Political Parties' System In Democratization and Good Governance Entrenchment in Post-Colonial Kenya (1963-2021: Harry Njuguna Njoroge

(2021) Journalofcmsd Volume 6(5))

Political Parties' System in Democratization and Good Governance Entrenchment in Post-Colonial Kenya (1963-2021)

By: *Harry Njuguna Njoroge**

Abstract

Democratization and governance goes back to about 2,500 years, during the periods of the Greek and Roman classical governments. The very fact that democracy has had such a long history of existence, it has created more questions, than producing answers. The Greeks were probably the first people to practice democracy followed by the Romans who used the term republic, but the two (democracy and republic) systems performed similar functions. The hallmark of democracy is characteristic of more than one political (at least two) parties competing in national elections, where the citizenry; belonging to different political parties (political parties' system) has the right of participation in regular, and timely scheduled elections to elect leaders of the choice in both the executive and legislative dockets.

A Political parties' system plays a central role toward the entrenchment and enhancement of democratization and governance processes of a country. Democracy is desirable for political, economic and socio-cultural development, and protection as well as the enjoyment of human rights. States that have championed a political parties' system, for instance, the United States of America and Britain have recorded a high degree in the democratization governance and landscape. However, in some of the states that have undermined a political parties' system, governments have collapsed and in some cases the states have become failed states. For example, Somalia has become a failed state for lack of a political parties' system. Ethiopia is another state with no semblance of a political parties' system, and has been as a result been experiencing political problems like the current Tigray uprisings.

_____

* *Master degree in Peace Studies and International Relations, Hekima Institute of Peace Studies and International relations (HIPSIR) in Nairobi, Bachelor degree (Economics) University of the District of Columbia (UDC) US. Diploma in Journalism, University of Nairobi.*

Political Parties' System In Democratization and
Good Governance Entrenchment in Post-Colonial
Kenya (1963-2021: Harry Njuguna Njoroge

(2021) Journalofcmsd Volume 6(5))

At the dawn of independence in 1963, Kenya practiced political parties' system, with two dominant parties, KANU and KAD. However, within the first year of independence, KADU dissolved voluntarily, and joined the government. This action by Kadu in effect, contributed a lot in undermining democratization and governance in the country. KPU was formed in 1966 as an opposition, but it was soon proscribed in 1966, again rolling back the gains in democratization and governance. Following the re-introduction in Kenya of a political parties' system 1991, the country has achieved hugely (though not fully) in its democratization and governance space.   The citizens are now able to enjoy their inalienable and fundamental rights, as well as the right of participation in government affairs. They are also able to picket and conduct demonstrations.   All these accomplishments can be attributed to the critical role that the political parties' system has played toward the enhancement and entrenchment of democratization and governance in the country.

A political parties' system is of crucial importance in perfecting, upholding and safeguarding democratization and governance landscape in state, especially in the young and emerging democracies like Kenya.

Key words: Political Parties, Democratization, good governance

Situating Democratization and Governance Discourses in the Classical and Middle Ages

Despite the historical developments in the international system that took place in the twentieth century, for instance, the world wars, rise and decline of communism and emergence of new powers in Asia especially China and Japan, the rise of democracy at the end of the Cold War as championed by the West remains the single-most momentous phenomenon (Amartya, 1999, p.3).

Democracy has been discussed on and off for about twenty-five hundred years, ample time to provide a neat set of ideas which would be accepted as universal. However, this is not so. The very fact that democracy has such a long history has created more questions, rather than answers. Democracy has meant different things to different people at different times and different places. During long periods in the history of humankind, democracy

disappeared in practice and, remained barely alive as an idea or a memory. Until only two centuries ago, democracy was treated more or less a domain for philosophers to theorize about, than a real political system for people to adopt and practice. Even in the rare cases where "democracy or a "republic" in fact existed, most adults were disenfranchised from participation in political life (Dahl, 1998, pp.2-3).

It was the Greeks, and most probably, the Athenians who came up with the term democracy or demokratia, from the Greek words; *demos* for the people, and *kratos*; to rule (Dahl, 1998 p.11). While in Athens the word *demos* denoted the entire Athenian people, sometime it differentiated only the common people, or even just the poor. The aristocrat class applied the word democracy to disparage or besmirch, as a kind of epithet to show disdain for the common people, who had taken away the aristocrats' previous control of government. Among the Greek democracies, the one of Athens was the most important, the best known then, and presently of incomparable influence on political philosophy, as it stood out later as the extra-ordinary example of citizen participation or participatory democracy. Although some Greek cities joined together to introduce rudimentary representative governments for their leagues, alliances and confederations, not much is known about them, and unfortunately these political formations did not leave behind any justifiable impression on democratic practices or principles. Greek democratic political institutions, as innovative as they were in their period, were ignored or even totally rejected during the development of modern representative democracy (Dahl, 1998, pp. 12 and 13).

Almost at the same period that popular government was introduced in Greece, it also took root in the Italian peninsula in the city of Rome. The Romans, however, decided to describe their system as a "republic," from *res*; thing of affair in Latin, and *publicus*, public; loosely meaning that a republic was the thing that belonged to the people(Dahl, 1998, p.13). The right to participate in governing the Republic was at first limited to the patricians or aristocrats. After much struggle, the common people also referred to as the *plebs* or *plebeians* gained entry into government affairs (Ibid p.13). The right to participate in Rome, just like in Athens and also in

all proceeding democracies and republics until the twentieth century was restricted to men only.

Despite the fact that the Romans were highly innovative, creative and practical citizens on the practice of electing certain important representatives in citizen assemblies, they lacked in developing a functional formula for a representative government, founded on democratically elected leaders. However, the Roman Republic lasted considerably longer than the Athenian democracy, and probably longer than any modern democracy has ever endured. But the Roman republic experienced much difficulties after roughly 130 B.C.E. civil strife, war, militarization, corruption and decline in the strong civic political culture previously manifested by the people. The little that remained of authentic republican practices died with the dictatorship of Julius Caesar. As an aftermath of Caesars' assassination in 44 B.C.E., a republic once governed by citizens became an empire ruled by emperors. With the collapse of the Republic, popular rule entirely vanished in Southern Europe. With the exception of political systems of small, thinly spread tribes, the republic disappeared for nearly a thousand years (Dahl, 1998, pp. 14, 15).

