

Potential Historical Origin of Tribalism in Multiparty Democracy in Africa 1963-2023: A Comparative Analysis of Kenya and Tanzania

Dr. Gitari Kathuru, PhD

Meru University of Science and Technology (MUST), Meru, Eastern, Kenya

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800153>

Received: 13 August 2026; Accepted: 19 August 2026; Published: 29 August 2026

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Ethnicity has remained one of the most influential factors shaping political development in Africa since independence. While ethnic identity is a natural social phenomenon that provides individuals with a sense of belonging, its politicization has often generated divisions, conflict, and unequal distribution of resources. In many African countries, political competition has increasingly been organized around ethnic affiliations, resulting in what is commonly referred to as tribalism.

The origins of tribalism in Africa can be traced to both pre-colonial and colonial periods. Pre-colonial African societies were organized around kinship, clans, and ethnic communities that maintained distinct cultural, linguistic, and territorial identities. Although these identities existed, they rarely formed the basis for large-scale political competition. The advent of colonialism transformed ethnic identities by creating administrative boundaries, introducing indirect rule, and promoting differential access to education, employment, and economic opportunities among communities.

Following independence in the 1960s, African leaders faced the challenge of transforming ethnically diverse societies into unified nation-states. While some countries successfully promoted national cohesion, others experienced persistent ethnic rivalries that became deeply embedded in political processes. The introduction of multiparty democracy in the late twentieth century further intensified ethnic political competition in several African countries, as political parties often mobilized support along ethnic lines.

Kenya and Tanzania provide a useful comparative framework for examining the historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy. Both countries share several similarities, including British colonial rule, ethnic diversity, geographical proximity, and independence in the early 1960s. However, their experiences with ethnicity and national integration differ significantly.

Kenya has experienced recurrent ethnic tensions, ethnic voting patterns, and politically motivated conflicts associated with electoral competition. Since the reintroduction of multiparty politics in 1991, ethnicity has remained a major determinant of political alliances, voting behavior, and distribution of political power.

Conversely, Tanzania has generally maintained a higher level of national cohesion despite having over 120 ethnic groups. The country's adoption of Kiswahili as a national language, the nation-building philosophy of Ujamaa under Julius Nyerere, and policies discouraging ethnic mobilization have often been cited as contributing factors to its relative success in minimizing tribal politics.

This study seeks to investigate the historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy by comparing Kenya and Tanzania between 1963 and 2023. Through a historical and comparative approach, the study aims to identify the factors that explain the different trajectories of ethnic politics in the two countries.

Statement of the Problem

Despite more than six decades of independence, tribalism continues to pose a significant challenge to democratic governance in many African countries. The reintroduction of multiparty politics in the 1990s was expected to

deepen democracy, promote political participation, and enhance accountability. However, in several African states, multiparty competition has often reinforced ethnic identities rather than promoting national unity.

Kenya represents one of the most prominent examples where ethnicity remains deeply intertwined with electoral politics. Political parties, electoral alliances, and voting patterns frequently reflect ethnic considerations. Consequently, elections have occasionally been accompanied by ethnic tensions and conflicts, undermining democratic consolidation.

In contrast, Tanzania has generally avoided the intense ethnic political competition witnessed in Kenya despite sharing similar colonial experiences and possessing comparable levels of ethnic diversity. The relative absence of tribal politics in Tanzania raises important questions regarding the historical factors that shaped different outcomes in the two countries.

Existing studies have examined ethnicity, nationalism, democratization, and governance in Africa. However, limited scholarly attention has been devoted to a comparative historical analysis of the origins of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania over an extended period spanning from independence to the contemporary era. This study seeks to fill this gap by investigating the historical processes, institutions, and political developments that contributed to divergent experiences of tribalism in multiparty democracy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study examined the potential historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy in Africa through a comparative analysis of Kenya and Tanzania from 1963 to 2023.

Objectives of the Study

General Objective

To examine the potential historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy in Africa through a comparative analysis of Kenya and Tanzania between 1963 and 2023.

Specific Objectives

To examine the influence of colonial policies on the emergence of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania.

To assess the role of post-independence nation-building strategies in shaping ethnic relations in Kenya and Tanzania.

To analyze the impact of single-party political systems on ethnic mobilization in the two countries.

To evaluate the relationship between multiparty democracy and the resurgence of tribal politics in Kenya and Tanzania.

To compare the historical factors that contributed to different levels of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania between 1963 and 2023.

Research Questions

Main Research Question

What are the potential historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy in Africa as reflected in the experiences of Kenya and Tanzania between 1963 and 2023?

Specific Research Questions

How did colonial policies contribute to the development of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania?

What role did post-independence nation-building strategies play in shaping ethnic relations in the two countries?

How did single-party political systems influence ethnic politics in Kenya and Tanzania?

To what extent has multiparty democracy contributed to the resurgence of tribalism in the two countries?

Why has tribalism become more pronounced in Kenya than in Tanzania despite similarities in colonial history and ethnic diversity?

Research Hypotheses

H₁: Colonial administrative policies significantly contributed to the emergence of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania.

H₂: Effective nation-building policies reduce the influence of tribalism in multiparty democracies.

H₃: Multiparty democracy increases ethnic political mobilization where national integration mechanisms are weak.

H₄: Differences in post-independence leadership and nation-building strategies explain variations in levels of tribalism between Kenya and Tanzania.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are significant in several ways:

Academic Significance

The study contributes to the existing body of knowledge on ethnicity, nationalism, democratization, and political development in Africa. It will provide a historical explanation of the persistence of tribalism in democratic politics.

Policy Significance

The study provides policymakers with insights into the historical factors that contribute to ethnic political competition and suggest strategies for promoting national cohesion.

Educational Significance

Students and scholars of history, political science, sociology, and African studies will benefit from the study as a reference source for understanding ethnicity and democracy in Africa.

Social Significance

The study may contribute to efforts aimed at strengthening national unity, peaceful coexistence, and democratic governance in multi-ethnic societies.

Justification of the Study

The study is justified on several grounds:

Tribalism remains a major challenge to democratic governance in many African countries.

Kenya and Tanzania offer a unique comparative case because of their similar colonial experiences but different outcomes regarding ethnic politics.

There is a need for a long-term historical analysis covering the period from independence to 2023.

Understanding the origins of tribalism can inform policies aimed at strengthening national cohesion and democratic stability.

The study contributes to ongoing debates regarding the relationship between ethnicity and democracy in Africa.

Scope of the Study

Geographical Scope

The study focused on Kenya and Tanzania.

Temporal Scope

The study covers the period between 1963 and 2023. The year 1963 marks Kenya's independence and the consolidation of post-colonial governance in East Africa, while 2023 represents the contemporary period of democratic development.

Thematic Scope

The study focuses on:

Historical origins of tribalism.

Colonial legacies.

Nation-building strategies.

Single-party and multiparty political systems.

Ethnic mobilization.

Democratic governance.

Political leadership and institutions.

Assumptions of the Study

The study assumes that:

Historical events significantly influence contemporary political behavior.

Ethnic identities can be politically mobilized under certain institutional conditions.

Reliable historical and contemporary records are available for analysis.

Kenya and Tanzania provide appropriate comparative cases for studying tribalism in Africa.

Limitations of the Study

The study faced the following limitations:

Some archival materials were inaccessible or incomplete.

Historical records reflected biases of colonial administrators or political actors.

Interpretations of ethnicity and tribalism varied among scholars.

The broad time span of sixty years presented challenges in data management and analysis.

These limitations were addressed through triangulation of sources and critical evaluation of evidence.

Operational Definition of Terms

Tribalism

The practice of promoting loyalty, political support, or resource allocation based on ethnic or tribal identity rather than national interests.

Ethnicity

A social identity based on shared ancestry, language, culture, history, and traditions.

Multiparty Democracy

A political system in which two or more political parties compete for political power through regular elections.

Nation Building

The process of creating a unified national identity and promoting social cohesion among diverse communities within a state.

Colonial Legacy

Political, social, economic, and administrative structures inherited from colonial rule that continue to influence contemporary society.

Comparative Analysis

A research approach involving systematic examination of similarities and differences between two or more cases.

Summary

This chapter has introduced the study by outlining the background, statement of the problem, objectives, research questions, significance, justification, scope, assumptions, limitations, and operational definitions. The study seeks to investigate the potential historical origins of tribalism in multiparty democracy through a comparative analysis of Kenya and Tanzania from 1963 to 2023. The next chapter reviews the relevant theoretical and empirical literature related to ethnicity, tribalism, nation-building, and democratic development in Africa.

TRIBAL ROYALTIES AND LACK OF IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENTIATION

Introduction

Tribal royalties and lack of ideological differentiation have characterized Multiparty politics in Africa. In Tanzania a former British colony after 1918, the situation was different. It has a national outlook and differences are settled at the political level. Kenya their neighbour to the North, the situation is the opposite. Every election comes with tribal conflicts and realignments. Political parties in Kenya are formed along tribal lines as opposed to Tanzania where political parties are more cohesive and more nationalistic in their formations. Tanzania has experienced very stable and strong political party politics as opposed to Kenya. For instance, in Tanzania, the ruling party Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM) has been in power in since the merger between TANU and Afro-Shirazi Party to form CCM in 1967. Politics revolving around CCM have been cohesive and democratic as Opposed to the merger of KANU and KADU in Kenya that was characterized with suspicion and tribalism leading to multiparty system and consequently collapse to KANU from a monolithic national political party to a small and regional party as it is today.

In 1992 parliament in Kenya made a constitutional amendment which repealed section 2A of the constitution. This amendment consequently made that Kenya moved from a de jure (single) state system to a multiparty political system where political parties were allowed to compete for political power to form government. Kenya had earlier changed the constitution in 1982 to make it a de jure (single party) state after the attempted coup d'état that had happened in August of the same year.

This move of allowing multiparty democracy consequently weakened political party system in Kenya since most of the political parties that were formed thereafter were formed on ethnic lines. Even those political parties that were formed for several ethnic communities never lasted past a general election. This scenario has continued since then and there seem to be no solution at hand to solve this puzzle. For instance, in 1991 after the repeal of section 2A of the constitution a very strong political party called Forum for the Restoration of Democracy (FORD) was formed cutting across the ethnic groups of Kenya. This party was so strong that it posed a serious threat to the then ruling party Kenya African National Union (KANU). The sad story is that this political party never lasted to reach the general election that was held the following year in 1992. The FORD party split into two, Ford-Kenya and Ford-Asili before the 1992 elections. This was due to tribal affiliations. Ford-Kenya was led by Jaramogi Oginga Odinga a Luo, while Ford-Asili was led by Kenneth Njindo Matiba a kikuyu.

Historical Legacy of Colonialism

Tribalism in African multiparty democracies remain a significant and persistent challenge that affects political stability, governance, and social cohesion. In many African countries, tribal identities are deeply intertwined with political affiliations, influencing voting behaviour, party dynamics, and government policies. The problem of tribalism can be understood through several interrelated factors. Colonial powers often drew arbitrary borders that grouped diverse ethnic communities into single political units. These boundaries ignored existing ethnic, linguistic, and cultural divisions, leading to the creation of multi-ethnic states where tribal affiliations became politically important.

The colonial powers often reinforced ethnic divisions by favouring certain groups over others, creating a legacy of competition for political power along ethnic lines. In many African countries, political parties align with particular ethnic groups, making elections highly contentious and often a matter of "us versus them." This exacerbates ethnic polarization, as voting patterns tend to follow tribal lines. Leaders often use ethnicity as a tool for gaining and maintaining power, offering patronage to their ethnic communities in exchange for political support. This can deepen ethnic loyalties and create competition between groups for state resources. In some African countries, the use of a first-past-the-post (FPTP) electoral system leads to the dominance of major ethnic groups, as the system rewards parties that can consolidate large regional or ethnic blocs. This encourages politicians to appeal to their ethnic base rather than national unity. During elections, politicians often stoke ethnic tensions to galvanize support from their ethnic group. This can lead to violence, vote manipulation, and a focus on ethnic interests rather than national policies.

Tribalism can fuel violent conflicts, as different ethnic groups compete for political control, resources, and state power. This is often seen in countries where multiple ethnic groups vie for influence within the government. Elections can sometimes serve as flashpoints for ethnic violence, particularly when political leaders exploit ethnic divisions to mobilize support. Instances of post-election violence in countries like Kenya (2007–2008) and Côte d'Ivoire (2010–2011) demonstrate how ethnic tensions can escalate into violent confrontations, undermining the democratic process and creating long-lasting divisions.

Ethnic favouritism can lead to the creation of patronage networks that undermine effective governance. The state may distribute resources and opportunities based on ethnic loyalty rather than merit or need, leading to inefficiency, corruption, and poor public services. Tribalism often undermines the development of a strong national identity, as people may prioritize ethnic loyalty over a shared sense of nationhood. This weakens social cohesion and can hinder national development. The media, both traditional and social, can exacerbate tribalism by amplifying ethnic rhetoric and creating echo chambers that reinforce divisive narratives. In some cases, media outlets are aligned with specific ethnic groups, using their platforms to incite ethnic conflict and mobilize political support along tribal lines.

In the digital age, social media platforms have become a powerful tool for political mobilization, but they also allow the spread of hate speech and misinformation. Politicians and individuals can use social media to stoke ethnic divisions, sometimes leading to violence. One of the key challenges in African multiparty democracies is creating political systems that are inclusive and foster national unity. Power-sharing arrangements or coalition governments are often necessary to ensure that all ethnic groups feel represented, but these solutions can sometimes be unstable and lead to inefficiency. There is often tension between ensuring adequate representation of various ethnic groups and promoting merit-based leadership. The challenge is to balance ethnic representation with the need for competent governance.

Examples of Tribalism in African Democracies

The political history of Kenya is deeply shaped by ethnic considerations, with the Kikuyu, Luo, Luhya, and Kalenjin being among the most politically influential groups. Ethnic competition has led to violence in the wake of elections, such as the 2007–2008 post-election violence, which was fuelled by both political and ethnic tensions. Nigeria's political landscape is marked by ethnic divisions between the Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo, among others. These divisions have led to both electoral competition and conflict, particularly in the context of regional politics and the distribution of oil wealth. While Rwanda is often cited as a success story in post-genocide reconciliation, the deep scars of ethnic division between Hutus and Tutsis remain a challenge in the country's political landscape, even as the government works to overcome these divisions.

Efforts to Mitigate Tribalism

Some African countries have adopted power-sharing mechanisms, such as federalism or proportional representation, to give various ethnic groups a stake in governance. However, these approaches can also perpetuate ethnic divisions if not carefully managed. Leaders in some African countries have made efforts to promote national unity through policies that downplay ethnic identity and emphasize common citizenship. These efforts include creating national symbols, promoting inter-ethnic dialogue, and fostering cross-cultural understanding. Promoting civic education that emphasizes national identity over ethnic identity can help build a sense of shared responsibility and belonging. This requires leadership that is committed to addressing the roots of tribalism and building inclusive institutions.

Tribalism in African multiparty democracies present a multifaceted challenge that impacts political stability, governance, and social cohesion. While ethnic diversity is an inherent feature of African societies, it can be manipulated in ways that undermine democratic processes and fuel conflict. Tackling tribalism requires reforms that promote inclusivity, strengthen institutions, and foster a strong sense of national identity that transcends ethnic divisions. Effective leadership and a commitment to good governance are essential for mitigating the negative effects of tribalism and ensuring that democracy serves all citizens equitably.

Significance of Kenya and Tanzania as Case Studies on Potential Tribalism in Africa 1992-2023 Kenya and Tanzania are two of the most significant case studies in understanding the dynamics of tribalism in Africa, particularly between 1992 and 2023. These two East African nations have experienced varying levels of ethnic and political tension, yet they offer contrasting lessons on managing tribalism in a multi-ethnic society.

Kenya is home to more than 40 ethnic groups, with the Kikuyu, Luhya, Luo, Kalenjin, and Maasai being the largest. Tanzania is more ethnically homogeneous in comparison, with over 120 ethnic groups, but the majority belong to the Bantu-speaking ethnic groups, such as the Sukuma, Chaga, and Nyamwezi.

Despite these differences, both countries faced colonial policies that laid the groundwork for later ethnic tensions. Colonial powers often favoured certain groups over others, leading to divisions that would later manifest in political and social conflict.

Tribalism in Kenya: A Case Study of Political Tensions (1992–2023)

In Kenya, ethnic divisions have been historically intertwined with political power, and the post-independence period was marked by competition between the major ethnic groups for political dominance. From 1992 to 2023,

the issue of tribalism in Kenya became particularly pronounced in the following ways: Kenya's transition from a one-party state to a multi-party system in the early 1990s was accompanied by violence along ethnic lines. This was most pronounced in the 1992 and 1997 elections, where political leaders incited their ethnic groups to vie for political control. The 1992 elections saw violence in the Rift Valley, where the Kikuyu, Luo, and Luhya communities were targeted by the Kalenjin, a key support base of President Daniel Arap Moi. This period exposed how ethnic groups were politicized and used for electoral gain.

The 2007 election was particularly significant for understanding Kenya's ethnic and political volatility. The aftermath of the disputed election between Mwai Kibaki (a Kikuyu) and Raila Odinga (a Luo) resulted in widespread violence, with ethnic groups aligning themselves with their preferred candidates. The violence was especially severe in the Rift Valley and parts of Nairobi, where thousands were killed, and hundreds of thousands were displaced. The violence highlighted the fragility of Kenya's ethnic relations and the vulnerability of marginalized groups when political leaders exploit ethnic identity for personal gain. The Kibaki-Odinga rivalry became a focal point for the ethnic fractures, as the Kikuyu and Kalenjin, for example, were pitted against each other.

Following the 2007–2008 violence, the National Accord and Reconciliation Act of 2008, brokered by former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, sought to address ethnic tensions by creating a coalition government and initiating reforms. The 2010 Constitution introduced important reforms aimed at decentralizing power, devolution of government to counties, and reducing the influence of ethnicity on national politics. The 2013 and 2017 elections showed some progress in terms of peaceful transitions, though ethnic voting patterns remained entrenched. The 2022 election also revolved around ethnic dynamics, with William Ruto (Kalenjin) defeating Raila Odinga (Luo), marking the latest in a long history of ethnic-based political competition. Despite Kenya's progress in terms of democracy and electoral transparency, tribalism remained a key factor in shaping electoral outcomes and political alliances.

Tanzania: A Case Study of Unity and Nation-Building

Tanzania's history presents a contrasting narrative, especially when it comes to ethnic relations. Since independence, Tanzania has emphasized Ujamaa (African socialism) and nation-building under the leadership of Julius Nyerere, who promoted a vision of unity among Tanzania's ethnic groups. While Tanzania has faced its own set of challenges, the experience of tribalism in Tanzania has been notably different from Kenya's.

Julius Nyerere worked hard to foster a sense of Tanzanian identity over ethnic loyalty, emphasizing that all Tanzanians, regardless of their ethnic background, were part of a larger national community. This focus on unity was institutionalized through policies that promoted Swahili as the national language, sought to reduce ethnic divisions, and focused on rural development and social welfare programs. Tanzania avoided the type of ethnic-based political competition seen in Kenya, and while ethnic identity remained a factor in social and cultural life, political leaders were generally less likely to exploit ethnic divisions for electoral purposes.

Despite Nyerere's vision, Tanzania has not been free from ethnic tensions. In the 1990s, the multiparty transition in Tanzania saw some political fragmentation along ethnic lines, particularly with the rise of opposition parties, but the impact was much less severe compared to Kenya. In the 2000s and 2010s, ethnic and regional identity occasionally surfaced in politics, but political parties have typically avoided making ethnicity a focal point in the way Kenyan politicians have. Zanzibar, however, has experienced more pronounced ethnic and political tensions, especially between the Zanzibar Arabs and the indigenous African populations. Since the death of President John Magufuli in 2021, the political environment in Tanzania has seen some shifts, but there have been fewer signs of overt tribalism in national politics. Tanzania's continued emphasis on national unity and its efforts to focus on economic development rather than ethnic division have helped avoid the worst outcomes associated with tribalism.

Lessons from Kenya and Tanzania for Tribalism in Africa

Kenya's Case highlights the dangers of ethnic polarization in the context of multi-party politics. The exploitation of ethnic identities by political elites has led to significant violence and instability, especially in the context of

elections. Kenya's experience underscores the need for reforms that address issues of governance, equitable distribution of resources, and respect for all ethnic groups. Tanzania's Experience, on the other hand, provides a counter-narrative, showing that strong leadership, a focus on national identity, and institutional reforms can reduce the salience of ethnic divisions. While Tanzania is not without its challenges, the country's relative stability in the face of ethnic diversity provides important lessons in nation-building and governance. Both countries illustrate the complex role that ethnicity plays in shaping political outcomes in Africa. Kenya's more fragmented approach to ethnicity contrasts with Tanzania's emphasis on unity, but both countries show that managing ethnic tensions requires careful governance, inclusion, and a commitment to national cohesion.

Between 1992 and 2023, Kenya and Tanzania serve as important case studies on the potential and actual consequences of tribalism in Africa. Kenya's more dramatic and violent episodes highlight the risks of ethnic competition in politics, while Tanzania's experience demonstrates that through strategic leadership and inclusive policies, ethnic conflict can be managed. For other African nations, these cases provide vital lessons on how to manage ethnic diversity without allowing it to destabilize national unity.

Ethnic Identity, Tribalism, and Democracy in Africa

Ethnic identity, tribalism, and democracy are pivotal themes in the social and political landscape of Africa. The relationship between these concepts is complex, often characterized by tensions between unity and division, national integration and ethnic pluralism. Ethnic identity can be both a source of social cohesion and a catalyst for conflict, depending on the political, social, and economic contexts in which it is situated. Similarly, tribalism, while often regarded as a negative force, is also linked to historical forms of social organization and collective identity in many African societies. The challenge for many African democracies lies in balancing the recognition of ethnic diversity with the need for national unity, development, and political stability.

Ethnic identity in Africa is often understood as a sense of belonging to a social group based on shared cultural attributes such as language, religion, customs, and ancestry. However, the formation and salience of ethnic identities in the modern African state are complex and historically contingent. As scholars like Barth (1969) and Cohen (1974) have argued, ethnicity is a fluid social construct that can be manipulated by political elites, especially in post-colonial African contexts. The colonial experience played a critical role in shaping ethnic identities in Africa. The drawing of arbitrary national borders by colonial powers (e.g., the Berlin Conference of 1884) often merged or divided ethnolinguistic groups, creating new political realities that did not reflect indigenous cultural and social configurations. Colonial rulers, such as the British and French, used ethnic groups as instruments of governance, co-opting ethnic leaders and reinforcing ethnic divisions through practices like indirect rule (Herbst, 2000). This reinforced the salience of ethnicity, which persisted after independence. Post-independence African leaders often manipulated ethnic identity for political gain, cultivating loyal ethnic constituencies through patronage networks. This practice is especially evident in countries with ethnically diverse populations like Nigeria, Kenya, and Côte d'Ivoire (Lindberg & Morrison, 2008). Ethnic politics became a dominant feature in the competition for state resources and power.

While "ethnic identity" refers to the shared social bonds among members of a group, "tribalism" is often used to denote a divisive or exclusionary form of ethnic solidarity. In the African context, tribalism is frequently associated with negative outcomes, such as intergroup violence, political instability, and social fragmentation. The literature on tribalism highlights both its historical roots and its negative impacts on contemporary politics. Tribalism has been cited as a factor contributing to violence in several African countries, particularly during periods of political competition or civil conflict. In countries like Rwanda, Sudan, and Nigeria, ethnic and tribal differences have been manipulated by elites to stoke violence, leading to tragic events such as the Rwandan Genocide (1994) and the Nigerian Civil War (1967-1970).

