and enforced change. Thirdly, the negotiation between African countries and their "development partners' which will be part of the process will inform future relationships between them.

It is being conceived as a compact, an understanding, confidence-building measure, a cooperative undertaking, a partnership, a solidarity voluntarily entered into by all in the enlightened individual self-interest and collective interest of all. It should be essentially self-projecting, self-executing and self-sustaining.

Brothers and sisters and friends, we will like to present for your deliberation the process of the CSSDCA in its relative comprehensiveness and inter-relatedness as a main instrument of achieving our goals locally, nationally, regionally, continentally and globally.

I wish you happy deliberations.

Statement by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere at the Kampala Forum on Security, Stability Development

in Africa 19 May 1991, Kampala, Uganda

It is unusual for a political leader after twenty-three years to step down. It is even more unusual for a soldier. Soldiers in Africa are the equivalent of the kings and emperors who built the states of Europe. Europeans are now reminding us of democracy which is very good, of course. But their states were built by kings and emperors, queens and empresses and the army. Their states were never built by political parties.

In Africa, the equivalent of the king is the general who takes over. And once the general takes over, what do you do? In Europe, once one family takes over, it remains until another member from the royal family can upstage the reigning family, a palace coup of some sort. And in Africa, you would have expected that once a general has taken over, he is going to stay there until another general of the family takes over.

It is unusual for a military man to say "I'm stepping down, I am handing over to democratic process. That is an example which many of our soldiers should learn. But what is either equally important or even more important, is what the general is doing after stepping down.

I visited Gen. Obasanjo at his farm. While I was there, a bank manager came to complain about the delay in the repayment of his loan and to find out when he is going to pay the loan he had taken to build his house and farm. I've heard somebody say here that, once upon a time, we had a head of state in Africa who was said to be the fourth richest head of state in the world. And at that time, I think the richest was the Shah of Iran, and I think followed by two monarchs in Europe, and then this particular African head of state.

And there was General Obasanjo . . . I don't know whether he has repaid that loan, I think he is still struggling to repay that loan. But here is the General, organizing an African Leadership Forum, something for which

I'm quite sure Africa will thank you. It is much more more permanent than even your stepping down.

When we met in Addis Ababa in 1963 to establish the Organization of African Unity, I think we made a mistake. Whether we will correct that mistake, I don't know. We were, all of us who met there, leaders of political organizations. Already, a coup had taken place in Togo; and you may want to know that is one of the explanations of the strict rule of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, because it was suspected that an African country had interfered in Togo, that had resulted in the assassination of the head of state.

But as I say, we were all political leaders who met there, but unlike the founders of the United Nations, we did not say "we the peoples of Africa . . . " So there we were the first heads of state of independent Africa, and a large number of African countries were still under colonial rule. And one of our commitments was to liberate the other parts of Africa which were not free, but nevertheless, we made it an organization of independent states, not an organization of peoples of Africa—we did not say "we the peoples of Africa."

In East and Central Africa, we had an organization called the Pan-African Freedom Movement for East and Central Africa, of which Kenneth Kaunda was then chairman. It was an organization of liberation organizations, and it was a very good movement.

And we had done well, it had evolved. We in Tanganyika were already independent, and we were part of that movement. But Ethiopia was asking to be part of that movement, so it would have been a movement of some independent states and some liberation organizations, but we abolished it —or we allowed it to die a natural death after Addis Ababa. We did not want to encourage the Casablanca business and the Monrovia business. We thought that this organisation should die. The then Chairman never called a meeting, so it died.

It was deliberate because we did not want to encourage another Casablanca in our part of the world. But I am saying, we made a mistake—why am I saying this? This forum for the first time, has put us together, heads of state, former Heads of State, leaders of NGO'S, and here we were able to let women's organizations, youth organizations, trade unions, delegates, and students speak. For the first time you have a combination of views, which is unusual in the Organization of African Unity.

Here, for the first time, we have this kind of gathering, this kind of dialogue, this kind of opportunity for a dialogue of the thinkers and leaders of Africa. This kind of opportunity is vital for our future, and I would like to thank you very much for providing the opportunity.

Even if we don't achieve anything else, but if this type of forum continues, it is an immense and lasting service to our continent, and I say thank you very much. Now what more do I want to say? When we have another forum, we should have representatives of the business community. I am

not sure they are here, as they did not speak yet. As Swedish Ambassador Oljelund said here, Europe has been gradually integrating, but actual integration not that of governments, because governments are suspicious of erosion of nationalism, sovereignty and so forth. Business people usually don't like borders. Transnationals – once upon a time they were called multinationals – they are the ones who, willy nilly, have the ability to go over the borders and even to the communist world.

Realistically, we don't have transnationals. There is a point which I want to defend. I have listened to all the speeches and I agree with everything the women have said. I am leaving this place with immense hope in my heart, because there is a new thinking in Africa, a new awareness, and I think we are going to move. I am saying to our leaders down the road, don't be too despondent.

Someone spoke of "democracy deficit", and I think that is the worst deficit we have, not the deficit of foreign exchange. The deficit of democracy and oppression are perhaps our main deficit. But we shouldn't be too hard on ourselves. We will be in trouble if we are too hard on ourselves. There are certain things we could not have done during the last thirty years whether we wanted to or not. Let us not blame ourselves for not having done what we could not have done.