Popular rule in Italy began to appear again in a several cities in northern Italy around 1100C.E. However, this happened just in small city-states, rather than in the expansive regions or countries. Initially, the governing authority in the city-states was entrusted to members of upper class families; the nobles, property (land) owners and such like, but as time moved on, urban dwellers, the lower class in the socio-economic status began to agitate for their right to participate in government. Citizens who would be today be described as the middle class, otherwise referred to as the newly rich (the working class, bankers, the skilled craftsmen organized in guilds, the foot-soldiers commanded by the knights) were not only superior in numbers compared to the powerful upper class, but also had the human agency to organize themselves, and they could threaten violent uprisings, if they so wished, and actualize such violent disorder. Therefore, in various cities, people like these, usually sometimes referred to as *popolo* were granted, though involuntarily, the right to participate in the government of the city. For more than two centuries, these republics thrived in several cities. Cities like Florence and Venice became pace-setter,

emerging as centers of enviable prosperity, exquisite craftsmanship, spectacular art and architecture, remarkable urban design, classic poetry and music.

What later generations called the Middle Ages was replaced by the Renaissance era. After the mid-1300s, the republican governments of some of the major cities unimpressed by the development of democracy, were however gradually forced to surrender to the perennial enemies of popular government. The aftermath of this development was economic decline, corruption oligarchy, war, conquest, capture of power, and authoritarian rule by princes, monarchs or the military. The emergence of a rival power with superior capabilities; the national state or country, saw the incorporation of towns and cities into the larger and more functional state-unit. The city-state form of government was rendered obsolete; glorious as it were. Conspicuously lacking in both the Greeks democracy and Romans republic were the three basic modern government institutions; the executive, legislature and judiciary. Also lacking was the important devolved system of government; a system combining democracy at local levels, and subordinate to the national government, present in contemporary democracies (Dahl, 1998, pp. 16- 17).

Political ideas and practices that were to develop into important elements of contemporary democracy had sprout in Europe by the early eighteenth century. Several states in Europe, notably Scandinavia, Flanders, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Britain. favored by local conditions and opportunities, the logic of equality encouraged the creation of local assemblies allowing free men to participate in government. These European ideas and practices provided a base on how democratization could be popularized and populated. Earlier, that has been provider proponents of today's democracy borrowed heavily from the plausible historical experiences and popular governments in classical Greece and Italian city-states, which showed that governments accountable to the will of people were not merely illusionary. (Dahl, 1998, pp.22).

Infusing Political Parties in Contemporary Discourse on Democratization and Governance

Democracy is ancient as has been demonstrated by the literature that has been provided hitherto. However, this article concentrates on how political parties have impacted modern democratization and governance. In the contemporary times, it is right to assume that democracy must guarantee virtually every adult individual the right to vote, amongst other freedoms. But since around 1918 or the end of First World War, in every independent democracy or republic that ever existed since then, a good half or more of all the adults had always been disenfranchised. This category of people comprised women, the black race, and slaves, especially in the United States (Dahl, 1998, pp.3-4).

Opposition, competition and participation in a government are key factors of democratization. An important characteristic of a democracy is the continuing responsiveness by a government to the preferences of its citizens, considered as political equals. For a government to continue over a long period to be responsive to the preferences of its people who have attained the voting age, it must afford its mature citizens unrestricted opportunities to: - i) formulate their preferences ii) signify their preferences to their fellow citizens and government by individual and collective action, and iii) have their preferences weighed equally in the conduct of government, without any discrimination, regardless of the content or source of the preferences. These three conditions, though not probably sufficient, are foundational basics for democratization (Dahl, 1971, pp. 1-2).

Bollen defined democracy as "the extent to which the political power of the elite is minimized and that of the non-elite in maximized" (Dahl, 1998, p. 222). In a subsequent substantiation, Bollen argued; "it is the relative power between the elites and non-elites that determines the degree of political democracy. Where the non-elites have minimalist control over the elites, political democracy is low. When the elites are accountable to the non-elites, political democracy is higher" (Ibid, 1998, p. 222). Democracy is determined from the type of information that is used to asses a political regime such as; are there fair electoral laws, equal campaigning opportunities, fair polling, as well as transparent counting of electoral ballot votes. Other considerations for a political system to qualify as a

democracy are whether voters are allowed to endow their representatives with real power, whether minorities enjoy the right to self-determination, self-government and autonomy, or the right fro them to participate through non-formal consensus in decision-making processes (ibid,p.222). Also, another determinant whether a political system can be considered as democratic or not is whether its citizens are free from military domination, foreign powers, totalitarian parties' regimes, economic oligarchies, religious hierarchies, or any other powerful group. Other dimensions of democracy include; the freedom and   independence of the media in a country, citizens' freedom to join political parties, trade unions and associations, and other professional bodies of their choice , as well a the right to effective collective bargaining. Another perspective of democracy is the right to the individual's autonomy and equality to opportunities. (Dahl, 1998, pp. 222-223).

The hallmark of a true democracy is an elected executive, and legislature (where two or more political parties compete regularly, and timely), and an independent judiciary, Dahl notes that this condition of democracy has been the norm, rather than the exception in the vast majority of democracies since 1946 (Dahl, 1998, p. 223).

Democracy scale requires one to decide whether constraints on the chief executive in any particular country are near to parity, face significant limitations, or are situated in one of the two possible intermediate categories (Dahl,1998, p. 222). The measure of "freedom" that citizens in a specific political system enjoy can be used to designate democracy. Similarly, democracy is considered as the presence of institutions that enable citizens to choose alternative policies, and leaders, in combination with "institutionalized constraints on the power by the executive" and "the guarantee of civil liberties to all citizens in their daily lives and in acts of political participation" (Dahl, 1998, pp. 222-223). According to Bollen and Jackman, "democracy is always a matter of degree" (Dahl, 1998, p. 224).
The Greeks were the first citizens to practice democracy more than two millennia ago. Slowly, the practice of democracy gained traction in other places such as Rome in Italy and India. However, in the course of time and space, democracy got weakened, and eventually collapsed. It was replaced by radically authoritarian forms of governments. Democracy took some

time to appear in places like the United States, Switzerland, New Zealand, Canada, and the United Kingdom, amongst other nations until the eighteenth century. But, real democratic explosion occurred within the twentieth century, characterized by key factors such as the British Magna Carta (1215), and the French and American revolutions of the eighteenth century, which accelerated the entrenchment of democratization and governance driven by the political parties' system. Democratization was further enhanced by the expansion of franchise to include white women of voting age in Europe and in the United States of America in the nineteenth century. The black race including slaves were not found fit to enjoy the franchise. It was not ingrained as the "normal" thing in government, an entitlement to every person and nation; irrespective of geographical area, political persuasion, color, religion, gender or economic status until the twentieth century (Sen, 1999, p. 1).

