G I G A *Working Papers*

German ▪ Institute of Global and Area Studies
Leibniz-Institut für Globale und Regionale Studien

GIGA Research Programme:
Violence, Power and Security

_____

**Ethnic Coalitions of Convenience and Commitment:
Political Parties and Party Systems in Kenya**

Sebastian Elischer

N° 68   **February 2008**

GIGA Working Papers

Edited by the GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies / Leibniz-Institut für Globale und Regionale Studien.

The Working Paper Series serves to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication in order to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. An objective of the series is to get the findings out quickly, even if the presentations are less than fully polished. Inclusion of a paper in the Working Paper Series does not constitute publication and should not limit publication in any other venue. Copyright remains with the authors. When Working Papers are eventually accepted by or published in a journal or book, the correct citation reference and, if possible, the corresponding link will then be included in the Working Papers website at <www.giga-hamburg.de/workingpapers>.

All GIGA Working Papers are available online and free of charge on the website: www.giga-hamburg.de/workingpapers. Working Papers can also be ordered in print. For production and mailing a cover fee of € 5 is charged. For orders or any requests please contact:
E-mail: workingpapers@giga-hamburg.de
Phone: ++49 (0)40 - 428 25 548

Ethnic Coalitions of Convenience and Commitment: Political Parties and Party Systems in Kenya

Abstract

This paper analyzes the role of ethnicity in shaping the character of Kenya's political parties and its party system since 1992. Drawing on a constructivist conception of ethnicity, it uses a framework of comparison derived from Donald Horowitz and distinguishes between three party types: the mono-ethnic party, the multi-ethnic alliance type and the multi-ethnic integrative type. It shows that although Kenyan parties have increasingly incorporated diverse communities, they have consistently failed to bridge the country's dominant ethnic cleavages. Consequently, all of Kenya's significant parties represent ethnic coalitions of convenience and commitment and, thus, ethnic parties. The paper further states that the country's post-2007 political environment is a by-product of the omnipresence of this party type.

Keywords: Social cleavages, ethnicity, political party identification, Kenya

Sebastian Elischer

is a PhD student at Jacobs University Bremen and a doctoral fellow of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation. He is an associated research fellow with the project "Managing Ethnic Conflict Through Institutional Engineering: Ethnic Party Bans in Africa" conducted at Jacobs University, the Universities of Duisburg-Essen and Darmstadt, and the GIGA.

Contact: s.elischer@jacobs-university.de

Website: www.jacobs-university.de/directory/selischer/index.php

Zusammenfassung

Der Einfluss von Ethnizität auf politische Parteien in Kenia

Afrikanische Parteien wurden in der Literatur nur sehr vereinzelt systematisch untersucht. Allerdings wird generell Ethnizität eine große Bedeutung bei der Klassifizierung afrikanischer Parteien zugemessen. Die vorliegende Analyse bestätigt dies für Kenia. Auf der Grundlage von Donald Horowitz' Theorie über politischen Wettbewerb in multiethnischen Gesellschaften werden in der Untersuchung des Einflusses von Ethnizität auf politische Parteien drei Parteitypen unterschieden: die monoethnische Partei, die multiethnische Allianz und die multiethnische integrative Partei. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass seit 1992 alle politisch signifikanten Parteien kurzlebige ethnische Koalitionen darstellen. Diese haben seit Einführung des Mehrparteiensystems Konfliktlinien zwischen ethnischen Gruppen verstärkt. Gewaltsame ethnische Konflikte, wie sie nach den Wahlen im Dezember 2007 zu beobachten waren, sind eine Folgeerscheinung dieser Koalitionen.

Ethnic Coalitions of Convenience and Commitment:
Political Parties and Party Systems in Kenya

Sebastian Elischer

Article Outline

1   Introduction

The 2007 Kenyan elections provided one of the rare instances on the African continent where the outcome of both the presidential and parliamentary elections could not be anticipated and where a change of government was a realistic possibility (Bogaards 2003). Yet the aftermath represented a setback on the country's journey to democratic consolidation, something which many had already taken for granted after Kenya's first democratic and peaceful handover of power from one government to another in 2002. Violent clashes between the Kenyan police forces and opposition supporters as well as strong ethnic rhetoric by all major political players[1] dramatically underlined the high salience of ethnicity in Kenyan politics. This study illustrates that these clashes and conflicts are a direct outcome of the particular type of party which is prevalent in Kenya. Accordingly, it pursues the following research question: *Which type(s) of political parties exist in Kenya? Which type, if any, is prevalent in Kenya's party system?* In order to arrive at answers, the study will initially outline a classifica-

---

[1]   Both President Kibaki and opposition leader Raila Odinga accused each other of attempted genocide in various TV interviews. *Kenya Television Network*, January 2, 2008.

tion scheme derived from Horowitz's theory of political competition in ethnically seg-
mented societies (Horowitz 2000). It includes the following party types: The mono-ethnic
party (representing one group), the multi-ethnic alliance, and the multi-ethnic integrative
party (representing various groups respectively). Subsequently, the scheme will be applied
to parties that were significant in Kenya between 1991 and 2007. In order to identify politi-
cally relevant parties, the study uses the Laakso and Taagepera effective number of parties
index.[2] The study distinguishes between three periods: Firstly, a period of fission (1991 to
1997), in which multi-ethnic alliances disintegrated. In this period the effective number of
parties ranged between 4.1 (1992 parliamentary election) and 4.5 (1997 parliamentary elec-
tion). Secondly, a period of fusion (1998 to 2002), in which this trend was reversed. In this
period parties merged into multi-ethnic alliances and the effective number of parties de-
clined from 4.5 to 2.9 (2002 parliamentary election) accordingly. Finally, a period of fluidity
(2003 until today), in which the position of parties in and out of government was increas-
ingly difficult to determine and in which party alliances were no longer made up of parties
but of party wings and individuals. The analysis will demonstrate that all of Kenya's signifi-
cant parties overwhelmingly follow Horowitz's logic of ethnic coalitions of convenience and
commitment and thus represent ethnic parties.

2   Framework for Comparison: Ethnicity, Party Types and Indicators

2.1   Ethnicity

Although there is agreement about the significance of ethnicity in African political life, there
are conceptual disagreements about the term. There has long been a debate in political sci-
ence between "primordalists," who see ethnicity as a static relic of a primordial African past,
and representatives of a more constructivist notion, who regard ethnicity as the product of
perceived norms and identity, which has the potential to change over time (Ogude 2002,
Berman et al. 2004). This study draws on the concept of ethnicity as outlined by Nelson Kas-
fir, which is closer to the latter. For Kasfir

> [E]thnicity contains objective characteristics associated with common ancestry, such as
> language, territory, cultural practices and the like. These are perceived by both insiders
> and outsiders as important indicators of identity, so that they can become the bases for
> mobilizing social solidarity and which in certain situations result in political activity.
> (Kasfir 1976: 77)

Thus Kasfir proposes a fluid concept of ethnicity: Actors' self-definition in any given situa-
tion might or might not involve ethnic considerations. The strength of his conception of eth-

---

[2]   The Laakso and Taagepera effective number of parties index gives increasing weight to parties that receive
       higher proportions of the vote. It is calculated by taking the inverse of the sum of the squared proportions of
       the vote or of the seats. For an application of the index, see Chhibber and Kollman (2004:4-9).

nicity is grounded in the fact that it allows for specification when applied to different political scenarios: Ethnic identities may play a significant role—for example, during an election campaign—but they may equally cease to matter. Recent quantitative studies undertaken by *Afrobarometer* encourage a situational approach towards ethnicity. In a cross-national study conducted in various African countries, Bannon and others have found that the political salience of ethnicity is heavily dependent on the national context as well as on the intensity of political competition (Bannon et al. 2004).