Studies have shown that political elites often invoke ethnic or tribal identities to rally support, frame opposition as enemies of the group, and justify violent actions (Gagnon, 2004). Researchers such as Fearon and Laitin (2000) and Cederman et al. (2011) argue that ethnic diversity, while not inherently causing conflict, can exacerbate tensions in weak or failing states, especially when governance is based on patronage and clientelism. In multi-ethnic societies with limited state capacity, competition for state resources becomes an ethnic struggle, with groups perceiving the state as a zero-sum game in which the gain of one group means the loss of another.

The relationship between ethnicity and democracy in Africa is contentious and multifaceted. On one hand, ethnicity can be a source of democratic empowerment, particularly in cases where marginalized ethnic groups use their identity to demand greater political participation. On the other hand, ethnicity can undermine democratic processes by fostering division and conflict, especially when political parties and elections are organized along ethnic lines. One of the central challenges in African democracies is how to incorporate ethnic diversity into democratic governance without allowing ethnic identity to dominate political life. Scholars such as Horowitz (1985) and Chazan (1992) have explored how ethnic-based political systems—where parties are defined along ethnic lines—can deepen divisions and contribute to democratic instability. The use of ethnic quotas, federalism, and power-sharing arrangements has been proposed as a way to manage ethnic diversity, but these mechanisms have had mixed results.

Ethnic mobilization often takes place during elections, where political parties exploit ethnic sentiments to garner votes. In such contexts, democracy can be seen not as a unifying force, but as a tool for ethnic groups to claim their share of power and resources. In countries like Kenya and Zimbabwe, election cycles have frequently been marked by ethnic tensions and violence, leading to questions about the sustainability of democracy in these contexts (Pottie & Weidmann, 2015).

According to scholars like Samuel Huntington (1996) and Larry Diamond (2008), ethnic conflict can hinder the process of democratic consolidation. In societies where ethnic divisions are deep, the transition from authoritarian rule to democracy can be fraught with tension, as various ethnic groups vie for political power. The inability of governments to mediate these tensions often leads to political instability, undermining democratic institutions. The issue of national integration in multi-ethnic states is central to the study of democracy in Africa. The challenge lies in creating inclusive political systems that accommodate ethnic diversity without sacrificing national unity. Several strategies have been proposed for managing ethnic diversity in democratic governance. Federal systems, like those in Nigeria, Ethiopia, and South Africa, are often suggested as solutions to ethnic conflict by decentralizing political power. These systems aim to provide ethnic groups with a degree of political autonomy, while still maintaining national unity. However, the success of federalism in promoting peace and stability is mixed. For example, while federalism in Nigeria has allowed for some ethnic accommodation, it has also exacerbated the country's ethnic rivalries, particularly in the allocation of resources (Suberu, 2001).

In contrast to ethnic federalism, inclusive nationalism seeks to promote a sense of belonging to the nation-state that transcends ethnic lines. Scholars like Ayoade (1999) have argued that inclusive nationalism is essential for promoting national unity and fostering democracy, but this has been challenging in Africa's highly fragmented societies. Inclusive nationalism requires strong leadership, as well as the construction of civic national identities that can overcome the divisiveness of ethnic politics.

The literature on ethnic identity, tribalism, and democracy in Africa reveals a deeply intertwined relationship between ethnicity and politics. While ethnicity can provide a foundation for collective identity and social organization, it is also a source of political instability and conflict, particularly when manipulated by elites. The challenge for African democracies lies in balancing the recognition of ethnic diversity with the need for national integration, political stability, and democratic consolidation. The path toward stable democracy in Africa requires mechanisms that foster inclusivity, manage ethnic conflict, and promote national unity while respecting the rights and identities of ethnic groups. Although ethnic politics remains a prominent feature of African democracy, there is evidence that effective political institutions, such as power-sharing agreements, federalism, and inclusive nationalism, can help mitigate the negative effects of ethnic divisions.

This review highlights how the intertwining of ethnic identity, tribalism, and democracy continues to shape the political landscapes of many African nations. The key takeaway is the need for policies that recognize and accommodate ethnic diversity while fostering national cohesion. Theories of ethnicity and nationalism in post-colonial African states are critical for understanding the complex political and social dynamics in the region. After gaining independence, many African states faced challenges related to identity, nation-building, and ethnic diversity. Scholars and theorists have developed various approaches to explain how ethnicity and nationalism have shaped African states in the post-colonial era. Below are some of the key theories and perspectives.

Primordialist theories argue that ethnicity is rooted in deep, historical, and often ancient connections between people. Ethnic identities are seen as "natural" and immutable, based on shared heritage, culture, language, religion, and ancestry. From this perspective, nationalism in post-colonial Africa is often seen as an expression of long-standing, pre-colonial ethnic attachments. Ethnic identity is seen as a fixed and deeply ingrained aspect of human society and nationalism emerges from the ethnic group's sense of belonging and shared history. Therefore, ethnic conflicts in post-colonial Africa are seen as natural extensions of pre-existing ethnic divisions. Critics argue that this theory overemphasizes the stability of ethnic identities, ignoring the role of colonialism and state formation in shaping contemporary identities.

Constructivist theories challenge primordialism by asserting that ethnicity and national identity are socially constructed rather than fixed. Ethnic identities are not biologically determined or timeless; they are products of historical, political, and social processes. In the context of post-colonial Africa, constructivists emphasize how colonialism and the process of state-building shaped the way people identify themselves and others. Ethnic and national identities are fluid and socially constructed through political, economic, and cultural processes. Nationalism can be seen as a project of unification, where a nation-state is built around a constructed sense of shared identity, often drawing upon selected aspects of ethnic groups. In Africa, colonial borders, which often ignored ethnic boundaries, contributed to the creation of diverse, multi-ethnic states where national identity was imposed from above. Colonial powers created artificial borders that grouped together diverse ethnic groups, often leading to tensions and competition for power in the post-colonial era. Nationalism, in this sense, is seen as a project of constructing a collective identity, sometimes by emphasizing common cultural traits or a shared anti-colonial struggle.

Ethno-symbolism is a middle ground between primordialism and constructivism. It argues that while ethnic identities may have deep historical roots, these identities are also shaped by the historical and political contexts of modern states. Nationalism in post-colonial Africa, from this perspective, often draws on symbols, myths, and histories that are rooted in pre-colonial ethnic cultures but are adapted to modern political realities. Ethnic identities are not purely invented; they are based on real historical and cultural foundations, but they are also flexible and adaptive. Nationalism often draws upon shared historical experiences, such as colonial resistance or cultural symbols, to foster a sense of unity and legitimacy. The construction of the nation is not just about creating new identities but reinterpreting or reimagining older ethnic symbols and traditions in the modern context.

The political economy approach emphasizes how the distribution of resources and political power shapes ethnic relations and nationalism. This perspective focuses on the role of the state, elites, and economic structures in fostering ethnic divisions or unity. In post-colonial African states, where economies were often underdeveloped and reliant on colonial legacies, ethnicity became a key means for mobilizing political support, securing resources, and maintaining power. Ethnicity is often instrumentalized by political elites who use ethnic identities to secure political loyalty and control state resources. Nationalism can be seen as a strategy for consolidating state power or accessing economic resources, especially in multi-ethnic societies. Economic inequalities, often shaped by colonialism, exacerbate ethnic tensions, as groups compete for political and economic dominance. In post-colonial African states, ethnic groups often compete for access to state power and resources. The state, in turn, may use ethnic identity to secure political legitimacy and power. This creates a dynamic where ethnicity becomes politicized, leading to conflicts such as civil wars and political instability in countries like Rwanda, Nigeria, and Sudan.

Instrumentalism posits that ethnicity is not a natural or deep-rooted feature of society, but rather a tool used by political elites to mobilize support. Ethnic groups are seen as politically constructed categories that can be manipulated for political gain. In the African context, elites often use ethnic identities to create loyalty among their supporters, justify political power, or legitimize their rule. Ethnic identities are viewed as fluid and malleable, created and manipulated by elites. Nationalism in post-colonial Africa can be seen as a way for elites to consolidate power and maintain control over state resources. Conflicts between ethnic groups are often driven by competition for political power, rather than deep-seated cultural or historical differences.

From a Pan-Africanist perspective, the problems of ethnicity and nationalism in post-colonial Africa are linked to the legacies of colonialism. Some Pan-African thinkers argue that the ethnic divisions in African states are largely the result of the colonial project, which divided and ruled African societies by fostering ethnic divisions.

Pan-Africanism calls for solidarity across ethnic lines and aims to create a sense of unity among African states to overcome the legacies of colonialism. The idea that Africa's ethnic divisions are not inherent but are a consequence of colonialism's divide-and-rule policies. Nationalism should transcend ethnic identity and focus on African unity and liberation. Pan-African movements like the OAU (Organization of African Unity) and later the African Union (AU) aim to promote a shared African identity, fostering political unity and cooperation.

Ethnicity and nationalism in post-colonial Africa have been shaped by a combination of pre-colonial histories, colonial interventions, and post-independence state-building efforts. The theories discussed above reflect different ways of understanding the political, social, and cultural dynamics that have shaped African states. While some emphasize the deep-rooted nature of ethnic identities, others focus on the role of elites and colonialism in constructing these identities for political purposes. Understanding the interplay between ethnicity, nationalism, and state-building is crucial for addressing contemporary challenges in Africa, including ethnic conflicts, national identity formation, and regional integration.

In Political Parties, the republic of Kenya was described in early 1979 as "a one-party state that is not without threats to its stability". (Janda, 1980: 992) For a long time this held true, but there have been some significant changes, especially since the early 1990s. Kenya has been, since its independence from the United Kingdom, a country with a capitalist-oriented economy, a stable political system and in general been viewed as a friend of the West. Increasingly this view of Kenya has changed. Its economy is in shambles, the political system is repressive, and Kenya has been, and continues to be, criticized by its former Western friends. In general, Kenya has not performed economically nor politically as predicted when she gained her independence over 60 years ago.

Since Kenya gained its independence on December 12 1963, it has been shaped primarily by the Kenya African National Union (KANU) and the de facto one-party system in place (which became a de jure one-party state in 1982). The one-party system was a trend that could be seen all over the African continent during the 1960s, and by the early 1970s, all but a few countries in Africa were one-party states. Of course, this did not mean that the one-party states mirrored each other, rather, there were important differences between the different countries. (Tordoff, 1997: 4) Furthermore, a trend that was obvious across the continent was one of personalizing power in the hands of the party leader, who also became state president. In the case of Kenya this power landed first in the hands of Jomo Kenyatta (1964-1978), and later with Daniel arap Moi, who is still in power today. (Tordoff, 1997: 4) Furthermore, there was a general move away from federal and quasi-federal systems of government to unitary systems, as in Kenya were federal elements of the constitution were removed in 1964. (Tordoff, 1997: 10) All of these trends point to centralization of power, personalized by the president. Very often this meant that power was diverted from party organs to the bureaucratic machine instead, as evidenced in Kenya. The main argument for retaining a one-party system was always for the sake of political stability. The Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU), sought to safeguard the interests of the country's minorities against the Kikuyu dominated KANU, dissolved voluntarily in 1964. (Tordoff, 1997: 114)

Usually, in the one-party state context, elections are used to demonstrate that the ruling party has a mandate to continue ruling. In Kenya, competitive elections were held at least once within the one-party framework. Between 1969 and 1982, Kenya felt little need to adopt competitive elections within the one-party framework. As (at the time) a de facto single-party state, Kenya retained "a system of open party primaries, in which aspirant candidates were free to stand" which ensured a high level of competition within the party at the same time as KANU did not face any challenges at general elections held during this time period. (Tordoff, 1997: 122). Kenya's one-party system had a weak ideological base and a weak party machinery. (Tordoff, 1997: 4, 134) Kenyatta had made sure that KANU did not play an important role in Kenyan politics. Instead, clientelism shaped and coloured Kenyan politics, with Kenyatta himself as the patron. Political alliances became increasingly important, and politicians at the center relied on linkages and network for support. Many supposedly apolitical bodies were politicized, such as "trade unions, co-operative societies, and the army." (Tordoff, 1997: 134-5) Thus, Kenya relied on the administration rather than on the party for purposes of development, execution of policy, and control. This created a reaction from parliamentarians who publicly attacked the bureaucracy. (Tordoff, 1997: 157) The administrative state that was created during Kenyatta's reign has persisted under Moi.

In June 1982, the National Assembly of Kenya officially declared Kenya a one-party state. This was followed by general unrest and a coup attempt in August, but Kenya was able to retain its civilian government. The Kenyan coup attempt to overthrow president Daniel arap Moi was enacted by the Kenyan air force. The attempt was put down by Kenya's own general service unit. (Tordoff, 1997: 180-2)

Muti-party Democrancy in Kenya 1963-2023

The Kenya People's Union (KPU) emerged in 1966, a radical party ready to challenge the domination of KANU, until it was banned in October 1969. (Tordoff, 1997: 114) This party did not last long enough to qualify for study under the ICPP criterion of strength and stability. Apart from the KPU there were no other parties formed after 1962 that terminated before 2000. However, there has been a significant growth of parties during the 1990s, parties that are still continuing in 2000.

During the 1990s, a wave of democratization swept across the African continent. The wave took many different shapes and forms, and sometimes (as in the case of Kenya) international pressure was pivotal in bringing about change. In November 1991, Western donors acting through the World Bank halted foreign aid while demanding government reform. (Bratton and van de Walle, 1997: 182) Previous to 1991, the Moi government had since 1986 faced mounting criticism from Kenyan church groups, and there had also been a series of riots throughout the country in July 1990. (Bratton and van de Walle, 1997: 182)

Forum for the Restoration of Democracy (FORD) was formed in May 1991 by six opposition leaders, including Oginga Odinga (Vice-President 1964-66), and FORD was later officially announced in July 1991 and subsequently declared illegal by the Moi government. (Throup and Hornsby, 1998: 77-8) Several members of FORD were arrested in November 1991 prior to a pro-democracy rally, which despite having been banned by the government took place. The arrests caused the international community to react strongly with outrage and, more importantly, withdrawing of financial funds. On 26 November 1991 the West discontinued bilateral aid to Kenya.

These events later led to the legalization of opposition parties in December 1991. In a way this enabled Moi and KANU to control the legislative process by having seized the initiative for reform towards a multi-party system. (Throup and Hornsby, 1998: 86) Primarily because of international pressure, but due to domestic pressure as well, president Moi agreed to reforming the party system. A reform that would end the monopoly on political power that his party, KANU, held but also reforms that would address Kenya's record on human rights that had come under international scrutiny and increasing criticism. (Tordoff, 1997: 16) Furthermore, in December 1991, former vice-president Mwai Kibaki, then minister of health, resigned and founded the Democratic Party (DP).

Later in August 1992, FORD split into two factions, which were registered in October as two separate parties. First, the Forum for the Restoration of Democracy -Asili (FORD-Asili) led by Kenneth Matiba (today by Martin Shikuku) and also Forum for the Restoration of Democracy-Kenya (FORD-Kenya) led by Oginga Odinga. Oginga Odinga died in 1994 and was replaced by Michael Kijana Wamalwa. In 1995, Raila Odinga (son of Oginga Odinga) claimed to have ousted Wamalwa as chairman of FORD-Kenya. Strife broke out within the party and as of December 1996 Odinga was reportedly expelled from FORD-Kenya. Odinga announced that he instead had joined the National Development Party and that he had voluntarily resigned from FORD-Kenya. In October 1997 Matiba's faction of FORD-Asili registered as an independent party, Forum for the Restoration of Democracy for the people (FORD-People). Only FORD-Kenya gained enough votes in the two consecutive elections of 1992 and 1997 to qualify for study.

During the first half of 1992, around 2000 people were killed in tribal clashes in Western Kenya. Consequently, the government put a ban on political rallies, a ban that was later lifted after protests organized by FORD. In December 1992 both presidential and parliamentary elections were held, but because of the oppositions' lack of cohesiveness and inability to form an alliance against KANU, Moi and KANU were able to remain in control. (Tordoff, 1997: 16) However, it is contested how free and fair these elections really were, and to what extent Moi and his political machine used their incumbent status to control the results. (KHRC, 1998) Moi was elected to a fourth term as president with 36.3% of the vote ahead of Kenneth Matiba (26.0%), Mwai Kibaki (19.5%)

and Oginga Odinga (17.5%). Of the 188 seats in the National Assembly, KANU won 100, FORD- Asili and FORD-Kenya gained 31 seats each and DP got 23 seats. (Europa Publications Limited, 1999: 2037)

After the 1992 elections tribal clashes continued. In May 1995 a new political party, SAFINA, was formed by opposition activists who claimed that the party intended to fight for human rights and against corruption. The chairman at the time was Mutari Kigano, a prominent human rights lawyer, and as secretary general SAFINA appointed Dr Richard Leakey, a prominent white Kenyan. Today SAFINA is led by Farah Maalim (chairman) and Mghanga Mwandawiro (secretary general). Again, even though SAFINA represents an important element in Kenyan politics, it did not meet the requirements to qualify for study.

The Kenya of today is marked by increased tension between ethnic groups. Tension that goes back to the days when Jomo Kenyatta was president (1964-1978) and the Kikuyu dominated Kenyan politics. The extent of Kikuyu domination came to alienate the Luo and other ethnic groups within the country. (Tordoff, 1997: 86-7) The Kikuyu is the largest ethnic group in Kenya, followed in size by Luhya, Luo, Kamba, Kalenjin and a host of other smaller ethnic groups. (KHRC, 1998: 11) Daniel arap Moi belongs to the Kalenjin group. (Tordoff, 1997: 166) In Kenya, "Democratization has resulted in reaffirmation of ethnic identities, with political parties emerging along ethno-regional criteria rather than ideological ones." (Bratton and van de Walle, 1997: 239)

The 1992 multi-party election did not change who was in power, and neither the level of corruption within the government. As before, the international community used its weight to put pressure on Kenya to take action against official corruption. However, this time pressure came from the IMF who suspended payments in August 1997 pending action on Kenya's part. Kenya promptly inaugurated an anti-corruption body. However, in late August serious strife erupted in and around Mombasa, essentially along ethnic lines.

Factionalism among the opposition prevented them from presenting a unified front against Moi and KANU in the 1997 elections as was the case in the 1992 elections. Furthermore, again there were widespread allegations of fraud surrounding the election. The December 29 1997 election re-elected Daniel arap Moi as President. In the 1997 presidential election Moi gained 40.64% of the popular vote, Mwai Kibaki 31.49%, Raila Odinga 11.06%, Michael Wamalwa 8.40%, and Charity Kaluki Ngilu 7.81%. In the election to the National Assembly, KANU won 107 out of the now 210 available seats. Out of the opposition, DP gained 39 seats, NDP 21 seats, FORD-Kenya 17 seats, and SDP won 15 seats. (Europa Publications Limited, 1999: 2046) After the election in 1997, ethnic groups clashed again, this time primarily in the Rift Valley. With the 1997 election Moi was elected to his fifth and final term as president. Whether Moi will step down or not as the time for the next election (early 2003) comes is a question that depends upon what the international community will do, if the Kenyan opposition will be able to form a cohesive alliance, and above all, what Moi and KANU themselves decide to do. The Kenya African National Union (KANU) became the single party in the de facto one-party state that emerged in Kenya after 1969, only to legally become the only party in 1982. (Tordoff, 1997: 114) KANU still remains in power, with president Daniel arap Moi as president and the head of state.

Democratic Party of Kenya (DP) was founded by Mwai Kibaki in December 1991. Kibaki being Kikuyu appealed greatly to this part of Kenyan society. DP is in general associated with big business and the Kikuyu power elite from the Kenyatta years. The formation of DP clearly undermined KANU's power among the Kikuyu group when many of them defected to DP from KANU. In many ways therefore, the DP leaders represented the interests of Kenya's indigenous bourgeoisie. DP favoured economic liberalization and privatization of state-owned enterprises. Even though the DP claimed democracy as part of its party's name, it did not pay much attention to democracy, but concentrated on the old Kikuyu oligarchy.

Forum for the Restoration of Democracy - Kenya (FORD-Kenya) originally was formed in May 1991 as FORD, but later became FORD-Kenya when FORD split up in two factions in August 1992, FORD-Asili and FORD-Kenya. However, only FORD-Kenya has been able to sustain somewhat of a political presence in the two elections 1992 and 1997. It is seen as a radical party, in clear opposition to KANU. Oginga Odinga had been the former KPU leader and one of the most prominent left-wingers in Kenya's first government after independence. FORD-Kenya was by far the most nationally oriented and intellectual of the opposition parties in Kenya. However, this caused FORD-Kenya to concentrate on national issues and to conduct a Western style election campaign, in a country where grass roots mobilization and local issues are the key to success. National

Development Party (NDP) is led by Raila Odinga (President) and Dr. Charles Maranga (secretary general). The NDP was founded in 1994. Social Democratic Party (SDP) was founded in 1992. The chairman is Mrs. Charity Kuluki Ngilu and the secretary general is Maurice Kamau Rubia.

On 25 October 2002, President Daniel arap Moi officially announced the end of his 24-year rule of the country, dissolving Parliament and launching the electoral campaign for the presidential and legislative elections scheduled for 27 December 2002.

President Moi was constitutionally barred from running for a new term. The nomination of his successor, Mr. Uhuru Kenyatta, son of Kenya's founding president Jomo Kenyatta, split the ruling party, the Kenyan African National Union (KANU), leading key party and government officials to resign and defect to the main broad-based opposition alliance, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC).

The elections marked the first time since the establishment of a multiparty system in 1991 that the opposition was able to offer a coherent challenge to the KANU party. Unlike in the two previous elections, when the opposition was fragmented, in 2002 the NARC was a strong alliance of opposition parties that had promised sweeping constitutional reforms and an end to corruption. Two weeks before the polls, ten political parties signed an electoral code of conduct amid rising incidents of violence, foul language and claims of vote-buying.

Among the five candidates vying for the Presidency, the two main contenders were Mr. Kenyatta and Mr. Mwai Kibaki, the leader of the NARC. Mr Kibaki, a former Vice-President, ran a campaign based on corruption-related issues and Mr. Kenyatta's lack of political experience, as well as direct attacks on KANU and the country's rulers for the last 39 years characterised by corruption and mismanagement. He further stressed the fact that the country's economy was in the doldrums and that the IMF had suspended aid because of concerns about corruption.

Mr Uhuru Kenyatta had to campaign hard to distance himself from his mentor, outgoing President Moi. Mr. Uhuru Kenyatta had only entered Parliament in October 2001 as a member nominated by the President, after a failed electoral bid in 1997. During the campaign, he promised to clean up KANU and presented himself as a "fresh face" untainted by power, pointing out that the NARC was full of recent defectors from KANU and led by the "old generation".

A total of 40,000 local and foreign observers were accredited by the Electoral Commission, making these the most closely scrutinised polls in the country's history. Both the European Union and the Commonwealth election monitoring groups congratulated Kenyans on conducting free, fair and peaceful elections.

The opposition won an overwhelming majority in both the presidential and parliamentary elections. In Parliament, the NARC took 126 seats out of the 210 at stake, as against 64 for KANU. On 29 December 2002, opposition leader, Mr. Kibaki was declared Kenya's third President. He was sworn in on the following day.