The nineteenth century theorists of democracy, considered it normal and natural to differentiate and decide which nation merited democracy, and which ones were not fit for democracy. This way of thinking, experienced a radical shift in the twentieth century. It was then accepted that democracy has universal value, and all people deserve democracy; not for the few. No country has special credentials "fit" for democracy; rather all countries, and citizens irrespective of their geographical area, color, gender, age, language, religion, culture and other features automatically by their own right qualify for practice and enjoyment of democracy. Democracy is universal; it is not a preserve for some and beyond others. It should be a requirement for every nation to embrace democratic principles. Any authoritarian government that oppress and suppress its citizens should be dethroned. Political parties as key drivers of political change play the critical role in the removal of dictators, tyrants, despotic and authoritarian rulers and illegal regimes from power. Political parties also play an important part toward the entrenchment, growth and consolidation of democratic practice and good governance. They also play a transformational role in the transition from other types of government to democracy (Sen, 1999).

It is unreasonable if not an absolute absurdity to think of modern democracy without a competitive political parties 'system Political parties function as

the connecting link between citizens and their government. If the connection holding together the people and government breaks, the political polity has no chance of survival, but will die and decay. Citizens have no hope for future, except with the presence of robust competitive political parties' system. Political parties act both as the drivers as well as agents in reinforcement of democratization and governance (Schattschneider, Encyclopedia.com).

Political parties have organized themselves and removed from power authoritarian, tyrants and despotic rulers. For example, a combination of the Democratic Party (DP) of Mwai Kibaki, National Alliance Party of Kenya (NAK), belonging to Charity Ngilu, and Ford Kenya Party of Michael Wamalwa Kijana (2002) joined forces and defeated the ruling KANU party's candidate; Uhuru Kenyatta. KANU had been in power since independence in 1963. In the same in December 2018, in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), political parties came together, elected the opposition party's candidate Felix Tshisekedi, defeating president Joseph Kabila's choice candidate (Linz, 1926, pp. 51-69).

Political parties have been key to political transformation from authoritarian rule to democratic system. Political parties as engine of change perform several roles necessary to functional democratic systems. They combine interests from diverse groups, and translate societal expressions into popular public policy. Political parties act both as channels of expression as well as tools of representation. Authoritarian rulers have been removed from office through party competition. Political parties serve as channels by which different groups are enabled to pursue their interests in an orderly, peaceful, and systematic manner, in the concept within a political system (Kuenzi and Lambright, 2001, p. 432).

In the early history of democracy conceptualization, political parties were dismissed as potentially undesirable divisive elements, which created avenues for people to destabilize and bring down governments. However, in the course of space of time this view was overturned, People realized that, by way of expressing different views, and the citizens having dissenting voices was not really bad. Indeed, it was accepted that healthy dissention and debate was most desirable for democratization. It must be

appreciated that political parties in a democracy have no intention to harm governments, but rather to promote the democratic values and principles. In this role political parties struggle for the rights of the citizens, including participation in government. In fact, where governments are not ready to practice democracy and suppress the citizens, and are adamant to remain in power through hook or crook, political parties have the absolute right to bring down such governments through agitation, uprisings or revolutions. (Kuenzi, and Lambright, 2001, pp. 432-439).

As early as the eighteenth century onwards, the idea of democracy has been accepted as the norm, rather than the option in many countries of the world including, the United States, Western Europe; France, Germany, Great Britain, Norway, Japan, India among others. Other countries which have adapted democratic system of government are in the Middle East; Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and Kuwait, and in sub-Sahara Africa; such as Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya (Dahl 1998, p. 30).

It is clear that where a robust political parties' system reigns, conversely there is healthy democracy and good governance. In such a political dispensation, the citizens are able to participate in government. They are able to elect leaders of their choice into office and/or remove them from office when their term expires, or when the people find it necessary to eject them out of office because of misrule or non-accountability. The citizens can demand representation, and are able to question their leaders on how they conduct governance. The citizens must have the right to demand how the government spends the taxes levied. They can voice their preferences, share their preferences with their fellow citizens, and demand equity on resources allocation and equal opportunities in education, employment and government positions. The citizens will be able to demand for inalienable rights to life and liberty, and fundamental rights of the individual including the freedom of movement, speech, freedom of the media, association and participation in government and the likes. This article attempts to underscore the relationship between the political parties' system practice, and the democratization and governance process in Kenya, and the central role that the political parties Kenya have played; at times under very difficult conditions to deepen democracy and governance in the country.

Political Parties' System In Democratization and
Good Governance Entrenchment in Post-Colonial
Kenya (1963-2021: Harry Njuguna Njoroge

(2021) Journalofcmsd Volume 6(5))

The role of political parties' system towards democratization and governance entrenchment in post-colonial Kenya (1963-2021)

The Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 set the stage for the rule of domination and suppression of the peoples and the occupation of the Africa continent by Western European powers. The "White supremacists" comprising of Great Britain, France, Germany, Portugal and Belgium came together, partitioned and mapped the continent, in what came to be popularly known as the "Scramble for Africa (Karari, 2018, p.1)." These colonial powers created artificial arbitrary boundaries that separated close relatives, groups, whole communities and societies, and placed them in different territorial locations (ibid, 2018, p.1). Kenya became a protectorate of the British East African Company in 1895, and was later declared a full British colony in 1920. Kenya remained a subject of Britain until independence in 1963, when it attained independence from the British colonial rule (Gertzel,1970, p.1). Like many other former British colonial colonies around the globe, the Kenyan black population was subjected to a most brutal, horrendous atrocities, and cruel inhumane mundus operandi. The colonialists used fist-iron and the harshest methods on earth of subjugation to rule the original (natives) population and owners of the Kenyan land. The so-called natives or tribes were oppressed, humiliated, and subdued. They were beaten, abused, flogged, and forced to provide labor pay on the white settlers' farm-estates, particularly at the "White Highlands," tea, maize, wheat, barley, and pyrethrum in the Rift valley region, and coffee, tea and sisal farms in the Central Kenya region at very low wages. These natives had no recourse to form trade unions to negotiate for commensurate pay or fight for their rights. The British also applied Land Ordinances to uproot the indigenous people from their good fertile lands, and consigned them to poor marginal unproductive peripheral areas, referred to as the African "reserves." The Africans were forced to pay taxes without representation, and were also restricted to a "Pass" or "Kipande" system (Karari, 2018, p.1). The whites introduced the locals to their European Christian religion, and condemned the indigenous religions as primitive and satanic faiths. The British further created, and caused ethnic strife and animosity (divide and rule tactics) against different African communities, and tortured citizens to make it easy for them to conquer and rule. When the Africans began to agitate for political self-determination, the whites declared a state of emergence (1952) to halt the liberation struggle. The British applied military domination, and