2.2   Party Types and Indicators

The framework for analyzing Kenyan political parties in the context of this study includes three different party types, the mono-ethnic, the multi-ethnic alliance and the multi-ethnic integrative party. These types are derived from a typology originally composed by Diamond and Gunther (2001:1-39), which is designed to classify political parties on a global scale. The typology used in this study is a limited version of the original Diamond and Gunther framework.[3] The existence of other party types in Africa, such as the programmatic party, is not denied here; instead, the typology provides a mere starting point for analyzing Kenyan political parties. If empirical evidence showed that Kenya's political parties did not fit our framework of comparison, the development of further party types would be required. However, as the discussion below will demonstrate, such considerations are unwarranted. In order to distinguish between the three party types under consideration, the following indicators will be used:

-   *Leadership Composition.* In this study party leadership refers to the top positions in a political party including the chairman, the vice-chairman (or vice-chairmen depending on the party's constitution), the secretary-general, and—where data is available—the national treasurer.[4] Looking at a variety of personalities at the top of a party brings the advantage of being able to decipher the setup of the party in greater detail than when simply looking at the party's presidential candidate or the chairman, as is often the case in the literature on African parties.
-   *Party Factions.* Factions exist in any party. Whether or not factions form around ethnic groups, programmatic ideas, generational groups, or merely powerful individuals underlines the salience of ethnicity in party politics.

---

[3]   Ethnicity-based parties in the original typology have been modified for present purposes: Diamond and Gunther's Congress Party Type is divided into two different parties, the multi-ethnic alliance and the multi-ethnic integrative party. This has been done to analyze the salience of ethnicity in Kenyan parties in a more thorough way.

[4]   This study outlines all party leadership positions as they were reported by the *Daily Nation*, Kenya's major newspaper. Unfortunately, in some rare cases position holders could not be identified, not even by the respective party headquarters in Kenya.

- *National Coverage.* This study measures the ability of a party to reach out by comparing the number of parliamentary candidates nationwide and per province to the total number of constituencies nationwide and per province.

- *Party Nationalization Scores (PNS) and Electoral Cleavages.* Party Nationalization Scores (PNS) provide a useful means of comparing different parties' electoral support nationwide.[5] These alone, however, cannot identify whether or not a party's vote is dominated by a particular group, especially in cases where districts or provinces are populated by diverse communities. Therefore, PNS must be analyzed in connection with a region's ethnic composition and election results. It is necessary to note that neither mono-ethnic parties nor multi-ethnic parties of any type have to claim the total support or even the majority support of the group they represent. According to Horowitz, "it is how the party's support is distributed, and not how the ethnic group's support is distributed, that is decisive" in determining a party's character (Horowitz 2000: 293).

How then can differences between different party types be observed empirically? The mono-ethnic party promotes the interests of one ethnic group and openly appeals to this group to unite politically under its party banner. Accordingly, in terms of its leadership composition, it is homogenous. All its leading figures come either from one ethnic group or from ethnic groups with cultural similarities. Consequently, its party factions do not represent ethnic factionalism but rather generational differences ("Young Turks" versus "Old Guard") or power struggles between individuals within the party. The party's ability to field candidates is restricted to the area(s) where the group it represents is located. Equally, its PNS are comparatively low; election results normally indicate rather quickly which ethnic groups it represents.

With regard to multi-ethnic parties, there is currently a growing trend in the literature to regard most of Africa's relevant political parties as such (Erdmann 2007). In this study two types of multi-ethnic parties will be used, the multi-ethnic alliance and the multi-ethnic integrative party, both of which represent various ethnic communities. The two basic differences between the two multi-ethnic types are their respective motivation and degree of internal stability: The alliance type corresponds to the logic of Donald Horowitz's *coalitions of convenience* and *coalitions of commitment*. A *coalition of convenience* is formed with the sole motivation of gaining a parliamentary majority. *Coalitions of commitment* indicate more amicable relations, yet anticipated gains on election day again provide the key impetus for communities to unite. Driven by such strategic considerations, the alliance type makes extensive use of "ethnic arithmetic": It tries to include as many groups as necessary in order to secure electoral victory. Consequently, these types of ethnic coalitions prove to be internally fragile and short-lived. By contrast, the integrative type's purposes transcend election day. This corre-

---

5   The PNS is measured by calculating the Gini coefficient of a party's electoral support and subtracting the coefficient from 1. The closer the PNS is to 1, the more the party's support can be seen as national. The closer it is to 0, the less its support is nationwide. For an application, see Jones and Mainwaring (2003).

sponds to Horowitz's logic of *permanent coalitions of ethnic parties.* The integrative party aims to form a long-lasting political force in which two conditions are fulfilled: Firstly, it bridges its country's dominant ethnic cleavages (past or present) by incorporating influential community leaders from both sides of the cleavage into its leadership structure. Secondly, the integrative party is formed long before election day and survives electoral defeats as well as leadership contests without any major changes (splits and mergers) in the groups that make up the party. By staying together as a united political force it demonstrates that it has overcome the divisive logic of ethnic arithmetic. Within the integrative party ethnicity no longer leads to exclusion; thus, the party no longer represents an "ethnic party" as conventionally understood in the literature and as represented by the mono-ethnic or multi-ethnic alliance party. Given the diverse social fabric of African societies, Africa's lack of an industrial revolution, and the continent's more or less limited ability to design social welfare policies, the integrative party is instead the closest an African party gets to the model of the catchall party found in Europe and the United States.[6]

Accordingly, with regard to party leadership composition, the alliance and the integrative type are rather similar; yet in contrast to the alliance type, the integrative party transcends the country's dominant ethnic cleavages. In terms of party factions, the alliance type is significantly less stable: It suffers from breakups and mergers preceding and succeeding parliamentary elections, and party splits regularly accompany leadership elections. As the alliance type is made up of groups which act according to individual group interests and as leadership elections ultimately produce more losers than winners, the alliance type is constantly in flux. Consequently, the alliance type is fractured by a variety of ethnic factions, which constantly have the potential to destroy the party. The integrative party is also made up of ethnic factions; however, it aims for equal representation of all the ethnic groups that make up the party in the long run. In addition, while in an alliance party ethnic factions oppose each other and try to dominate the party, in an integrative party they complement each other by reaching out to their respective communities—while still refraining from excluding other communities from running the party. In an integrative party, factions may emerge in relation to generational differences or powerful individuals as they do in the mono-ethnic party. Within the alliance type, such divisions are clearly overshadowed by ethnic factionalism. Both types of parties have the capacity to field candidates nationwide, though the alliance type might focus on its "home regions." Election results further reflect this: the alliance type has distinguishable strongholds; the integrative type's support is evenly spread. The PNS of both types are higher than those of the ethnic party, yet the PNS of the integrative type can be expected to be higher than those of its alliance counterpart.

One should note that it might be difficult to distinguish the alliance type from the integrative type in the event that the party under scrutiny is the party in government. The vast lit-

---

6   For a model of the catchall party see Wollinetz Steven (2002).

erature on neopatrimonialism illustrates that access to state resources is frequently used to buy political support in order to secure one's claim to power (Bratton and van de Walle 1997, Erdmann and Engel 2007). Given its ability to do this at any time, a governing party might often appear to be internally stable. Its factions might appear not to be ethnically opposed. This is not the result of the party's seemingly integrative character but rather of "sponsorship from above." In that case the question of whether or not its leadership structure bridges the country's ethnic cleavages is even more important. A better indicator here might be the composition of the cabinet rather than party leadership. Table 1 summarizes all party types including their indicators.