Updated figures show that intra-African trade is four percent of total African trade, or possibly between five and six percent. If you add the smuggling across the borders, it might even reach twelve percent. So, the maximum trade between African countries is twelve percent of their total trade, but the legal trade is between four percent and six percent. This is bad, and we must correct it. There was a time we couldn't do very much, how could we? We couldn't; the communication link was not there between our countries. Rwanda, Burundi and Tanganyika used to be colonies. After the First World War, Rwanda and Burundi were given to the Belgians, and we in Tanganyika to the British. After independence, I could not phone Kigali directly, I have to phone Kigali through Brussels or London. Well that is a reality. We have now remedied it; now my successor can phone Kigali.

We had no roads linking these countries. Before I stepped down, we had a loan from the European Community to link Rwanda and Burundi with Tanzania with a good road. It is still in the process of being built—that is a reality, a physical reality which hinders our trade. We have already formed a habit of trading with the North, and it will continue to thrive if we do not break the habit.

Even when you have the administrative capacity, how many African countries have the critical mass of personnel for development? The capacity to deal with an immense heritage from slavery and colonialism. In Tanzania at independence, I was given by the Germans and the British combined two university trained engineers and twelve doctors. That was the type of inheritance we had at that time. And I say, that's why we should not blame ourselves too much.

We tried to build democracies without democrats. I'm told the Soviet Union now is going to try and introduce private enterprise without private entrepreneurs. But we tried that in Africa, or either we tried or we were blamed for not trying. How could we have tried? Who were the private entrepreneurs in Tanzania when we took over? None! Absolutely none, with the exception of a few Asians, whom the British had allowed to establish a few shops. But we had no African entrepreneurs, because that was not what the British were there for. Today, of course, you could blame us, but now we have entrepreneurs. But look, we created them, they were not created by the British and the Germans.

We tried to build socialism without socialists! We look at Europe, for example, for democracy, we also like to be democratic. There was private enterprise, and we said we also like private enterprise. There was something called socialism, especially in Eastern Europe, and we were told, we also wanted to be socialist. I joked with President Neto in Luanda when I saw big posters of Lenin and Marx and Engels in the rooms. And I joked, "do you eat cassava here?" He said yes, and I said to late President Samora Michel, "Samora do you eat cassava in Mozambique?" He said yes. "Have you ever heard of a Marxist-Leninist country which eats cassava?"

The harm they have done to us, because we had to be Marxist-Leninist, we had to be democrats of the British Westminster model or something like that—a lot of stupidity. Yesterday I read something about the movement which is taking place in Africa now, the movement back to democracy? I said, "Back to what democracy?" Let's be realistic, back to what democracy? After slavery, colonialism, before colonialism, we knew the tribes, the kings and so forth. Looking back, the Europeans had their own kings, but we had our own kings. So, how are we able to promote democracy, when they were colonised kings? And when we had colonial governments, colonial provisional commissioners,—was that democracy?

As President Museveni said yesterday, we built the political parties. We had people in Africa we called 'prison' presidents. I wasn't unfortunately. The British never threw me into jail, but a large number of my colleagues were thrown into jail for daring to form a political party, or daring to form a trade union. The same people are now telling us that we should organize democracy on a large number of parties. You must have a million parties. It is absurd that democracy is to be based upon the number of parties, of course we are learning. And we have some very clever leaders in Africa— they will give you the parties and remain in power!

So what am I saying? I am saying, we should not blame ourselves for not doing what we could not have done in any case. We really tried, for thirty years. And in these thirty years, we have learnt a lot. And we have people —did you see the way they were speaking here? You think thirty years ago you would have seen or found people speak like that?

They were a small sample of what Africa has been able to produce during the last thirty years. It is a different continent, but we need to disclose

this. Have we been going back within the last thirty years? We have not. If you think we were, we would not have participants sitting here, if we had gone back to tribalism and back to the days of slavery? So, Africa can move forward into the twenty-first century, we can. We have thirty years experience, we have improved the education of our people.

You have these professors here. Didn't you hear this professor speaking here yesterday? Professor Adedeji, and he is only one out of thousands. Actually I am told and Adedeji was saying it yesterday, perhaps we may have, perhaps we may have lost to Europe about a hundred thousand experts from Africa.

This is not the Africa of 1960, so don't you believe it. We have many, many deficits, and especially the democratic deficits, because we thought we could develop somehow without the involvement of our people. It is impossible. How do you develop without the people? When we said "educate our people", they said "education was unproductive."Everything we suggested that should be directed in the development of human resources was not forthcoming other than saying "that is unproductive." Primary education, unproductive? We refused to accept primary education as unproductive. Adult education, we were told, is unproductive. We refused in a poor country like Tanzania, we said no! How can you have development or even democracy with illiterate people? How can you? Although at independence, 85 percent of our adult population was illiterate, today, 90 percent are literate. With that base, you can do something; with that base, you might do something, not with 20 percent literacy and 80 percent illiterates. What can you do with an illiterate?

I have a feeling that now there is greater realization in Africa not only that without development and cooperation, you can't have security and stability, as you have told us here very truly. But that also without security and stability you can't have development. There is no way in which you are going to have those things on the basis of misguided nationalism. Uganda on their own, Zambia on their own, Cape Verde—especially being an island —on their own, Tanzania on their own, Nigeria, our biggest country, it has half the population of Indonesia and when you are thinking of the giants of Asia, you don't think of Indonesia at all—what place can we have?