police brutalities, detention in concentration camps where individuals were forced to perform forced labor. There were illegal and extra-judicial executions of Mau Mau freedom fighters. Following the imposition of emergence, citizens were involuntary removed from their natural habitat and domiciled in mass concentration villages. Their natural way of living was disrupted, curfew was imposed, and men and women were compelled to perform hard labor. Women were subjected to all manner of humiliation; violation of human rights, and rape amongst other atrocious ordeals. (Karari, 2018, p.1).

Kenya is an abundantly, multifaceted, and racial community, comprising an assortment of people from a varied range of African communities, and incorporating two major immigrant peoples of Asian and Caucasians. The different people regarded as Kenyans today have existed together in this particular geographical habitat for over a long time, and in ever-changing cultural, economic, and political surroundings. Kenyans have in the last 100 years or so, struggled to coexist, albeit, with each ethnic community aiming to gain over the other/s in matters of cultural, economic and political postures. It has been a case of survival, and self-help to satisfy, secure and protect each ethnic group's interests in the true spirit of realism, as espoused in the international relations theory. (Nangulu-Ayuku, 2007, p. 127).

Kenya has been the home of roughly 43 heterogeneous ethnic communities. Also not lacking in the country, is a proliferation of impulsive politicians, a powerful and sophisticated elite representing a combination of diverse, and often conflictual groups, institutions, and interests spread across a sweeping and expansive geographical space. During both pre-colonial and colonial periods, Kenya was not known of having ever practiced a centralized, or democratic political system with a hierarchical governance or bureaucratic order. But, this does not imply that Kenya did not have a political system of its own type, however primitive during pre- colonial period, or authoritarian during the colonial era (Nangulu-Ayuku, 2007, p. 128).

Kenya gained internal independence from Her Majesty's Queen Elizabeth the II, of England (British rule) government on June 1, 1963, after a bitter and bloody struggle, that left many nationalists dead, other maimed, and

wide-spread poverty spanning over several decades. The indigenous Kenyans endured misrule, atrocities, and capital exploitation during these dark years of brutal British colonial domination. A year later; 1964, Kenyan nationalists founded a Republic with an executive president, and the other two arms of government; the legislature and the judiciary, run by indigenous people. The birth of the Kenyan republic was viewed as a systematic part of a process of moving in the direction towards total independence (Gertzel, 1970, p. 1). However, full independence did not in any way suggest an absolute total break with its former colonial masters. For example, Kenya was not fully endowed with human capital, and required human capacity development nurtured at British universities and learning institutions, supported by British. Kenya also required financial capital from Britain to run government programs that had earlier benefited from the queen's government. Kenya further needed knowledge on how to govern, and the British government had the necessary experience; such as political parties' practice. The patterns of political and governance organization since Kenya's independence can be well understood only against the backdrop of post-independence needs, and capabilities, but also in regard of the legacies left behind by the colonial powers, such as respect for inalienable rights; life and liberty, and individual's fundamental rights; freedom of speech, movement, association, religion, press freedom, human rights; right against torture, right to participation, and regard to the constitution and the rule of law, and the importance of political parties' system as a basis for democratization and governance amongst other heritages (Gertzel, 1970,pp. 1-2).

African political parties had been prohibited in Kenya during the colonial period, particularly in the aftermath of the declaration of emergence in 1953, but the ban was lifted the ban by 1955, but only at a district level, and outside the Central province (Central region). The colonial government was convinced that the District Associations would serve as convenient agencies to the then African nominated members of the Legislative Council (Legco), and at the same time provide a stabilizing mechanism of "moderate" African public opinion (Gertzel, 1970, p. 8).

Since the time of independence in 1963, Kenya has not had what can truly be described as political parties, but, rather electoral parties. A political

party should have characteristics such as; political ideology and culture. A political party also should have acceptance over an expansive geographical area, or by a great number of people. Furthermore, a political party must also enjoy longevity of time. These requirements are lacking in Kenya's political establishment, except maybe for KANU, which has existed since independence. But even for KANU most of the times, mainly in the 1980 and 1990s lacked in tolerance and inclusiveness. The elite use these electoral parties just as convenient vehicles to land them into parliament or at a position of power, like the presidency. The moment the elite land into the intended political destination, these political parties lose both in value and relevance. The serving political outfits either die, or they are abandoned mid-way in the course of a parliamentary life-term. The elites wait for the next political race, when the hastily cobble up new electoral parties as machines to get them where they intend to go, that is; gain political power. At dawn of independence (1963), Kenya had two political parties; the Kenya African National Union (KANU) and the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU). Soon thereafter within the first year of independence through manipulation, cajoling and bribery, KADU voluntarily dissolved, joined the ruling KANU party. Henceforth, Kenya became a de facto one-party state in December 1964, thus in effect undermining the growth and consolidation of a political parties' system in the country. (Gertzel, 1970 pp. 34, 54). Jaramogi Odinga, then KANU party vice president, having experienced numerous tribulations in the single party rule resigned on April 14, 1966 from the party and government position, and founded an opposition party; the Kenya People's Union (KPU) (Gertzel 1970, pp 73).

This action can be viewed as a effort in the res-establishment of a political parties' system in Kenya. Thirty members from KANU, including two ministers; Achieng Oneko, minister for Information, Broadcasting and Tourism and Okelo Odongo Assistant Minister for Finance, ditched the ruling KANU party, and trouped with Odinga to KPU. The newly formed party was registered and recognized as the party of opposition on April 28, 1966(Gertzel, 1970, p.73). However, it did not find it easy to operate, and a lot of road blocks were placed on its way by the government. Sadly, that same afternoon that KPU's status were recognized, the government introduced and passed a new constitutional amendment that required the opposition members to resign from their parliamentary seats, and seek fresh

mandate as people's representatives (Gertzel 1970, p, 76). The Little general election was held in June 1966. This was the foremost election since the 1963 general election that saw KANU government into power. The government applied its full machinery, tough and unorthodox means during the mini-polls (Gertzel 1970, p, 78 and 80). that saw the new party return poor results compared to those posted by the KANU party. KANU scooped eight out of the ten Senate and twelve of the nineteen House seats. KPU won a sum total of nine seats in parliament (two in Senate, and seven in the House). However, this election marked a spectacular success in the political parties' system come-back and the democratization schema in Kenya. The formation of KPU was a direct challenge to Kenyatta and KANU and offered Kenyans the hope in future of an alternative government, with equally alternative leaders. (Gertzel, 1970, p. 89).