Kenya was at a point of consolidating its democratic gains when a government with a reform agenda, the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC), came to power after winning the December 2002 general election. NARC had campaigned on a reform platform, promising to promote economic recovery and good governance reforms. The new government did then implement some good governance reforms, such as initiating the fight against corruption and setting up a semi-autonomous human rights agency. But the government abandoned the reform path halfway after the coalition collapsed due to internal disagreements over power and the distribution of spoils in particular. After the collapse, NARC, like the previous governments, began to secure power for those in leadership positions. A small group of ethnic elites close to President Mwai Kibaki pulled the government out of the reform agenda. They started to consolidate political power by manipulating the political environment and reneging on some of the promises made before coming to power. They manipulated the constitutional review process to come up with a draft that reflected their political interests. They preferred a constitution that favoured their desire to secure a hold on power. This contradiction, in which gains are made through struggles for democracy, but are then reversed through state actions and the practice of politics, has considerably undermined the concrete realisation of participatory democracy. The dispute over the presidential election resulted in unprecedented violence, which divided the country into two major ethno-regional blocs that were fiercely

opposed to each other. The post-2007 election violence reversed many of the democratic and economic gains made since the return of multi-party democracy in 1991. The space for the enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms contracted. Society became more polarised. Ironically, the post-2007 election crisis paved the way for a greater gain: the promulgation of a new constitution. The crisis revealed a number of fundamental weaknesses in Kenya's political system that required addressing to prevent future conflicts over contestation for political power. The international mediation resolved that constitutional and institutional reforms were a requisite in this respect. The parties signed a National Accord that outlined the steps towards a new constitution and institutional reforms. A new constitution was promulgated in August 2010.

Multi-party Democracy in Tanzania 1963-2023

Little is known of the history of Tanganyika's interior during the early centuries of the Christian era. The area is believed to have been inhabited originally by ethnic groups using a click-tongue language similar to that of Southern Africa's Bushmen and Hottentots. Although remnants of these early tribes still exist, most were gradually displaced by Bantu farmers migrating from the west and south and by Nilotes and related northern peoples. Some of these groups had well-organized societies and controlled extensive areas by the time the Arab slavers, European explorers, and missionaries penetrated the interior in the first half of the 19th century.

The coastal area first felt the impact of foreign influence as early as the 8th century, when Arab traders arrived. By the 12th century, traders and immigrants came from as far away as Persia (now Iran) and India. They built a series of highly developed city and trading states along the coast, the principal one being Kibaha, a settlement of Persian origin that held ascendancy until the Portuguese destroyed it in the early 1500s.

The Portuguese navigator Vasco da Gama explored the East African coast in 1498 on his voyage to India. By 1506, the Portuguese claimed control over the entire coast. This control was nominal, however, because the Portuguese did not colonize the area or explore the interior. Assisted by Omani Arabs, the indigenous coastal dwellers succeeded in driving the Portuguese from the area north of the Ruvuma River by the early 18th century. Claiming the coastal strip, Omani Sultan Seyyid Said (1804-56) moved his capital to Zanzibar in 1841.

European exploration of the interior began in the mid-19th century. Two German missionaries reached Mt. Kilimanjaro in the 1840s. British explorers Richard Burton and John Speke crossed the interior to Lake Tanganyika in 1857. David Livingstone, the Scottish missionary-explorer who crusaded against the slave trade, established his last mission at Ujiji, where he was "found" by Henry Morton Stanley, an American journalist-explorer, who had been commissioned by the New York Herald to locate him.

German colonial interests were first advanced in 1884. Karl Peters, who formed the Society for German Colonization, concluded a series of treaties by which tribal chiefs in the interior accepted German "protection." Prince Otto von Bismarck's government backed Peters in the subsequent establishment of the German East Africa Company.

In 1886 and 1890, Anglo-German agreements were negotiated that delineated the British and German spheres of influence in the interior of East Africa and along the coastal strip previously claimed by the Omani sultan of Zanzibar. In 1891, the German Government took over direct administration of the territory from the German East Africa Company and appointed a governor with headquarters at Dar es Salaam.

Although the German colonial administration brought cash crops, railroads, and roads to Tanganyika, European rule provoked African's resistance, culminating in the Maji Maji rebellion of 1905-07. The rebellion, which temporarily united a number of southern tribes and ended only after an estimated 120,000 Africans had died from fighting or starvation, is considered by most Tanzanians to have been one of the first stirrings of nationalism.

German colonial domination of Tanganyika ended after World War I when control of most of the territory passed to the United Kingdom under a League of Nations mandate. After World War II, Tanganyika became a UN trust territory under British control. Subsequent years witnessed Tanganyika moving gradually toward self-government and independence.

In 1954, Julius K. Nyerere, a school teacher who was then one of only two Tanganyikans educated abroad at the university level, organized a political party--the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU). TANU-supported candidates were victorious in the Legislative Council elections of September 1958 and February 1959. In December 1959, the United Kingdom agreed to the establishment of internal self-government following general elections to be held in August 1960. Nyerere was named chief minister of the subsequent government. In May 1961, Tanganyika became autonomous, and Nyerere became Prime Minister under a new constitution. Full independence was achieved on December 9, 1961. Mr. Nyerere was elected President when Tanganyika became a republic within the Commonwealth a year after independence.

An early Arab/Persian trading center, Zanzibar fell under Portuguese domination in the 16th and early 17th centuries but was retaken by Omani Arabs in the early 18th century. The height of Arab rule came during the reign of Sultan Seyyid Said, who encouraged the development of clove plantations, using the island's slave labor.

The Arabs established their own garrisons at Zanzibar, Pemba, and Kilwa and carried on a lucrative trade in slaves and ivory. By 1840, Said had transferred his capital from Muscat to Zanzibar and established a ruling Arab elite. The island's commerce fell increasingly into the hands of traders from the Indian subcontinent, whom Said encouraged to settle on the island.

Zanzibar's spices attracted ships from as far away as the United States. A U.S. consulate was established on the island in 1837. The United Kingdom's early interest in Zanzibar was motivated by both commerce and the determination to end the slave trade. In 1822, the British signed the first of a series of treaties with Sultan Said to curb this trade, but not until 1876 was the sale of slaves finally prohibited.

The Anglo-German agreement of 1890 made Zanzibar and Pemba a British protectorate. British rule through a Sultan remained largely unchanged from the late 19th century until after World War II. Zanzibar's political development began in earnest after 1956, when provision was first made for the election of six nongovernment members to the Legislative Council. Two parties were formed: the Zanzibar Nationalist Party (ZNP), presenting the dominant Arab and "Arabized" minority and the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP), led by Abaid Karume and representing the Shirazis and the African majority.

The first elections were held in July 1957. The ASP won three of the six elected seats, with the remainder going to independents. Following the election, the ASP split; some of its Shirazi supporters left to form the Zanzibar and Pemba People's Party (ZPPP). The January 1961 election resulted in a deadlock between the ASP and a ZNP-ZPPP coalition. On April 26, 1964, Tanganyika union with Zanzibar to form the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, renamed the United Republic of Tanzania on October 29. TANU and the Afro-Shirazi Party of Zanzibar were merged into a single party (Chama cha Mapinduzi-CCM Revolutionary Party) on February 5, 1977. On April 26, 1977, the union of the two parties was ratified in a new constitution. The merger was reinforced by principles enunciated in the 1982 union constitution and reaffirmed in the constitution of 1984.

The elections that followed the granting of self-government in June 1963 produced similar results. Zanzibar received its independence from the United Kingdom on December 19, 1963, as a constitutional monarchy under the sultan. On January 12, 1964, the African majority revolted against the sultan and a new government was formed with the ASP leader, Abeid Karume, as President of Zanzibar and Chairman of the Revolutionary Council. Under the terms of its political union with Tanganyika in April 1964, the Zanzibar Government retained considerable local autonomy.

In 1977, Nyerere merged TANU with the Zanzibar ruling party, the ASP, to form the CCM as the sole ruling party in both parts of the union. The CCM was to be the sole instrument for mobilizing and controlling the population in all significant political or economic activities. He envisioned the party as a "two-way street" for the flow of ideas and policy directives between the village level and the government.

President Nyerere stepped down from office and was succeeded as President by Ali Hassan Mwinyi in 1985. Nyerere retained his position as Chairman of the ruling party for 5 more years and was influential in Tanzanian politics until his death in October 1999. The current President, Benjamin Mkapa, was elected in 1995 and will stand for re-election in nationwide balloting scheduled for October 2000. Zanzibar President Salmin Amour was

elected in single-party elections in 1990. In 1995, he was named the winner of Zanzibar's first multi-party elections, a victory widely deemed to have been tainted by fraud. He is not eligible to run for a third term. Tanzania's president and National Assembly members are elected concurrently by direct popular vote for 5-year terms. The president appoints a prime minister who serves as the government's leader in the National Assembly. The president also selects his cabinet from among National Assembly members. Elections for president and all National Assembly seats will be held in October 2000.

The unicameral National Assembly elected in 1995 has 275 members, 232 of whom are from the mainland and Zanzibar. There are 37 appointed seats for women, and each political party receives a proportion of appointed seats commensurate with the number of constituency seats won. Also, five members are elected by the Zanzibar House of Representatives to participate in the National Assembly. At present, the ruling CCM holds about 80% of the seats in the Assembly. Laws passed by the National Assembly are valid for Zanzibar only in specifically designated union matters.

Zanzibar's House of Representatives has jurisdiction over all nonunion matters. There are currently 76 members in the House of Representatives in Zanzibar, including 50 elected by the people, 10 appointed by the president of Zanzibar, 5 exofficio members, 10 women appointed by political parties commensurate with constituency seats won, and an attorney general appointed by the president. Zanzibar's House of Representatives can make laws for Zanzibar without the approval of the union government. The terms of office for Zanzibar's president and House of Representatives also are 5 years. The semiautonomous relationship between Zanzibar and the union is a relatively unique system of government.

Tanzania has a five-level judiciary combining the jurisdictions of tribal, Islamic, and British common law. Appeal is from the primary courts through the district courts, resident magistrate courts, to the high courts, and Court of Appeals. Judges are appointed by the Chief Justice, except those for the Court of Appeals and the High Court who are appointed by the president. The Zanzibari court system parallels the legal system of the union, and all cases tried in Zanzibari courts, except for those involving constitutional issues and Islamic law, can be appealed to the Court of Appeals of the union. A commercial court was established in September 1999 as a division of the High Court.

For administrative purposes, Tanzania is divided into 25 regions--20 on the mainland, 3 on Zanzibar, and 2 on Pemba. Ninety-nine district councils have been to further increase local authority. Of the 99 councils operating in 86 districts, 19 are urban and 80 are rural. The 19 urban units are classified further as city (Dar es Salaam), municipal (Arusha, Dodoma, Tanga), and town councils (the remaining 15 communities).

From independence in 1961 until the mid-1980s, Tanzania was a one-party state, with a socialist model of economic development. Beginning in the mid-1980s, under the administration of President Ali Hassan Mwinyi, Tanzania undertook a number of political and economic reforms. In January and February 1992, the government decided to adopt multiparty democracy. Legal and constitutional changes led to the registration of 11 political parties. Two parliamentary by-elections (won by CCM) in early 1994 were the first-ever multiparty elections in Tanzanian history. In October and November 1995, Tanzania held its first multi-party general elections. The ruling CCM party's candidate, Benjamin W. Mkapa, defeated his three main rivals, winning the presidential election with 62% of the vote. In the parliamentary elections, CCM won 186 of the elected seats, while the two main opposition parties--CUF and NCCR--won 24 seats and 16 seats, respectively. In the Zanzibar presidential election, incumbent CCM candidate Salmin Amour was declared the winner over rival CUF contender, Seif Sharif Hamad, in a controversial decision by the Zanzibar Electoral Commission that underpins current tensions on the island.

President Mkapa, Vice President Omar Ali Juma, Prime Minister Fredrick Sumaye, and National Assembly members will serve until the next general elections in 2000. Similarly, Zanzibar President Salmin Amour and members of the Zanzibar House of Representatives also will complete their terms of office in 2000. In October 2001, the CCM and the CUF parties signed a reconciliation agreement that called for electoral reforms and set up a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the deaths that occurred in January 2001 on Pemba. The agreement also led to the President appointment of an additional CUF official to become a member of the Union Parliament. Changes to the Zanzibar Constitution in April 2002 allowed both the CCM and CUF parties to nominate

members to the Zanzibar Electoral Commission. In May 2003, the Zanzibar Electoral Commission conducted by-elections to fill vacant seats in the parliament, including those seats vacated by the CUF boycott. Observers considered these by-elections, the first major test of the reconciliation agreement, to be free, fair, and peaceful. President Mkapa, Vice President Ali Mohamed Shein, Prime Minister Frederick Sumaye, and National Assembly members will serve until the next general elections in 2005. Similarly, Zanzibar President Karume and members of the Zanzibar House of Representatives also will complete their terms of office in 2005.

As of 2010, Tanzania was ranked Partly Free by Freedom House. The 2011 Democracy Index marked Tanzania as a "hybrid regime", ranking it 90th out of 167, an improvement from 92nd the year before, but preceding a decline on a number of metrics as shown in subsequent Freedom House studies. By 2018, many of the factors taken into account by Freedom House had undergone a small but significant decline, with the most recent reports citing a marked deterioration in the rights of civil society and reduced the abilities of political opposition to criticize the Magufuli regime. Tanzania remains in the "Partly free" category as of 2018.

According to Human Rights Watch since the election of President John Magufuli in December 2015, Tanzania has witnessed a marked decline in respect for free expression, association and assembly.

On 19 March 2021, Vice President Samia Suluhu Hassan became the new president after the sudden death of President John Magufuli. She is the first female President of Tanzania. The executive branch of the Tanzanian government is responsible for implementing and enforcing the laws and policies of the country. It is headed by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania, who serves as both the head of state and the head of government. The President is elected for a term of five years, and can be re-elected for a maximum of two terms.

The president appoints a prime minister who serves as the government's leader in the National Assembly. The president selects his cabinet from among National Assembly members. The Constitution also empowers him to nominate 10 non-elected members of Parliament, who also are eligible to become cabinet members.

The President is assisted in his duties by the Vice President, who is also elected by the people (popular vote). The Vice President is responsible for supporting the President in his duties, and may be assigned specific responsibilities by the President.

The executive branch is further divided into ministries, each of which is responsible for a specific area of government policy. The ministers are appointed by the President and are responsible for the day-to-day operations of their respective ministries. Each ministry is headed by a Permanent Secretary, who is the chief administrative officer of the ministry.

Other important officials in the executive branch include the Attorney General, who is the principal legal adviser to the government, and the Chief Secretary, who is the head of the civil service and is responsible for ensuring the smooth functioning of the government.

The executive branch in Tanzania is responsible for overseeing the country's economic development, foreign affairs, defense, and internal security. It plays a key role in implementing policies aimed at promoting economic growth, improving living standards, and reducing poverty. It also works to maintain peace and stability within the country, and to build strong partnerships with other countries in the region and beyond.

The unicameral National Assembly of Tanzania or Bunge has 393 seats — 264 elected by popular vote, 113 allocated to women chosen by their parties in proportion to their share of the electoral vote, 10 nominated by the president, five members chosen by the Zanzibar House of Representatives, and the Attorney General as an ex officio member — all members serving five-year terms. In addition to enacting laws that apply to the entire United Republic of Tanzania, the Assembly enacts laws that apply only to the mainland. Zanzibar has its own House of Representatives to make laws especially for Zanzibar (the Zanzibar House of Representatives has 70 seats, directly elected by universal suffrage to serve five-year terms).

Wikipedia has a list of current members of the Bunge arranged in two ways, alphabetically by member and alphabetically by constituency.

Tanzania's National Assembly members are elected concurrently by direct popular vote for 5-year terms. The unicameral National Assembly elected in 2000 had 295 members. These 295 members included the Attorney General, five members elected from the Zanzibar House of Representatives to participate in the Parliament, the 48 special women's seats which were made up of 20% of the seats a particular party had in the House, 181 constituents' seats of members of Parliament from the mainland, and 50 seats from Zanzibar, as well as seats for the 10 members of Parliament nominated by the President. The ruling CCM holds about 86% of the seats in the Assembly elected in 2005, and held 93% of seats in the previous Assembly elected in 2000.

Laws passed by the National Assembly are valid for Zanzibar only in specifically designated union matters. Zanzibar's House of Representatives has jurisdiction over all non-union matters. There are currently 76 members in the House of Representatives in Zanzibar, including 50 elected by the people, 10 appointed by the president of Zanzibar, 5 exofficio members, and an attorney general appointed by the president. In May 2002, the government increased the number of special seats allocated to women from 10 to 15, which will increase the number of House of Representatives members to 81. Ostensibly, Zanzibar's House of Representatives can make laws for Zanzibar without the approval of the union government as long as it does not involve union-designated matters. The terms of office for Zanzibar's president and House of Representatives also are 5 years. The semiautonomous relationship between Zanzibar and the union is a relatively unique system of government.

Conceptualizing Tribalism in the Context of Multiparty Democracy

In a multiparty democratic system, tribalism can play a complex and sometimes disruptive role. Tribalism, in this context, refers to strong group loyalties, often rooted in ethnicity, culture, or historical community ties, that influence political behaviour and decision-making. While multiparty democracies are based on the principles of political competition, pluralism, and representation of diverse interests, tribalism can both enhance and hinder democratic processes depending on how it is channelled and managed. Below are several dimensions to consider when conceptualizing tribalism in such systems:

In many societies, tribal or ethnic groups represent key sources of identity. Political parties in a multiparty system may emerge as representatives of these groups, providing them with a voice and platform. For voters, tribal or ethnic affiliation may help define their political preferences. In some cases, tribal leaders or ethnic groups may use political parties as instruments to assert their identity, protect their cultural values, or demand greater political or economic rights. Multiparty democracy may lead to political parties that primarily represent ethnic or tribal groups. This can result in the fragmentation of the political landscape, where parties are seen less as ideological entities and more as vehicles for ethnic or tribal interests.

In situations where political competition is organized along tribal lines, tribalism can become an obstacle to national unity. It may lead to the "us vs. them" mentality, where political allegiance becomes defined by ethnic or tribal identity rather than policy preferences or broader national interests. The politicization of ethnic identity can exacerbate societal divisions, leading to political polarization, violence, or even civil conflict. This can undermine the stability and functioning of a multiparty democracy, particularly in societies where ethnic groups have a history of tension or marginalization. In some cases, political parties aligned with powerful ethnic groups may disproportionately control resources, such as state funding, employment, and development projects, leaving smaller or marginalized groups disenfranchised. The electoral system can affect how tribalism operates in multiparty democracy. In a "first-past-the-post" (FPTP) system, political competition may become highly concentrated around the largest ethnic groups, leading to winner-takes-all politics. This can marginalize smaller or less powerful ethnic groups. Conversely, a proportional representation (PR) system may allow for greater representation of diverse ethnic groups, though this can also amplify tribalism if party formation and voting patterns are strongly ethnic.

Voters in a multiparty system may base their choices on tribal affiliations, resulting in bloc voting where members of a particular ethnic group vote in solidarity for candidates from their own group. This can distort the principle of vote aggregation based on ideology or policy preference. Politicians in multiparty democracies may appeal to tribalism to mobilize voters, often using ethnic identity as a tool to secure votes. They may also distribute patronage or resources along ethnic lines to ensure loyalty and political support. This can deepen divisions but also serve as a means of political access for marginalized or excluded groups. In contexts where

tribalism is deeply entrenched, party leaders may adopt clientelist strategies, offering favors, resources, or services in exchange for votes from their ethnic base. This can exacerbate dependency on ethnic loyalty rather than policy-based support.

On the positive side, in some cases, tribalism can stimulate greater inclusion and representation in the political process. A multiparty democracy can give voice to ethnic minorities and allow for political dialogue that transcends old divisions. Political elites may be forced to form coalitions with other ethnic or tribal groups, fostering negotiation and compromise. To address the challenges posed by tribalism, some countries have adopted power-sharing mechanisms, such as consociationalism democracy, which ensures that ethnic or tribal groups are equally represented in key political institutions. This can be a way to institutionalize inclusivity while maintaining the core tenets of democracy.

In a multiparty democracy, the media can play a key role in shaping political discourse. If media outlets align themselves with particular ethnic or tribal groups, they can exacerbate divisions by framing political events in tribal terms, focusing on ethnic conflict rather than policy debates. This can further entrench tribal loyalties and reduce opportunities for broader political engagement. With the rise of social media, tribalism can be amplified even further, as online platforms often facilitate the rapid spread of polarizing content. Political actors may use social media to mobilize their ethnic base, spreading narratives of victimization, historical grievances, or tribal superiority, deepening the emotional and ideological divides between groups. Tribalism in multiparty democracies can also influence how state resources are distributed. Political leaders may prioritize their ethnic group's interests in the allocation of resources, leading to accusations of corruption, nepotism, or inequality. The challenge for democratic governance is to ensure that resources and opportunities are distributed equitably across ethnic lines, without favouring one group over another.

The strength and fairness of democratic institutions are tested when tribalism influences governance. The rule of law, justice, and fair representation require that leaders not prioritize their ethnic group's interests over the common good. The success of multiparty democracy may depend on institutional reforms that reduce the role of ethnicity in political life, encouraging policies of inclusion rather than exclusion. Tribalism in the context of a multiparty democracy presents both challenges and opportunities. While tribalism can provide a powerful source of political identity and mobilization, it can also undermine the cohesion and stability of democratic systems. Political leaders and institutions need to strike a delicate balance between accommodating diverse ethnic and tribal interests while fostering a broader sense of national unity. Effective electoral systems, inclusive policies, power-sharing arrangements, and responsible media can all play important roles in managing tribalism in multiparty democracies, ensuring that it does not overshadow the ideals of representative democracy and equality.

The Impact of British Colonial Policies on Ethnic Divisions in Kenya and Tanzania.

The British colonial policies had a profound impact on the ethnic divisions and social fabric of both Kenya and Tanzania (then Tanganyika). Although the two countries share some similarities in terms of colonial experiences, the consequences of British rule on ethnic divisions were shaped by different political and social contexts. British colonial policies in Kenya significantly contributed to ethnic divisions by favouring certain groups over others and implementing systems that deepened pre-existing social cleavages. The British introduced the policy of land appropriation, particularly in the fertile highlands, which were designated as European settler areas. This land was taken from indigenous groups like the Kikuyu, Maasai, and Kamba. As a result, many ethnic groups were displaced and forced into less productive areas, which created economic disparities. The Kikuyu were the largest group in the highlands, and their displacement and discontent with land policies led to growing tensions. These tensions ultimately fuelled the Mau Mau Uprising (1952–1960), a violent revolt against British rule, largely driven by Kikuyu grievances but also involving other ethnic groups.

The British employed a divide-and-rule strategy by fostering divisions among the different ethnic communities. They favoured certain ethnic groups, like the Luo and Kikuyu, for administrative roles, while systematically marginalizing others, such as the Maasai, who were seen as less useful in the colonial system. This practice exacerbated ethnic rivalries and inequalities that would persist into post-independence Kenya. The British created a class of educated elites from groups that were seen as more cooperative or assimilable, such as the

Kikuyu. These elites were given access to education, employment, and economic resources. In contrast, groups considered "less developed," like the Maasai and others from the Northern Frontier, were denied these privileges. This created political and economic divides that contributed to a highly stratified society. As the struggle for independence gained momentum, various ethnic groups vied for power, leading to competition and, in some cases, violent conflict. The post-independence political landscape was characterized by ethnic-based political parties and leaders, with the Kikuyu emerging as dominant. This contributed to tensions and conflicts in the early years after independence, notably during the violent ethnic clashes of the 1990s and early 2000s.