Table 1: Party Types and Indicators

	Ethnic Party	**Alliance Party**	**Integrative Party**
Leadership Composition	Mono-ethnic	Multi-ethnic	Multi-ethnic Bridges dominant ethnic cleavages
Party Factions	Personalistic Factions Young Turks versus Old Guards	Opposing Ethnic Factions	Supplementary Ethnic Factions Personalistic Factions Young Turks versus Old Guards
Ability to Reach Out	Regionally Limited	Medium to Nationwide	Nationwide
Party Nationalization Score	Low	Medium to High	High

Source: Author's compilation.

3   Ethnicity and Political Parties in Kenya

3.1   Ethnic Composition of Kenya and Its Provinces

Before applying our framework, it is worth noting the ethnic makeup of Kenya and its dominant cleavages. Tables 2 and 3 provide greater detail on the ethnic composition of the country and its provinces. The subsequent section will outline the historical relationships between the country's different communities.

Table 2: Ethnic Composition of Kenya

Ethnic Groups	**Share of Total Population (in Percent)**
Kikuyu	21
Luhya	14
Luo	12
Kalenjin	12
Kamba	11
Kisii	6
Meru	5
Mijikenda	5
Masai	2
Others/Smaller communities*	12

* Individually these groups account for less than 1% of the population.
Source: Schröder, Günther (1998: Annex 8).

Table 3: Ethnic Composition of Kenya's Provinces

Province	Ethnic Composition	Comments
Nairobi	47% Kikuyu 16% Luhya 15% Luo 15% Kamba	Kenya's most ethnically diverse region
Coast	Smaller coastal communities	96% of Kenya's coastal communities live in Coast
Eastern	55% Kamba 39% Meru/Embu	87% of all Kamba live in Eastern 97% of all Meru/Embu live in Eastern
North-Eastern	96% Somali	95% of all Somali live in North-Eastern
Rift Valley	51% Kalenjin 15% Kikuyu 7% Masai	95% of all Kalenjin live in Rift Valley 97% of all Masai live in Rift Valley
Western	88% Luhya	80% of all Luhya live in Western
Nyanza	63% Luo 31% Kisii	87% of all Luo live in Nyanza 95% of all Kissi live in Nyanza

Source: Nellis, John (1974: 8-14).

3.2   Cleavages in Historical Perspective

In the run-up to Kenyan independence two major political parties emerged, the Kenyan African Democratic Union (KADU) and its counterpart, the Kenyan African National Union (KANU). The former was led by Ronald Ngala (Coastal), Masinde Muliro (Luhya), and Daniel arap Moi (Kalenjin) and driven by Kenya's smaller communities and large parts of the Luhya, whose leaders advocated a federal constitutional setup (majimboism) in order to contain Kikuyu dominance. Kenya's two largest communities were represented in the latter and led by Jomo Kenyatta (Kikuyu) and two Luos, Tom Mboya (Luo) and Oginga Odinga (Ajulu 2002). After KADU lost Kenya's first general election it merged with KANU. The rift between the smaller communities and the Kikuyu governing elite around Kenyatta ("The Family") surfaced again during the succession struggle over the presidency in the last years of Kenyatta's life. In this battle for the presidency the KANU faction around Vice-President Daniel arap Moi proved successful in resisting the onslaught of the GEMA (Gikuyu, Embu, and Meru) welfare association; this facilitated Moi's succession to the presidency after Kenyatta's death.[7] Following a failed coup d'état against his government, Moi radically altered the composition of key cabinet positions in 1985 and filled them largely with members of the Kalenjin and smaller communities (Widner 1992:165-166). Thus from the early days of political activity onwards a cleavage developed between the larger and smaller communities in general and between the Kikuyu and Kalenjin in particular.

An additional cleavage between the Kikuyu and the Luo emerged during the reign of Kenyatta. The assassination of Tom Mboya, one of Kenya's most prominent Luo leaders, who

---

[7]   Within KANU GEMA represented the party wing associated with the Kikuyu elite and Kenyatta. GEMA tried to alter the constitutional provision according to which the vice-president automatically assumes the presidency in case of the president's death. For detailed information on GEMA and its campaign against Moi, see Throup and Hornsby (1998: 20-23).

was regarded as the political heir of Kenyatta, under mysterious circumstances in 1969 (Goldworthy 1982) and the detention of Oginga Odinga after his breakaway from KANU under the umbrella of the Kenya's People's Union (KPU) led to a sense of betrayal among the political elite of the Luo community (Geertzel 1970:7-11). In the run-up to independence, KANU's Luo elite had boycotted the first African-led government until Kenyatta had been released from prison. In their eyes they had withheld their own political aspirations and thus facilitated Kenyatta's claim to power in the late 1950s. By the late 1960s their leaders were either imprisoned or had fallen victim to politically motivated murder (Ajulu 2002). Table 4 summarizes the historical rise of Kenya's cleavages.

Table 4:   Summary: Historical Cleavages in Kenyan Politics

Cleavage	Issue	Political Manifestation	Leading Figures
Small communities versus large communities: Kalenjin, Masai, Turkana, Samburu versus Luo, Kikuyu	Fear of domination by larger communities Federalism	KADU versus KANU	KADU: Daniel arap Moi (Kalenjin) Martin Shikuku (Luhya) Robert Ngala (Coastal Communities) Masinde Muliro (Luhya) KANU: Jomo Kenyatta (Kikuyu) Oginga Odinga (Luo) Tom Mboya (Luo)
Luo versus Kikuyu	Presidency and Political Power	Mboya versus Kenyatta KPU versus KANU	Mboya versus Kikuyu elite Odinga and Kenyatta
Kikuyu versus Kalenjin	Succession of Kenyatta	Moi wing of KANU versus GEMA	Moi/Kibaki GEMA leaders

Source: Author's compilation.

3.3   Political Parties and Ethnicity

The following discussion will examine Kenya's party types in greater detail. It will first look at the period of fission, covering those political parties significant between 1991 and 1997. During this period a variety of multi-ethnic parties collapsed, which resulted in the appearance of mono-ethnic ones. The effective number of parties index in this period ranges from 4.1 (1992 election) to 4.5 (1997 elections). Politically significant parties accordingly include the Forum for the Restoration of Democracy-Kenya (FORD-K); the Forum for the Restoration of Democracy-Asili (FORD-A); the Democratic Party (DP); the Kenyan African National Union (KANU); and after the 1997 elections, the National Development Party (NDP) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP). Table 5 and Table 6 summarize each party's national coverage and electoral performance during this time period.

Table 5: Parties' National Coverage in the 1992 and 1997 Elections as Percentage of Seats Contested (in Percent)

Province	FORD-K 1992	FORD-K 1997	FORD-A 1992	FORD-A 1997	DP 1992	DP 1997	NDP 1997	SDP 1997	KANU 1992/1997
Nairobi	100	87	100	63	100	100	100	89	100
Coast	89	66	85	10	100	81	81	62	100
North Eastern	90	36	80	27	100	63	73	36	100
Eastern	81	25	90	6	91	83	47	67	100
Central	60	10	96	24	92	90	24	55	100
Rift Valley	40	42	48	8	59	52	29	25	100
Western	85	95	85	42	90	38	22	25	100
Nyanza	100	29	45	3	55	34	94	63	100
Total	74	50	76	16	83	64	52	49	100

Source: 1992 parliamentary election data compiled from David Throup and Charles Hornsby (1998: Appendix 2). 1997 election data is compiled from Electoral Commission of Kenya, 1997 Parliamentary Results by Constituency.

