Community based approach to sustainable national development: A panacea for negative ethnicity in Kenya

Asige M Lawrence, John N Kungu, Phillip K Chemelil, Vitalis A Ngore
Department of Social Studies, School of Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences and Creative Industries, Maasai Mara University, Narok, Kenya

Abstract
This paper examines the manifestation of ethnicity in Kenya and its implication for sustainable national development. It questions the resilience of devolved ethnicity in the county's political arena despite efforts to curb it. Efforts by the successive regimes to advance a national identity have proved futile as all of them have worked to exacerbate it through its exploitation and politicization. Community based approaches not only guarantee sustainable national development but present a remedy to the deeply rooted problem of negative ethnicity that has since colonial rule threatened to ravage the very foundations of Kenyan society. This study employed both the ex post facto method and philosophical reflection to generate and analyze data. The findings of the study establishes that for sustainable national development to be realized, the problem of negative ethnicity and its far-reaching effects must be addressed. It is argued that community development principles can play a critical role towards this end and thereby ensuring the achievement of sustainability in the county's national development. The paper concludes that community-based approach can help in the adoption of an all-inclusive proposition that upholds the dignity of the human person, fosters national integration and rallies the people behind their own development. The findings will be useful to policy makers, and development planners at both county and national levels and will play a critical role in addressing the social, political development challenges occasioned by tribalism in Kenya.

Keywords: colonization, ethnicity, Kenya, national development, panacea

Introduction

The term *ethnicity* is derived from Greek word '*ethnos*', which means a nation or a people (Cashmore, 1996) [4]. The term may also mean a race or group of people with common racial features and common cultural uniqueness. More succinctly, ethnicity refers to a subjective perception of common origins, historical memories, ties and perceptions [1]. It implies all those aspects associated with a culturally constructed group identity. Once consciousness of being part of an ethnic group is created, it takes on a self-preservation dimension and is passed from one generation to another. On the other hand, Nyaura (2018) [21], defined an ethnic group as those human beings or groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of migration or colonization in such a way that this belief is important for the continuance of non-kinship communal relationships.

The concept of ethnicity focuses on the ways in which social and cultural processes intersect with one another in the identification of, and interaction between, ethnic groups. However, the negative aspects appear to be overemphasized in the societies. It is for this reason that this paper may appear to overemphasize the negative connotations and their effects and its manifestation in the Kenyan society. Ethnicity can be viewed as the mobilization of groups sharing a language, culture and ancestry which is the main fulcrum around which national and local politics in Kenya revolves. Ethnic affiliation is deeply embedded inside people's consciousness and is difficult for them to break away from it (Kanyinga, 2015). Thus, it's not only the case that ethnic characterizations are socially constructed, rather,

ethnicity is natural and innate in human beings as part of their nature, which is inevitable. Every human being has a natural inclination towards identifying with other persons whom he/she share common interests, history or origin. Man's sense of belonging makes him associate with people he/she is closely related with, which results in the formation of an ethnic group with its unique and peculiar way of life.

Young (1976) [36], believes the various approaches to ethnicity are enmeshed. Hence, he argues that ethnicity involves three interactive dimensions: primordial, instrumental, and socially constructed. The elaborate quote below is apposite in capturing, although in a summation, his understanding of the concept of ethnicity;

Recent debate about ethnicity suggests that it involves three interactive dimensions: primordial, instrumental and socially constructed. Ethnic identity often involves deep emotional attachments to the group, supplies an internal gyroscope and cognitive map through which the social world is perceived, and histories of selfhood in a web of primordial cultural meanings. In everyday political and social interaction, ethnicity often appears in an instrumental guise, as a group weapon in the pursuit of material advantage; thus, its activation is contingent, situational and circumstantial. Ultimately, all identities are socially constructed, a collective product of the human imagination ... Social identities are invoked, used, and rewoven in the myriad encounters of everyday life at both the individual and group level. Combining these three perspectives, we may conclude that ethnicity rests upon a singularly potent set of symbolic resources and affective ties, but operates in a fluid and changing way in the political arena. The units of

identity are not themselves timeless, but evolve in social praxis.

According to Kasomo (2012) [11], ethnicity in itself does not connote a negative attitude. On the contrary, ethnicity indicates a nature's gift which makes us different for our mutual enrichment. He further stipulates that; ethnicity gives us our social and cultural identity as well as our security. The individuals find their roots and values in their ethnic groups. Therefore, one should not apologize for belonging to a particular ethnic community. However, the political elite have taken into account the importance of ethnicity by manipulating the masses into forming groups. In this view, ethnic groups compete through overtly ethnic parties, vying for power.