British policies in Tanzania (then Tanganyika) had a somewhat different impact on ethnic divisions. The colonial state was more focused on economic exploitation, with less direct ethnic manipulation than in Kenya. However, the legacy of colonial rule still contributed to the shaping of ethnic identities and divisions in significant ways. The British employed a system of indirect rule in Tanzania, working through local chiefs and traditional leaders. This reinforced existing ethnic hierarchy in some areas and sometimes created new divisions by elevating certain groups over others. In regions with strong ethnic identities, like the Chaga or Hehe, this system strengthened traditional leadership structures, which would later be sources of political power and influence after independence. Although the British did not engage in the same level of ethnic favouritism as they did in Kenya, the promotion of tribal divisions during the colonial era encouraged the crystallization of ethnic identities. This was particularly the case in areas where different groups were segregated or had competing claims over resources. The use of ethnicity for administrative convenience by the British helped to institutionalize ethnicity as a form of identity that was later manipulated by politicians.

British land policies were also significant in Tanzania, particularly in the way they structured agriculture around export crops like coffee and sisal. This created uneven economic development across different regions, and ethnic groups in resource-rich areas, such as the coastal regions or the highlands, were more integrated into the colonial economy. In contrast, ethnic groups in peripheral areas, such as the Maasai and other pastoralist communities, were often marginalized. The British focused much of their infrastructure development in the coastal areas (such as Dar es Salaam) and on export-oriented agriculture, leading to growing urban-rural divides. These economic disparities created tensions among ethnic groups, particularly between those who had access to economic opportunities and those who did not.

Unlike Kenya, where ethnicity became a major divisive factor in politics after independence, Tanzania's first president, Julius Nyerere, worked to create a strong sense of national identity that transcended ethnic lines. Nyerere promoted the idea of "Ujamaa" (African socialism) and emphasized Tanzanian unity rather than ethnic or tribal identities. The focus on social cohesion and integration in post-colonial Tanzania helped mitigate the impact of ethnic divisions that might have emerged from colonial policies.

Both Kenya and Tanzania experienced colonial policies that, in different ways, fostered ethnic divisions through land dispossession, unequal economic development, and the manipulation of local power structures. While British policies in Kenya directly exacerbated ethnic rivalries, particularly in the form of land allocation and settler interests, the impact in Tanzania was more indirect, with ethnicity being manipulated through indirect rule and the fostering of uneven economic development. In both countries, British colonial policies sowed the seeds for ethnic divisions, although the nature and extent of this impact differed. In Kenya, the policies of land alienation, economic stratification, and ethnic favouritism created deep divisions that would later fuel political conflict. In contrast, Tanzania's experience under colonial rule, though still significant, did not lead to the same level of ethnic fragmentation. Post-independence, Tanzania succeeded in fostering a sense of national unity under Nyerere, while Kenya's politics became deeply entangled with ethnic rivalries, contributing to cycles of violence and instability.

Indirect rule, a colonial administrative policy primarily used by the British Empire in Africa, played a significant role in reinforcing ethnic identities. This policy involved governing through local traditional rulers, rather than through direct European control. While the system was designed to ease colonial administration by using existing power structures, it also had profound effects on the way ethnic identities were constructed and solidified in the colonial context.

Indirect rule often relied on pre-existing local leaders (chiefs, elders, or kings) to administer justice, collect taxes, and maintain order. These leaders were often selected or empowered by colonial authorities based on their perceived ability to maintain control and their alignment with colonial interests. This reinforced the idea of a distinct ethnic identity tied to specific traditional leadership structures. In many cases, the colonial authorities encouraged or even institutionalized the divisions between different ethnic or tribal groups, creating artificial distinctions between communities that may have been fluid or less rigid before colonial intervention. The British, for instance, might have focused on unifying people from one group under a particular leader, which created or solidified ethnic boundaries that had not been as strongly emphasized before.

Indirect rule often led to the solidification of what we now call "tribal" identities. In pre-colonial Africa, groups might have had shared cultural practices, language, and kinship ties, but their social and political organization was often more fluid. Under indirect rule, the British and other colonial powers started to categorize and organize people into distinct, rigid ethnic groups (often referred to as "tribes") based on their own frameworks and misunderstandings of local traditions. The colonial government encouraged a narrow view of ethnic identity, emphasizing only certain aspects of culture (such as language or traditional customs) and ignoring other fluid or cross-group characteristics. This led to an emphasis on ethnicity as a static and essential part of individuals' identities, a legacy that has persisted in many post-colonial African societies.

By empowering local leaders and reinforcing the role of traditional governance systems, colonial powers legitimized specific ethnic or communal hierarchies. These leaders were often considered the primary authorities over their people, and their authority was reinforced by the colonial state. This not only made ethnic identity central to governance but also created a system in which political power was often defined along ethnic lines. For example, in places like Nigeria, colonial authorities worked with traditional rulers in regions like the Yoruba or Igbo areas, embedding these ethnic identities in the formal political structures. When these states gained independence, the political landscape was already shaped by colonial decisions that favoured certain ethnic groups over others.

Indirect rule was also tied to the colonial economic system, which often resulted in the stratification of ethnic groups based on their access to resources, labour, or trade. Some ethnic groups were given privileged positions in the colonial economy, while others were marginalized or exploited. This economic stratification further solidified ethnic boundaries, as some groups came to be seen as "dominant" or "privileged" while others were viewed as subordinate. This economic favouritism often created long-lasting tensions between different ethnic groups, which were exacerbated when post-colonial states struggled to balance these inequalities after gaining independence. Indirect rule had long-term effects on ethnic identity in post-colonial societies. The colonial powers' creation of rigid ethnic boundaries, combined with the preferential treatment of certain groups, left a legacy of ethnic tensions and divisions that have persisted after independence. In some cases, ethnic identity became the primary means of political organization, which has led to conflicts and competition over resources, power, and recognition in post-colonial states.

For instance, the colonial emphasis on ethnic identities contributed to the development of "ethnic politics," where political parties and movements are often organized around ethnic lines. In some African countries, this has led to civil wars, ethnic violence, and struggles over national unity, as different groups contend for dominance or recognition. Indirect rule also involved the promotion of "traditional" customs and practices as a means of controlling the local population. Colonial authorities often idealized certain aspects of indigenous culture while suppressing others. This selective reinforcement of culture created a "traditional" ethnic identity that was often not a reflection of how people identified before colonial rule but was instead shaped by colonial interests. The colonial state's emphasis on traditional authority, cultural norms, and practices can still be seen today in how some ethnic identities are constructed and perceived. The imposition of a specific cultural framework by colonial rulers often led to a narrow and sometimes inaccurate understanding of what constituted an "ethnic" group.

Indirect rule played a central role in the construction and reinforcement of ethnic identities by embedding colonial power structures within local traditions, categorizing and dividing populations, and creating a system of governance based on ethnic leadership. The legacy of this system is still evident in many post-colonial African states, where ethnic identities continue to influence politics, social dynamics, and conflicts. While indirect rule was primarily a tool of colonial control, it inadvertently shaped the way ethnic groups see themselves and relate

to one another, with long-lasting consequences for post-independence nation-building. The role of indirect rule in reinforcing ethnic identities is a multifaceted and significant phenomenon, especially in the context of British colonialism in Africa and other parts of the world. Indirect rule, as implemented by colonial powers, had profound implications on the way ethnic identities were shaped, manipulated, and solidified during the colonial period, and its effects reverberated long after the end of colonial rule.

The British, in particular, employed this system in many of their colonies, especially in Africa (e.g., Nigeria, Uganda, Kenya). Colonial administrators relied on indigenous rulers (like chiefs, kings, or elders) to govern on their behalf, often co-opting them into the colonial system by granting them authority and influence. The system allowed the colonial government to exert control over large territories with relatively fewer resources and administrative personnel.

Indirect rule reinforced ethnic identities in a number of ways, often deepening the divisions between different ethnic groups, or, conversely, inventing new identities that were more aligned with the interests of the colonial powers. Under indirect rule, colonial powers typically did not administer the entire population as a homogeneous group but instead divided societies along existing ethnic or tribal lines. They often formalized and institutionalized these divisions, creating or reinforcing distinctions between groups that may not have been as pronounced before colonialism. In many cases, these boundaries were drawn not based on indigenous political or cultural realities, but in a way that facilitated easier governance.

In Nigeria, the British classified people into three major groups: the Igbo, the Yoruba, and the Hausa-Fulani. While these groups were certainly distinct, the British often exaggerated these divisions, creating more rigid and artificial categories that did not account for the significant internal diversity within these groups. By doing so, the British both bolstered and solidified ethnic identities that were easier to control and manage. By emphasizing these ethnic distinctions, the colonial authorities not only created political structures that reflected these divisions but also promoted the idea of separate and distinct ethnic identities, often leading to competition, rivalry, and conflict between groups. This created a "divide and rule" dynamic, which ensured that no single group could easily challenge the colonial order. Indirect rule relied heavily on local elites to act as intermediaries between the colonial government and the indigenous population. These traditional leaders—whether kings, chiefs, or elders—were granted powers that were often expanded or formalized under colonial rule. These leaders were incentivized to maintain control over their ethnic communities in exchange for their cooperation with the colonial government.

In Uganda, the British worked through the Buganda Kingdom, allowing the Baganda king (Kabaka) to retain power and influence under colonial rule. This system not only reinforced the Kabaka's authority but also strengthened the identity of the Baganda people as distinct from other ethnic groups in Uganda, such as the Basoga or Banyankole. The ethnic identities of the Baganda were thus codified and reinforced through the formalization of the Kabaka's role within the colonial administrative system. This system not only solidified the role of ethnic leaders but also linked ethnic identity with political power, often creating loyalty to these leaders who were seen as the legitimate authorities. In this way, traditional ethnic hierarchies were often reinforced, and the colonial government was able to maintain control through local rulers who had the trust and recognition of their communities.

Indirect rule also had a significant impact on how ethnic categories were defined and understood. The British and other colonial powers often had limited knowledge or understanding of the complexity of local cultures and histories, and thus they imposed their own systems of classification that fit their administrative needs.

In Kenya, the British colonial government grouped people into categories such as "Africans," "Europeans," and "Asians." Within the African category, they further subdivided people based on ethnic groups, such as Kikuyu, Maasai, Luo, etc. These classifications were used to establish separate administrative regions and political boundaries, which were often at odds with pre-existing social structures. By creating and institutionalizing these categories, the colonial authorities shaped the way people thought about themselves and their neighbours. This often meant that ethnic identities were exaggerated, simplified, or even artificially created. Over time, these categories became entrenched in social, political, and economic life, further perpetuating a sense of ethnic difference and division. Indirect rule often led to ethnic tensions as colonial administrators played different ethnic

groups off one another to maintain control. By giving power to certain groups while marginalizing others, colonial rulers inadvertently—or sometimes intentionally—fomented rivalry and competition between ethnic groups. This could lead to long-lasting animosities, even after the end of colonial rule.

In Nigeria, the British reinforced the dominance of the Hausa-Fulani in the north and the Yoruba in the southwest, which led to inter-ethnic competition and conflict. After independence, these tensions manifested in events like the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970), where ethnic identities became a central feature of the political and military conflict. Colonial administrators, in attempting to govern efficiently, often made choices that left lasting legacies of ethnic conflict. These conflicts were not simply about territorial or political control but were often grounded in the very identities that colonialism had sought to manipulate and reinforce. Through the colonial education system, which was often a tool of indirect rule, the colonial authorities propagated certain cultural norms and values that reinforced ethnic identities aligned with colonial interests. Schools taught students not only the language and history of the colonizers but also emphasized the ethnic divisions that had been created or solidified by colonial rule.

In many British colonies, the education system focused on promoting the English language and British cultural norms. However, students were also taught about the history and importance of their "ethnic group" as defined by the colonial authorities. This education further entrenched the idea that ethnic identity was not just a cultural or social construct, but a formalized, politically significant category. This educational approach ensured that ethnic identities were perpetuated across generations, even after colonial rule had ended. The effects were often seen in the post-independence period, when national unity was challenged by the persistence of ethnic identities and loyalties that had been strengthened under colonialism.

In sum, indirect rule played a crucial role in reinforcing ethnic identities during the colonial period, primarily by formalizing and institutionalizing divisions between ethnic groups. Through a combination of administrative decisions, the empowerment of traditional leaders, the creation of artificial ethnic categories, and the fostering of inter-group competition, colonial authorities significantly altered the social and political landscape. These shifts in identity had lasting consequences, often contributing to ethnic conflict and political instability in post-colonial societies. Understanding the legacy of indirect rule is key to understanding the complex ethnic dynamics that continue to shape many former colonies today.

The colonial experiences of different countries shaped their post-independence politics in significant and varied ways. Although colonialism manifested in unique forms depending on the colonial power, region, and historical context, there are several common threads in the ways these experiences influenced political, social, and economic trajectories after independence. Below are comparisons of different colonial experiences and their influence on post-independence politics

Post-Independence Nation-Building in Kenya and Tanzania

After gaining independence in the early 1960s, Kenya and Tanzania pursued different approaches to nation-building, shaped by their unique social, political, and economic contexts. Both countries faced challenges of integrating diverse ethnic groups, ensuring political stability, and achieving economic development. However, the strategies they adopted reflected differing ideologies, leadership styles, and national priorities.

After independence in 1963, Kenya adopted a multi-party-political system, but the country soon evolved into a de facto one-party state under President Jomo Kenyatta's leadership. The Kenya African National Union (KANU) became the dominant political force, and in 1969, opposition parties were banned, making Kenya a one-party state for most of the post-independence period. The Kenyan political system was heavily influenced by ethnic identities, with the Kikuyu community, to which Kenyatta belonged, exerting significant power. Ethnic patronage networks played a major role in politics, leading to regional inequalities and fostering tensions between ethnic groups, especially between the Kikuyu and other ethnic communities such as the Luo, Luhya, and Maasai.

Kenyatta's government aimed to foster national unity, but ethnic loyalties remained strong, and many policies favoured the Kikuyu, which led to tensions and alienation among other groups. The government also

implemented a top-down approach to governance, with limited input from the public in policy decisions. Kenya pursued a relatively capitalist economic model. The government encouraged private sector growth and foreign investment, with the goal of modernizing the economy. The focus was on agricultural exports (tea, coffee, and horticulture), as well as industrialization and infrastructure development. Land distribution was a key issue in Kenya's post-independence economy. The land redistribution policies, which sought to address the injustices of colonial land appropriation, led to uneven outcomes. Large landholdings were concentrated in the hands of a few, particularly in areas like the Rift Valley and Central Kenya. This created tensions over land ownership, especially among ethnic minorities and marginalized communities.

Kenya invested in building infrastructure like roads, schools, and hospitals. Nairobi, the capital, was developed as a hub of commerce and politics. However, economic inequality persisted, with wealth concentrated in urban areas and among the elite. The Kenyatta government sought to foster a unified national identity through education, but the legacy of ethnic divisions continued to influence how people perceived their place in the nation. The government encouraged Swahili as a lingua franca, but ethnic languages remained important in daily life. The reliance on ethnic networks also exacerbated social inequality, and the government's emphasis on unity often masked deeper ethnic cleavages. This tension would later contribute to political instability, particularly after Kenyatta's death in 1978.

Tanzania, under President Julius Nyerere, pursued a socialist model of nation-building. Nyerere's philosophy, Ujamaa (Swahili for "familyhood"), emphasized collective agricultural and economic development, and the government sought to create a classless, egalitarian society. The Tanzanian government implemented state-led policies in areas such as education, health, and rural development. Like Kenya, Tanzania also moved toward a one-party system, with the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) as the dominant political force. The government emphasized national unity and sought to overcome ethnic divisions through the promotion of a shared Tanzanian identity. Nyerere emphasized "African socialism" and the importance of unity and national pride. Unlike Kenya, where ethnic groups had strong political influence, Tanzania's government focused on promoting the idea of "Umoja" (unity) and sought to minimize ethnic differences in favour of a unified Tanzanian identity.

Nyerere's government implemented the Ujamaa policy, which aimed to collectivize agriculture and promote self-reliance. This was based on the idea that rural development was key to national development. The government encouraged the creation of collective farms (Ujamaa villages), where people would live and work together in communes. The government nationalized industries and sought to reduce reliance on foreign investment and capital. Tanzania pursued an autarkic model, seeking to develop its own industries and reduce dependency on the West. While the Ujamaa policy was well-intentioned, it faced significant challenges. Poor implementation, lack of proper planning, and resistance from rural populations led to economic difficulties. Many Ujamaa villages failed to thrive, and the government struggled to achieve meaningful economic development outside of urban areas.

Tanzania's socialist policies and focus on self-reliance did not prevent the country from experiencing economic stagnation. As a result, Tanzania became highly dependent on foreign aid, particularly from socialist bloc countries and later, from international organizations.

Nyerere's government promoted Swahili as the national language, which helped unify the diverse ethnic groups in Tanzania. Swahili became the medium of instruction in schools and the language of government and public life, contributing to a sense of national cohesion. The government's policies were focused on social justice, and significant strides were made in improving access to education and healthcare. By the 1970s, Tanzania had one of the highest literacy rates in Africa, though its economy remained underdeveloped. The Ujamaa policy was designed to reduce urban-rural inequality by promoting rural development and encouraging self-sufficiency. Although it did not achieve the desired results, it reflected Nyerere's commitment to fostering a more egalitarian society.

Kenya adopted a capitalist economic model with a focus on private sector development and multi-party politics (later evolving into a one-party state). In contrast, Tanzania pursued a socialist agenda with a focus on state-led development and collective agriculture under the Ujamaa policy. Kenya's political landscape was shaped by

ethnic patronage networks, where the Kikuyu community had significant influence. Ethnic rivalries and competition for resources and political power were central to Kenya's post-independence politics. Tanzania, however, adopted a more centralized approach to governance, and Nyerere's emphasis on national unity helped to mitigate ethnic divisions. While both countries focused on rural development, Kenya's capitalist approach led to an agricultural export-oriented economy, and industrialization focused on urban growth. Tanzania's socialist policies led to attempts at self-reliance and rural collective farming but faced difficulties in implementation, leading to economic stagnation. Both countries promoted Swahili as a national language, helping to bridge ethnic divisions. However, Tanzania's emphasis on socialism and egalitarianism aimed to create a more equitable society, while Kenya's capitalist approach resulted in more pronounced social inequalities.

In conclusion, while both Kenya and Tanzania faced the challenge of creating a unified, post-colonial state, their strategies for nation-building reflected distinct ideologies, with Kenya favouring a capitalist, multi-party system and Tanzania embracing socialism and a more centralized, one-party approach. These differences in governance and economic strategies shaped their political and social trajectories in the decades after independence.

The Role of Political Elites in Shaping National Identity

The role of political elites in shaping national identity is a critical and multifaceted one, influencing how a nation's identity is constructed, maintained, and sometimes transformed over time. Political elites—such as politicians, government officials, intellectuals, business leaders, and other influential figures—play a significant part in defining what a nation is, who belongs to it, and what values and traditions should be upheld. Their influence can be seen in areas such as policy-making, cultural discourse, education, and media, all of which contribute to the broader national narrative.

Political elites are often at the forefront of defining what constitutes the national "self" and what it means to be a member of the nation. They craft narratives around shared history, culture, language, and values. Through speeches, policies, and public pronouncements, elites can highlight particular historical events (such as independence movements, wars, or revolutions) or symbols (like flags, anthems, or monuments) that resonate with citizens and help forge a collective sense of identity. Elites determine which historical events are emphasized and which are downplayed, shaping how the nation's past is perceived. For instance, the way political leaders frame colonial history, wars, or economic crises can affect national unity and identity. Political leaders often promote certain cultural elements (language, traditions, festivals) to strengthen national pride. They can also choose to elevate certain ethnic or religious groups as representing the nation, or conversely, attempt to integrate or marginalize others.

Political leaders use discourse as a powerful tool to mobilize public support and define collective identity. National identity is often articulated through political rhetoric, particularly in times of national crisis (e.g., during wars, economic downturns, or political upheavals). Political elites may invoke the idea of a "national community" or use rhetoric to frame the nation as unified and resilient. The rhetoric employed by political elites can either promote national unity or deepen divisions within the country. National identity can be shaped by emphasizing inclusivity (e.g., "we are all one people") or exclusivity (e.g., emphasizing certain ethnic, racial, or religious identities over others). During crises (like natural disasters or wars), elites may mobilize nationalistic rhetoric to consolidate national identity, framing the situation as a test of national unity and survival.

Political elites shape national identity through legislation and policies that reflect certain values, ideologies, and priorities. Decisions about citizenship, immigration, and national symbols often have profound implications for how the nation perceives itself. The way elites define citizenship and handle immigration issues can greatly influence who is considered part of the nation and who is not. This is especially important in multicultural societies, where political elites might promote policies of integration, assimilation, or multiculturalism. Political elites often decide on symbols of national identity, such as official languages, national holidays, or flags. In addition, they have control over the national education system, which plays a significant role in transmitting ideas about national history, values, and citizenship to younger generations. Political elites are often at the center of nationalist movements, whether these are inclusive or exclusive in nature. Nationalism, in its various forms, plays a significant role in shaping national identity, and political elites can either promote civic nationalism (which defines the nation in terms of shared citizenship and values) or ethnic/cultural nationalism (which defines

the nation in terms of shared heritage or ethnicity). In some cases, elites promote a civic nationalism that is inclusive of all citizens, regardless of their ethnic or cultural background. In other cases, they may support ethnic or cultural nationalism, which emphasizes the importance of shared ethnicity, language, and traditions in defining the nation. Elites may either champion or oppose political movements that seek to redefine national identity. This includes populist movements, independence movements, and efforts to challenge the status quo. Political elites play a central role in either embracing or resisting such efforts.

The mass media, controlled or influenced by political elites, is another key arena where national identity is shaped. Political elites can use media platforms—television, newspapers, radio, and increasingly, social media—to disseminate ideas about what it means to be a member of the nation. The portrayal of national symbols, historical figures, and national events helps to create a shared understanding of the nation. In many countries, political elites’ control or heavily influence state-run media outlets. Through these outlets, they can promote nationalistic ideas or present an idealized version of the nation, focusing on unity and strength. In the digital age, political elites also engage with citizens through social media. This has opened new ways for national identity to be shaped, both through direct communication from elites and by the ability of citizens to interact with elite discourse.

In an era of increasing globalization, political elites play a significant role in balancing national identity with global influences. National identity is increasingly affected by global trade, migration, cultural exchange, and international institutions. Political elites may position their nation within the global order, framing national identity in opposition to foreign influences or integrating global elements into the national narrative. Some elites may promote the idea that national identity is threatened by foreign influences, emphasizing a return to traditional values. Others may argue for a more cosmopolitan approach, integrating elements of global culture into the national identity to present a modern and open national image. Political elites also shape national identity through their engagement in international relations. By projecting a particular image of the nation on the world stage—whether as a global leader, a cultural powerhouse, or a defender of human rights—elites shape how citizens understand their place in the world. The role of political elites in shaping national identity is both powerful and complex. By framing historical narratives, controlling the political discourse, and implementing policies that affect citizens’ sense of belonging, political elites help construct and maintain the collective identity of a nation. At the same time, the influence of political elites is not absolute; national identity is also shaped by social movements, cultural forces, and public opinion. Nonetheless, political elites remain central actors in the ongoing process of defining who a nation is and what it stands for.