The policy issues of debate during the election campaign highlighted allegations of tribe bias in government allocation of resources, police on land, nationalization and social services as well as foreign policy. The debate also raised the legality of constitutional amendment, and suggested that the constitution had been manipulated by the government for its own advantage. The constitutional issue was however down-played in the broader policy debate, mainly because KANU's counter accusation that the opposition itself had in its policy proposals disregarded the guarantees of the individual's right to own property provided by the constitution (Gertzel 1970, p.84). KPU's Interim Manifesto Unveiled on the eve of the party's nomination day embodied the radical demand for the guarantee of individual's rights and political association provided for in the constitution. In its appeal, the manifesto dealt with socialism, African tradition, land, agriculture, employment policies, the civil service, corruption and education. The party condemned government for pursuing capitalist policies which were developing a class of rich people, while the great majority lived in poverty (Gertzel 1970, p.84). KPU leaders challenged government policies, which encouraged class formations, and the dangers posed by such policies. For example, the leaders cited a decision by the government to give free education to students in higher classes (forms five and six of secondary school), while those in lower classes were supposed to pay for their education. The KPU politicians viewed the program as discriminatory endowment to a "few" against the "majority". Such a

skewed policy would place in future give the "few" undue advantage over the "majority", especially when it came to job opportunities, political power, as well as wealth accumulation. This situation would be perpetuated to the future generations and to perpetuity. The halves will continue to have, while the have-nots will be condemned to a life of exclusion (Gertzel, 1970, p.74).

KPU promised if it formed a government to introduce policies consistent with democracy and socialism, such as distribution of free land to the neediest, either by expropriation or through lad consolidation, as well as restricting land ownership to Kenyan citizens. The party manifesto also promised the introduction of free primary education as well as increased technical education and improved conditions for teachers (Gertzel, 1970, pp.84-85).

According to Gertzel, the founding of KPU constituted a significant watershed in independent Kenya politics. It marked the return of political pluralism. It offered a direct challenge not only Kanu but also to president Kenyatta. It also opened up the possibility of a new type of inter-party debate in which economics took a significant prominence than personal idiosyncrasies or tribal loyalty. Faced with a new opposition party the KANU government behaved and acted as several African governments have done. It challenged the legitimacy of opposition and constrained the political field within which KPU might operate. As the landscape within which political debate could take place was strictly narrowed, members of both parties found it difficult to publicly air dissent. As a result, parliament continued to occupy an important role as a platform for public debate. Its members contend to use it to popularize all the major political matters (Gertzel, 1970, p.144).

The KANU regime applied draconian tactics to frustrate, disrupt and impede the functionality of the KPU. KANU had spelt out adequate hints of the dirty methods the party would adopt towards any KPU candidates returned to parliament. President Kenyatta at a major rally during the min-polls employed a traditional Kikuyu curse to relegate the Opposition to extinction (Gertzel, 1970, p.144). A KANU statement dispatched a short moment before the polls results were made public declared that Kenya

would remain a de facto one party state even though a "handful of political rejects" had abandoned Kanu to form a splinter group. Tom Mboya, a cabinet minister, shortly after the results jubilantly declared that the Opposition because of their small numbers might not be recognized (Gertzel, 1970, p.144).

The existence of KPU was considered by the government as untenable, and on October 30, 1969, the party was banned. This drastic action by the government essentially transformed Kenya into a de facto one-party state, and effectively put the political parties' system again into limbo. It eroded the democratization and governance gains (though pretty moderate), which had been achieved during KPU's short period of existence (Wikipedia, free encyclopedia, Kenya People's Union).

The latter part of Jomo Kenyatta's rule (1969-1978), and the early years of Moi's regimes (1978-1981) were regrettable detrimental periods on the political parties' system progress, and a draw-back to the democratization and governance process in the Kenya. Several citizens lost lives, under mysterious circumstances, some of which being believed to have been sponsored by the government. Other citizens considered as government detractors were detained by the government without due process of law. Many more others were tortured, and maimed by government agencies. Jaramogi Odinga was arrested and kept under house arrest for two years from 1969 to 1971 without charge or trial, and again from 1983 (after the failed coup) to 1988 (Amnesty International,1991, p.1). Tom Joseph Mboya; a cabinet minister for Economic Planning and Development was assassinated on July 5, 1969 on Government Road (Moi Avenue) in Nairobi. James Mwangi Kariuki; popularly known as "J.M." an assistant minister in the government was murdered on March 2, 1975, and his dead body found a few days later, hidden in a thicket in Ngong area of Kajiado district. The involvement of government security agencies; the police was highly suspect in the assistant minister's killing. Foreign Affairs minister, John Robert Ouko was also murdered on the night of 12/13 February 1980. His mutilated body was discovered by a herds-boy in his Koru farm, in Muhoroni of Kisumu district. The government could not be absolved from Ouko's death. But, the era between 1982 upto 1991 was the darkest moment

in Kenya's political multi-parties' system history, and grievously dented the democratization and governance process (Adar and Munyae, p 2).

When Jaramogi and George Anyona attempted to register an opposition political party in 1982, president Moi reacted mercilessly, and explicitly set Kenya into a de jure one- party state roller coaster. Moi, and the KANU government criminalized competitive politics, and any criticism targeting of his rule. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the security forces, especially the police agencies were used to harass, intimidate, subvert, and suppress any censure directed at him or his regime. To ensure his hold to power, the president methodically usurped power of the legislature, judiciary, and other governance institutions, to the extent that the principle of separation of powers was obliterated and rendered nugatory. Within a brief moment later, after releasing political detainees, Moi hastily pushed through a bill (Section 2A) in parliament which gave him emergency powers for the first time in the country's post-colonial history. The bill introduced into the floor of parliament by the then Minister for Constitutional Affairs Mr. Charles Njonjo and seconded by the then vice president Mwai Kibaki, prohibited politics of dissent and opposition. Ironically, both Njonjo and Kibaki became casualties of the same bill that they brought to parliament. The president equated criticism and censure to his policies and rule to insecurity and instability, which would not be tolerated by the government (Adar and Munyae, p.2).