Background of Negative Ethnicity in Kenya

One of the most enduring attributes of colonial legacy in post-colonial Kenya was a sense of ethnic division that found expression not only in terms of group identity, but also became a mobilizing agent in pursuit of economic interests. This complex process of class formation intersected with attempts by the colonial regime to manage the attributes of a traditional society and its mobilization to develop a colonial capitalist market. Therefore, it is not easy to understand the ethnic incubus in Kenya's politics unless one goes back to colonial capitalism and its uneven impact on various ethnic groups. The origins of ethnic consciousness, as manifested in Kenya's political processes, lay partially in the arbitrary way in which the British colonialists based administrative boundaries and local government on cultural and linguistic lines, a decision informed by an assumption that Africans lived in tribes, so tribes must constitute the basis of colonial administration (Kasomo, 2012) [11].

Esman (2018) [7], further notes that Kenya, like most of former British colonies in Africa, was the invention of European capitalist interests, an invention which seemed to have been flawed from the start and hence was a crisis in the making because the invented territory brought together different ethnic communities, some of which had little or nothing in common culturally. Other communities were mutually hostile. This does not mean that cultural homogeneity is a *sine quo non* for political stability and national development. What can be said is that culturally diverse ethnic communities would clash unless those in authority made a deliberate effort to engender coexistence among them.

Kenya has more than 42 distinct ethnic groups. These groups *per se* do not pose a threat either to the national stability or development, since people do not fight one another simply because they have different cultural and linguistic attributes. Recurrent animosity among ethnic communities in Kenya was the result of the politicization of ethnicity. Postcolonial leaders seem to have approached ethnicity with the same intent as the colonialists, failing to infuse a national civic culture within the country's body politic because those at the center of power pursued insular, sectarian and self-serving interests. On the threshold of independence, for instance, it was a sense of nationalism, not ethnic considerations that guided some of the decisions made by nationalist politicians. In 1961, for instance, Oginga Odinga and his fellow nationalists refused to enter independence negotiations with the British colonialists until Jomo Kenyatta was released from detention. The reasoning

was that to enter negotiations while Kenyatta and others were still in detention would be tantamount to betraying the collective cause that was supposed to bind all freedom fighters irrespective of their ethnic origin (Sand brook, 1985) [26].

At the apex of Kenya's independence, ethnicity was seen to be based on regionalism with the premise that devolution of power from the major ethnic groups to the various regions would devolve power that was concentrated on the two groups, that is the Kikuyu and Luo communities (Ochieng, 1989) Resources, especially land, that was recovered from the British colonial settlers was granted to the Kikuyu for resettlement. This unequal distribution of resources-built resentment and created infrastructure inequalities within the country and the initial victims became the perpetuators of the structural violence. Furthermore, this aggravated alienation of the members of other ethnic groups which led to regional disparities in terms of distribution of resources, which further fanned negative ethnicity (Nyaura, 2018) [21]. The art of grouping Africans into tribes was perfected by establishment of the *East African Protectorate Ordinance and Regulation* of 1904 which authorized the creation of reserves. The Ordinance mandated the Governor to remove Africans from a District declared as closed area.

The policy of African reserve was to limit the quantity of land held by Africans. By limiting the land and the knowledge available to Africans in the reserves, Protectorate land policies induced them to leave the reserves for employment as wage earners on European farms (Rutten & Ombongi, 2005) [25]. It can be argued that the establishment of reserves contained Africans into a certain locality that limited their access to factors of production. This violated the Indigenous People's subsistence economy, identity, and customary ways of life. The British also established the African Reserves-designed to confine the natives within specific settlements to supply cheap labour to settlers' farms [1]. Kenyan natives thus became construction sites in which the colonial authorities reconstructed identities. Native groups were turned into active agents of hatred and mistrust.

It is worth noting that the penetration of colonial capital and British settlement in Kenya destabilized the natives' subsistence livelihood, leading to a nation-wide anti-colonial insurgency between 1952 and 1960 (Elkins, 2005) [6]. While this insurgency dominated the Mount Kenya region of Kikuyu ethnic group, there were other pockets of rebellion around the country. Examples of such insurgencies include the 1895-1905, Nandi uprising and the 1913-1914, Giriama revolt. Organization of these tribal revolts was followed by formation tribal movements that acted as a platform of tribal politics. They were meant to air grievances of the affected communities. For example, these agitations were led by young educated Africans who formed ethnic based and political movements that advocated for the return of African land and opposed paying of taxes. Among the political movements formed were: Young Kikuyu Association (YKA) by Harry Thuku in 1920, Kikuyu Central Association (KCA) formed in 1924, Kavirondo Tax Payers and Welfare Association (KTWA) emerged as Young Kavirondo Association in 1921 in Western Kenya, Ukamba Members Association (UMA) formed in 1938, Taita Hills Association 1939 and Coast African Association (CAA) formed in 1943 (Markhan, 1969) [18]. These political movements acted as foundation of tribal politics.