The Relative Success of Tanzania’s Ujamaa Policies versus Kenya’s Ethnic Political Alliances.

The relative success of Tanzania’s Ujamaa policies and Kenya’s ethnic political alliances can be analyzed through a variety of lenses, including social, economic, and political outcomes. Both countries, despite their shared colonial history and proximity, followed very different paths post-independence. Tanzania’s Ujamaa policies, implemented under the leadership of Julius Nyerere, focused on socialism and collective rural development, while Kenya’s political landscape has been shaped by ethnic political alliances, often influencing the distribution of power and resources. To assess their relative success, we must look at both short-term and long-term outcomes.

Ujamaa, meaning “familyhood” in Swahili, was Nyerere’s vision for a socialist, agrarian society. The central idea was to promote self-reliance and social equality by organizing rural people into collective farming villages, known as Ujamaa villages, and promoting a state-controlled economy. The main goals of Ujamaa were to reduce economic dependence on foreign aid and create a fairer distribution of resources. However, while the policies had some success in terms of reducing income inequality and fostering a sense of national unity, they were not as successful in promoting long-term economic growth.

The forced collectivization of agriculture in Ujamaa villages did not result in increased agricultural productivity. In fact, it often led to a decline in output due to poor planning, lack of incentives for farmers, and inadequate infrastructure. Tanzania’s socialist policies limited foreign investment and trade, leading to an inefficient and stagnant economy. While the country made strides in education and health under Nyerere, economic growth

remained sluggish. Despite Ujamaa's goal of self-reliance, Tanzania remained heavily reliant on foreign aid throughout much of its post-independence history.

Kenya's post-independence politics, on the other hand, were heavily shaped by the country's ethnic composition. Political leaders used ethnic alliances to build support, with the Kikuyu ethnic group, due to their economic power, playing a dominant role. Jomo Kenyatta's leadership after independence saw a shift toward a mixed economy, with state-led development in some sectors and a greater reliance on private capital and foreign investment. Kenya's political system encouraged private investment and capitalist development, which led to relatively higher rates of economic growth compared to Tanzania. However, much of this growth benefited a small elite, and economic inequality remained a significant issue. Under the influence of ethnic alliances, especially the dominance of the Kikuyu elite, Kenya saw significant infrastructural development, including roads, schools, and hospitals, though this development was often uneven and favouring certain regions over others.

Kenya's reliance on ethnic alliances created a volatile political environment. Political power was often distributed based on ethnic quotas, leading to competition for resources among different groups. This fostered ethnic tensions, and at times, violent conflicts, particularly during election cycles. Political patronage networks based on ethnic lines were linked to widespread corruption, with ethnic groups using state resources to benefit their own communities, contributing to economic inefficiency and social fragmentation.

Ujamaa placed a significant emphasis on education and healthcare. Nyerere's policies led to substantial improvements in literacy and health outcomes during the 1960s and 1970s. The country invested heavily in social services, which, though constrained by economic limitations, led to improved access to basic education and healthcare, especially in rural areas. The emphasis on national unity over ethnic identity also helped to reduce ethnic divisions and foster a sense of Tanzanian nationalism. Nyerere prioritized education, and by the early 1980s, Tanzania had achieved near-universal primary school enrolment. Health services expanded, though they were often rudimentary in rural areas. Ujamaa promoted a sense of Tanzanian nationalism, which helped maintain relative social stability in a diverse country with many ethnic groups.

Kenya's ethnic political alliances contributed to uneven social development. While Kenya experienced significant economic growth, social services were more likely to benefit areas controlled by politically powerful ethnic groups. Education and healthcare services were also heavily concentrated in the central region, where the Kikuyu elite held power. Despite the ethnic fragmentation, Kenya did make strides in education, with many universities and institutions emerging over time. Kenya's healthcare system expanded, though disparities remained between rural and urban areas. Ethnic-based politics, particularly during elections, led to social instability, including violent clashes. The 2007–2008 post-election violence, which was fueled by ethnic divisions, highlighted the volatility of Kenya's political system.

Tanzania, despite its economic struggles, enjoyed relatively high political stability under Nyerere's leadership. The country avoided the kind of ethnic violence and civil wars that plagued other African nations. This was largely due to Nyerere's emphasis on national unity and the lack of a strong ethnic basis for political power. However, by the 1980s, economic decline, compounded by the failure of Ujamaa and the rise of external debt, led to a shift toward market-oriented reforms. Tanzania's one-party system, under the leadership of the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), promoted a degree of political stability. Despite the lack of political pluralism, Tanzania avoided the ethnic violence that marred many African countries. Tanzania eventually transitioned to a multi-party system in the early 1990s, though CCM's dominance persisted.

Kenya, in contrast, has been more prone to political instability due to the dominance of ethnic alliances. The political system has been characterized by a high degree of patronage, corruption, and a focus on ethnic rather than national unity. This has led to political crises, including violent elections and contested leadership transitions. Kenya's political system, revolving around ethnic alliances, often triggered violence, especially during elections. The most notable example was the 2007–2008 post-election violence, which left over 1,000 people dead and displaced hundreds of thousands. Kenya's political culture has been marred by corruption, often related to the way ethnic groups have been co-opted into the political elite. Political patronage, and the allocation of state resources based on ethnic lines, have contributed to systemic inequality.

Tanzania's Ujamaa policies were less successful economically but yielded positive social outcomes in terms of education, healthcare, and national unity. Ujamaa's emphasis on equality and unity helped Tanzania avoid the ethnic conflicts that characterized many other post-colonial African states. However, its socialist economic model was unsustainable, and economic growth remained limited.

Kenya's ethnic political alliances were more successful in promoting economic growth and infrastructure development, thanks to a more open-market approach. However, these successes were tempered by deep ethnic divisions, political instability, and social inequality. The focus on ethnic politics fostered social fragmentation and fuelled violent conflicts, particularly around election times.

In summary, Tanzania's Ujamaa policies succeeded in creating a relatively cohesive and stable society with a focus on social equality, but they struggled to foster sustainable economic growth. Kenya's ethnic political alliances, while promoting faster economic growth, have led to persistent ethnic divisions, political instability, and social inequality. Therefore, while Tanzania may be considered more successful in terms of national unity and social development, Kenya's model has led to greater economic development at the cost of political and social cohesion.

The History of Multiparty Democracy in Kenya and Tanzania.

The history of multiparty democracy in Kenya and Tanzania is shaped by their respective political landscapes, which were heavily influenced by colonial legacies, independence struggles, and the leadership of post-independence presidents. Both countries initially operated under single-party systems but later transitioned to multiparty democracies in the late 20th century, each following distinct paths. During the British colonial era, Kenya was governed under a system that largely excluded the majority African population from political participation. A small European settler population held significant political power, while African political movements were suppressed. In the 1940s and 1950s, anti-colonial resistance movements, like the Mau Mau uprising, emerged, calling for independence and self-rule. By the 1950s, political organizations such as the Kenya African Union (KAU), led by Jomo Kenyatta, became prominent in the push for independence. The Kenya African National Union (KANU) was formed in 1960 as the leading nationalist party, which later merged with the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU) to form the government following independence.

After Kenya gained independence in 1963, Jomo Kenyatta, the leader of KANU, became the first President. The country was initially a multiparty state, but by 1969, political tensions between KANU and KADU led to the marginalization of opposition parties. In 1969, opposition parties were banned, and Kenya became a de facto one-party state. This move was solidified in 1982 when KANU became the official ruling party and a constitutional amendment made Kenya a de jure one-party state. During this period, political dissent was not tolerated, and opposition leaders were often harassed, jailed, or forced into exile. Kenya's political landscape was dominated by the presidency, and the ruling party controlled much of the economy and the media.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, growing internal and external pressure for democratic reforms began to mount. The international community, particularly Western countries and donor organizations, pushed for political liberalization, while local civil society groups, such as the Kenya Human Rights Commission, called for political freedoms and the restoration of multiparty politics. In response to these pressures, the government of President Daniel Arap Moi, who had succeeded Kenyatta in 1978, reluctantly lifted the ban on opposition parties in 1991. This paved the way for the re-emergence of multiparty democracy. Kenya held its first multiparty elections in 1992, which were marked by significant political unrest and ethnic violence. Although President Moi won the elections, the opposition's participation in the political process was a significant milestone in the history of Kenya's democracy. Kenya held several competitive elections after 1992, though these were often marred by electoral fraud, ethnic violence, and manipulation of political institutions by the ruling elite. The 2007 general election was particularly controversial, resulting in widespread violence and a contested result.

The 2010 Constitution of Kenya introduced significant reforms, including provisions for the devolution of power to local counties, a more robust system of checks and balances, and the establishment of a more inclusive and transparent electoral system. Despite significant strides, Kenya's multiparty democracy has faced challenges such as electoral violence, corruption, and issues surrounding political dynasties.

Tanzania (then Tanganyika) was under German and later British colonial rule. The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), led by Julius Nyerere, became the main political force advocating for independence. Tanzania gained independence from Britain in 1961, and Julius Nyerere, the leader of TANU, became the country's first prime minister and later its first president. After independence, Tanzania became a one-party state under the leadership of Nyerere and TANU. Nyerere introduced a form of African socialism known as Ujamaa (familyhood), which emphasized collective farming and the establishment of communal villages. This system, while aiming to promote equality, faced significant economic challenges. Nyerere's leadership was marked by political centralization. The country's political system was dominated by the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), the political party formed from the merger of TANU and the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) after the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar in 1964. The CCM was the only legal party in the country, and opposition was not tolerated.

The single-party system allowed Nyerere to maintain political stability, but it also stifled political competition and dissent. During this period, Tanzania was known for its relative political stability in East Africa, though the economy faced difficulties due to state-led development policies.

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, Tanzania, like Kenya, faced pressures from the international community and internal calls for democratic reforms. Economic challenges, coupled with changing global political dynamics (e.g., the end of the Cold War), created a context in which calls for multiparty politics gained traction. In 1992, under President Ali Hassan Mwinyi, who had succeeded Nyerere in 1985, Tanzania amended its Constitution to allow for the reintroduction of multiparty politics. This was a significant shift, as Tanzania had been one of the last countries in Africa to maintain a single-party system. Tanzania held its first multiparty elections in 1995. Although the CCM continued to dominate the political scene, the introduction of multiparty elections was an important step in the country's political evolution. Despite the reintroduction of multiparty elections, the CCM has remained the dominant political force, winning every presidential election since 1992. Opposition parties have struggled to gain significant traction, often due to legal and institutional challenges, as well as the dominance of CCM in the media and electoral process.

The period following the introduction of multiparty democracy has seen growing concerns about political repression, especially under the leadership of President John Magufuli (2015–2021). Magufuli's government was accused of stifling opposition, limiting press freedom, and suppressing civil society groups. After Magufuli's death in 2021, President Samia Suluhu Hassan, his successor, has signalled a shift toward more inclusive politics, promising greater openness, dialogue, and political tolerance.

In both Kenya and Tanzania, the transition to multiparty democracy was a gradual process influenced by internal and external pressures. While Kenya's path to multiparty democracy was marked by significant political struggles, including electoral violence and contested legitimacy, Tanzania's transition was relatively peaceful, though the CCM continued to dominate. Both countries have faced challenges in consolidating democracy, including issues of political repression, ethnic tensions, and electoral manipulation, but their transitions represent important milestones in the broader history of democratization in Africa.

The Role of Political Parties in Kenya and Tanzania: Ethnicity as a Mobilizing Tool.

Political parties in both Kenya and Tanzania have played crucial roles in shaping the political landscapes of their respective countries. One of the most significant ways these parties mobilize support is through ethnicity, leveraging ethnic identities as a tool to garner votes and build political coalitions. However, the role of ethnicity in politics differs between the two countries, primarily due to their distinct political histories and institutional frameworks. Here's a detailed analysis of how political parties in Kenya and Tanzania use ethnicity as a mobilizing tool, and the implications of such practices.

In Kenya, ethnicity has been a central feature of the political process since the country gained independence in 1963. The relationship between political parties and ethnicity is more pronounced in Kenya, where political identity is often deeply intertwined with ethnic identity. Several factors contribute to the prominence of ethnicity in Kenya's political system.

At independence, Kenya's political system was organized along ethnic lines. The major political parties—such as the Kenya African National Union (KANU), which was led by Jomo Kenyatta, and the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU), which represented smaller ethnic groups—reflected the ethnic divide in the country. The formation of political parties during this period was heavily influenced by ethnic interests, as various communities sought to protect their economic and political power. Over time, this ethnic division continued to shape political alignments and rivalries. The political leadership under Kenyatta, Daniel arap Moi, and later Mwai Kibaki, often used ethnic groupings to maintain support, but also to control access to state resources and political power.

Ethnicity remains a key factor in voter preferences, with many voters identifying with political candidates who share their ethnic background. In Kenya's general elections, ethnic voting blocs are often formed around prominent political figures who represent specific communities. Political parties, such as the Orange Democratic Movement (ODM), led by Raila Odinga (a member of the Luo community), and Jubilee Party, which was associated with the Kikuyu and other communities, have frequently used ethnicity to mobilize voters. Political parties in Kenya often use patronage systems to win votes. Ethnic loyalty is rewarded with jobs, government contracts, and other resources, creating a system where ethnic groups align with parties that promise to deliver tangible benefits to their communities. The use of state resources to build political loyalty has resulted in a "winner-takes-all" system, where those who control the government favour their ethnic groups in terms of appointments and development projects.

The mobilization of ethnic groups through political parties has also led to ethnic conflict. One of the most notable instances of ethnic violence linked to party politics occurred after the 2007 presidential elections, where allegations of election fraud triggered widespread violence, largely along ethnic lines, between supporters of the two main parties: the Party of National Unity (PNU) and ODM. This violence led to the 2008 power-sharing agreement, which included the formation of a coalition government to ease tensions and ensure political stability. The introduction of a devolved government under Kenya's 2010 constitution created new political incentives. Political parties now compete not only at the national level but also at the regional level, where ethnicity continues to be a key factor in political alliances and contestations for resources. Regional leaders often use ethnicity to consolidate local support for both national and county-level elections.

Tanzania's political landscape is distinct in that ethnicity has played a less central role in political party formation and mobilization. Unlike Kenya, Tanzania's political system has historically been more unified, with the ruling party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), actively promoting a national identity over ethnic divisions. Tanzania, under the leadership of Julius Nyerere's vision of "Ujamaa" (African socialism) sought to create a sense of national identity that transcended ethnic divisions. The CCM, which has been in power since independence, has focused on the idea of a "Tanzanian identity," promoting nationalism rather than ethnic affiliations. Unlike Kenya, where political parties emerged based on ethnic interests, Tanzania's political party system was initially built on the basis of a single-party state, where ethnicity was downplayed to avoid divisions. After Tanzania transitioned to a multi-party system in the 1990s, the role of ethnicity in politics became more pronounced, but it has remained less divisive than in Kenya. CCM has continued to dominate the political scene, often presenting itself as the champion of national unity, while the opposition parties, including Chadema and CUF (Civic United Front), occasionally appeal to specific ethnic or regional identities to mobilize support. However, ethnic differences are often not as explicit in Tanzanian politics, as the CCM has been successful in uniting the country through a strong central government that prioritizes national cohesion over ethnic loyalty. While ethnicity itself is not as deeply ingrained in Tanzanian politics as it is in Kenya, regionalism (i.e., support for political leaders from specific regions) plays a significant role. For example, political figures from the Zanzibari islands or from the southern regions of Tanzania may mobilize support based on regional identities. However, even regional political contests are often framed in terms of national unity, with leaders seeking to avoid ethnic conflict by presenting themselves as leaders of all Tanzanians, rather than representatives of specific ethnic communities.

Tanzania has largely avoided the kind of ethnic-based political violence that Kenya has experienced, largely due to the CCM's policies of integration and national unity. Tanzanian identity, rather than ethnicity, has been emphasized in education, media, and public discourse. Despite these efforts at national cohesion, there have been some signs of ethnic and regional tensions creeping into Tanzanian politics. In recent years, opposition parties

have tried to challenge CCM dominance by appealing to specific ethnic or regional constituencies. However, these appeals have not yet taken on the same intensity as in Kenya.

In Kenya, ethnicity remains a powerful tool for political mobilization, shaping party formations, voting patterns, and even national policies. Ethnic loyalty and patronage systems are deeply entrenched, with ethnicity often determining political fortunes. In contrast, Tanzania's political system has been more resilient to ethnic politics. The CCM has successfully cultivated a sense of Tanzanian national identity, although regional and local political issues do occasionally bring ethnic identities to the fore. In Kenya, the ethnicization of politics can lead to polarization, ethnic conflict, and a competitive but unstable political environment. In Tanzania, the emphasis on national unity has fostered greater political stability, although it has also created challenges for opposition parties and limited political competition. Ultimately, while both countries use ethnicity as a mobilizing tool, Kenya's political system is far more defined by ethnic divisions, while Tanzania has worked to mitigate such divisions through a stronger focus on national unity and integration. However, as political dynamics evolve in both nations, the role of ethnicity in shaping political outcomes will continue to be a significant factor.

Comparative Analysis of Election Dynamics and Ethnic Voting Patterns of Kenya and Tanzania

Kenya and Tanzania, two East African neighbours, share a history of colonialism, ethnic diversity, and post-independence state-building efforts. However, their electoral dynamics and ethnic voting patterns have evolved differently, influenced by their distinct political histories, economic structures, and social configurations. This analysis seeks to compare and contrast the election dynamics and ethnic voting patterns in these two countries, focusing on their electoral systems, party politics, ethnic groupings, and the influence of ethnicity on voting behaviour.

Kenya's political history has been shaped by the complex interplay of ethnic identities, especially following the British colonial period, which pitted various ethnic groups against each other in resource allocation and political representation. The divide-and-rule tactics of the British heightened ethnic rivalries that have persisted into post-independence politics. After gaining independence in 1963, the Kenyan state adopted a unitary system with a highly centralized government under Jomo Kenyatta. Ethnic groups, particularly the Kikuyu, dominated the political landscape during the early years of independence, leading to grievances from other ethnic communities. The formation of political parties along ethnic lines has continued to influence elections, leading to a competitive and often divisive electoral environment.

Tanzania (then Tanganyika) was also under British colonial rule, but unlike Kenya, it benefited from a relatively more unified political framework. Under Julius Nyerere, Tanzania pursued a policy of socialist-oriented development and the creation of a single-party state until the 1990s. This reduced ethnic polarization in the political process as there was little room for ethnic-based political competition. After Nyerere's retirement in 1985, Tanzania shifted to a multi-party system. However, ethnic identity has remained less influential in Tanzanian politics compared to Kenya. This is due to Nyerere's promotion of the "Ujamaa" socialist policies and the relatively weak ethnic-based political mobilization.

Kenya operates a presidential system where the President is both the head of state and government. The system allows for multi-party competition, and Kenya's elections are often highly contested. The requirement for a candidate to win more than 50% of the vote in the first round has led to run-off elections, typically when no candidate wins outright. Due to Kenya's ethnic diversity, elections are often characterized by the mobilization of ethnic groups around key political figures. The main political parties have historically aligned with certain ethnic groups, leading to an "ethnic coalition politics" model. This ethnicization of politics often results in high-stakes competition, with the winner-takes-all outcome increasing the stakes for ethnic groups. Tanzania initially had a single-party system, and even after multi-party politics was reintroduced in 1992, the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) party has maintained dominance in the political landscape. The presidency is elected through a majority vote, but there is a relatively more stable political environment than in Kenya. While Tanzania is home to numerous ethnic groups, the political system under the CCM has generally downplayed ethnic divisions. The ruling party has been successful in creating a national identity that transcends ethnic divisions, although regionalism and local politics still play a role.

Ethnic voting is a prominent feature of Kenyan elections. Political loyalty is often linked to the candidate's ethnic background, leading to tribal-based alliances during election campaigns. Presidential elections, in particular, are seen as a contest between the country's major ethnic communities. Kenya has several major ethnic communities, with the Kikuyu, Luhya, Luo, Kalenjin, and Maasai among the most prominent. These groups tend to dominate the political landscape, with political leaders from these ethnicities often seeking to form coalitions with other ethnic groups to build electoral support. Political parties like the Kenya African National Union (KANU), Orange Democratic Movement (ODM), and Jubilee Party of Kenya have historically been associated with specific ethnic groups. For example, the Kikuyu community has been linked to KANU and Jubilee, while the Luo and Luhya have been associated with ODM. The UDA party which gained a lot of popularity in 2022 and won the elections, quickly disintegrated after the impeachment of the deputy president Rigathi Gachagua. The UDA party is now turning out to be associated with the Kalenjin community.

Tanzania's political system has historically minimized the role of ethnic identity in national elections. Julius Nyerere's vision of a united nation under the banner of Ujamaa focused on creating a common identity for all Tanzanians, which diminished ethnic mobilization. While ethnic voting is less pronounced, there are regional voting trends. For example, the CCM enjoys strong support in rural areas, while opposition parties tend to have more backing in urban areas. However, these patterns are more related to regional development and political party loyalty rather than ethnicity. The CCM has been able to build a broad-based national coalition that includes members from various ethnic groups, effectively dampening the ethnic divisions that could destabilize the country. Its control over state resources, including local government structures, has helped maintain political stability.

Ethnic voting has contributed to political instability in Kenya, with electoral outcomes often leading to tensions between different ethnic groups. The 2007-2008 post-election violence is a notable example of how deeply entrenched ethnic identities can lead to violent clashes when a significant portion of the population feels excluded or marginalized. The use of ethnic identity in electoral politics has also led to fragmented party systems and difficulty in forming stable governments. The competition for ethnic support often results in coalition governments, which can be fragile and short-lived.

Ethnic voting is less pronounced in Tanzania, contributing to a more stable political environment. The CCM has been able to promote a unified national identity, which has helped prevent the kind of ethnic conflict seen in Kenya. Although there are tensions related to the distribution of resources, particularly between mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar, ethnic division does not dominate the political discourse. While ethnic competition is minimal, regional politics—such as the division between mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar—has occasionally caused tensions, especially during elections. Kenya's electoral system and political culture are deeply influenced by ethnic factors, with political parties often reflecting ethnic loyalties. This has contributed to an environment of high political volatility and, at times, violence. In contrast, Tanzania has managed to maintain political stability by downplaying ethnic divisions and promoting a sense of national unity, despite its ethnic diversity.

While both countries operate presidential systems, Kenya's more pluralistic and competitive electoral environment contrasts with Tanzania's more dominant-party system. Tanzania's stability owes much to the leadership of the CCM and the historical emphasis on national unity, while Kenya's elections are more subject to ethnic competition and fragmentation. Ultimately, the role of ethnicity in Kenyan politics is a defining feature, shaping party affiliations and electoral strategies, while in Tanzania, ethnicity has been subordinated to the creation of a broader national identity. However, both countries face challenges in balancing ethnic diversity with political unity, which will likely continue to evolve in the coming years.