What place can Africa have? General (turning to Bashir), the unity of Sudan is important and work for it, the unity of Africa, what is Sudan on its own? What can you do? Huge country it is but so are others.

There is no future for this continent except in unity. Europeans, the people who governed us, the people while keeping us talking about Francophone and Anglophone, are now uniting. They are going, and Mrs. Thatcher can't stop the movement of Europe towards unity, they will throw her out, she's out! Europe is powerful. Belgium on its own has the income which is as big as that of the whole of Africa south of the Sahara. Belgium alone! And we say, if we don't mind, we are going to be marginalized? You are marginalized. But having said that, I think nobody

can marginalize us if we don't want to marginalize ourselves. You can marginalize 500 chickens, 500 million chickens. How do you marginalize 500 million people? It is not possible, if we don't want to be marginalized. And that is what you should be saying forever. We refuse to be marginalized. But we cannot refuse to be marginalized singly, we have to unite. The method of refusal to be marginalized is in our unity. That is what this forum is about, and that is why I urge that the document which comes from here plus the document which our leaders are going to be signing in Abuja—about the creation of an African Economic Community—and the efforts you are making at the non-governmental, regional and sub-regional levels are important and should be maintained. If we keep our promise, this time with the cooperation of the people of Africa, not simply the individual, I think we can do it.

I want to thank you very much for this opportunity you have given me.

   (please note that Mwalimu Nyerere spoke extemporaneously).

APPENDIX 3

Address by His Excellency Dr. Ernest Bai Koroma,

President of the Republic of Sierra Leone at the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD) IV Yokohama, Japan, May 28th, 2008.

Mr. Chairman, Your Majesty, Excellencies and colleagues, distinguished delegates, I would like to begin by expressing, on my personal behalf and that of the people of Sierra Leone, our sincere gratitude to the Government and people of Japan for the exceptional hospitality accorded us since our arrival and for hosting this TICAD IV summit.

   Mr. Chairman, Japan's initiative to organize this high-level policy dialogue to discuss the threats, opportunities and challenges facing African governments in addressing poverty and human suffering and, to mobilize support for African development initiatives is most welcome.

   This is a clear manifestation of Japan's commitment to promoting African security and sustainable development in the spirit of this TICAD conference. Excellencies, Colleagues and Distinguished Delegates, Peace and development are mutually interrelated and reinforcing.

   There is a strong link between the two—no development takes place in the absence of peace and stability. Experience and extensive studies have proven that conflict thrives at the instance of poverty, social, political and economic exclusiveness.

Many of Africa's conflicts, including ours in Sierra Leone, were largely ignited by the post-colonial legacies of arbitrary boundaries, authoritarian governance, scarcity of land and water resources, and centralization of political and economic power and politicization of ethnicity. When conflicts end, it is incumbent upon all actors, local and international, to engage in actions that will help to consolidate the peace and prevent a recurrence of violence.

These involve measures such as the disarmament, demobilization and re-insertion of ex-combatants, the reintegration and rehabilitation of refugees and internally displaced persons. It must also involve the strengthening of national democratic institutions, restoration of law and order, the promotion of human rights and the provision of basic social facilities.

A review of our experience reveals that implementation of such actions and interventions require a considerable outlay of human, material and financial resources. Though responsibility for peace and stability lies primarily with individual member states, the role of the international community in conflict transformation is critical for setting the stage for sustainable peace and development.

Mr. Chairman, Your Majesty, Excellencies, distinguished delegates, it is with respect to the above issues and in pursuit of our national post-war priority of consolidating our hard-won peace and establishing sustainable governance that we embarked on a number of significant measures since the civil conflict formally ended in 2002.

The government of Sierra Leone in collaboration with the International Community embarked on a broad programme of governance focusing on rebuilding a democratic political system, improving the legal system and combating corruption. We have also emphasized the promotion of human rights, enhancing grassroots participation in national development and the reduction of poverty. Africa is making considerable efforts to reverse the image of gloom and doom and to bring about positive change on the continent. Some successes are being achieved in addressing the causes of conflict.

However, poverty, endemic diseases, the current global market realities and the unsustainable debt burden on many African countries continue to mar efforts in improving the quality of life of our populations and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These further compromise the circumstance of fragile states and countries emerging from conflict.

In such circumstances, rebuilding basic infrastructural facilities and empowering local communities through capacity building can only be accomplished through partnership and sustained engagement of the international community.

Though secure in our conviction that we should not be entirely donor dependent, we remain highly appreciative of the assistance received from our development partners.

In Sierra Leone for example, TICAD-sponsored projects have included support to peace consolidation, youth development and community empowerment, model projects in agriculture, education, water and sanitation as well as training and development of agricultural experts. We have received

support from the Government of Japan for various activities including elections, improvement in electric power and rural health.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, helpful as these interventions have been, they are not sufficient by themselves to lift our compatriots out of poverty. We need increased investment in infrastructure, agriculture, mineral resources and research; and the scientific capability of our citizens needs to be raised to appreciable levels.

There is no doubt that the returns on such investments in these sectors will attract further financial inflows and foreign direct investments. We therefore hope that our Japanese partners will embrace the challenge and help in developing economic infrastructure for sustainable development.

Excellencies, Building and consolidating peace and the transformation to growth require a considerable level of political will from the stakeholders, such as the countries themselves and the international community to undertake and support reforms for good governance and democracy. In all of these, the role of women and the civil society as drivers of change is crucial in this process.