Kenyans experienced the worst form of human rights violations during the 1989 upto 1991 period. President Moi accused advocates of multi-party politics of subversion, which gave him the political "moral" excuse to haul into detention a new generation of political liberators that championed democratization and good governance. These people were regarded by the KANU regime as dissidents, saboteurs, and worst enemies of the state. Several champions of multi-party democracy, including lawyers Dr. John Khaminwa, Gitobu Imanyara, and politicians Kenneth Njindo Matiba, Charles Rubia and Koigi wa Wamwere alongside many others were arrested and condemned to languish in detention for long periods before being released, following local and international pressure. Others were made to endure and suffer intolerable inhuman conditions in filthy cells, such as the notorious Nyayo House torture chambers in Nairobi, and Kamiti

Political Parties' System In Democratization and
Good Governance Entrenchment in Post-Colonial
Kenya (1963-2021: Harry Njuguna Njoroge

(2021) Journalofcmsd Volume 6(5))

and Naivasha maximum prisons. These victims included; Raila Amolo Odinga, Wanyiri Kihoro, Prof. Ngotho Kariuki, Gacheche wa Miano alongside several others. Gibson Kamau Kuria, Kiraitu Murungi fled to the United States to escape Moi's wrath. University dons such as Maina wa Kinyati, Ngugi wa Thiongo, Miceere Mugo, Mukaru Nganga, Kimani Gecau abandoned lucrative teaching careers and fled to exile. Civil society groups agitating for greater space of freedom and political participation were also curtailed from their operations during this era of purging of what was branded disloyal elements Political meetings, picketing or street demonstrations were not permitted except for the ruling party KANU (Adar and Munyae, p. 7).

This harassment waged upon democratization and governance liberation heroes by the government machine, however, neither dampened nor killed the people's struggle for the restoration of democracy and human rights. Seeing that the determination of these diehards would not be deterred, and considering that these advocates had already infiltrated some people within the KANU ranks, the regime went a notch higher, and increasingly began to suppress dissenting voices within the party itself. The oppression and purging by the KANU supremos of its own members suspected of disloyalty to the party and the government, particularly in the 1990s served as a catalyst for them to combine forces with opposition in the orchestration scheme for restoration of democracy in and outside the party. The heightened clamor for democratization and governance caused unrest to Moi, and KANU. The international community and Kenya's development partners threatened to isolate the government, and treat Kenya as a pariah state. Having run out of options, president Moi in the 1991 caved in under international and domestic pressure and allowed for the repeal of Section 2A, amendment of the Kenyan Constitution paving the way for a return to multi-partism. The concerted efforts for the promotion of democratization and governance by a combination of political elites, the masses, the civil society, and different faiths groups, plus both international and local institutions of political goodwill were not in vain, and proved to quite effective. The hard road and difficult struggle of the 1980s upto 1990s referred to as the "second liberation" saw a rebirth of a political parties' system in Kenya (Bannon, 2001, p.8).

Democratization and good governance is now an accepted phenomenon in Kenya as an important aspect of political development. The agitation by political parties for multi-party system in the 1980s-1990s is a major accomplishment towards democratization and governance process. The drive towards this goal was reinforced by national rather than sectarian, ethnic or other interests. The opposition parties were galvanized by the need of entrenching democratization and good governance in the country, more so following the repeal of Section 2A of the constitution (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010, p. 22).

In the aftermath of these successes, political parties now working as independent functionaries started to fight each other in the struggle for power, which unfortunately culminated into a polarized political cacophony that was determined by individualistic, ethnic and regional interests. Eventually, political parties fragmented into small units, instead of solidifying alliances to push for grandeur democratic reforms. For example, the Forum for Democracy (FORD) party which was viewed as the forerunner in the "Second liberation" struggle split into FORD-Kenya and FORD-Asili. Other opposition parties such as the Safina, Kenya National Congress, National Development Party (NDP), Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), Kenya Democratic Alliance (KENDA), Kenya Social Congress, and the Democratic Party (DP) appeared into the already crowded political landscape (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010, p. 22).

After KANU won the 1992 presidential and parliamentary general elections, which was contested in the corridors of justice, but withheld by the courts, a parliamentary parties formed the Inter-Parties Parliamentary Group (IPPG), in an attempt to review electoral laws and procedures among other legal reforms. During the 2002 general elections, an alliance of opposition political parties under the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) succeeded in removing KANU from power. However, the winning alliance failed to introduce the desired long lasting changes into the country's political system. (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010, p. 23).

The removal of KANU from power; a party which had ruled the country with an iron-hand from 1963-2002 clearly demonstrates the central role played by political parties to restore a political parties' system in Kenya.

Political parties in the country have thereafter pushed for the repeal, amendment several existing laws, and enactment of new laws in parliament to address the concerns and interests of the citizenry. Political parties agitated for a new constitution, which was promulgated in the country in 2010. They also agitated for a devolved government. However, political parties have served as both enablers and impediments of political changes in Kenya, as their quest for personal, group, societal or own party power and influence, has sadly placed national interests and concerns on the altar of sacrifice. Kenyan political parties portray functional weaknesses, characterized by patrimonialism, ethnic allegiances and political insecurity (Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2010, p. 24).

The robust political participation of 2002 in Kenya charted an unprecedented democratization space in the country. Ahead of the 2007 general elections, more than 300 political parties had been registered. Out of these registered political parties at least 117 of them presented candidates for presidential, parliamentary and local government posts. The enforcement of the Political Parties Act of 2007 saw this large number of political parties decline to only 47 by March 2010. Nevertheless, this figure is quite high for a country like Kenya (African Democracy Encyclopedia). An alliance of opposition parties; the DP of Mwai Kibaki, Ford Kenya of Kijana Wamalwa, and NARC of Charity Ngilu during the 2002 presidential and general election sponsored Mwai Kibaki as their choice candidate for the presidency against the KANU's Uhuru Kenyatta. Kibaki scooped victory to become the third president of republic of Kenya, after Moi and Jomo Kenyatta respectively. Out of the total 210 parliamentary seats, KANU garnered just about 70 seats, while the rest; majority seats were captured by the league of the alliance. Kibaki vied again for the top post in the 2007 on the Party for National Unity (PNU) ticket, and defeated Raila Odinga of the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM) party. Kibaki's win was contested in court, but the court ruling confirmed Kibaki in the presidency. This decision created a lot of political heat that culminated with the 2007/8 political elections violence (PEV). The country was at the brink of precipice. The African Union (AU) attempted to mediated the conflict, but failed. The mediation team was headed by the former United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan leading a group of eminent leaders from Africa; Gracia Machel, and Benjamin Mkapa of Tanzania, among

others, managed to strike a power-sharing deal between the warring parties. A Government of National Unity (GNU), was brokered to accommodate both groups. The mayhem and ethnic strife that had captured the country following the elections stopped, and there was restoration of   peace and security in the country (Juma, 2009).