The Role of Political Elites and State Policies in Managing Ethnic Relations

The role of political elites and state policies in managing ethnic relations in Kenya and Tanzania has been significant and shaped the dynamics of national unity, stability, and social integration in both countries. Despite their shared geographical location in East Africa, Kenya and Tanzania have had different approaches to ethnic relations, largely influenced by their colonial legacies, political leadership, and the state policies implemented after independence. In Kenya, ethnic relations have been a central aspect of the political landscape, and political elites have often been closely tied to ethnic communities. Kenya is a multi-ethnic society with over 40 ethnic

groups, and the political system has been historically characterized by ethnic-based mobilization. The interplay between political elites and state policies has contributed to both ethnic integration and tensions.

After independence in 1963, the political elite, led by President Jomo Kenyatta, adopted a system where ethnic groups, particularly the Kikuyu (Kenyatta's ethnic group), played a dominant role in the political and economic spheres. This created a system where power was often distributed along ethnic lines, with elite competition based on ethnicity rather than national cohesion. As new political leaders emerged, especially in the post-Kenyatta era, ethnicity became a primary factor in electoral politics. Presidents Daniel arap Moi (1978–2002) and Mwai Kibaki (2002–2013) also relied on ethnic coalitions to maintain power. These coalitions often reinforced ethnic divisions, and political elites would distribute resources and patronage to their respective ethnic groups in exchange for political loyalty. Kenya's state policies, such as land allocation, affirmative action, and resource distribution, have been criticized for favoring certain ethnic groups over others. During the Moi era, the government used state resources to reward ethnic supporters, which led to resentment among marginalized groups. This exacerbated inter-ethnic tensions and fostered a culture of patronage politics.

The most notable example of ethnic tension in Kenya is the violence that erupted after the 2007 presidential election. The disputed election results triggered a wave of ethnic violence, which was partly fueled by the manipulation of ethnic identities by political elites. The crisis highlighted the central role of political elites in shaping ethnic relations, with leaders often using inflammatory rhetoric to rally their ethnic constituencies and gain political power. In response to these tensions, Kenya introduced a series of reforms, including the 2010 constitution, which sought to decentralize power and promote national unity. However, the challenge of managing ethnic relations remains a significant concern in Kenyan politics. Kenyan elites have increasingly recognized the need for national cohesion, especially after the post-election violence of 2007-2008. The power-sharing agreement between President Mwai Kibaki and opposition leader Raila Odinga, facilitated by international mediators, demonstrated the potential for ethnic-based coalitions to contribute to political stability. However, the challenge remains that ethnic loyalty often trumps national unity, especially during election periods.

Tanzania's experience with ethnic relations has been markedly different from Kenya's, largely due to the vision and leadership of Julius Nyerere, Tanzania's first president, and his policies aimed at creating a unified nation. Julius Nyerere's vision for Tanzania emphasized national unity over ethnic divisions. Under his leadership (1961–1985), Tanzania adopted policies that discouraged ethnic identification and promoted a sense of Tanzanian identity. Nyerere's vision was embodied in the Ujamaa (African socialism) program, which sought to build a cohesive national identity based on shared values rather than ethnic diversity. Nyerere downplayed ethnicity in favor of a common Tanzanian identity, and his government promoted the idea of a "one nation, one people." State policies encouraged a sense of solidarity and discouraged ethnic divisions. Ethnic groups were recognized but were not used as a basis for political mobilization, and political elites in Tanzania generally avoided ethnic-based politics. Tanzania's state policies, particularly the focus on egalitarianism, land redistribution, and social welfare, helped to mitigate ethnic tensions by ensuring that resources were distributed more equally across the country. Nyerere's policies were focused on reducing regional inequalities, with special emphasis on rural development and social programs. By promoting the idea of "ujamaa," Nyerere aimed to create a society where the ethnic and regional backgrounds of citizens were less important than their shared national identity.

While ethnic tensions were not absent in Tanzania, the leadership succeeded in fostering a political culture that was less prone to ethnic fragmentation. Political elites in post-Nyerere Tanzania have largely adhered to the ideals of national unity, and the state has largely avoided the kind of ethnic-based power struggles that have plagued Kenya. After Nyerere's retirement in 1985, Tanzania experienced some shifts in political dynamics, but the institutionalized focus on national unity continued. The ruling Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) party, which Nyerere helped to found, has generally managed to suppress ethnic-based politics by emphasizing the party's role in national development and unity. However, with the rise of multiparty politics in the 1990s and increasing political competition, there has been a slow emergence of regional and ethnic tensions, particularly in the Zanzibar region. Political elites have at times used ethnic identities to mobilize support, though the overarching framework of national unity has remained a dominant force in Tanzanian politics.

In Kenya, ethnic divisions have been more pronounced, and political elites have often mobilized their ethnic bases to gain political advantage, leading to a more fragmented political environment. Ethnic-based competition, particularly during elections, has resulted in significant ethnic tensions, including violence. In Tanzania, Nyerere's policies succeeded in reducing the prominence of ethnic identity in national politics. His emphasis on national unity and socialist policies helped to create a less ethnically divided society. However, the emergence of multiparty democracy in the 1990s has gradually introduced more regional and ethnic dynamics into the political sphere, albeit less intensely than in Kenya.

In Kenya, political elites have been central to both exacerbating and managing ethnic tensions. The manipulation of ethnic identities by elites has often led to instability, but in some cases, such as the 2007-2008 crisis, elites have also played a role in negotiating peace and fostering unity, albeit under external pressure. In Tanzania, political elites have generally adhered to the vision of national unity, and the state has been more successful in managing ethnic relations through state-led policies of integration and national identity building. The role of political elites in managing ethnic relations in Kenya and Tanzania highlights the contrasting approaches of ethnic mobilization and national unity-building. Kenya's political system has been more prone to ethnic-based competition, often leading to tensions and violence, while Tanzania has been more successful in promoting national unity through the efforts of its political elites and state policies. However, both countries continue to face challenges in balancing ethnic diversity with national cohesion, particularly as they modernize and evolve politically.

The Role of Leadership in Kenya and Tanzania in Promoting or Mitigating Tribalism.

Leadership in Kenya and Tanzania plays a critical role in either promoting or mitigating tribalism, a deeply ingrained issue in both countries due to their ethnic diversity. However, the way leaders' approach and address tribalism in each country differs based on their political contexts, historical legacies, and institutional frameworks. Kenya is a highly diverse country with more than 40 ethnic groups, and tribalism has been a significant issue in its political landscape. Political leaders often appeal to ethnic constituencies to gain support, and elections are frequently marked by ethnic tensions and violence. Politicians in Kenya have sometimes exacerbated tribalism by mobilizing support along ethnic lines. This was particularly evident in the 2007-2008 post-election violence, where the election was seen by many as an ethnic contest between the Kikuyu (supporting President Mwai Kibaki) and the Luo (supporting Raila Odinga). Ethnic tensions escalated into widespread violence, resulting in over 1,000 deaths and displacement of hundreds of thousands of people. In many parts of Kenya, political power is seen as belonging to certain ethnic or clan groups, and leaders often push their agendas with a focus on favouring their own ethnic communities in terms of government appointments, resource allocation, and development projects. The 2010 Constitution of Kenya was a significant attempt to address ethnic division by decentralizing power and promoting inclusivity through devolution. County governments were established to bring services closer to local communities, and this was intended to reduce the concentration of political power in the hands of the elite from specific ethnic groups. National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC), was established to promote national unity and prevent hate speech and discrimination based on ethnicity. Kenya's leadership, especially since 2008, has sought to address tribalism through dialogue and national healing efforts, with initiatives aimed at fostering unity after the post-election violence. Peaceful Transitions and the "Handshake" (2018), between President Uhuru Kenyatta and Raila Odinga, known as the "Handshake," was seen as an effort to heal the ethnic divisions that had characterized previous elections. Kenyatta, a Kikuyu, and Odinga, a Luo, came together in a symbolic gesture to promote national unity and reduce ethnic tensions.

The 2022 general elections in Kenya were seen to be more issue based with two main coalitions. The Kenya Kwanza coalition led by Dr. William Samoei Ruto was leading a campaign of Bottom-Up economic model which became very popular with the masses and this led to Ruto's win to become the 5th president of Kenya. On the other side of the political divide, we had the AZIMIO LA UMOJA coalition led by RAILA AMOLO ODINGA and supported by the then president UHURU MUIGAI KENYATTA. The AZIMIO LA UMOJA ONE KENYA, advocated for unity, equity and equality in sharing the national resources. This election proved to be very divisive and the winner only led by 200,000 votes.

The Kenya Kwanza coalition did not implement the promises it had made to Kenyans. Instead, they introduced very punitive fiscal policies which led to high taxation and high cost of living. Due to these punitive policies, Kenyans demonstrated and later these demonstrations turned violent. The climax of these demonstration came June 2024 during the Gen-Z movement. The Gen-Z stormed parliament leading to many young people being killed by the police. Due to the political tensions the followed after the Gen-Z movement, president William Ruto was forced to dissolve his entire cabinet and reconstituted a broad basic government which included members of the opposition from AZIMIO LA UMOJA ONE KENYA coalition mainly from ODM party. In march 2023, president William Ruto sign a memorandum of understanding with the opposition, leader RAILA AMOLO ODINGA. The ODM party of RAILA ODINGA join government to give president Ruto some legitimacy which was dwindling by the day. However, from the look of things, the broad-based government seemed to have support from mainly the Luo and the Kalenjin. Tribalism was at play again the the Kenyan politics.

The standard Newspaper on 21st March 2025, carried this story and I quote ‘Raila's influence in government grows as allies clinch key posts’

If there had been doubts about former Prime Minister Raila Odinga’s growing influence in President William Ruto’s government, they were significantly settled with appointing the former premier’s allies as principal secretaries. Nothing could come between President Ruto’s plan to keep Raila in his corner – not even the fear that bloating the government could anger the masses, given that such grievances fueled last year’s youth-led revolt against tax hikes.

In the latest shake-up of the government, the former prime minister added to his allies’ already significant roles in Ruto’s cabinet. National Treasury Cabinet Secretary John Mbadi and Energy CS Opiyo Wandayi hold two of the country’s most significant jobs. The changes show that Raila has essentially cemented his position within Ruto’s government, although he has previously tried to feign independence as an opposition politician. Ahead of the shuffle announced by Head of Public Service Felix Koskei, Raila had met Mbadi, Wandayi and CSs Hassan Joho (Mining) and Wycliffe Oparanya (Co-operatives). The four are among the former premier’s staunchest allies and owe some loyalty to him. While the President may have selected them, observers have pointed out that Raila is their de facto appointing authority as he fronted their names to Ruto.

Herman Manyora, a lecturer at the University of Nairobi’s linguistics and languages department, described Raila as “a very powerful man”. “The President is sending signals that Raila is relevant, important and is almost running the government with him,” said Manyora. Although he has no official office, the opposition veteran seems to wield immense power within Ruto’s administration. Ruto hinted as much when he signed his cooperation agreement with Raila weeks ago, stating that he would ensure the former premier was “respected”.

That “respect” has been manifest in recent weeks, with Raila elevated above most top government officials. On Tuesday evening, Raila sat at the high table during a state banquet in honour of the visiting King of the Netherlands, Willem-Alexander. He was placed two seats away from the King to the right, flanking Deputy President Kithure Kindiki, who sat next to the monarch. A day later as the Head of State awarded a charter to Riara University, it was Raila who ushered him on stage. The former prime minister, who had been invited by Education Cabinet Secretary Julius Ogamba, used the presidential podium, which had been switched just as Ogamba was finalizing his speech. Behind him stood the Kenyan flag. Ruto would use the same lectern.

The same happened when they signed the cooperation agreement, with Kindiki inviting Raila on stage, terming him “Prime Minister”. A few days earlier, Kindiki also ceded his role of inviting the President to Raila. “Raila is holding true influence and Ruto has no choice but to let him have a free hand. The President has to embrace someone with popular support because he lacks it. He has to make Raila believe he is second in command or holds a 50-50 share of the government,” Machakos Deputy Governor Francis Mwangangi observed.

“Ruto must be careful because of Raila’s history of destroying the political organization of parties he collaborated with in the past, such as KANU and NARC, which have never recovered. But Ruto is also cunning and that is why he has criss-crossed ODM zones after the CS appointments,” he added.

Dr Timothy Onduru, who teaches history at Moi University, said the Head of State had to give the impression that Raila holds some power “to get support from Raila’s backyard.” “How else will Raila’s supporters trust him? Ruto said he wants Kenyans to respect Raila and he must lead by example and offer a sense of respect,” said Dr Onduru.

Manyora concurred, saying it was in the President’s interest to give Raila “a larger-than-life profile”. “Before Ruto gives Raila the prime minister’s position, he must make people know that Raila is the de facto PM. It was always clear after the AUC loss that Ruto had to do something to maintain Raila’s standing among his supporters in the hope that they will follow Raila wherever he takes them,” said Manyora.

Since Ruto and the former premier closed ranks last July, Raila has been the Head of State’s sidekick. It had a lot to do with Raila’s flopped bid for the African Union Commission chairperson. The former premier tagged along in most of Ruto’s trips abroad to campaign for the seat. For the longest time, Raila has dismissed talk that such proximity to the President meant that he was a part of the ruling administration. However, he has recently changed his tone, admitting that he was helping the Head of State in some unspecified way.

For instance, he tells the masses that his partnership with Ruto will see some of the country’s most pressing issues fixed. “...Kenyans are suffering because of this social health insurance scheme which is not working properly... we are committed to ensuring that the issues that are of concern,” Raila said as he met some surviving Mau Mau veterans and their kin last week.

Tanzania has a relatively smaller number of ethnic groups (about 120) compared to Kenya, and its leadership has historically been more successful in mitigating tribalism, thanks to policies that promote national unity and the country’s focus on building a national identity. Under the leadership of the first president, Julius Nyerere, Tanzania adopted the policy of Ujamaa (African socialism) in the 1960s and 1970s. Nyerere emphasized Tanzanian nationalism over ethnic identities, fostering a sense of unity that transcended tribal affiliations. His leadership promoted the idea that all Tanzanians were equal, and tribal divisions were discouraged in favor of a collective national identity.

Unlike Kenya, Tanzania has had relatively peaceful elections and a political culture that stresses national cohesion over ethnic competition. The ruling party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), has managed to maintain a broad base of support across various ethnic groups, and no single ethnic group is perceived as dominating the political landscape. Tanzania’s leaders have largely avoided ethnic-based political mobilization. The CCM, while being dominant, has generally managed to integrate various ethnic groups into the party structure, rather than creating separate ethnic-based political factions. This has helped mitigate the intensity of tribalism in the political sphere.

While Tanzania has been relatively successful in preventing tribalism from escalating into violence, there have still been instances where ethnic tensions have surfaced, particularly in the context of competition for political power and resources in certain regions. For instance, in the Lake Tanganyika region and Zanzibar, issues related to ethnic identity have occasionally come to the forefront, albeit on a much smaller scale than in Kenya. Some regions in Tanzania, such as the coastal areas, have historically felt marginalized in terms of economic development, which can sometimes be framed in ethnic terms, even if the issue is more about resource distribution and regional inequalities. Kenya’s history of ethnic-based colonial rule, where the British favored certain ethnic groups over others, has shaped the political landscape and led to ethnic divisions. Tanzania, under Nyerere’s leadership, emphasized national unity and discouraged ethnic identities, fostering a stronger sense of Tanzanian nationalism.

Kenya’s political environment has been characterized by strong ethnic political mobilization, with elections often seen as zero-sum contests between rival ethnic groups. Tanzania’s leaders have worked to avoid ethnic-based political mobilization, and the CCM has been successful in creating a broad, multi-ethnic coalition. Kenya has implemented significant constitutional reforms with devolution aimed at promoting local governance, but this has also created new challenges in managing ethnic competition at the local level. Tanzania has a more centralized system, with less regional autonomy, which has helped to mitigate ethnic competition but has also created other challenges related to regional disparities. Kenya’s leadership has struggled with ethnic violence,

particularly in the aftermath of elections (e.g., 2007-2008), and has had to take steps toward reconciliation. Tanzania, by contrast, has avoided large-scale ethnic violence, largely due to its leadership's emphasis on unity and the creation of a more cohesive national identity.

In both Kenya and Tanzania, leadership plays a central role in either mitigating or exacerbating tribalism. While Kenya's political leaders have at times fuelled ethnic divisions for political gain, efforts toward reform, national healing, and constitutional changes have sought to reduce these tensions. Tanzania's leaders, on the other hand, have been more successful in promoting national unity through policies that discourage ethnic divisions and emphasize a shared Tanzanian identity. However, in both countries, the challenge remains for leaders to continue fostering inclusive governance, promote equality, and reduce the influence of ethnicity in politics to ensure long-term stability and peace.

The role of state policies and institutions in managing ethnic diversity in Kenya and Tanzania is a critical area of study, as both countries have diverse populations and have implemented different strategies to manage this diversity. While both countries share a history of colonialism and experience significant ethnic diversity, their approaches to managing this diversity have differed considerably. Here, we will examine how state policies and institutions in Kenya and Tanzania have shaped the management of ethnic diversity, focusing on historical context, national policies, institutional frameworks, and challenges faced by each country. Both Kenya and Tanzania are home to numerous ethnic groups. Kenya has over 40 ethnic groups, with the Kikuyu, Luo, Luhya, Maasai, and Kalenjin among the largest. Tanzania, by contrast, has over 120 ethnic groups, including the Sukuma, Chaga, and Nyamwezi. Despite their different ethnic compositions, both countries share a colonial history under British rule, which left legacies of ethnic division and regional inequality.

Kenya's ethnic diversity has often been associated with political competition and conflict. The colonial administration in Kenya employed a "divide-and-rule" strategy that exacerbated ethnic differences, particularly between the Kikuyu and other groups. After independence in 1963, ethnic divisions remained entrenched, and political competition largely followed ethnic lines, contributing to violence in the post-independence period (e.g., the 2007-2008 post-election violence). Tanzania, under Julius Nyerere, took a different approach to ethnic diversity. Nyerere promoted the concept of ujamaa (African socialism) and sought to build a national identity based on unity, equality, and collective ownership. Nyerere's approach aimed to transcend ethnic divisions, and Tanzania's official state ideology emphasized national cohesion over ethnic identities.

Kenya's approach to managing ethnic diversity has been shaped by its political and economic systems, which have often prioritized ethnic patronage. Since independence, ethnic groups have been seen as key to political power and resource allocation. Ethnic representation in government has been a central issue in Kenya. Ethnic-based parties and coalitions play a critical role in the political process. The post-independence political system was designed to incorporate the interests of various ethnic groups but also became a system in which ethnic groups vied for political and economic dominance. A major turning point in Kenya's effort to manage ethnic diversity was the promulgation of the new Constitution in 2010, which introduced key reforms to address ethnic marginalization. The Constitution enshrines devolution, creating 47 counties with local governments to promote more equitable distribution of resources. This was intended to reduce tensions between ethnic groups and ensure more localized participation in governance. Despite these measures, Kenya has experienced periods of intense ethnic violence, particularly during election periods. The post-election violence of 2007-2008, which was partly fueled by political manipulation of ethnic identities, led to the International Criminal Court (ICC) investigations and the subsequent reforms in the Constitution. Tanzania's approach to managing ethnic diversity has been strongly influenced by the ideals of socialism and Pan-Africanism promoted by Nyerere. Nyerere's government sought to downplay ethnic differences in favor of creating a "Tanzanian" identity. Swahili, as a unifying language, was promoted across the country, and ethnic-based politics were discouraged. Ethnic diversity was seen as a strength, but ethnic identities were largely subordinated to the national identity. Ujamaa, or the policy of African socialism, was intended to create a society based on shared resources, collective farms, and a focus on national unity. The emphasis on collective rather than individual ethnic identity aimed to transcend traditional divisions.

While Tanzania avoided ethnic federalism, it implemented a form of decentralization through regional governments. However, these regions were not based on ethnicity but on geographic administrative boundaries.

The Tanzanian state has generally avoided the deep ethnic cleavages seen in other African countries. Kenya's institutions have been shaped by the need to balance ethnic interests. Kenyan political parties are often organized around ethnic lines, with ethnic patronage playing a significant role in political campaigns and party organization. The judiciary in Kenya has been involved in resolving ethnic conflicts, particularly after the 2007-2008 violence. The establishment of the Truth, Justice, and Reconciliation Commission (TJRC) was part of post-conflict efforts to address historical injustices and promote reconciliation. The 2010 Constitution introduced a devolved system of government that created 47 counties, each with its own elected governor and county assembly. This institutionalized local ethnic identity within the political system, providing an outlet for local ethnic groups to have a voice in governance.

Tanzania's institutions were designed to reflect the socialist ideology of unity and collective governance. Under Nyerere, Tanzania was governed by a single party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), which emphasized national unity and discouraged ethnic-based parties. This prevented ethnic fragmentation in the political arena. The promotion of Swahili as the national language helped to reduce ethnic divisions by providing a common medium of communication across different ethnic groups. The state's institutions focused on providing social services and promoting regional development, attempting to balance development across various regions without favouring any particular ethnic group.

The political system in Kenya has often been characterized by ethnic competition for state resources, which has led to tensions and conflict. The "winner-takes-all" electoral system has exacerbated these tensions, with ethnic communities vying for control of the presidency and national resources. Some ethnic groups in Kenya, particularly those in the coast and north-eastern regions, have felt politically and economically marginalized. This marginalization has fuelled separatist movements and calls for greater autonomy, such as the push for a "coastal" state. Ethnic violence remains a serious issue, especially during election periods. The inability of institutions to address the root causes of these tensions has undermined efforts at national cohesion.

While Tanzania has avoided ethnic conflict, there are still regional disparities in development. Some regions feel neglected by the government, which has sometimes led to regionalist sentiments. Although ethnic divisions have been downplayed by the state, growing recognition of ethnic identities and demands for greater representation in the political system are emerging, especially in urban areas. This could potentially challenge the established unity-focused approach. High levels of youth unemployment and the growing demand for political inclusion are creating new challenges in managing social cohesion, particularly as younger generations increasingly identify with ethnic rather than national identities.

Comparative Analysis

Kenya has struggled with political ethnicization, where ethnicity is often a key factor in electoral politics. The introduction of devolution through the 2010 Constitution has provided some relief by allowing ethnic groups to express their interests at the local level, but challenges related to ethnic violence, patronage politics, and regional inequalities persist.

Tanzania, on the other hand, has largely avoided ethnic-based political conflict due to the emphasis on national unity and the promotion of a collective identity. However, the long-term sustainability of this approach is challenged by increasing demands for greater regional autonomy and recognition of ethnic identities in the face of globalization and demographic changes. Both Kenya and Tanzania have made significant strides in managing ethnic diversity, but the approaches have been shaped by their respective political, social, and historical contexts. Kenya's policy of devolution and the 2010 Constitution mark important efforts to address ethnic inequalities, while Tanzania's historical emphasis on national unity and the suppression of ethnic identities has contributed to a relatively peaceful coexistence among its diverse groups. However, the challenges of managing ethnic diversity continue to evolve in both countries, influenced by globalization, demographic changes, and political dynamics.

The Implications of Ethnic-Based Political Representation in Governance in Kenya and Tanzania

Ethnic-based political representation refers to the inclusion of various ethnic groups in the political system, ensuring that political offices, decision-making processes, and national resources reflect the diversity of a

society. In the context of Kenya and Tanzania, both of which are multi-ethnic societies, this form of representation has had significant implications on governance, state-building, and socio-political dynamics. While both countries have pursued different models of ethnic representation, the effects of these approaches have been far-reaching and have shaped their political landscapes in unique ways.