Mr. Chairman, It cannot be denied that with the support of the international community we in Sierra Leone have made significant progress in our post-conflict recovery. Key among our achievements are two peaceful parliamentary and presidential elections and one local government election since the end of war in 2002.

We have also undertaken the reform and restructuring of certain institutions such as, the Police, the Armed Forces, the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC), and other state organs supporting the democratic process, good governance and the rule of law. We are also reviewing our constitution in line with the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

All of these are a practical manifestation of our determination to make Sierra Leone a model for war-to-peace transformation in the West African sub-region and beyond. Mr. Chairman, Despite these achievements, there are still numerous challenges owing mainly to the lack of resources needed to implement the required reforms.

The low level of development and the capacity of our citizens to take advantage of economic opportunities also continue to hamper the development of the private sector in order to create employment opportunities for the country's youthful population. Indeed, the pace of attainment of our development aspirations has yet to match the strides we have achieved in our political maturity.

Mr. Chairman, your Majesty and Excellencies, the recent increase in food prices have resulted in the leaders in Africa taking another look at the unique opportunities the soil and climate conditions present.

If there is one region in the world that can contribute towards agricultural development and feeding the world, that region is Africa and this presents a challenge for the nations with funds to work together with the nations with the natural resources for the mutual benefit of all.

I believe Mr. Chairman that this is what the cooperation between Japan and Africa is all about. In concluding therefore, we expect that this conference would be able to come up with a road map on how to approach issues in Africa, adopt the declaration and implement the follow-up mechanisms agreed upon. Let us take the challenge!

I thank you all.

APPENDIX 4

STATEMENT AT TICAD IV YOKOHMA JAPAN

By President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni of Uganda

Your Excellency, Mr. Yasuo Fukuda, The Prime Minister of Japan,
Your Excellencies the Heads of State and Government,
Distinguished Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen.

On behalf of the people of Uganda and myself, I would like to, first of all, pay tribute to the Government and people of Japan for the extremely warm welcome you have accorded to me and my delegation and for the excellent arrangements you have made for this historic meeting in this magnificent city of Yokohama. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that since we last met here in Japan for TICAD III in 2003, Uganda has experienced a period of impressive economic growth averaging 8.3 per cent per annum over the last five (5) years.

We have also been able to maintain macroeconomic stability while improving the business environment for our market-driven and private sector-led economy.

Let me hasten to add that this achievement in increasing the rate of economic growth while maintaining stability has not been without significant challenges. We have had to overcome the stresses arising from our landlocked location, the rapid and persistent increases in the price of fuel and a severe reduction in the production of electricity arising from unfavourable climatic and hydrological conditions and the unfortunate delays in building new hydro-dams. If it was not for these bottlenecks, some of them completely avoidable, our rate of growth would have been double-digits.

Mr. Chairman, despite these and other challenges, we have come to TICAD IV truly optimistic that the economic and strategic cooperation between Africa and Asia which has been growing stronger over the past 5

years can be further strengthened so as to enable us to improve living conditions for our respective continents.

In this regard I want to welcome the increases in trade between Africa and Asia, the increase in resource flows from Asia to Africa and the increased technical assistance that Japan has been providing to Uganda in particular and to Africa in general.

I wish to take this opportunity to welcome the financial assistance provided by Japan for infrastructure financing as well as for the private sector which Japan has made available to African Nations through the African Development Bank (ADB). I welcome these funds and I call upon the Government of Japan to continue to commit additional resources to this most important catalyst for Africa's economic growth and development. Our experience has convinced us beyond doubt that in order to accelerate economic growth, we must improve our infrastructure, such as roads, rail and energy, as well as increase the availability of affordable long term credit to the private sector. Mr. Chairman, I applaud Japan for the efforts you are making in this direction and I assure you of our commitment to make the most effective use of these resources. I also want to welcome the efforts your government is making to promote value addition especially in agricultural processing under the "one village one product movement."

Although this effort is only beginning in Uganda, we are in principle in agreement that Africa should move away from the exportation of raw materials to high value added products. This is the position we articulated in TICAD III and it is still our position.

We believe that increased value addition is essential to provide employment opportunities to our growing populations. It is, therefore, an integral part of the strategy for accelerating economic growth, increasing the exportation of processed products, expanding employment opportunities and consolidating social and political stability.

The affluence and even profligacy previously limited to Western Europe, North America and Japan has now spread to China, India, Brazil, some other Asian and Latin American Countries, as well as to Africa. Demand for fuel, food and other raw-materials (copper, steel, cement, etc.), has outstripped supply in the short-run. I would like to inform this Conference that as far as Uganda is concerned, our perennial problem has been over-supply of food (milk, bananas, sweet potatoes, maize, fruits, etc.) that did not have enough demand. This was due to trade distorting policies of Europe, USA, Japan and, even, African Countries. Now that reality has caught up with us, let us resolve past mistakes: get rid of subsidies and other free trade barriers. Using the 40 million acres of arable land in Uganda, producing two crops based on rain-fed agriculture or more relying on irrigation, we can make a good contribution in alleviating the shortage of food in the World. We only need to take care of renewing the nutrients in the soil; nitrogen, phosphorous, potassium, etc. Hitherto, only producing for the internal market and homestead consumption, those nutrients were being recycled. Let Japanese private com-

panies participate in local value addition. Indian companies have done this in Uganda. Why can't Japanese companies similarly do it? Through bio-fuels, Africa can also contribute to alleviating the energy crisis.