Political parties, at this same period, managed to push for the writing and promulgation of the 2010 Constitution to replace the independence constitution which had been subjected to numerous changes and amendments, which were deemed as political machinations to suit the whims and interests of certain political individuals. Sadly, these changes and alterations effectively served to attack and diminish democratic principles and values. 2010 was a watershed moment for the political parties to rectify past gaffes and misadventure on law committed by both Jomo Kenyatta and Moi. The political parties ensured that there was citizen's participation in the writing of the new constitution. The constitution draft was subjected to a referendum where the ordinary citizens gave their contribution (Kenya Constitution, 2010, p.1).

The 2013 general elections favored Uhuru Kenyatta, who had vied for the presidency under the Jubilee Alliance Party to become the Republic's fourth president. Raila Odinga of ODM, who had also vied for the presidency faulted the outcomes and petitioned the results in court. Raila Odinga, however, lost the court case at the Supreme Court of Kenya, and accepted the verdict. Both Uhuru Kenyatta under Jubilee, and Raila Odinga on the National Super Alliance (NASA) ticket faced each other again in 2017 for the presidency. Uhuru Kenyatta beat Raila Odinga in the race; a success which was challenged by Raila in the corridors of justice. The Supreme Court of Kenya annulled the elections' results for lack of transparency among other grounds, and ordered for a repeat of the elections afresh. This landmark court ruling was viewed as milestone in political parties' accomplishments of democracy (Supreme Court of Kenya Ruling 2017).

Raila Odinga refused to participate in the repeat elections, arguing that victory had been stolen from him, and instead of the Supreme Court should have declared him the outright winner. For him and his followers, the repeat

elections were unconstitutional. However, Uhuru Kenyatta participated in the repeat elections, and after the votes' tallying he was declared the winner, and sworn in as the Republic's president for a second and final term. This action infuriated Raila and the NASA followers, and street demonstrations in Nairobi ensued. Raila Odinga was sworn-in (unofficially) as the "people's president." The political environment became such toxic that it almost rendered the country ungovernable (Kenya Media, November, 2017).

A political volatility in the aftermath of the two swearing events; Kenyatta as the republic's president and Raila as the people's president was redressed through the March 9, 2018 epic hand-shake between President Uhuru and opposition leader Raila Odinga. The two leaders agreed to work together, and further agreed for formulate the Building Bridges Initiative (BBI) bill in parliament, that would allow a public referendum to be conducted, and reform the constitution to tackle a myriad of issues that have been viewed as a hindrance towards participation, equality and inclusion in government for all citizens as well as democratization and good governance in the country (Kenyan media, November, 2017). The hand-shake which was opposed and supported by people from different divides in equal measure breathed a sigh of relief, and hope for the future. The ethnic animosity that previously prevailed in the country abated tremendously. The BBI process is on course, and its outcome is yet to be discerned (Kenyan media) In May 2021, the High Court of Kenya declared the BBI process and the Constitutional Amendment Act 2020 as null and void. Interested parties have filed appeals in the Court Appeal contesting the ruling of the High Court (Kenyan media, November, 2017).

Conclusion
Political parties play a central role in the democratization and governance process, and Kenya has made a crucial accomplishment towards this goal. When political parties in Kenya have been active, there has been a co-relational up-swing in democratization and good governance. On the other hand, when political parties have been depressed either by choice, compromises, suppression, coercion and intimidation, democratization and good governance has suffered. At independence when KANU and KADU competed politically, there was an air of democratic growth. When KADU

crossed the floor in parliament, joining KANU, and later the KANU government declared Kenya a de facto one party-state, democratization and governance faced a sharp threat. During the 1980s when opposition was absent, democratization and good governance were at the lowest ebb. From 1982 when Moi's regime introduced a de jure single-party system, democratization and governance took a nosedive and was completely sabotaged. However, come the repeal of Section 2(A) of the constitution, Kenya experienced a proliferation of several political parties in the country, evidently; demonstration political parties had a fundamental role in the enhancement of democratization and governance.

The political parties' system has a vital role to play in the democratization and governance process in every country and Kenya is no exception. Countries with powerful political parties have made great strides in development as compared to those countries who suppress political parties' system. In democratic states the citizens enjoy happiness, the inalienable rights to life and liberty, alongside other fundamental rights such as freedom from torture, freedom of movement and conscience, freedom of speech and the media, the freedom to human rights and the freedom of political participation amongst other freedoms.

In Kenya, during periods of unrestricted political parties' formations, particularly from 1991 to present day, people have enjoyed fundamental freedoms, though at times not in full. Political parties have pressurized the government to ensure that the citizenry are not constrained from enjoyment of inherent rights and freedoms. However, during periods of the single party system (1969-1991) many people were detained without trial, or on trumped-up charges, tortured, and several of them lost their lives (disappeared or killed) in unexplained circumstances. Although the different political regimes of Jomo Kenyatta and Moi promised that "no stone will be left unturned" to unearth the perpetrators of such heinous crimes, to date no one has been caught and tried in a court of law for committing such dreadful crimes some of which have been horrendous and very cruel. During the same era, people were not allowed to participate in government conduct. The citizens were not permitted to elect leaders of the own choice. For example, during the queue (mlolongo) system of voting of 1988, an individual with the longest line of persons could lose to a person

with a shorter line of people, there was no transparency in votes tallying, powerful individuals in the government were involved in high corruption, where the government lost colossal resources, but no one could raise a finger for fear of reprisals.

The government of Kenya should appreciate that there is nothing to gain by stifling a political parties' system, but everything to gain and as such it should encourage and promote political pluralism. History has demonstrated beyond doubt, that the major champions of political parties' system, like the United States, Britain, the Nordic states of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, Switzerland, France and Germany, Canada and Australia are the most progressive states globally in terms of political, economic and social-cultural affairs. The Kenyan government should empower the parties through state funding. The political parties not in the government should be a loyal opposition, and they realize that they are the alternative government or government in waiting. Opposition parties in the country should resist undue dalliance with the government, and refrain from any attempts to lure them to conduct themselves in a manner that would undermine their functionality in the furtherance of democratic practices and the rules of good governance.