Table 6: Parties' Parliamentary Electoral Performance in 1992 and 1997 Elections

Province	FORD-K 1992	FORD-K 1997	FORD-A 1992	FORD-A 1997	DP 1992	DP 1997	NDP 1997	SDP 1997	KANU 1992	KANU 1997
Nairobi	22%	6%	37%	1%	19%	32%	20%	12%	17%	22%
Coast	19%	4%	10%	0%	15%	16%	12%	7%	54%	53%
North Eastern	11%	4%	11%	7%	5%	5%	0%	1%	64%	60%
Eastern	6%	4%	9%	3%	43%	24%	2%	23%	39%	40%
Central	5%	0%	50%	2%	36%	48%	3%	11%	4%	11%
Rift Valley	9%	9%	25%	0%	15%	25%	3%	1%	48%	59%
Western	19%	44%	33%	3%	6%	1%	3%	1%	40%	47%
Nyanza	70%	10%	1%	0%	7%	4%	48%	3%	17%	30%
Total	49%	10%	24%	1%	30%	22%	11%	4%	30%	39%
Seats	31	17	31	1	23	39	21	15	100	110
PNS	.56	.45	.60	.42	.61	.57	.42	.48	.68	.76

Source: 1992 parliamentary election data compiled from David Throup and Charles Hornsby (1998: Appendix 2). 1997 election data is compiled from Electoral Commission of Kenya, 1997 Parliamentary Results by Constituency.

3.3.1 The Period of Fission: Kenya's Political Parties between 1992 and 1997

FORD-Kenya's Long Decline

Since its split from the original Forum for the Restoration of Democracy (FORD), FORD-Kenya has experienced a constant decline, transforming from a major opposition force in 1992 to a comparatively small mono-ethnic party by late 1997. Starting out as the larger part of FORD, it initially accommodated Luo, Kikuyu, Luhya, Meru, and Somali members within its leadership.[8] Soon, however, FORD-K followed in the footsteps of FORD. In September 1993 Paul Muite and Gitobu Imanyara left FORD-K; they accused Odinga of having kidnapped the party and of running it like a Luo kingdom. Muite's public support for Kikuyu unity and his

---

[8] *Daily Nation*, May 22, 1992.

constant appeals to fellow Kikuyu leaders to unite politically illustrate the ethnic undertones that accompanied the FORD-K split.[9] With the Kikuyu wing of the party gone and the take-over of the party leadership by Kijana Wamalwa (Luhya) after Odinga Oginga's death, FORD-K leadership was increasingly drawn from Nyanza and Western Province.[10] This, however, did not lead to less controversial intraparty relations. As Raila Odinga was steadily emerging as the dominant political figure among the Luo, the relationship between him and Wamalwa deteriorated.[11] In March 1995, FORD-K MPs dropped Raila from the influential parliamentary Public Accounts Committee after the party headquarters was cleansed of employees allied to him.[12] Meanwhile, Raila increasingly advocated a strategic Luo-Kikuyu alliance and challenged Wamalwa more than once to resign over the leader's alleged involvement in the Goldenberg scandal.[13] The party's steady slide into chaos became unstoppable at the end of 1995 when Raila unsuccessfully staged a coup and declared himself chairman of FORD-K.[14] Table 7 illustrates the ethnic factionalism which ultimately tore FORD-K apart.

Table 7: Ethnic Factionalism inside FORD-K

Division	Factions	Issue	Outcome
Luo versus Kikuyu	Oginga Odinga (Luo) versus Paul Muite (Kikuyu)	Cooperation with KANU Odinga's leadership	Muite and Imanyara exit party → end of Kikuyu participation
Luo versus Luhya	Raila Odinga (Luo) versus Wamalwa (Luhya)	Party leadership	Raila exits party→ end of Luo participation in FORD-K

Source: Author's compilation.

In January 1997 the Raila faction quit the party and defected to the National Development Party. Shortly after the dissolution of parliament in late 1997, all Luo FORD-K MPs followed Raila.[15] This exodus and the further decline of nationwide support also manifested itself in FORD-K's ability to field parliamentary candidates and in its electoral performance. Both indicators display the party's diminishing ability to reach out to any province other than Nairobi, Coastal, and Western by 1997. The declining PNS underline the increasing overall ethnic bias towards the Luhya.

FORD-Asili: The Prisoners of Kenneth Matiba

In the period of multipartyism, FORD-A, at least initially, posed a greater challenge to the Moi regime than its FORD-K counterpart. Its presidential candidate and party leader, Kenneth Matiba, not only symbolized the struggle against Moi's autocracy but also came a close second in the presidential race. The party's leadership composition conforms to the way the Kenyan

9   *Daily Nation*, May 9, 1994.
10   Daily Nation, March 21, 1994.
11   *Daily Nation*, March 8, 1994.
12   *Daily Nation*, November 24, 1995; *Daily Nation*, March 29, 1995.
13   *Daily Nation*, April 18, 1995.
14   *Daily Nation*, November 30, 1995.
15   *Daily Nation*, November 13, 1997.

media portrayed FORD-A: a party representing first and foremost Kikuyu and Luhya interests and in particular the interests of the "common man" among the two communities (Troup and Hornsby 1998:136). Some Kenyan commentators even referred to it as a "ghetto party."[16] Yet instead of taking on KANU and President Moi, Matiba continuously boycotted parliamentary debates, much to the disadvantage of his party, which lacked clear leadership throughout the 1993 to 1997 period. In October 1994 Matiba single-handedly closed down FORD-A's party headquarters and removed all documents and files without explaining his actions.[17] His 1996 shadow cabinet did not include any sitting FORD-A MPs.[18] His consistent failure to hold party elections further damaged the image of FORD-A, as did the fact that he did not attend the meetings of the FORD-A National Executive Council.[19] This at times led to his temporary and later permanent suspension from the party. Although the party at times suffered from Kikuyu-Luhya rivalry,[20] the main line of division clearly ran between Matiba and the rest.[21] A general lack of confidence in FORD-A as well as Matiba's decision not to stand again as FORD-A's presidential candidate explain the party's devastating 1997 election results. Central Province, Western Province, and Nairobi had been the strongholds of the party in 1992, both in terms of its capacity to field candidates and its electoral performance. By 1997 the party no longer commanded any political leverage and, with the exception of Western and Nairobi, was largely unable to present a feasible democratic alternative.

The Democratic Party: The Beneficiaries of FORD-A's Collapse

While FORD-K and FORD-A emerged out of a large-scale opposition movement, the DP was founded by Mwai Kibaki, a Kikuyu, a former Moi –ally, and a long-term KANU minister for finance. As an isolated advocate of political reforms inside KANU, Kibaki, together with Cabinet Minister John Keen, one of Kenya's most vocal defenders of Masai interests, defected from the ruling party on December 24, 1991.[22] Though the DP party leadership composition reached beyond Kikuyu membership and included Kamba, Kissi, and Masai,[23] many of its vocal members were previously high-ranking members of GEMA, such as former GEMA leader Njenga Karume and the architect of the "Change-the-Constitution" movement, Dixon Kihika, who became a sitting DP MP.[24] The defection of John Keen back to KANU in 1996, which he justified by referring to the advice of Masai elders and the importance of a united Masai front within KANU, resulted in a narrowing of the Democratic

---

[16] *Daily Nation*, June 5, 1993.
[17] *Daily Nation*, October 21, 1994.
[18] *Daily Nation*, May 3, 1996.
[19] See for example, *Daily Nation*, June 6, 1997.
[20] For an example, see *Daily Nation*, July 26, 1993.
[21] For illustrative examples of falling outs between Matiba and his party, see *Daily Nation*, August 11, 1993; *Daily Nation*, October 31, 1994; *Daily Nation*, June 23, 1995; *Daily Nation*, January 13, 1996; *Daily Nation,* May 31, 2007.
[22] *Daily Nation*, December 27, 1991.
[23] *Daily Nation*, July 6, 1993.
[24] *Daily Nation*, May 29, 1993.