As far as minerals are concerned, Uganda does not wish to continue exporting metals. It will give more value to Uganda if the metals are alloyed with steel in Uganda so that we create jobs for our people and earn more money from our natural resources. Japanese companies can play a role here. Uganda sees TICAD IV as a strategy for increased cooperation between Africa and Asia and as an instrument for promoting economic progress and political stability. The increased flow of technical and financial resources to Africa will build infrastructure, increase industrialization, expand employment opportunities and promote free and fair trade among our countries.

It is, therefore, a worthwhile effort that will strengthen the economic growth of Africa as well as the growth of the world economy as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, Uganda supports the spirit of TICAD IV and its commitment to increase economic growth. In this connection, we specifically support:

•additional resource flows for the Private Sector

•additional resource flows for value addition by Japanese private companies

•additional resource flows for infrastructure the commitment to free trade

• the expansion of employment opportunities.

We look forward towards faster economic growth in all our countries and we promise to work tirelessly to increase the friendship and cooperation that exists between the peoples of Africa and the people of Japan.

I thank you all for listening to me.

Wednesday, 28th May, 2008

APPENDIX 5

Keynote Speech by H.E. JakayaA Mrisho Kikwete, President of The United Republic of Tanzania, at the TICAD IV Opening

Session Yokohama, Japan, 28 May 2008

Mr. Prime Minister;
Distinguished Heads of State and Government;
Invited Guests;
Ladies and Gentlemen;

On behalf of my colleagues from the African continent and on my own behalf, I thank you, Prime Minister Fukuda first for inviting us to TICAD IV. We also thank the people of Yokohama for welcoming and receiving us so warmly. We thank and congratulate you and your government for organizing this important conference so well. *Mr. Prime Minister;*

My colleagues and I from Africa have come to Japan in such record numbers because we hold with very high esteem our relationship with the government and people of Japan. We have come to cement the invaluable friendship that so happily exists between Japan and Africa.

We are here in full force to underline our trust and collective support for the TICAD process which, over 15 years of its existence, has proved to be a very useful instrument for our cooperation.

It is the sincere wish of all of us gathered here to see to it that TICAD IV transforms Japan-Africa relations into a new paradigm of effective partnership that we can further develop for the mutual benefits of our two sides.

Ladies and Gentlemen;

The TICAD process, though multilateral in character, has been so successful through this period of time because of the pivotal leadership role played by the successive governments and support by people of Japan.

Japan's continued commitment to Africa and the strength of its own leadership of the Process will be crucial. Fortunately, Japan has consistently exercised that leadership, and the success of the TICAD process so far testifies to that. *Mr. Prime Minister;*

We thank you and your government for choosing a very befitting theme for TICAD IV: Towards a Vibrant Africa. For TICAD IV to give a particular attention to the development of infrastructure, especially development of regional road networks in Africa, resonates very well with all of us gathered here and the people we represent back in the Continent. You have captured the essence of what needs to be done to unlock Africa's development potential.

We also welcome the announcement to double aid to Africa by 2012. Together with the focus on enhancing maternal and child health in Africa,

as well as assisting Africa double rice production and provide safe drinking water, among others, TICAD IV indeed answers some of the critical factors in the promotion of economic growth and development on the continent.

Africa needs more ODA to develop its infrastructure, develop its human capital and improve the provision of basic social and economic services.

My colleagues and I encourage you to continue to be committed to the cause of Africa's development and exercise leadership in that regard. We pledge to work ever more closely with you, as partners in progress, in the reconstruction of this important chapter in our overall relationship. *Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;*

Besides the increase in ODA, which is highly appreciated, TICAD needs to go further. What remains to be seen is increased trade and investment between Africa and Japan. We also need to see more involvement and active presence and participation of the Japanese private sector on the continent.

We are aware of the caution with which the Japanese private sector approaches Africa. For them, Africa is a far-off land and too risky to invest in. Consequently, Japanese investment in Africa has remained small. According to the World Bank, Japanese FDI in Sub-Saharan Africa between 2002 and 2004 amounted to US $415 million only. This was roughly 0.4% of Japan's total global FDI flow of US $108.5 billion.

Interestingly, of those US $415 million that Japanese firms have invested in Africa, US $352 million or 85% went to just two countries—South Africa and Egypt. So, the rest of Africa was left to share the remaining US $63 million.

With regards to trade, goods and services exported to Japan from Africa were less than 2% of Japan's total imports in 2003–2004. *Ladies and Gentlemen;*

This must change, and it is possible for that change to happen. There can be more investments and more trade between us. I know we in Africa have to go the extra mile to convince the Japanese investors about coming to Africa. We have been doing precisely that over the many years but we realize that we have to do a lot more until we succeed in convincing the Japanese private sector that Africa is a good place to invest. While we pledge readiness to continue to do so, we seek the support of the Government of Japan to do more to encourage the Japanese private sector to venture into Africa.

I say with no hesitation, on behalf of my colleagues, that the perceived risks of doing business with or in Africa today are more a matter of the unforgotten past history than what is actually obtaining on the ground today. Africa is a safer, prospective and lucrative place to invest. My colleagues and I will take time and turns to explain about that in greater detail during this meeting.