In 1952, the colonial governor, Sir Evelyn Baring declared a state of emergency in colonial Kenya. Declaration of the state of emergency was meant to curb the Mau Mau insurgency, which was a threat to the British colonial economy in Kenya. The colonial government used airpower to suppress the insurgency and spread propaganda by dropping leaflets and photos of mutilated bodies depicting the Mau Mau as brutal, inhumane and irrational savages. The state of emergency was characterized by massive impunity and human rights abuses (Elkins & Anderson, 2005) [6]. The settlers exercised extreme brutalities on suspects to force them to renounce their oaths and allegiance to Mau Mau and pledge their loyalty to the British Queen.

Such brutalities included rape and sodomy, huts being soaked with paraffin and then torched, cutting off men's scrotum, squeezing testicles between blunt objects, slicing off people's ears, inserting pins in people's buttocks and finger nails, drilling holes in people's eardrums, slow electrocution, burning native's eardrums with cigarette butts, clamping and cutting off native people's fingers, as well as the use of execution, public hanging, strangling, and dragging the victims on the ground (Elkins & Anderson, 2005) [6].

The colonial state employed several key military operations that fought against the Mau Mau. For example, the 1954 Operation Anvil was planned to wipe out all Kikuyu, Embu and Meru in Nairobi, which was their main operational zone. Massive arrests were made, and those captured were confined in barbed wire enclosures, followed by screening and detention (Ochieng, 2002) [22]. It is vivid that the colonial state employed ethnic preferential treatment that nurtured a privileged center of loyalists and a disgruntled periphery of rebels. The loyalists became the beneficiaries of the preferential system while the Mau Mau fighters and their sympathizers were marginalized [3]. The colonial authorities used a system of costs and benefits, which rewarded the loyalists and punished the rebels. Colonial authorities nurtured identity formations by rewarding the loyalists and dispossessing, humiliating, and exploiting the Mau Mau and their sympathizers. To perfect the administration of divide and rule, colonial authorities shunned national political parties such as Kenya African Union (KAU) and endorsed ethnic political parties such as Baluhya Political Union (BPU), Kalenjin Political Alliance (KPA), Maasai United Front (MUF), and Luo United Movement (LUM), among others (Mazrui, 2009) [19].

Attainment of Kenya's independence was without doubt a historic moment. Kenya's new dispensation and future were thrust upon a new leadership. Jomo Kenyatta became the first president of the republic. There was hope that the distribution of resources would no longer be skewed and land which was the core of the Mau Mau war would be redistributed to the majority of Kenyans who were poor and had suffered under the impoverishing and dehumanizing yoke of colonialism (Oyugi, Wanyande & Odhaimbo-Mbai, 2003) [31]. At independence, the Kenyatta government was determined to fight the underlying problems of Poverty, disease and ignorance that faced the country. However, in 1963 the leading political parties, the Kenya African National Union (KANU) and the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU), became amalgams of ethnic groups. Kenyatta used an ethnic cabal to consolidate power in the office of the president and marginalized his erstwhile liberation colleagues such as Oginga Odinga (Throup, 2003)

[29]. To stave off opposition both the Kenyatta and Moi conveniently imposed a one-party government on the pretext that it was necessary for the promotion of national unity and nation-building.

As a result, Kenyatta, in cahoots with a clique of politicians with ethnic inclinations, interfered with the doctrine of separation of powers by emasculating the judiciary and legislature and creating an imperial presidency. Most of the politicians who wielded political and economic power hailed from the Kikuyu community to which he belonged. This regime regularly changed the constitution in pursuit of unbridled power. The net effect was the creation of a presidential behemoth that resulted in a one-party dictatorship. Between 1963 and 1978 the constitution was amended numerous times with the express object of consolidating power in the presidency (Ogot & Ochieng, 1995). At the peak of independence, the Cold War played a significant role in the ethnicization of politics in Kenya in the 1960's. It can also be argued that this period experienced tense moments of the Cold War between the Americans and its allies on one side and the Soviets and its allies on the other. Oginga Odinga and the Luo's were branded as communists while Kenyatta and GEMA were pro-capitalists. The Kenyatta regime went to an extent of showing how Jaramogi was using scholarships offered by the Soviet Union as a camouflage strategy of exporting men for a military training. Majority of those taken were from the Luo tribe and some few from other tribes (Himbara, 1994).