Party's scope.[25] Between 1993 and 1997 divisions between Kibaki and the representatives of Kamba DP MPs, namely Agnes Ndetei (Kamba) and Charity Ngilu (Kamba) became visible. Also, smaller communities such as the Meru, represented by MP Benjamin Ndubai, complained about being sidelined by Kibaki's Kikuyu entourage.[26] The summary of factionalism inside the DP between 1991 and 1997 outlined in Table 8 shows that the DP became increasingly mono-ethnic, particularly after the defection of Ndetei to KANU in 1996 and Ngilu's takeover of the SDP in 1997.

Table 8:   Factionalism inside the DP

Division	Factions	Issue	Outcome
-	Masai	-	Defection back to KANU → exit of Masai
-	Kikuyu	-	-
Kikuyu versus Kamba	Kibaki (Kikuyu) versus Ngilu (Kamba) and Ndetei (Kamba)	Party leadership	Defection of Ngilu → exit of the Kamba from DP

Source: Author's compilation.

The electoral performance of the Democratic Party reflects the changes in its leadership composition over time. Like its fellow opposition parties, the DP was increasingly unable to field parliamentary candidates nationwide and consequently focused on its stronghold, the richer Kikuyu areas in Central Province and the Kikuyu diaspora in the Rift Valley. The party clearly profited from the meltdown of FORD-A, through which it managed to contain its losses elsewhere. Despite a decrease in its overall vote share (30% in 1992, 22% in 1997), the DP could increase its share of seats, while maintaining a similar party nationalization score.

KANU: The Effects of Multipartyism

KANU entered the arena of multiparty democracy as the party in power, the top leadership of which included Kalenjin, Luo, and Kikuyu. However, its party leadership composition does not give us an indication of the extent to which multipartyism impacted on KANU as the party did not hold any party elections between 1988 and 2001. The composition of the Kenyan cabinets of 1993 and 1998 is more indicative of which communities Moi tried to reach out to, both symbolically and in terms of patronage. The lion's share of the 1993 cabinet in the multiparty era went to the Kamba, the Luhya, and the Kalenjin, who took four cabinet positions each. The Masai and the Kissi received two ministries respectively. The Luos and the Kikuyus received one. Several cabinet positions went to smaller communities.[27] The 1997 cabinet saw the exit of the last Luo minister, a decrease in Kikuyu ministers from two to one, and subsequently, a rise in the number of Luhya and Kalenjin ministers.[28]

---

[25]   For Keen's justification of his defection see *Daily Nation*, February 3, 1995.
[26]   *Daily Nation*, August 31, 1997.
[27]   *Daily Nation*, January 14, 1993.
[28]   *Daily Nation*, January 10, 1998.

Internally, KANU was divided less by ethnicity than by disagreements over whether or not party elections should be held. This internal debate was heavily motivated by the looming departure of Moi from politics and the question of who would eventually succeed him. "KANU A," led by Cabinet Minister Simon Nyachae (Kikuyu) and ole Ntimama (Masai), advocated internal party reforms, while "KANU B" brought together party hardliners such as Vice-President Saitoti (Masai), Secretary-General Joseph Kamotho (Kikuyu), and Cabinet Minister Nicholas Biwott (Kalenjin).

On the outside KANU leaders, and in particular Moi, pursued a double strategy: On the one hand the party continuously stressed the idea that multiparty democracy had the potential to incite ethnic hatred and destroy the nation. On official occasions such as Kenyatta Day, Moi appealed to all political players to abstain from tribally inclined political statements and urged national unity, often referring to the notion of Kenyan nationhood.[29] On the other hand, KANU strategically reached out to several selected communities in order to secure its numerical superiority come election day. This was largely pursued by cabinet ministers, who appealed to their communities to understand that their welfare was intrinsically linked to the welfare of KANU. In May 1994 Joshua Angatia (Luhya) announced that the Luhya community would strengthen its political bargaining power if Western Province became united with KANU.[30] Around the same time Dalmas Otiento (Luo) declared that the only way for Luos to rule Kenya was through KANU; he urged the community to "return" to the party they had founded.[31] Some went even further. Kenya's minister for cooperative development, Munyi (Meru), called on the Meru people to vote for KANU if they wanted to receive further governmental assistance.[32] After the surprise takeover of the FORD-K leadership by Wamalwa (Luhya), KANU's stance in one of its strongholds was seriously endangered. The party propaganda machinery reacted promptly: Cabinet Minister Masinde (Luhya) and Luhya KANU MPs appealed to their community not to be tricked by FORD-K's Luo membership base, which according to KANU was out to cheat the Luhya community.[33] Moi himself repeatedly warned against a revival of GEMA and told his Kalenjin community to be on guard against a looming Kikuyu attack on the presidency.[34] Having championed the game of divide and rule during the era of the one-party state (Widner 1992), Moi applied this approach to multiparty politics, which proved successful. KANU managed to maintain its strongholds among the Kalenjin in the Rift Valley and among the smaller tribes of Coastal Province. It did badly in the Kikuyu areas and among the Luo, which is not surprising and corresponds both to the party's rhetoric and the allocation of cabinet positions. To overcome Kikuyu and Luo opposition was indeed the challenge KANU had to meet. They did so by

---

[29]   Generally, Moi used national holidays such as Independence Day or Kenyatta Day to appeal for national unity.
[30]   *Daily Nation*, May 23, 1994.
[31]   *Daily Nation*, February 21, 1994.
[32]   *Daily Nation*, February 22, 1994.
[33]   *Daily Nation*, February 8, 1994.
[34]   *Daily Nation*, May 3, 1996.

holding on to their Luhya and Kalenjin support and by relying on the party's backing among the Somali people in North Eastern Province. Despite its comparatively high PNS, one should not forget that KANU was essentially an ethnic party, even though some of these figures might lead one to assume otherwise. Firstly, KANU MPs in the Rift Valley and parts of Eastern Province were in many cases elected unopposed due to the lack of alternative candidates, which meant that elections did not take place in these constituencies. This resulted in slightly higher PNS than would have been the case if elections had taken place. Presidential election results for these constituencies show overwhelming support for Moi, and thus it is reasonable to argue that if elections had taken place, the number of votes for KANU would have been drastically higher these two provinces. This would have reduced the PNS, to the disadvantage of KANU, as the party's votes would have been spread less equally nationwide. Secondly, KANU's rhetoric throughout the 1993 to 1997 period played on ethnic divisions; more than any other party it thus professionalized the logic of ethnic arithmetic. Thirdly, the fact that ethnic factions within KANU were not fighting each other as intensely as factions in the opposition camp were can be easily explained by the financial opportunities of a party in government. Fourthly, and despite the absence of opposing ethnic factions within the party, KANU's cabinet did not bridge the country's ethnic cleavages, as the allocation of government positions to the Luo and Kikuyu demonstrate. In addition, frequent calls for majimboism by various KANU ministers further prove that in the mid-1990s Kenyan history had come full circle: While in the run-up to independence the advocates for majimboism (including the young Moi) had gathered in KADU, the same groups now dominated KANU. By contrast, the personalities and groups which had initially made up KANU (such as Oginga Odinga and the Luo) now made up the opposition.