It is our considered view that, may be Japanese businesses need more assurances from their government to allay their fears about risks in Africa. I see the initiatives announced by the Prime Minister of Japan, to be undertaken through JBIC, as an appropriate antidote to the trepidations of the Japanese private sector about investing in Africa. *Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;*

Another critical component of TICAD IV is the focus it will give to the increasingly critical issue of climate change. Africa, which contributes least to the global warming phenomenon, bears far more than its fair share of the direct and indirect consequences thereof.

We salute the Japanese leadership in attaining a broad global consensus on a practical mechanism to follow-on from the Kyoto Protocol. Africa is solidly behind you. We applaud the creation, by Japan, of the U$ 10 billion Climate Change Fund. On behalf of my colleagues, I humbly request the Government of Japan to set aside a fixed percentage of that Fund specifically for Africa. Above all, make those funds easily accessible by us.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Not long after TICADIV meeting, Japan will host the 2008 G8 Summit. It is our hope—certainly our expectation—that the outcome of TICAD IV will serve as a concrete basis for Japan to urge its G–8 partners to fully honour their own commitments to Africa, and to fully support the new economic-development focus of TICAD IV. *Ladies and Gentlemen;*

Let me end where I began. Africa has come to Japan, with high expectations. Those expectations revolve around the success of this Summit in setting a solid base for a new, more dynamic relationship between Africa and Japan. A relationship based on the shared vision of a vibrant and prosperous Africa.

Today we rededicate ourselves to realize that vision. I seek the pledge of all of us to make that vision into a reality. We expect no less of ourselves. We hope for no less from Japan. I thank you for your kind attention.

Notes to Appendix 1

1. The King. Title of an order of the priesthood
2. The customary attitude of a submissive inferior at that time.
3. The God Osiris was believed to have reigned on earth many thousand years before Mêmês, the first historical king.
4. Soul = *ka',* and throughout this work. *Ka'* is translated *person* in § 22, *will* in § 27.
5. An obscure or corrupt phrase here follows, which does not admit of satisfactory translation.
6. Translation doubtful.
7. *i.e.* comfortable.
8. The above translation *is* not satisfactory; the text may be corrupt. No intelligible translation of it has yet been made.
9. His belly, presumably.
10. *i.e.* all wickedness is contained therein.
11. A servant.
12. Compare Prov. xvii. 18.
13. So also in life, by diversity of aim, alternating work and play, happiness is secured. Tacking is evidently meant in the case of the steersman.
14. This section refers to the relations between the son of a nobleman and his tutor, dwelling on the benefits from former pupils in high places, if their schooldays have been pleasant. The last sentence of this section, as of sections 23 and 25, is somewhat á *propos des bottes.*
15. An obscure phrase is here.
16. Literally, "It is that which preventeth the heart from advancing (?)" A curious phrase.
17. Literally, after his stick or sceptre.
18. ho knows them.
19. The greater part of this section is a play upon the root *šôdem,* which in its meaning includes our *hear (listen)* and *obey.* This tiresome torture of words is frequent in Egyptian, especially in old religious texts.
20. The "Followers of Horus" are a legendary dynasty of demigods, believed by the Egyptians to have ruled for about 13,400 years after the reign of Horus, and before that of Mênês. There is also an order of spirits of this name.
21. A word of unknown meaning; apparently some kind of plant. Such a word seems out of place here, and may be idiomatic, like our "flowery language." But the preceding line obviously refers to this book.

Bibliography

Achebe, Chinua. (1987). *Anthills of the Savannah*. New York: Anchor Books.

Adams, Russell. (1998). African-American Studies and the State of the Art. In (Ed) Mario Azevedo, *Africana Studies: A Survey of Africa and the African Diaspora Second Edition*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

African Forum for Envisioning Africa: Focus on NEPAD Report. (2002). Nairobi: Mazingira Institute, African Academy of Sciences and Heinrich Boell Foundation.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. (2007). *Borderlands, La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt lute Books.

Asante Molefi. (1998). *The Afrocentric Idea* (Revised and Extended Edition). Philadelphia: Temple University.

Asante, Molefi. (1992) *Kemet Afrocentricity and Knowledge*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Auer, Jeffrey, J. (1959). *An Introduction to Research in Speech*. New York: Harper and Row.

Badian, Seydou. (1998). *Caught in the Storm* (Translator: Marie-Therese Noiset). Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Black, Edwin (1970). The Second Persona. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* Vol LV1 #2.

Blake, Cecil. (1993). "The Characterological Dimension," *Journal of the Africa Leadership Forum*, February, 1993. pp.4–5

Blake, Cecil (2004). Cultural Warrants in Development Communication Contexts in Africa, in (eds) Charles Okigbo and Festus Eribo, *Development Communication in Africa*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Blake, Cecil (2004). Communication and Governance in Africa. In (Ed) Ola Uduku and Alfred B. Zack-Williams, *Africa Beyond the Post-Colonial: Political and Socio-Cultural Identities*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Blake, Cecil (2005). An African Nationalist Ideology framed in Diaspora and the Development Quagmire: Any hope for a Renaissance? *Journal of Black Studies* Vol. 35, #5 pp.573–596.

Blyden, Edward Wilmot. (1887). *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh Press.

Biko, Steve (1978). *I Write What I Like*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Bitzer, Lloyd. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* Vol.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routeledge.

Boehmer, Elleke. (2005). *Colonial and Post-Colonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boulding, Kenneth (1968). *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Bryant, Donald(1953). Rhetoric: Its Function ands Scope. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* (December)

Budge, E.A. Wallis. (1920). *An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary.* London: John Murray.