On the other hand, the Kenyatta government organized Kikuyus into groups and co-operatives as indicated above to fundraise with the intention of buying land. Members of other tribes were not organized with the intention of buying land especially in the Rift Valley and Coast. This was again confirmed by the way Kenyatta just like the British colonial administration in Kenya preferred to give senior positions in government to whites. In the case of Kenyatta almost all key areas in government were occupied by members of the Kikuyu tribe. Under Kenyatta the exercise of political power was so informal that the line dividing the then ruling party, KANU, and an ethnic grouping called the Gikuyu, Embu, Meru Association (GEMA) was invisible (Himbara, 1994). Under Kenyatta, KANU was almost moribund as a functioning political party, making it easy for the GEMA association to supplant it as the de facto ruling party and to dominate Kenya's business and political landscape with abandon. Ethnicization and mobilization of political parties have continued to cause ethnic animosities, antagonism, and violence in post-colonial Kenya.

The formation of GEMA became a formidable force within the ruling party between 1971 and 1976. This was an attempt to bring the Kikuyu, the Embu and the Meru together under one umbrella of leadership and structure. This was a move to consolidate their social, cultural and economic advantage following the attainment of political independence in Kenya. GEMA had an economic agency, GEMA Holdings Ltd which was incorporated late in 1973. The organization went on to amass a lot of wealth discriminately (Karimi & Ochieng, 1980). Oginga Odinga went ahead to form a political party that was not taken kindly by Kenyatta and his close confidants and associates majorly from the GEMA tribes. A narrative was developed, that Oginga Odinga and the Luos wanted to take over power from the GEMA by force. They would not allow this

because it was felt and believed that they deserved to lead Kenya by virtue of their suffering during the Mau Mau war against the British colonial occupation of the country. This exacerbated ethnic feelings in Kenya. The other communities especially those that supported KADU perceived that the KANU government did not think about their interests. They also thought that GEMA and Luos were the only ones managing the affairs of the country at their exclusion (Ochieng, 2002) [22].

After the death of Kenyatta in 1978, Moi took over. Moi came to power amid a lot of power intrigues and jostling among the Kikuyu senior politicians and civil servants commonly referred to as the Kiambu Mafia. One section of the Kikuyu politicians wanted the presidency to remain under a Kikuyu man. Another section preferred Moi so that they could remove him forcibly through a coup or a vote of no confidence in parliament as a result of incompetence caused by low education (Ocheing, 2002). Other non-GEMA communities observed that Kenyatta had consolidated power by having people from Mount Kenya region in key positions in the cabinet and the civil service. That is when the concept of negative ethnicity gained a lot of prominence. Each community perceived state politics as competition of access to resources and other development privileges. Each tribe yearned for a day where a member of their tribe would acquire state power especially the presidency so that they could empower themselves and develop their regions (Tamarkin, 1985). The balkanization of regions in Kenya into "tribal units" worsened during Moi's era. Ethnic dictatorship and ethicizing government and politics in Kenya pervaded in the entire 24 years of Moi's rule (Kioli, 2012) [14].

The year 1982 marked a turning point in his administration after an attempted coup. Moi became insecure especially in trusting members of the Kikuyu and Luo tribes. This was because members of these tribes especially politicians, a section of junior military officers and senior civil servants who could be said to be remnants of the Kenyatta regime had organized it. He began to develop some phobia against these communities. That is when he changed his mode of leadership by trusting majorly members of his Kalenjin tribesmen, the Somali, Kamba, Luhya and other minority tribes. This infuriated the Kikuyu and Luo communities because they felt sidelined by the government. Resources and political privileges were now skewed majorly in favour of the Kalenjin of Rift-valley and the smaller tribes mentioned above (Wrong, 1991). As a result, the Kikuyu formed clandestine groups like the *Mwakenya* that enjoyed a lot of support from University of Nairobi students.

Mwakenya movement and other agitation groups from all over the country became a thorn in the flesh of the Moi government. Detention without trial became the order of the day (Kinyatti, 2014) [13]. Those who were detained at this time became additions to those who were detained after the failed coup of 1982 (Kinyatti, 2014) [13]. Meanwhile Moi continued to concentrate the Kalenjin in the armed forces (the military, the regular police, Administration Police and prison warders) and the Somali in the Provincial Administration. In order to firmly consolidate power, some Kalenjin politicians like Nicholas Biwott, Henry Kosgei and Ezekiel Barngetuny became so powerful and rich. This cemented perception by other communities that indeed power is used to the advantage of members of your tribe and

allies in terms of regional development and personal enrichment (Southwall, 1998) [28].