The Defected: NDP and SDP

Election data from the 1997 elections, the only parliamentary elections the two parties contested, confirm the ethnic character of the NDP and SDP, as do their respective leadership compositions. The leadership of the NDP was initially ethnically balanced; however, non-Luo members quit the party rather quickly, which was reminiscent of the KPU's destiny in the 1960s. The leadership composition of the SDP is unknown, yet on various occasions Charity Ngilu declared the party to represent first and foremost Kamba interests.[35] Unsurprisingly, the NDP achieved a very impressive result in Nyanza Province, home of the Luo, while the SDP managed to get a sizeable portion of the vote in Eastern Province, home to the majority of the Kamba.

---

[35]   For an example of Ngilu's ethnic rhetoric, see *Daily Nation*, June 9, 1995.

3.3.2   A Period of Fusion: Kenya between 1998 and 2003

Though it had won the 1997 elections, KANU soon suffered even more from internal divisions caused by the overarching question of who would eventually succeed Moi, whose end of power was now constitutionally no longer a matter of if but of when. KANU's increasingly endangered majority in parliament led to the merger of KANU with the NDP into New KANU. Simultaneously, the opposition merged into the National Rainbow Alliance (NARC). This had an impact on the number of politically significant parties after the 2002 elections: The index declined from 4.5 (1997 elections) to 2.9 (2002 elections). Significant parties included (New) KANU, NARC, and FORD-P.[36] Both KANU and NARC were able to contest all constituencies. The 2002 parliamentary election results, as well as NARC's and KANU's PNS, are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9:   Parties' 2002 Parliamentary Electoral Performance

Province	NARC	KANU 2002
Nairobi	67%	17%
Coast	42%	31%
North Eastern	14%	54%
Eastern	49%	24%
Central	54%	23%
Rift Valley	41%	47%
Western	63%	20%
Nyanza	51%	10%
Total	50%	28%
Seats	125	64
PNS	.84	.73

Source: Electoral Commission of Kenya 2002, Results by Constituency.

The Formation of New KANU and Its Downfall

Despite its repeated electoral triumphs, KANU and President Moi reached a crisis point shortly after the 1997 elections. Criticism within KANU and reoccurring parliamentary defeats increasingly threatened the continuation of the Moi regime.[37] In order to secure its political dominance, the governing party engaged in a parliamentary alliance with the NDP, which eventually resulted in the merger of the two parties in August 2001. After Raila and several other NDP members were promoted to the cabinet, the NDP formally joined the ruling party (New KANU) in March 2002. Simultaneously, KANU elected its national party officials for the first time in over a decade. Its new leadership included Kalenjin, Kamba, Luhya, Kikuyu, the coastal minority tribes, and the Luo.[38] Shortly after the election of the new party leadership, Moi began to campaign for the new vice-chairman, Uhuru Kenyatta (Ki-

---

[36]   FORD-P, however, never played as dominant a role as the other two. Therefore, the following section will not go into great detail about the party. It can be discarded as a mono-ethnic party.

[37]   For examples see *Daily Nation*, April 13, 1998 and *Daily Nation*, April 20, 1998.

[38]   *Daily Nation*, March 19, 2002.

kuyu), as KANU's 2002 presidential candidate.[39] Moi's appointment of Musalia Mudavadi (Luhya) as vice-president at the constitutionally latest possible moment before the 2002 election illustrates KANU's electoral strategy for 2002, through which it hoped to combine the Kalenjin, the Luhya, and a large part of the Kikuyu vote.[40] The outcome of Moi's succession struggle and the anger this caused among KANU heavyweights led to the formation of the Rainbow Alliance, a rebel group within KANU under the leadership of KANU Secretary-General Raila Odinga (Luo). It included former vice-president George Saitoti (Masai), former KANU secretary-general Joseph Kamotho (Kikuyu) as well as New KANU vice-chairmen Katana Ngala (Coastal) and Kalonzo Musyoka (Kamba).[41] Two days before Kenyatta was officially elected KANU's presidential candidate on October 14, 2002, the Rainbow Alliance formed the Liberal Democratic Party and, under the leadership of Raila Odinga, defected to the opposition.[42] Raila's defection from New KANU after his disappointment over Moi's bias towards the Kikuyu demonstrates that New KANU cannot be seen as an integrative party, even though its party composition might one lead to such a conclusion. The party's inclusion of the Luo community was short-lived and motivated by Moi's desire to once again win the game of "ethnic arithmetic."

The Formation of NARC

In the face of ongoing cooperation, and later the merger, between KANU and the NDP, the opposition followed suit. With no major changes amongst the opposition parties regarding their makeup, two lost elections in which all parties failed to overcome the logic of ethnic arithmetic, and a potentially rejuvenated New KANU on the horizon, Kibaki, Ngilu, and Wamalwa formed the National Alliance for Change (NAC) in January 2002. In August of the same year the NAC transformed itself into the National Alliance Party for Kenya (NAK), which shortly afterwards nominated Kibaki as its presidential candidate. With the emergence of the Liberal Democratic Party, NAK further transformed itself into the National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (Ndegwa 2003). Thus, for the first time, Kenya's opposition managed to challenge KANU in all constituencies. Further, by bringing together Kibaki's Kikuyus, Ngilu's Kambas, Wamalwa's and Musalia's Luhyas, and Odinga's Luos, it managed to beat New KANU using the same means Moi had so successfully employed for over a decade. Despite its very high PNS, one should note that NARC was probably the prototype of a multi-ethnic alliance party: It always saw itself as an alliance of individual parties, each of which continued to remain in existence. Its candidates agreed to contest the election on a NARC ticket, yet its member parties did not dissolve (Kadima and Owuor 2006). Throughout the 2002 campaign all NARC leaders on various occasions spelled out the purpose of the

---

[39] *Daily Nation*, July 14, 2002.
[40] *Daily Nation*, November 13, 2002.
[41] *Daily Nation*, August 7, 2002.
[42] *The Nation*, October 16, 2002.

alliance: to remove KANU from power. Its quick disintegration after the 2002 election further confirms the view of NARC as an alliance party. Its performance illustrates the party's strongholds: It did well in those regions where its various leaders hailed from. NARC's impressive performance in the Rift Valley is the result of many Kalenjin leaders' defection from Moi and their belief that a political reorientation was necessary.

3.3.3 *From Fusion to Fluidity: Kenya since 2003*

In recent years Kenya's political system has experienced a further transformation, which has seen a further restructuring of the party system into a state of fluidity, with constantly changing party structures and party affiliations. This has made Kenyan politics increasingly unpredictable and, further, has at times even made it impossible to determine whether parties are in or out of government.