Kenya is home to over 40 ethnic groups, with the largest being the Kikuyu, Luhya, Luo, Kalenjin, and Maasai. Ethnic-based politics have been deeply entrenched in Kenya's political history, often shaping election outcomes, party systems, and the allocation of political power. In Kenya, ethnicity plays a dominant role in political identity. Political parties are often formed around ethnic lines, with major ethnic communities backing candidates from their groups. This leads to what is referred to as "ethnic mobilization"—where political leaders appeal to their ethnic communities for support, often at the expense of national unity. After independence in 1963, Kenya adopted a "winner-takes-all" political system, where the president is the head of state, and political power tends to be centralized around the ruling ethnic group. This created a perception that political power is a zero-sum game, and ethnic communities that are excluded from power often feel marginalized. In particular, the Kikuyu ethnic group, which had close ties to the first president, Jomo Kenyatta, benefitted disproportionately from post-independence governance.

The 2007 general election in Kenya was a major turning point in the country's ethnic politics. The controversial election results sparked widespread ethnic violence, particularly between the Kikuyu and Kalenjin communities, reflecting how deeply intertwined ethnic identity and political loyalty had become. The violence, which left over 1,000 people dead and hundreds of thousands displaced, highlighted the dangers of ethnic-based political competition and the failure to address historical grievances. The 2010 Constitution of Kenya introduced major reforms aimed at addressing ethnic tensions and creating a more inclusive system. Key among these reforms was the introduction of devolution, which aimed to decentralize power and ensure that resources and political representation were spread more evenly across the country. The creation of 47 counties, each with its own government, allowed for more localized political participation and an attempt to reduce the centralization of power in Nairobi. However, the focus on ethnic-based political identities persists, as regional loyalties continue to influence voting patterns and political alignments.

Ethnic-based politics have led to the exclusion of minority groups, intensified competition for power, and increased ethnic divisions. Leaders often prioritize the interests of their ethnic communities over national concerns, which can lead to ethnic favoritism and inequality. Ethnic representation can also promote inclusion by ensuring that diverse groups are included in the political process. Devolution and affirmative action measures (such as the gender rule in the Constitution) have sought to balance ethnic representation and foster national unity.

Tanzania, under its first president, Julius Nyerere, took a different approach to ethnic representation. Nyerere promoted the idea of a "national identity" centered around Ujamaa (African socialism) and sought to de-emphasize ethnic divisions in favor of creating a united Tanzanian identity. However, ethnicity remains a factor in political representation, albeit in a subtler and managed manner. Julius Nyerere's vision of Tanzania as a "unified" state was explicitly anti-ethnic, and his policies sought to suppress ethnic-based political organizations. He promoted a form of nationalism that sought to transcend ethnic identities in favor of a shared national identity rooted in the ideals of socialism and self-reliance. In this system, political participation was framed around the ideology of Ujamaa, which emphasized collective development over individual ethnic interests. Tanzania's ruling party, the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), has dominated the political landscape since independence. It has managed to maintain a multi-ethnic composition by drawing support from different regions, though ethnic loyalty has been secondary to ideological loyalty to the party. Unlike Kenya, where political parties often reflect ethnic constituencies, the CCM has sought to unify various groups under its banner, using national development as the central platform for garnering support. Although ethnic identity has not played a dominant role in formal political competition, regionalism has been a more significant factor. Different regions in Tanzania, such as Zanzibar, the Coast, and the Highlands, often have distinct political dynamics. For instance, Zanzibar has had a history of tension between its Arab and African populations, leading to political rivalry between the Zanzibar-based CUF (Civic United Front) and the ruling CCM. With the introduction of the multi-party system in 1992, the political landscape became more competitive. Although ethnicity has remained less central to Tanzanian politics, parties still reflect regional and community interests, and political parties have occasionally engaged in

ethnic appeals. However, these appeals are generally less explicit than in Kenya, with the focus still being on national development issues.

Although Tanzania has been largely successful in suppressing ethnic-based political competition, challenges remain, especially with regard to regional disparities and tensions, such as those between the mainland and Zanzibar. Moreover, the rise of political parties with regional bases could challenge Tanzania's unity in the long term. Tanzania's model has allowed for more national cohesion, with an emphasis on shared development goals rather than ethnic division. However, as the country continues to modernize, addressing regional economic inequalities and ensuring fair political representation will be crucial to maintaining stability.

Comparative Implications of Ethnic-Based Representation

In Kenya, ethnic-based representation has been a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it has allowed for greater political participation of marginalized ethnic communities through mechanisms like devolution. On the other hand, it has deepened ethnic divisions and created cycles of exclusion and marginalization.

In Tanzania, the emphasis on a national identity has helped reduce ethnic divisions, but it has not completely eliminated the challenges posed by regionalism. The centralized control under the CCM has been able to mediate these tensions, but as the country grows, the importance of addressing both regional and ethnic inequalities will become more pressing. In Kenya, the politicization of ethnicity has often resulted in resource allocation based on ethnic loyalty, sometimes side-lining national development goals. Devolution has somewhat mitigated this, but local elites still tend to prioritize ethnic interests.

Tanzania, with its more centralized governance model, has focused on national development. However, regional inequalities persist, and there are concerns about how to ensure equitable distribution of resources across the country, especially in Zanzibar and peripheral regions. Kenya's history of ethnic violence, especially after the 2007 elections, underscores the fragility of its political system in the context of ethnic rivalry. This has led to efforts like the 2010 Constitution to address these divisions, but stability remains a challenge. Tanzania has enjoyed relative stability, largely due to the post-independence emphasis on national unity. However, as political competition intensifies, maintaining this stability without reigniting ethnic or regional tensions will be a challenge.

CONCLUSION

Ethnic-based political representation has distinct implications for governance in both Kenya and Tanzania. While Kenya's approach has led to more explicit ethnic divisions, the country has made strides toward greater inclusion through devolution and constitutional reforms. In contrast, Tanzania's avoidance of overt ethnic-based politics has fostered a more unified national identity but still faces challenges related to regionalism and equitable development. The challenge for both countries will be to manage ethnic and regional diversity in ways that promote national unity, political stability, and equitable development.

Comparative Analysis of Kenya and Tanzania: Successes and Failures

Kenya and Tanzania are two East African countries that share a similar colonial history and geographic proximity, but they have followed distinct political, economic, and social trajectories since gaining independence in the early 1960s. Here's a comparative analysis of their successes and failures across various sectors.

Kenya has a relatively robust democratic system, especially in recent decades. Since the introduction of multi-party politics in the 1990s, the country has held competitive elections, despite occasional violence (e.g., 2007-2008 post-election violence). The 2010 Constitution, which devolved power to counties, marked a significant step toward decentralization and greater inclusivity. Despite political instability at times, Kenya has managed to maintain relative political stability compared to other countries in the region. Corruption has been a persistent issue in Kenya, affecting all levels of government. Scandals such as the "Goldenberg" and "Anglo Leasing" have undermined public trust. Elections, particularly those in 2007, have been marked by significant violence,

reflecting deep ethnic and political divisions. Kenyan politics are often defined by ethnic allegiances, which sometimes results in marginalization of minority groups and weak national cohesion.

Tanzania has maintained relative political stability, especially under the leadership of Julius Nyerere (the country's first president). The country avoided major post-independence ethnic conflicts and has fostered a relatively strong sense of national unity. While the one-party system under Nyerere (1964-1992) has been criticized for restricting political freedoms, it was successful in unifying a country with numerous ethnic groups and providing stability.

The long tenure of Nyerere's leadership and the one-party rule stifled political pluralism and limited democratic freedoms. Post-Nyerere Tanzania had some challenges in transitioning to multi-party democracy. Critics have argued that political dissent was often suppressed, and opposition parties faced significant challenges under the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) party, which has dominated the political landscape.

Kenya has emerged as one of the more dynamic economies in Sub-Saharan Africa, with consistent growth, especially in sectors such as services, agriculture, manufacturing, and information technology (IT). Nairobi has become a hub for technology and innovation, particularly in mobile banking with M-Pesa, which has revolutionized financial inclusion in the region. Kenya is a leading economy in East Africa and a key player in the East African Community (EAC), contributing to regional integration and trade. Despite its economic progress, Kenya struggles with significant income inequality, poverty, and high unemployment rates. Rural areas, in particular, remain underdeveloped. Although there has been significant investment in infrastructure, Kenya's transport, energy, and healthcare systems still face major challenges, impacting the overall economy. Kenya has experienced growing levels of public debt, particularly through infrastructure loans from China and other sources, leading to concerns about fiscal sustainability.

Tanzania has enjoyed steady economic growth in recent years, with a focus on agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. The government has also emphasized infrastructure development, including roads, ports, and energy. The Tanzanian government has made significant progress in improving education, healthcare, and other social indicators, particularly compared to many other Sub-Saharan African nations. Tanzania is a major producer of crops like coffee, tea, and cashews, and it has managed to increase agricultural exports significantly. Despite economic growth, poverty remains widespread, especially in rural areas, and there is a significant urban-rural divide.

While Tanzania has diversified its economy somewhat, it is still heavily dependent on agriculture, which is vulnerable to climate change and external price shocks. Like Kenya, Tanzania faces challenges in managing its external debt, particularly with regards to large-scale infrastructure projects. Kenya has made substantial strides in improving access to education, with free primary education introduced in 2003 and growing enrolment rates. It has made significant progress in combating HIV/AIDS and has seen improvements in maternal and child health.

Despite improvements, Kenya's healthcare system remains underfunded, with inequalities in access to services, especially in rural areas. A growing young population and insufficient job creation opportunities have contributed to high youth unemployment. Tanzania has made significant strides in improving access to education and healthcare, with increased enrolment in schools and significant progress in reducing child mortality. It has also been recognized for making progress in gender equality, with more women in government and education, though challenges remain. Despite improvements in education and health, Tanzania still faces high levels of poverty and inequality, particularly in rural areas. The education system has been criticized for not equipping students with the skills required by the labour market, leading to underemployment.

Kenya has been a leader in regional diplomacy and conflict resolution, notably playing a role in peacekeeping efforts in Somalia and South Sudan. Kenya has benefitted from greater global integration through trade partnerships, especially in the fields of agriculture, tea, and floriculture. While Kenya has played a significant role in regional security, it faces challenges stemming from instability in neighbouring countries, including the ongoing conflict in Somalia. Kenya's economy is somewhat dependent on global markets, which makes it vulnerable to fluctuations in demand and commodity prices.

Tanzania has maintained a strong independent foreign policy, emphasizing Pan-Africanism and non-alignment. It played a leading role in the African Union and has been instrumental in peacekeeping efforts in the region. It has developed strong trade and infrastructure ties with China, which have boosted its development prospects. While Tanzania has a solid regional presence, it has not been as assertive as Kenya in leading initiatives or forging regional partnerships in sectors like trade, security, and diplomacy. Tanzania's economy remains heavily reliant on foreign aid and investment, particularly from countries like China, which could pose risks to its long-term development.

Both Kenya and Tanzania have achieved notable successes and faced significant challenges in their post-independence development. Kenya's strengths lie in its relatively vibrant democratic processes, strong economic growth, technological innovation, and regional influence. However, it suffers from issues like corruption, electoral violence, and socio-economic inequality.

Tanzania's strengths are rooted in political stability, social development, and unity. While it has maintained a peaceful society and a growing economy, its challenges include poverty, a heavy reliance on agriculture, and a need for more diversified industrialization. Ultimately, while both countries have made substantial progress, their future success will depend on their ability to tackle their respective failures, address inequality, and enhance governance to build sustainable and inclusive economies.

Comparative Analysis of Ethnic Politics in Kenya and Tanzania

Kenya and Tanzania, two East African nations with shared colonial histories and geographical proximity, present contrasting models of ethnic politics despite having similar demographic compositions. Both countries are home to numerous ethnic groups, and their political trajectories have been influenced by the interplay between ethnicity, nationalism, and governance. This comparative analysis explores how ethnic politics have shaped their respective political landscapes, focusing on key aspects such as post-independence political development, ethnicity's role in governance, and the policies that each country has adopted to manage ethnic diversity.

During British colonial rule, Kenya's ethnic groups were organized into "tribes" which were often simplified and stereotyped by the colonial administration. The colonial state favoured certain groups over others, which deepened inter-ethnic divisions. The British played certain ethnic groups against each other, such as favouring the Kikuyu in the highlands and the Luo and Luhya in some other regions, as a means of dividing and ruling. After independence in 1963, Kenya's political system was significantly shaped by these ethnic divisions, particularly through the rise of key political figures like Jomo Kenyatta (Kikuyu), who became the first president, and his policies of economic control and land distribution that favoured his own ethnic group. This set the stage for what would later become a "politics of exclusion."

In contrast, Tanzania's history of ethnic politics has been less divisive. Under the leadership of Julius Nyerere, the country's first president, Tanzania sought to promote a unified national identity through the policy of Ujamaa (African socialism), which aimed to reduce tribal distinctions and emphasize "Tanzanianism" as a central identity. While Tanzania had many ethnic groups, the government actively worked to downplay ethnic identity in favour of a national, socialist agenda. Nyerere's policies of villagization and the formation of the ruling party, Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM), helped to reduce ethnic competition for resources, though some ethnic tensions persisted, especially in the periphery.

Ethnic politics in Kenya are often tied to the "winner-takes-all" nature of its political system, especially during presidential elections. The political elites, typically drawn from large ethnic groups (e.g., Kikuyu, Luo, Luhya, Kalenjin), often form coalitions around these ethnic lines to gain electoral advantage. The ethnicization of political competition means that elections can be highly polarized, and political rivalry is often framed as an ethnic struggle. For example, the violence following the 2007-2008 elections was widely seen as an ethnic conflict, with accusations of vote-rigging and disputes over the presidency exacerbating ethnic tensions. Kenya's political elite have often relied on their ethnic bases to secure political power, which has led to the development of patronage networks. Leaders from different ethnic groups often mobilize their communities based on ethnic loyalty and promises of resource distribution. This dynamic has entrenched ethnic divisions and led to a series of violent confrontations, particularly during election periods.

In contrast, Tanzania's political culture has been characterized by a more centralized and state-driven approach. Although ethnic identities have not been entirely erased, the ruling party, CCM, has maintained a tight grip on the political system and has been able to ensure that ethnic identity does not dominate national politics in the same way it does in Kenya. The country's political parties and leadership have emphasized national unity, and most politicians are able to appeal to a broad spectrum of ethnic groups, reducing the salience of ethnic identity in political competition. Tanzania's political structure has generally been more inclusive. The CCM has been successful in integrating members from different ethnic groups, partly because the ruling party has remained in power for so long, and its dominance has helped to moderate ethnic competition. Ethnicity has been side-lined in favour of broader political ideologies and the vision of a "unified Tanzania," although regional economic disparities and localized ethnic issues, especially in Zanzibar, still occasionally surface.

Ethnic politics in Kenya are evident in the governance structure, especially with the creation of political offices and the allocation of resources. The Constitution of 2010, which was a response to the post-election violence of 2007-2008, introduced devolution as a means of addressing ethnic tensions by decentralizing power to 47 counties. The aim was to ensure that all ethnic groups had a stake in governance and access to resources. However, ethnic loyalty still plays a crucial role in local elections, with many county governments being controlled by ethnic-based political parties or alliances. Ethnic patronage networks continue to shape the distribution of government resources and opportunities.

Tanzania's system has sought to avoid the ethnicization of governance. In terms of ethnic representation, the government has largely focused on centralizing power and promoting a technocratic elite rather than ethnic-based leaders. While the CCM has traditionally ensured broad ethnic representation within its leadership, the political structure has been largely top-down. Tanzania has also been relatively successful in managing ethnic diversity through its regional administrative divisions and in emphasizing Tanzanian national identity over ethnic identities. The notion of Ujamaa has also contributed to social cohesion and national integration.

Ethnic tensions in Kenya are often most acute in the context of land disputes, resource allocation, and the competition for political power. The Rift Valley, for example, has witnessed clashes between different ethnic groups, such as the Kikuyu and the Kalenjin, which were fuelled by historical grievances and competition for land. Similarly, political competition in Central and Western Kenya, and among the Kikuyu and Luo communities, has often been framed in ethnic terms. Post-election violence, most notably the 2007-2008 clashes, highlighted the dangers of ethnic polarization and the risks of failing to create an inclusive political system.

While Tanzania has experienced occasional ethnic conflicts, these have been far less frequent or violent compared to Kenya. One notable area of ethnic tension has been Zanzibar, where ethnic and religious identities (between the majority Arabs and the African mainlanders) have occasionally sparked conflicts, particularly in the context of the political rivalry between the Zanzibar-based parties. However, the central government in Dar es Salaam has largely been able to contain these tensions through a combination of regional diplomacy and political accommodation.

Ethnic politics in Kenya remains a central challenge. Although the 2010 Constitution has introduced reforms aimed at reducing ethnic divisions, Kenya still faces the challenge of managing political competition along ethnic lines. Political figures continue to leverage ethnic support to secure power, and the country remains vulnerable to electoral violence. However, efforts to build a more inclusive political culture, such as through the BBI (Building Bridges Initiative) and devolution, could gradually reduce the salience of ethnic politics if effectively implemented.

Tanzania's approach to managing ethnic diversity has been relatively successful, and the country continues to be one of the more stable nations in Africa in terms of ethnic relations. However, challenges remain, particularly in ensuring equitable development across the country's diverse regions and in addressing the economic disparities between the mainland and Zanzibar. There is also the ongoing challenge of ensuring that the ruling CCM party remains responsive to the evolving political and ethnic landscape.

While Kenya and Tanzania both share a similar ethnic composition, their political trajectories have been very different due to the way each country has handled ethnic identity and politics. Kenya has struggled with ethnic

competition and division, with ethnicity often acting as a powerful force in electoral and political mobilization. In contrast, Tanzania has largely avoided such tensions, thanks to a long-standing emphasis on national unity and the state-driven policies of the CCM and its emphasis on Tanzanian identity. Despite these differences, both countries face ongoing challenges in managing ethnic diversity, with Kenya continuing to work toward a more inclusive governance model and Tanzania trying to balance unity with regional and ethnic diversity.

Examining the Impact of Multiparty Democracy on Ethnic Fragmentation

Multiparty democracy refers to a political system in which multiple political parties compete for power in elections, allowing voters to choose from a range of ideological platforms. This system contrasts with single-party or authoritarian regimes, where opposition is either limited or non-existent. While multiparty systems are widely seen as a cornerstone of democratic governance, their relationship with ethnic fragmentation is complex and multifaceted. Ethnic fragmentation refers to the division of a society into distinct ethnic groups, often with different languages, religions, or cultural practices, which can lead to tensions or conflicts.

This essay explores the impact of multiparty democracy on ethnic fragmentation, considering both the potential benefits and challenges. It examines how multiparty systems can either exacerbate or mitigate ethnic divisions, depending on various factors such as the design of the electoral system, the role of political parties, and the broader social and political context. Multiparty democracy and ethnic fragmentation are both linked to the broader concepts of political competition and social cohesion. To understand their relationship, we must first explore key theoretical ideas:

Consociationalism: This theory argues that in ethnically divided societies, power should be shared across different groups to ensure political stability. In a consociationalism democracy, the electoral system is often designed to ensure that no single ethnic group can dominate. This might include mechanisms like proportional representation (PR) and power-sharing agreements.

Pluralism: This theory holds that a healthy democracy is one where multiple group—ethnic, religious, or otherwise—compete for influence, but without any one group being able to impose its will. Here, multiparty democracy is seen as a means of balancing ethnic interests, provided that political competition does not lead to polarization.

Ethnic Entrepreneurism: This perspective highlights the role of political leaders in mobilizing ethnic groups for electoral advantage. In a multiparty system, parties may form around ethnic identities, and leaders may emphasize ethnic division to rally support. This can contribute to ethnic fragmentation; as political identity becomes synonymous with ethnic identity.

In some cases, multiparty democracy can act as a stabilizing force in ethnically diverse societies by encouraging cooperation, negotiation, and compromise. Several mechanisms can help mitigate ethnic fragmentation:

Incentives for Cross-Ethnic Alliances: In a multiparty system, political parties often need to build coalitions to form a government. This provides incentives for parties to reach out to ethnic groups beyond their base, fostering cross-ethnic alliances. In societies where no single ethnic group is large enough to dominate, coalitions of ethnic minorities and majorities may work together to form stable governments.

Proportional Representation (PR): Electoral systems based on proportional representation tend to offer better representation for ethnic minorities compared to majoritarian systems. In countries with diverse ethnic populations, PR allows smaller ethnic groups to elect representatives who can advocate for their interests, reducing feelings of exclusion and political marginalization.

Devolution of Power: Multiparty systems often encourage decentralization, allowing ethnic minorities to exercise greater control over local or regional governments. Devolution of political power can reduce tensions between the center and peripheral ethnic groups, helping to preserve peace and stability.

Challenges: Multiparty Democracy and Ethnic Fragmentation

Despite its potential for mitigating ethnic fragmentation, multiparty democracy can also exacerbate ethnic divisions, particularly if political parties are organized along ethnic lines or if political competition is based on ethnic identities. Several factors contribute to this challenge.

Ethnic Mobilization and Polarization: In some cases, multiparty democracy can lead to the politicization of ethnicity, where political parties are primarily organized along ethnic lines. In this scenario, political competition can encourage ethnic groups to perceive each other as adversaries rather than fellow citizens. This can lead to the fragmentation of the political landscape along ethnic lines, where each group seeks to protect its own interests, often at the expense of national unity.

Electoral Fragmentation: In societies with significant ethnic diversity, multiparty systems may lead to a proliferation of parties, many of which represent narrow ethnic or regional interests. This fragmentation can make it difficult to form stable governments, leading to coalition governments that are unstable or ineffective. The resulting political deadlock or instability may deepen ethnic divisions, as parties fail to cooperate across ethnic lines.

Ethnic Voting Patterns: In some instances, political parties explicitly target ethnic constituencies, creating a form of "ethnic voting." When political parties appeal to voters primarily on the basis of ethnic identity, this can entrench ethnic divisions, making it harder to build inclusive national coalitions. In extreme cases, ethnic-based parties may promote narratives of exclusion, intolerance, or even violence.

Competition for Resources: In ethnically fragmented societies, competition over resources (economic, political, or social) can become closely tied to ethnic identities. Multiparty democracy may exacerbate these tensions if parties represent different ethnic groups and each group is fighting for access to state resources. This can heighten ethnic competition and reduce the prospects for cooperation.

CASE STUDIES

India

India, the world's largest democracy, provides a useful example of how multiparty democracy can both mitigate and exacerbate ethnic fragmentation. India's multiparty system includes national, regional, and ethnic parties. While India has managed to avoid large-scale ethnic conflict since independence, the emergence of ethno nationalist parties (such as the Bharatiya Janata Party) and the rise of regional parties in states like Punjab, Tamil Nadu, and West Bengal have led to heightened ethnic and regional tensions.