Byrd, Michael W. & Clayton, Linda A. (2002). *An American Health Dilemma: Race, Medicine, and Health Care in the United States Volume 2.* New York and London: Routledge.

Cartey, Wilfred & Kilson, Martin. (1970). *The Africa Reader: Independent Africa.* New York: Random House.

Cheney-Coker, Syl. *Concerto for an Exile.* London: Heineman, 1973.

Childs, Peter, Weber, Jean Jacques &Williams, Patrick. (2006). *Post-Colonial Theory and Literatures.* Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Cooper, Lane. (1960. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle.* Prentice Hall.

Covino, William A. & Joliffe, David A. (1995). *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Davidson, Basil. (1989). The Ancient World and Africa: Whose Roots? In Sertima, Ivan Van. *Egypt Revisited.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. pp.39–52.

De Waal, Alex. (2002). "What's new in the New Partnership for Africa's Development?" *International Affairs* 78 #3, 463–475.

Dew, T.R.(1970). *Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature.* Westport, CT: Negro University Press.

Diop, Cheikh Anta. (1962). *The Cultural Unity of Negro Africa; the domain of patriarchy and of matriarchy in classical antiquity.* Paris: Presence Africaine.

Diop, Cheikh Anta. (1974). *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality.* Chicago: Lawrence Hill

Douglass, Frederick. (1854). The Claims of the Negro Ethnologically Considered. In Foner, Phillip S. (ed)1972. *The Voice of Black America.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Duhamel, Albert P. (1965). The function of Rhetoric as Effective Expression. In Schwartz, Joseph and Rycenga, John A. *The Province of Rhetoric.* New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Ehninger, Douglas. (1968). On Systems of Rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rhetoric.* Summer 1, pp.131–144.

Ehninger, Douglas. (1972). *Contemporary Rhetoric.* Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Ellis, A. B. (1970). *The Yoruba-Speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast of West Africa.* Oosterhout N.B. The Netherlands: Anthropological Publications.

Ferkiss, Victor C. (1967). *Africa's Search for Identity.* Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company.

Fox, Michael V. (1983). Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric. *Rhetorica* Vol.1 #1, pp.9–22.

Floistad, G. (1987). *Contemporary Philosophy: A New Survey.* Dordrecht, Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Frederickson, George M. (1971). *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on African American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Gray, Giles, W. (1946). The 'Precepts' of Kegemni and Ptah-Hotep." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* Vol. 32 pp.446–54.

Graff, Richard, Walzer, Arthur E., & Atwill, Janet M. (2005). *The Viability of the Rhetorical Tradition.* Albany: The State University of New York Press.

Gross, Alan J. (2005). The Rhetorical Tradition. In *The Viability of the Rhetorical Tradition* (Eds): Graff, Richard et al. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gunn, Battiscombe. (1918). *The Instruction of Ptah Hotep and The Instruction of Ke'gemni.* London: John Murray

Hallo, William. (2004). The Birth of Rhetoric. In Lipson, Carol S. (2004). *Rhetoric Before and Beyond The Greeks*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. Pp.1–25.

Hegel, G. W. (1956). *The Philosophy of History*. (Trans.) Sibree, J. New York: Wiley Book Co.

Hodgkin, Thomas. (1957). *Nationalism in Colonial Africa*. New York: New York University Press.

Hoijer, Harry (1962). The Relation of Language to Culture, in Sol Tax (Ed). (1962). *Anthropology Today*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hutto, David (2002). Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric in the Old and Middle Kingdoms. *Rhetorica* Volume XX, #3, pp.213–233.

Hyman, Stanley Edgar (1955). *The Armed Vision: A Study in the Methods of Modern Literary Criticism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jebb, R. C. (1893). *The Attic Orators*. London: Macmillan and Co.

Jordan, Wintrop D. (1968). *White Over Black: American Attitude Towards the Negro, 1550–1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kant, Emmanuel. (1960). *Observations on the feeling of the beautiful and Sublime* (Translator, John T. Goldthwait). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Karenga. Maulana (2002). Introduction *to Black Studies (Third Edition)*. Los Angeles: University of Sankore Press.

Karenga, Maulana. (1989). Towards a Sociology of Maatian Ethics: Literature and Context. In Sertima, Ivan Van. *Egypt Revisited*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. pp.352–398.

Kesteloot, Lilyan (1972). *Intellectual Origins of the African Revolution*. Rockville, MD: New Perspectives.

Kelley, Venita (2002). 'Good Speech': An Interpretive Essay in Investigating an African Philosophy of Communication. *Western Journal of Black Studies*. Vol. 26, #1. pp.44–54.

Kennedy, George K (1998). *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kortenaar, Neil. Only connect: *Anthills in the Savannah* and Achebe's *Trouble with Nigeria. Research in African Literature, Vol. 24*.

Kuhn, Thomas. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lacey, Nick (1998). *Image and Representation: Key Concepts in Media Studies*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lichtheim Miriam. (1973) *Ancient Egyptian Literature: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lipson, Carol S. (2004). Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric: It comes Down to Maat. In *Rhetoric Before and Beyond The Greeks*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lipson, Carol S. & Binkley, Roberta A. (Eds) (2004). *Rhetoric Before and Beyond The Greeks*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

M'Bow, Amadou-Mahtar. (1990). Preface in Mokhtar, G. (1990). (Ed). *General History of Africa 11: Ancient Civilizations of Africa. (*Abridged Edition). California: James Currey; Paris: UNESCO.