KANU's departure from power resulted in further losses of support: Shortly after the 2002 election, former vice-president Mudavadi ditched the party, further undermining the party's support base in Western Province.[43] In the years leading up to the most recent elections in December 2007, KANU was split down the middle between the Uhuru (Kikuyu) camp and a faction rallied around KANU's new secretary-general, Nicolas Biwott (Kalenjin). In January 2005 Kenyatta defeated Biwott in KANU's national party elections for the position of party chairman, which caused the latter to build up a parallel party in the Rift Valley (also called "New KANU").[44] KANU's 2005 party elections did represent a new beginning and once more reflected Kenyan society as a whole.[45] However, in the following months KANU continued to be deeply divided between the Kenyatta and Ruto (Kalenjin) camps. Ruto, a lifelong ally of Moi and a longtime KANU powerhouse, continued to challenge Kenyatta's position. In doing so Ruto found the support of that part of the Kalenjin establishment which had remained inside the party.[46]

Simultaneously, the situation inside NARC proved to be at least equally difficult. The second most important factor holding NARC together, after its members' jointly held belief that KANU had to be removed from power, was the common goal of initiating constitutional reforms, which would ultimately result in the creation of a strong prime minister. After over a decade of various rounds of constitutional debates, the Constitution of Kenya Review Commission (CKRC) outlined its reform proposals shortly before the 2002 elections. In its document it put forward many far-reaching changes which would have fundamentally altered Kenya's institutional setup. Among other things, the commission proposed a bicameral national assembly, a mixed-member proportional electoral system, the demotion of the presi-

---

[43]   *BBC Monitoring Africa*, November 22, 2003.
[44]   *The East African Standard*, December 27, 2004.
[45]   *Daily Nation*, February 2, 2005.
[46]   *The East African Standard,* January 22, 2006. Ruto was at times advocated as presidential contender by KANU Rift Valley MPs.

dency to a merely ceremonial post, the introduction of a strong prime minister, and the implementation of a federal system (majimboism).[47] While KANU's exact position on the constitutional reforms was difficult to pin down,[48] NARC wholeheartedly supported them. Thus, constitutional reform was the only genuine policy issue which had brought NARC together. The memorandum of understanding between its two main participating parties (NAK and the LDP) foresaw a 50/50 power-sharing formula between NAK and the LDP with regard to cabinet membership as well as the promise that Raila would be made prime minister once the post was established (Kadima and Owuor 2006). Accordingly, Kibaki's first cabinet included members from all of Kenya's major ethnic groups: Kikuyus, Luhyas, Luos, Kalenjins, and Kambas. Once more, however, the logic of Kenyan party politics was shining through: Contrary to Kibaki's election promises, no immediate constitutional changes were on the horizon. In response, Raila's LDP announced in September 2004 that it would contest the 2007 election outside the NARC coalition (Kadima and Owuor 2006). What led to further instability within the NARC were the increasingly tense relations between FORD-K and the LDP. After Wamalwa's death in September 2003, Kibaki appointed Moodi Awori, another Luhya, as his new Vice-President. This provoked tension between FORD-K and the LDP as Awori was not only a Luhya but also a leading LDP figure.[49] With FORD-K MP Musikari Kombo emerging as the new FORD-K leader, an intense political fight developed between the two parties over the Luhya vote and political domination in Western Province.[50] On various occasions the new FORD-K leader denounced Awori and LDP Luhya minister Mudavadi as traitors of the Luhya. Other prominent FORD-K MPs such as Soita Shitanda and Bonny Khalwale explicitly warned LDP leaders not to enter Western Province as it was "owned" by FORD-K.[51]

In the months preceding and following the 2005 constitutional referendum, Kenya's political parties, both in government and in the opposition, underwent alterations. For the purpose of the referendum, the LDP faction of NARC teamed up with parts of KANU and formed the "no" camp together with Ngilu's National Party of Kenya (formerly SDP). This side campaigned under the banner of an orange and opposed Kibaki's constitutional bill, which contained a strong executive presidency. The DP, FORD-K, FORD-P, and the many smaller parties which had originally made up NAK came together in the "yes" camp, campaigning under the banner of a banana. Table 10 summarizes the shifting political alliances before and after the referendum.

---

[47]   Constitution of Kenya Review Commission (2002): The People's Choice: The Report of the Constitution of Kenya Review Commission. Nairobi: The Constitution of Kenya Review Commission.

[48]   Throughout the 1990s KANU had sent mixed signals about a new constitution.

[49]   *Daily Nation*, December 7, 2003.

[50]   *Daily Nation*, October 19, 2003.

[51]   *The East African Standard*, December 21, 2004. Party recruitment drives for new members in Western Province more often than not caused violence between LDP and FORD-K supporters.

Table 10: Political Changes Immediately after the 2005 Referendum

Pre 2005 Referendum	Post 2005 Referendum
Government alliance: NARC Member parties: FORD-K, DP, NPK (formerly SDP) and 11 smaller parties	Government alliance: NARC-K Member parties: FORD-K, FORD-P, DP, KANU (Kenyatta) plus smaller parties
Opposition: KANU, FORD-P	Opposition: ODM-K Member parties: LDP, KANU (Ruto), NPK

Source: Author's compilation from various media reports.

Following a humiliating defeat in the referendum, Kibaki called for a government of national unity and appointed prominent members of KANU and FORD-P into government, now known under the label of NARC-Kenya. His post-2005 cabinet again contained many former DP figures associated with GEMA and Jomo Kenyatta's post-independence political elite; its overall composition clearly showed a strong bias for Central Province and the Kikuyu.[52] Shortly before the 2007 elections Kibaki decided to contest them under yet another label, the Party of National Unity, an umbrella organization of all the political parties campaigning for his re-election.

Once more Raila Odinga became the leader of the country's opposition, now known under the label of Orange Democratic Movement-Kenya (ODM-K). Neither NARC-K nor ODM-K proved to be particularly stable in the run-up to the 2007 elections. For once it was not clear on which side FORD-K would eventually end up. Party leader Kombo (Luhya) allegedly worked towards a FORD-K–LDP alliance in order to boost the party's chances in Western Province. His inner-party rival Kitui (Luhya), who had stood against him in the party leadership contest after Wamalwa's death, advocated the opposite and favored the backing of Kibaki.[53] In late December, FORD-K finally fell apart when 12 of its MPs declared the formation of a new party, New FORD-K. Additionally, although KANU had been allocated a ministry in the cabinet, it remained officially inside the Orange Democratic Movement-Kenya. It was at times unclear whether KANU as a party was in opposition or in government; the Kalenjin wing of the party advocated the former, and the Kenyatta (Kikuyu) wing promoted the latter.[54] On the opposition side, ODM-K split over the question of who would be Kibaki's challenger in the 2007 elections. The personal rivalry between Raila Odinga (Luo) and Kalonzo Musyoka (Kamba) proved too much for the party to withstand. On August 14, 2007, the Raila camp broke away and formed the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM).[55] Of the two groups, the ODM included a far greater number of the country's leading Kibaki opponents including former foreign minister Mudavadi (Luhya) and former Moi ally William Ruto (Kalenjin). Table 11 displays the lineup of personalities in the top two parties contesting the 2007 presidential and parliamentary elections.

---

[52]   Great Lakes Centre for Strategic Studies (2006:1-4).
[53]   *East African Standard*, August 21, 2006.
[54]   *Daily Nation*, June 3, 2007.
[55]   *Daily Nation*, August 14, 2007.

Table 11: Main Alliances in the 2007 Elections

Presidential Candidate	Kibaki (Kikuyu)	Odinga (Luo)
Party	Party of National Unity	Orange Democratic Movement
Main Member Parties	DP, FORD-K, FORD-P, KANU (Kenyatta/Moi), New Kanu (Biwott)	LDP, KANU (Ruto)
Influential Figures	Moody Awoi (Luhya) Musikari Kombo (Luhya) Nicolas Biwott (Kalenjin) Symon Nyachae (Kisii)	Musalia Mudavai (Luhya) William Ruto (Kalenjin) Charity Ngilu (Kamba) Najib Balala (Coastal)

Source: Author's compilation from various media reports.