In certain states, electoral politics has become heavily ethnically polarized, with parties representing specific linguistic, religious, or caste-based identities. The formation of coalitions in the national government has often required careful management of ethnic diversity, although at times, national politics has also reinforced ethnic divisions.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnia and Herzegovina present a clear example of the challenges of multiparty democracy in ethnically fragmented societies. Following the Bosnian War and the Dayton Accords (1995), the country was divided along ethnic lines, with distinct political structures for Bosniaks, Croats, and Serbs. The electoral system, which includes power-sharing arrangements, has led to the dominance of ethnic parties that often prioritize ethnic interests over national unity. This has resulted in a fragmented political system, characterized by frequent deadlocks and a lack of cooperation between ethnic groups. The system has made governance difficult and has reinforced ethnic divisions, hindering efforts to build a cohesive national identity. The relationship between multiparty democracy and ethnic fragmentation is complex and context-dependent. While multiparty systems can offer mechanisms for ethnic inclusion, representation, and cooperation, they can also exacerbate ethnic divisions if parties mobilize along ethnic lines and if competition becomes rooted in ethnic identity.

To maximize the potential of multiparty democracy in ethnically fragmented societies, electoral systems must be designed to promote inclusivity, such as through proportional representation, and power-sharing arrangements must be carefully managed to prevent the exacerbation of divisions. Additionally, political elites and civil society must work to foster national cohesion and shared political identities, rather than allowing ethnic identities to dominate political discourse. Ultimately, the impact of multiparty democracy on ethnic fragmentation depends not only on the formal institutions in place but also on the broader political culture and the willingness of political actors to promote unity over division.

Lessons Learned for Other African Countries on Potential Tribalism in Multiparty Democracy

In many African countries, tribalism or ethnic divisions can pose significant challenges in multiparty democracies. While democratic frameworks provide opportunities for political inclusivity and participation, tribalism can undermine the political process, leading to instability, conflict, and inequality. Several African countries have grappled with these challenges, and there are important lessons to be learned from both successes and failures in addressing ethnic divisions within multiparty systems.

Here are key lessons that other African countries can learn from the experiences of those that have confronted tribalism in multiparty democracy:

Promote National Unity Over Ethnic Identity

Lesson: Political leaders should prioritize building a sense of national identity over narrow ethnic loyalties. When ethnic identity becomes the cornerstone of political affiliation, it can lead to zero-sum politics, where the success of one ethnic group is perceived as the failure of others.

Example: Countries like Botswana have had success in promoting national unity and inclusive governance. Despite being a multi-ethnic society, Botswana has managed to avoid severe ethnic tensions largely due to its strong sense of national identity and the commitment of its leadership to uphold democratic principles that transcend ethnic divisions.

Institutionalize Power Sharing and Inclusivity

Lesson: Systems of governance that promote power-sharing, coalition-building, and inclusivity can reduce the risks of tribalism. Proportional representation systems and decentralization of political power can help mitigate ethnic exclusion and create a more equitable political landscape.

Example: In South Africa, the post-apartheid government established a power-sharing system through a proportional representation electoral system that brought together different ethnic groups in the national government. This helped to balance the interests of the country's diverse communities and reduce the potential for ethnic conflict.

Curb the Politics of Ethnic Patronage

Lesson: Political patronage systems that reward supporters based on ethnic lines can perpetuate division. Ensuring that government programs and resources are distributed based on need and merit rather than ethnic affiliation is critical to reducing ethnic tensions.

Example: In Kenya, the politics of ethnic patronage have often fuelled cycles of political violence and marginalization, particularly during election periods. In contrast, Rwanda has focused on building a "Rwandan" identity, emphasizing reconciliation and the creation of a unified state that transcends ethnic divisions.

Strengthen Political and Civic Education

Lesson: Comprehensive political and civic education that promotes democratic values, inclusivity, and tolerance is key to reducing tribalism. People should understand the dangers of ethnic-based voting and be encouraged to vote based on policy and leadership qualities, not ethnic affiliations.

Example: Ghana is often cited as a model for democratic stability in Africa. The country has invested in civic education to foster democratic participation and a political culture that prioritizes national over ethnic interests. This has contributed to its relative political stability compared to other countries with similar ethnic diversity.

Empower Civil Society and Media

Lesson: A free and independent media and an active civil society can act as checks on ethnic-based manipulation and exclusionary politics. Media outlets can highlight divisive ethnic rhetoric and hold politicians accountable, while civil society organizations can promote dialogue and reconciliation between ethnic groups.

Example: In Liberia, the civil society and media played an important role in promoting peace and reconciliation after the country's civil war, during which ethnic divisions were manipulated by warlords. The media and civil society groups helped to bridge ethnic divides and encouraged national healing.

Electoral System Reform and Decentralization

Lesson: Electoral systems should be carefully designed to ensure that no single ethnic group can monopolize power. This includes adopting mechanisms such as mixed electoral systems or decentralizing power to give local ethnic groups a voice in governance.

Example: In Nigeria, the use of federalism and the creation of states along ethnic lines has helped to prevent dominance by one group. However, challenges remain due to the system's manipulation for political gain. Ethiopia's ethnic federalism, though controversial, has allowed ethnic groups to exercise some degree of autonomy and representation in the federal structure.

Promote National Dialogue and Reconciliation

Lesson: Establishing forums for national dialogue and reconciliation is crucial to heal ethnic divisions and build trust among communities. When political leaders and civil society can engage in meaningful conversations about ethnicity, history, and governance, it fosters a sense of shared ownership in the democratic process.

Example: South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was a critical step in addressing the deep-rooted ethnic and racial divisions caused by apartheid. The TRC allowed for truth-telling and national healing, demonstrating the value of formal mechanisms for reconciliation in a post-conflict, multiparty democracy.

Address Economic Inequality Across Ethnic Groups

Lesson: Socio-economic inequality can exacerbate ethnic tensions, especially when some groups feel excluded from economic opportunities. Inclusive economic policies that ensure equitable development can reduce grievances that fuel ethnic divisions.

Example: Mauritius has used policies of inclusive economic growth, focusing on reducing poverty across all communities, which has helped to create a more stable political environment despite the country's ethnic diversity.

Ensure Accountability and Rule of Law

Lesson: Institutions that ensure accountability, transparency, and the rule of law can serve as a safeguard against tribalism. When citizens trust that their rights are protected, regardless of their ethnic background, the likelihood of ethnic divisions undermining the political system decreases.

Example: Botswana's strong anti-corruption institutions and rule of law have fostered political stability and reduced ethnic tensions. Even though there are ethnic groups in Botswana, there is a strong tradition of meritocracy and rule of law that transcends ethnic affiliations. Leadership that emphasizes national unity, healing, and national development over narrow ethnic or partisan interests is crucial. Leaders must take a firm

stance against ethnic incitement and actively work to create a political culture that values unity and shared progress.

Example: Rwanda's leadership under Paul Kagame has been able to promote national reconciliation and development following the genocide. The emphasis on "Rwandan-ness" has been integral to bridging ethnic divides, though it has also faced criticism for suppressing political opposition. The potential for tribalism to undermine multiparty democracy in African countries is a very real concern, but it is not inevitable. Many countries have demonstrated that with the right political will, inclusive policies, and active efforts to promote unity, it is possible to build resilient democracies that accommodate diverse ethnic communities. By learning from the experiences of others, African nations can take proactive steps to ensure that their democratic processes are inclusive, stable, and forward-looking, creating an environment where all citizens, regardless of ethnic background, can participate meaningfully in the political and social life of the nation.

Theoretical and Practical Contribution

Both Kenya and Tanzania inherited deeply fragmented societies due to colonial policies. However, the colonial approach to ethnic groups differed significantly in each country, influencing post-independence political dynamics. In Kenya, colonial authorities promoted ethnic divisions, establishing policies that favoured certain groups over others (e.g., the Kikuyu were favoured in economic and political spheres), creating long-lasting ethnic rivalries.

In contrast, Tanzania's post-independence leader, Julius Nyerere, pursued a policy of national unity and sought to minimize ethnic divisions. Nyerere's socialist ideals of "Ujamaa" emphasized collective identity over individual ethnic or regional interests. In Kenya, the absence of a strong national identity led to the prominence of ethnic loyalty in political life. The introduction of multiparty democracy in 1992 further entrenched tribalism as political parties became more ethnically based, particularly under the leadership of figures like Daniel arap Moi.

Tanzania's post-independence policies of "Nyerereism" and national unity efforts helped to suppress ethnic identities in the early years. However, over time, as the political system evolved and multiparty elections were reintroduced in 1995, subtle ethnic cleavages began to emerge, though not to the same extent as in Kenya. The return to multiparty politics in 1992 led to a dramatic rise in ethnic-based political competition. Ethnic identities became increasingly mobilized during electoral periods, with major political parties often led by ethnic elites seeking to rally their communities. In Tanzania, the introduction of multiparty democracy in the 1990s was less disruptive to national unity, but regional political dynamics (e.g., Zanzibar's political tensions) revealed underlying ethnic and regional disparities.

In Kenya, tribalism has been a significant factor influencing political leadership and governance. Leaders often use ethnic solidarity to secure political power, leading to patronage networks that reinforce ethnic divisions. The phenomenon of "ethnic based violence" has periodically erupted during elections, particularly in 2007–2008 and 2017. Tanzania has generally avoided the worst excesses of ethnic violence seen in Kenya, but ethnic identity politics have nonetheless begun to influence electoral outcomes, especially in Zanzibar, where the major political parties are divided along ethnic and regional lines. Both countries have struggled with regional disparities and inequalities that are often linked to ethnic identities. In Kenya, historical grievances related to land distribution and economic marginalization along ethnic lines have exacerbated tensions. In Tanzania, despite efforts to promote equality, economic disparities between the mainland and Zanzibar, as well as regional disparities, have contributed to subtle ethnic and regional politics, particularly in resource-rich areas like the coast.

Over the last two decades, Kenya has seen the rise of coalition governments, where ethnic elites form alliances to win elections. This has not completely diminished tribalism, but has shifted it to a more strategic, political tool rather than an overtly violent force. In Tanzania, the legacy of Nyerere's vision of unity has helped dampen ethnic conflict, but multiparty politics have still brought latent ethnic tensions to the surface. The dominance of Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) in Tanzania's political system has helped maintain political stability, but regional competition (particularly between Zanzibar and the mainland) has remained a source of tension.

The origins and persistence of tribalism in Kenya and Tanzania's multiparty democracies are deeply rooted in their colonial histories, nation-building efforts, and the introduction of multiparty politics. While Kenya's political environment has been more susceptible to ethnic conflict due to historical divisions and competitive electoral politics, Tanzania's approach to national unity and the relative stability of its political system have largely mitigated the rise of ethnic tribalism. However, as multiparty democracy has evolved in both countries, ethnic considerations have played a growing role in the political landscape, contributing to the complex interplay of tribalism and democratic processes in East Africa.

The impact of tribalism in African politics has been a subject of considerable academic interest, especially in the context of post-colonial democracies. This paper seeks to investigate the historical origins of tribalism in two East African countries—Kenya and Tanzania—through the lens of multiparty democracy. Since both nations gained independence in 1963, they have experienced political, social, and economic shifts that have influenced the development of tribal identities and political factions.

While Kenya has often been associated with intense ethnic rivalry and political competition, Tanzania has been relatively more successful in promoting national unity and curbing ethnic fragmentation. The comparative analysis of Kenya and Tanzania provides a unique opportunity to explore how historical factors, political structures, and state policies have shaped the development of tribalism in these countries during the era of multiparty democracy (1963-2023)

Impact of Multiparty Democracy (1963-2023)

The introduction of multiparty democracy in both Kenya and Tanzania had significant implications for ethnic politics. The analysis here contrasts the evolution of multiparty systems in both countries and their relation to tribalism. In Kenya, the advent of multiparty democracy in the 1990s deepened ethnic fragmentation. The state's political landscape became heavily ethnicized, with major political parties like KANU (largely representing the Kikuyu) and the opposition parties (often representing other ethnic groups) consolidating ethnic loyalty. During the 1992, 1997, 2002, and 2007 elections, ethnic allegiances and competition for political power exacerbated tensions, culminating in the violent post-election conflicts of 2007-2008. Ethnic mobilization was used strategically by politicians to build clientelist networks and garner support during elections. This often meant that ethnic violence accompanied electoral cycles, with accusations of ethnic favoritism and the marginalization of minority groups.

Tanzania's move to a multiparty system in 1992 was relatively less disruptive to national unity compared to Kenya. The ruling CCM remained the dominant party, and while opposition parties began to emerge, the traditional Tanzanian emphasis on national unity and state control over ethnicity continued to moderate ethnic conflict. However, regional and factional competition within the ruling party and between opposition groups have still given rise to tensions, particularly in Zanzibar and in the context of corruption scandals. Tanzania's approach to multiparty politics has been marked by more controlled competition and state-sponsored efforts to mitigate ethnic divisions. Political campaigns tend to focus on regional development and economic issues rather than ethnic identity.

Comparative Analysis:

Kenya's multiparty system has led to more pronounced ethnic mobilization, particularly during election periods. Ethnicity plays a pivotal role in shaping party affiliation and political outcomes. In contrast, Tanzania's multiparty system has not seen the same degree of ethnic mobilization, as national unity has been a stronger feature of Tanzanian political culture.

Kenya's political institutions, including the electoral system and political parties, have often reinforced ethnic divisions. Tanzania's approach has been more state-centric, with policies that downplay ethnic identity in favor of national unity. However, the rise of opposition politics in both countries has led to greater ethnic competition.

Kenya's history of ethnic favoritism under Jomo Kenyatta and subsequent presidents has cemented ethnic divisions in the political system, while Tanzania's socialist policies under Nyerere helped mitigate ethnic

competition in the early years. However, the transition to multiparty politics in both countries has led to a resurgence of ethnic politics.

Policy Recommendations for Reducing Ethnic Divisions in African Democracies.

Reducing ethnic divisions in African democracies requires multifaceted, context-sensitive approaches. African nations often face complex ethnic landscapes where ethnic identities can be closely tied to political, economic, and social opportunities. This can lead to tensions and, in some cases, violent conflicts. Below are some policy recommendations aimed at reducing ethnic divisions and promoting national unity and inclusive governance:

Promote Inclusive Political Institutions

Adopt electoral systems such as proportional representation or mixed-member systems that ensure smaller ethnic groups are not marginalized in national elections. This approach can promote power-sharing arrangements and encourage coalitions between different ethnic groups. Strengthen local governance through decentralization, which gives ethnic minorities more control over their local affairs, while still maintaining national unity. In federal systems, power can be more evenly distributed across regions, which can help mitigate ethnic tensions by allowing for cultural autonomy within a larger national framework.

Foster National Identity

Promote a shared sense of national identity that transcends ethnic affiliation. Education systems, public media, and national symbols can be used to emphasize the values of inclusivity and citizenship over ethnic ties. Ensure that national holidays, symbols, and rituals reflect the diversity of ethnic groups within the country. This can help avoid the alienation of minority groups and foster a sense of shared belonging.

Implement Fair and Transparent Governance

Enact and enforce laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of ethnicity in both the public and private sectors. This includes policies to ensure equitable distribution of resources and opportunities (e.g., access to education, healthcare, employment, and land). Strengthen the judiciary to protect against ethnic favoritism and ensure that disputes related to ethnicity are resolved fairly. A robust judicial system can also protect the rights of ethnic minorities and prevent the abuse of power.

Promote Economic Equity

Design economic policies that ensure equitable distribution of resources across ethnic groups. Address disparities in access to education, employment, healthcare, and economic opportunities that disproportionately affect certain ethnic groups. Implement policies that specifically target marginalized ethnic groups in poverty alleviation programs. This could include affirmative action policies, land redistribution programs, or tailored microfinance schemes.

Encourage Inter-Ethnic Dialogue and Integration

Promote inter-ethnic dialogue through community engagement initiatives, joint development projects, and cross-cultural education programs. These programs can help break down stereotypes and build trust among different ethnic groups. Establish national or local peacebuilding commissions that include representatives from different ethnic groups to address historical grievances and work toward social cohesion. These commissions should focus on reconciliation, truth-telling, and restorative justice. Encourage media outlets to portray diverse ethnic groups positively and to avoid promoting ethnic stereotypes. Public media campaigns that highlight stories of cooperation and unity across ethnic lines can be a powerful tool in shaping public perception.

Strengthen the Rule of Law and Security

Reform security institutions (police, military, intelligence) to ensure that they are professional, ethnically diverse, and committed to upholding the law impartially. Ethnic bias in the security sector often exacerbates tensions and alienates communities. Establish community policing models that involve local ethnic communities

in the security process. This can build trust between the police and local populations, reduce ethnic bias, and prevent the politicization of security forces.

Address Historical Grievances

In post-conflict or transitional settings, establishing truth and reconciliation commissions can provide a platform for addressing past injustices, acknowledging the suffering of ethnic groups, and fostering national healing. Revise national curricula to include the diverse histories, cultures, and contributions of different ethnic groups. This can promote understanding and respect among citizens and reduce historical grievances that may fuel ethnic conflict.

Strengthen Civil Society and Political Participation

Support the development of Civil Society Organizations (CSO) that advocate for ethnic minority rights and work on issues of social justice, equality, and inclusion. CSOs can be a vital tool for raising awareness and pushing for legislative reforms that address ethnic inequalities. Ensure that ethnic minorities are included in political decision-making processes at all levels of government. This may involve affirmative action measures or quotas for underrepresented groups in legislatures or government bodies.

Engage International Support

Regional organizations like the African Union (AU) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) should play a greater role in promoting ethnic harmony and preventing conflicts by providing early warning systems and facilitating dialogue between ethnic groups. International support for democratization and conflict resolution can also help mediate tensions. International partners, including development agencies and NGOs, can provide technical assistance to help African governments build inclusive political institutions, strengthen the rule of law, and promote human rights.

Confront Ethnic Elites and Political Manipulation

One of the major sources of ethnic divisions in African democracies is the exploitation of ethnic identities by political elites to mobilize support. Policies should aim to limit the ability of political elites to manipulate ethnic divisions for personal or political gain. Political parties should be encouraged to adopt platforms that appeal to broad national interests rather than ethnic constituencies. Electoral reforms should be implemented to discourage ethnocentric political campaigns and promote the formation of cross-ethnic coalitions. Ethnic divisions in African democracies are deeply entrenched but not insurmountable. The key to reducing these divisions lies in promoting inclusive governance, economic equity, social integration, and a shared sense of national identity. It requires sustained efforts from both national governments and civil society, as well as international support. By addressing the root causes of ethnic division and fostering cooperation across ethnic lines, African countries can create more peaceful, prosperous, and unified democracies.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the historical origin of tribalism in multiparty democracy in Africa, particularly in the cases of Kenya and Tanzania, reveals a complex interplay of colonial legacies, post-independence political strategies, and socio-economic factors. Both countries, though sharing similarities in their struggles for independence and subsequent transitions to multiparty democracies, have experienced divergent paths when it comes to the role of ethnic identities in political life. Kenya's history of ethnic competition, exacerbated by colonial policies of divide and rule and post-independence political manoeuvring, has led to a more entrenched tribalism within its multiparty system. In contrast, Tanzania's more centralized approach under Julius Nyerere's leadership, emphasizing national unity and socialism, succeeded in mitigating the overt politicization of ethnicity, even though tribalism remained an underlying issue.

By comparing the two nations, it becomes evident that while the colonial history of ethnic division played a significant role in shaping post-independence political dynamics, the differing leadership approaches and state policies significantly influenced the manifestation of tribalism. In Kenya, multiparty democracy has become a

platform where ethnic identity often determines political allegiance and access to resources, whereas in Tanzania, the emphasis on collective national identity has largely suppressed overt ethnic politics. However, both countries continue to face challenges in balancing national unity with ethnic diversity. As the analysis of the period from 1963 to 2023 illustrates, the historical origin of tribalism in multiparty democracy is deeply rooted in the legacies of colonialism, but its evolution has been significantly shaped by the political choices made by the leaders and the broader socio-political context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adenya, A. (2015). Ethnic identity and political loyalty in Africa: A comparative study of Kenya and Tanzania. *African Journal of Political Science*, 35(2), 155-173. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3567423>
2. Baker, C. (2020). *Multiparty democracy and ethnic conflict in Africa: The Kenyan case*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Multiparty-Democracy-and-Ethnic-Conflict-in-Africa-The-Kenyan-Case/Baker/p/book/9780367231258>
3. Gaventa, J., & Cornwall, A. (2019). *Ethnicity, power, and democracy in Africa: Comparative perspectives*. Oxford University Press. <https://academic.oup.com/book/36233/chapter/299507548>
4. Kagwanja, P. (2018). The politics of ethnicity in post-colonial Africa: Kenya's multiparty system and its challenges. *African Political Science Review*, 23(4), 29-45. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/28314670>
5. Lal, M. (2019). *National unity and the politics of ethnicity in Tanzania: Post-independence development and political practices*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/national-unity-and-the-politics-of-ethnicity-in-tanzania/2AA4C7D48A3824E2094E632660D66B30>
6. Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Waveland Press.
7. Cohen, A. (1974). *Two-Dimensional Man: An Essay on the Anthropology of Power and Symbolism in Complex Society*. Routledge.
8. Diamond, L. (2008). *The Spirit of Democracy: The Struggle to Build Free Societies Throughout the World*. Times Books.
9. Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2000). Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity. *International Organization*, 54(4), 845-877.
10. Herbst, J. (2000). *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton University Press.
11. Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. University of California Press.
12. Lindberg, S. I., & Morrison, M. (2008). Exploring the Links Between Democracy and Development: A Comparative Analysis. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 2(4), 70-88.
13. Suberu, R. T. (2001). *Federalism and Ethnic Conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
14. Adenya, A. (2015). Ethnic Identity and Political Loyalty in Africa: A Comparative Study of Kenya and Tanzania. *African Journal of Political Science*, 35(2), 155-173. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3567423>
15. Baker, C. (2020). *Multiparty Democracy and Ethnic Conflict in Africa: The Kenyan Case*. Routledge. URL: <https://www.routledge.com/Multiparty-Democracy-and-Ethnic-Conflict-in-Africa-The-Kenyan-Case/Baker/p/book/9780367231258>
16. Gaventa, J., & Cornwall, A. (2019). *Ethnicity, Power, and Democracy in Africa: Comparative Perspectives*. Oxford University Press. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/book/36233/chapter/299507548>
17. Kagwanja, P. (2018). The Politics of Ethnicity in Post-Colonial Africa: Kenya's Multiparty System and Its Challenges. *African Political Science Review*, 23(4), 29-45. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/28314670>
18. Lal, M. (2019). *National Unity and the Politics of Ethnicity in Tanzania: Post-Independence Development and Political Practices*. Cambridge University Press. URL: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/national-unity-and-the-politics-of-ethnicity-in-tanzania/2AA4C7D48A3824E2094E632660D66B30>
19. Mbiti, J. S. (2022). *Ethnic Division and Nationhood in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Kenyan and Tanzanian Experience*. University of Nairobi Press. URL: https://www.uonpress.ac.ke/mbiti_ethnic-division_and-nationhood

20. Mugomba, E. (2021). Political Elites and Ethnic Mobilization in Africa: Case Studies from Kenya and Tanzania. *African Studies Review*, 29(3), 112-131. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2672631>
21. Nabudere, D. (2017). Ethnic Politics and State Failure in Africa: Lessons from Kenya and Tanzania. *Africa Spectrum*, 52(4), 63-81. URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/home/afr>
22. Sambala, P., & Ndlovu, C. (2018). Tribalism in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Kenya and Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 49(2), 77-98. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/afraf/article/49/2/77/3073487>
23. Shivji, I. G. (2023). *The Struggle for the Democratic Republic of Tanzania: Political Elites, Identity Politics, and State Formation*. Dar es Salaam University Press. URL: <https://www.dupress.org/book/the-struggle-for-tanzania>