Mathabane, Mark. (1986). *Kaffir Boy*. New York: Free Press.

Maddy, Yulissa Amadu & MacCann Donnarae. (1996). *African Images in Juvenile Literature: Commentaries on Neocolonialist Fiction*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, Inc. Publishers.

McKerrow, R. (1989). Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Practice. *Communication Monographs*. Vol. 56, pp.91–110.

Mokhtar, G. (1990). (Ed). *General History of Africa 11: Ancient Civilizations of Africa. (*Abridged Edition). Californa: James Currey; Paris: UNESCO.

Moyers, Bill. (2003). Interview with Chinua Achebe. *The Moyers Collection: A World of Ideas*. Princeton, N.J.: Films for the Humanities and Sciences.

Mudimbe, V.Y. (1994). *The Idea of Africa*. London: James Curry.

NEPAD Document (October, 2001). Abuja, Nigeria. (www.dfa.gov.za/events/nepad.pdf

Nyrere, Julius. (1991). Statement by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere at the Kampala Forum on Security, Stability Development in Africa. In, Obasanjo, Olusegun & Mosha, Felix G.N. (eds) 1992. Ota, Nigeria: The Africa Leadership Forum.

Obenga, Theophile. (1992). *Ancient Egypt and Black Africa: A Students Handbook for the Study of Ancient Egypt in Philosophy, Linguistics and Gender Relations*. London: Karnak House.

Obenga, Theophile. (1996). *Icons of Maat*. Philadelphia, Penn: The Sources Editions.

Obenga, Theophile. (2004). "Africa's Place in the World: African Renaissance in the 21st Century," paper presented at the First Conference of Intellectuals From Africa and the Diaspora. Dakar, Senegal, October 6–9 2004.

Ojaide, T. (1992). Modern African literature and cultural identity. *African Studies Review*. Vol. 35, 3.

Oliver, Robert T. (1995). Culture and Rhetoric. In Covino, William A & Jolliffe, Davis A. *Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions, Boundaries*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. pp.353–363.

Oruka, Odera. (1987). African Philosophy: A Brief Personal History and Current Debate. In Floistad, G. *Contemporary Philosophy: A New Survey*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. pp.45–78.

Padmore, George (1956). *Pan Africanism or Communism: The Coming Struggle for Africa*. London: D. Dobson; Accra: Guinea Press.

Parkinson, R. B. (2003). *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection*. London: Continuum.

Peden W. (Ed). (1955). *Notes on the State of Virginia* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. (1992). *White On Black: Imaghes of Africa and Blacks inb Western Popular Culture*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Platz, Mabel. (1935). *The History of Public Speaking*. New York: Noble and Noble Publications

Polanyi, Michael (1958). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. New York and Evanston: Harper Torchbooks/The Academy Library, Harper and Row Publishers.

Poulakis, John, & Poulakis, Takis. (1999). *Classical Rhetorical Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Said, Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Sarvan, Charles P. (1988). Feminism and African fiction: The novels of Mariama Ba. *Modern Fiction Studies,* Vol. 34 3.

Schiapa, Edward. (1992). Rhetorike: What's in a name? Toward a revised history of early Greek rhetorical theory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* (78) pp.1–15.

Schillington, Kevin. (1995). *History of Africa* (Revised Edition). New York: Sty. Martin's Press

Schwartz, Joseph & Rycenga, John A. (Eds) (1965). *The Province of Rhetoric*. New York: The Ronald Press.

Shome, Raka & Hegde, Radha S. (2002). Postcolonial Approaches to Communication: Charting the terrain, engaging the intersections. *Communication Theory*. Vol 12, #3, pp.249–270.

Shome, Raka. (1996). Postcolonial interventions in the rhetorical canon: An "Other" View. *Communication Theory.* Vol. 6, #1, pp.40–59.

Sigmund, Paul E. (1972). *The Ideologies of Developing Nations*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Simpson, William Kelly (Ed). (1973). *The Literature Of Ancient Egypt* (With translations by R.O. Faulkner, Edward F. Wente, Jr., William Kely Simpson). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Spitzer, Leo. (1974). The *Creoles of Sierra Leone*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1987). New York and London: Metheun, Inc. *This Day,* August 6, 2003.

Wallace, W & Miller, A V. (2007). (Trans). *Hegel's Philosophy of the Mind*. Translated from the 1830 Edition. OXFORD: Clarendon Press.

Watson, James. An interview reported in *The Sunday Times*, October 14, 2007.

Wyse, Akintola. (1989). *The Krio of Sierra Leone: An Interpretive History*. London: C. Husrt & Company.

Zaba, Z. (1956). *Les maxims de Ptahhotep*. Prague: Editions de L'Academie Tchecoslovaque des Sciences.

APPENDICES 2–5

Speeches by the following
(Retrieved on October 27, 2008)

President Thabo Mbeki
http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2003/mbek0929.htm

President Ernest Bai Koroma
http://www.sierra-leone.org/GOSL/koroma052808.html

President H.E. Jakaya Mrisho Kikwete
http://www.ticad.net/presskit2008/AU_statement.pdf

President Hosni Mubarak
http://www.sis.gov.eg/En/Politics/Presidency/President/Speeshes/000001/040105
0200000000000344.htm

President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni
http://www.statehouse.go.ug/news.php?catId=2&&item=266

Index