4   Conclusion: Parties and Party Systems in Kenya

This study has proven that all of Kenya's politically significant parties represent Horowitz's coalitions of convenience or commitment. Accordingly, all significant political parties in Kenya between 1992 and 2007 represent ethnic parties. Though the country's dominant ethnic cleavages were at times overcome, these periods proved to be short-lived and tactically motivated. As a result, the return of multiparty democracy in Kenya has exacerbated the country's dominant ethnic cleavages, in particular the division between the Kikuyu and the Luo people. In addition, ethnicity has consistently proven to provide a stronger rallying ground for political activity than party structures. This is true of both opposition and government: The disintegration of KANU, once out of power, and NARC, once in power, illustrate this. The case of NARC is especially interesting for the study of African politics as the literature on neopatrimonialism assumes that governments provide stability by creating clientelistic networks of power. The immediate downfall of NARC, however, proves that ethnicity is the stronger of the two forces: access to state resources was not a sufficient condition to overcome the centrifugal powers of ethnicity.

The widely covered incidents of post-electoral violence in Kenya in 2007 and 2008 are further outcomes of the type of political party which is omnipresent in the country. Post-electoral violence with heavy ethnic undertones also occurred in the post-election environments of 1992 and 1997. Thus, the peaceful and much heralded 2002 election represented an exception and not a turning point, as some have argued, in Kenyan electoral history (Muthai 2005). The fact that the 2002 election was won by an alliance which (though only temporarily) bridged all the country's past and present cleavages suggests a causal relationship between electoral violence and the type of party in place. Again, this has consequences for the study of African politics as a whole: While for Kenya the 2007 election represents a step back in terms of political stability and electoral conduct, it also raises the question of the feasibility of peaceful elections in multi-ethnic countries in which ethnicity dominates party politics.

Bibliography

Ajulu, Rok (2002): Politicized Ethnicity, Competitive Politics and Conflict in Kenya: A Historical Perspective, in: African Studies, Vol. 61, No. 2.

Bannon,Alicia et al. (2004): Sources of Ethnic Identification in Africa, in: Afrobarometer Working Paper No. 44.

Berman, Bruce / Eyok, Dickson / Kymlicka, Will (2004): Ethnicity and Democracy in Africa. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bogaards, Matthijs (2003): Counting Parties and Identifying Dominant Party Systems in Africa, in: European Journal of Political Research, No. 43, pp. 173-197.

Bratton. Michael / van de Walle, Nicolas (1997): Democratic Experiments in Africa. Regime Transitions in Comparative Perspective. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Constitution of Kenya Review Commission (2002): The People's Choice: The Report of the Constitution of Kenya Review Commission. Nairobi: The Constitution of Kenya Review Commission.

Chhibber, Pradeep / Kollman, Ken (2004): The Formation of National Party Systems. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Diamond, Larry / Gunther, Richard (2001): Types and Functions of Parties, in: Diamond, Larry/Gunther, Richard (ed.), Political Parties and Democracy. USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 1-39.

Electoral Commission of Kenya (1997): 1997 Parliamentary Results by Constituency, in: www.eck.or.ke.

Electoral Commission of Kenya (2002): 2002 Parliamentary Results by Constituency, in: www.eck.or.ke.

Electoral Commission of Kenya (2005): 2005 Referendum Results by Constituency, in: www.eck.or.ke.

Erdmann, Gero / Engel, Ulf (2007): Neopatrimonialism Reconsidered: Critical Review and Elaboration of an Elusive Concept, in: Commonwealth and Comparative Studies, Vol. 45, No. 1, pp. 95-119.

Erdmann, Gero (2007): Party Research: Western European Bias and the African Labyrinth, in Basesau et al. (ed.), Votes, Money and Violence. Political Parties and Elections in Sub-Saharan Africa. Sweden: Elanders Gotab.

Geertzel, Cheery (1970): The Politics of Independent Kenya. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.

Goldworthy, David (1982): Ethnicity and Leadership in Africa: The 'Untypical' Case of Tom Mboya, in: The Journal of Modern African Studies, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 107-126.

Hodgkin, Thomas (1961): African Political Parties. United Kingdom: Penguin Books.

Horowitz, Donald (2000): Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Institute for Education in Democracy (2003): Enhancing the Electoral Process in Kenya. Nairobi: The Institute for Education in Democracy.

Jones, Mark/Mainwaring, Scott (2003): The Nationalization of Parties and Party Systems: An Empirical Measure and an Application to the Americas. USA: Kellogg Institute for International Studies.

Kasfir, Nelson (1976): The Shrinking Political Arena. Participation and Ethnicity in African Politics with a Case Study of Uganda. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kadima, Denis / Owuor, Felix (2006): The National Rainbow Coalition, in: Kadima, Denis (ed.), The Politics of Party Coalitions in Africa. South Africa: Konrad Adenauer Foundation, pp. 179-221.

Karume, Shumbana (2003): Factional Intrigues and Alliance Politics. The Case of NARC in Kenya's 2002 Elections, in: Journal of African Elections, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 1-11.

Lipset, Seymour/Rokkan, Stein (1967): Party Systems and Voter Alignments. New York: The Free Press.

Mutahi, Patrick (2005): Political Violence in the Elections, in: Herve Maupeu et al. (ed.), The Moi Succession. Nairobi: Transafrica Press.

Nellis, John (1974): The Ethnic Composition of Leading Kenyan Government Positions. Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Ndegwa, Stephen (2003): Kenya: Third Time Lucky, in: Journal of Democracy, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 145-158.

Ogude, James (2002): Political Ethnicity in the Democratization Process in Kenya, in: African Studies, No. 61, pp. 209-221.

Rosberg, Carl/Nottingham, John (1966): The Myth of Mau Mau: Nationalism in Kenya. Nairobi: East Africa Publishing House.

Schlachter Morgenthau, Ruth (1964): Political Parties in French-Speaking Africa. Oxford: Clarendon.

Schröder, Günther (1998): The Multi-Party General Elections in Kenya. Nairobi: National Council of Churches of Kenya Service Overseas.

Throup, David / Hornsby, Charles (1998): Multi-Party Politics in Kenya. USA: Ohio University Press.

Widner, Jennifer (1992): The Rise of a Party-State in Kenya. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wollinetz Steven (2002): Beyond the Catch-All Party: Approaches to the Study of Parties and Party Organization in Contemporary Democracies, in Gunther et al. (ed.), Political Parties. Old Concepts and New Challenges. Oxford: UK, Oxford University Press, pp. 147-168.

Annex: The Various Processes of Political Reconstruction in Kenya

Table A1:   Parties and Their Constituent Ethnicities, 1993 to 1998

Party (Foundation Year)	Constituent Ethnicities
DP (1992)	Kikuyu, Kambas, Masai
DP (1997)	Kikuyu,
FORD (1991)	All major communities
FORD-A (1992)	Kikuyu, Luhya
FORD-K (1992)	All major communities
FORD-K (1995)	Luo, Luhya
FORD-K (1997)	Luhya
KANU	Kalenjin, Luhya, Kamba, Masai
NDP (1997)	Luo
SDP (1996)	Kamba

Source: Author's compilation.

Table A2:   Parties and Their Constituent Parties, 1998 to 2007

Party (Foundation Year)	Constituent Parties
NAK (2002)	DP, FORD-K, NKP (SDP) plus several smaller parties
NARC (2002)	NAK, LDP
PNU (2007)	DP, FORD-K, KANU ODM (2005), LDP, KANU (Ruto), NPK
New KANU (1999)	KANU+NDP
KANU (2002)	KANU (2002)

Source: Author's compilation.

GIGA Working Papers

Recent issues:

GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies / Leibniz-Institut für Globale und Regionale Studien
Neuer Jungfernstieg 21 • 20354 Hamburg • Germany
E-Mail: info@giga-hamburg.de • Website: www.giga-hamburg.de