So far, it cannot be claimed that Kenya has since independence had what can be termed as perfect political parties, with the exception of KANU. Maybe, it can be argued that what has been there could be described as political pluralism. A political party must have some specific characteristics; such as; it should cover a big political space, must have been there for a long period, and must have an ideology and cultural specifics. Most of the political parties in Kenya are based on ethnic or regional considerations, and lack the perfection of a political party. Hardly do these political parties last a full parliamentary term. They wither during the course of parliament's life term. New political parties' outfits are hurriedly cobbled up as political machines to land politicians into the next parliament. Kenyan political parties must adapt these attributes to be considered as fully-fledged political parties. Otherwise, they are not yet there.

Old democracies have at least two dominant political parties that have been there for generations, and have served their people and government well.

For example, the United States has had the Republican and the Democratic political parties since the country's independence in 1763. Great Britain has had the Labour and the Conservative parties which have served their people quite adequately. Both the US and Great Britain political parties meet the criteria of a countrywide outreach, longevity requirement, ideology and culture. The political parties' system in Kenya should aspire to achieve these criteria. In addition, democratic principles and good governance are universal, and Kenya should emulate political parties that have existed and thrived before them. As the old adage goes, "Rome was not built in a day," Kenya is on track of perfecting a political parties' system which would in turn enhance democratization and good governance issues. Arguably, Kenya political parties' system has made major inroads in democratization and good governance, but the ideal objective should be the ultimate consolidation of democracy.

References

Adar K.G and Munyae I.M, "Human Rights Abuse in Kenya under Daniel arap Moi, 1978-2001."

Adar K.G "The Internal and External Contexts of Human Rights Practice in Kenya: Daniel arap Moi's Operational Code," African Sociological Review Vol. 4, No. 1 pp. 74-96, 2000

Amnesty International, "Raila Odinga, A Prisoner of Conscience, 1991."

Anne Nangulu-Ayuku, "Reflections on the Post-Colonial State in Kenya," in P.O. Agbese et al., Reconstructing the State in Africa (Pita Agbese and George

KlayJr., pp. 127-128, 2007

African Democracy Encyclopedia Project, eisa.org.za/wep/Kenya.2010.parties.htm) Amartya Sen, "Democracy as a Universal Value," Journal of Democracy Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 3-17 1999

Bannon A.L, "Designing a Constitution-Drafting Process: Lessons from Kenya," The Yale Law Journal (2001).

Branch D and Cheeseman N., "The politics of Control in Kenya: Understanding the Bureaucratic Executive State, 1952-78," Review of African Political Economy, Vol. 37, No. 107, pp. 11-31, March 2006

Constitution of Kenya, Laws of Kenya 2010

David A. Anderson, "Briefing: Kenya Elections 2002: The Dawning of a New Dawn Era?" Africa Affairs Journal Vol. 102, No. 407, 2002, pp. 331-342

Dahl R.A. On Democracy (Second Edition), 1998, Yale University, USA

Dahl R.A, A Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition 1917, Yale University, USA

David Throup," Elections and Political Legitimacy in Kenya," African Journal of the International African Institute, Vol. 63, No. 3, Understanding Elections in Africa (1993) pp. 371-396

Dunkwart A. Rustow, "Transition to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model," Comparative Politics, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 337-363, 1970

Elischer Sebastian, "Ethnic Coalitions of Convenience and Commitment: Political Parties and Party Systems in Kenya," German Institute of Global Studies, 2008, http://hdl.handle.net/10419/47826

Gertzel C (1974). The Politics of Independent Kenya, East African Publishing House, Nairobi, Kenya

Gilbert Muruli Khadiagal, "Political Movements' and coalition Politics in Kenya: Entrenching Ethnicity," South African Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 17, No. 1, April 2010, pp. 65-84

Jonas Fossli Gjerso, "The Scramble for East Africa: British Motives Reconsidered, 1884-95," Journal for Imperial and Commonweal History, Vol. 43, No. 5 2015

Juan J. Linz, "The Perils of Presidentialism," Journal of Democracy, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1990, pp.69 Kenya Media, 2017

Lise Rakner and Nicolas van de Walle, "Democratization by Elections? Opposition Weakness in Africa," Journal of Democracy, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2009

Michelle Kuenzi and Gina Lambright, "Party System Institutionalization in 30 African Countries," Party Politics, Vol. 7, No. 4 pp. 437-468

Monica Kathina Juma," Africa n Mediation of the Kenya Post 2007 election crisis," Journal of Contemporary African Studies Vol. 27, No. 3, 2009

Mumo Nzao and Guyo Mohammed, "The Challenges of Securing Kenya: Past, Experience, Present Challenges and Future Prospects," Journal of Social Encounters, Vol. 2, No.1, 2018, pp. 37-59Nic Cheeseman, "The Kenyan Elections of 2007: An Introduction," Journal of Eastern African Studies, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2008

Nyandera N. I., Agwanda B., and Maulani N, "Evolution of Kenya's Political System and Challenges to Democracy," Springer Nature Switzerland AG (2020) in A. Farazmamnd (ed) Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance, https//doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3997-1

Peter Karari, "Modus Operandi of Oppressing the "Savages:" the Kenyan British Colonial Experience" Peace and Conflict Studies Vol. 25, No. 1 Article 2, 2018, p. 1

Prof. Macharia Munene Lecturer; "Kenya's Political History, "United States Internal University (Africa), March 12, 2020

Renee Speijcken, "Strengthening the role of Political Parties in Public Accountability: A case study of new Approach in Political Party Assistance in Kenya, "International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2012
Rutto K and Njoroge G. K (2001).The Democratization Process in Africa, Quest &Insight Publishers, Nairobi, Kenya

Schattschneider E.E Encyclopedia.com
Susanne D. Mueller; "Government and Opposition in Kenya 1966-9," The Journal of Modern African Studies Vol. 22, No. 3, , pp. 399-427, Sept. 1984

Valerie J. Bunce and Sharon L. Wolchik, "Defeating Dictators: Electoral Change and Stability in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes," World Politics, Vol. 62, No. 1, pp. 43-86, 2010

Wikipedia, "Kenya People's Union",
https://en.wikipedia.org>wiki>kenya_people's_union.