Resources and state power continued to develop some perceptions that attracted ethnic emotions. At the forefront was the issue of land. "Land allocation became an explicit political artifact". Those who were close to Moi were allocated land in the Coast, the Rift-valley and Nairobi. The Rift –valley situation can be described as "the theatre of the absurd." This was because the Moi regime incited the "indigenous" residents to fight for the "liberation" of their ancestral lands (Esman, 2018) [7]. This was in reference to communities that were settled by Kenyatta just after independence (the Kikuyu) and others who bought land on private capacity or those rewarded by the Moi regime by being given land especially in Trans Nzoia District.

According to Kioli (2012) [14], majority of those rewarded were political allies and senior military officers. This situation came into being because the Kikuyus in the larger Rift-valley did not support Moi's re-election especially in 1992 and 1997 after the removal of section 2(A) of the constitution that allowed multi-partyism to be practiced again in the country. The displacement of "immigrants" or "alien communities" would have enabled the achievement of two objectives. Firstly, the reduction of opposition votes in the Rift-valley and the cementing of support for Moi by the re-allocation of abandoned lands to the Kalenjin. Kioli (2012) [14] further established that propaganda had been hatched in the region that Kikuyus were settled there free of charge by Kenyatta. And due to the exponential population increase by the Kalenjin, leaders found it easy to incite them that their shortage of land was as a result of Kikuyu settlement.

The problem was further complicated by the government's decision to excise forest lands in the pretext of settling the landless Ogiek, Kikuyus and Kalenjins of the Rift-valley. Environmentalists and civil society movements opposed this. Coincidentally leaders and founders of these organizations were members of the Kikuyu and Luo tribes. A good example is Wangari Maathai of the Greenbelt Movement (a Kikuyu). Politicians from the Kalenjin community used this as evidence of Kikuyu interference and blockage of their re-settlement. This fanned bitter sentiments by the Kalenjin against Kikuyus. These feelings and perceptions have not been reversed since the 1990s given the fact that the Ndung'u Report and the Truth Justice and Reconciliation Commission have not been released to the public (Kanyinga, 2014) [10].

Arguably, Luos have never been happy since the fallout between Jaramogi Odinga and Kenyatta in the late 1960s. Since then, the community has often felt sidelined by successive governments by being branded "an opposition community". As earlier noted, the Kalenjin and Agikuyu have equally stigmatized the Luo as a "bother" when Kenyatta, Moi, Kibaki and Uhuru Kenyatta have been in power (KHRC, 2018) [12]. This has continuously maintained ethnic politics and exclusion in Kenya. This was also used to deny development to regions that were deemed "opposition zones" by the regime. Poverty levels in these regions were higher than other pro-regime regions. From the above discussion, it is clear that political orientation determined development levels based on ethnicity.

The promulgation of the 2010 constitution was aimed at solving the ethnic and development questions in Kenya. After ten years of implementation, it emerged that the

constitution was unable to address them. It was highly anticipated that devolution would mitigate the perception of presidency being used to reward ethnicity but that was not the case. Presidency continued to rally ethnic sentiments as was witnessed in the 2017 general elections (Esman, 2018) [7]. Devolution also became a focal point of practicing ethnic exclusion in development. In majority of the counties, positions were given to members of the dominant tribes or clans. Ethnic exclusion was now exported to the grassroots (Clotte, 2020) [5]. From the above observations, it is clear that the problem of negative ethnicity and development in Kenya need to be relooked at.

Methodology
This paper used a desk top research design to critically review various studies on ethnicity and national development in Kenya. The ex post facto method was utilized to trace the historical roots and development of the problem of negative ethnicity and its implications for sustainable development. The paper also employed philosophical reflection in its various techniques to analyze how negative ethnicity has affected the social, economic and political dimension of the Kenyan society and thereby undermining national development (Oduor, 2020). The approaches have been used to further illustrate how ethnicity has been developed since independence and how it has led to uneven distribution of national resources thereby marginalizing the citizens socially, economically and politically and thus impeding sustainable national development in Kenya.

Ethnicity and Sustainable National Development
National development as the ability of a country to improve the social welfare of the people, is an inward-looking process which targets the satisfaction of local population. It is a holistic approach to development, a continuous process in which progressive positive changes in material (quantitative) and non-material (qualitative) requirements of a people are discernible (Were & Amutabi, 2000). Arguably, national development is an ideal and preferred condition, a panacea to the people's social, economic and political quagmire (Otieno & Nyaburi, 2019) [24]. Ethnicity can be a blessing or a curse to national development. When ethnic diversity is positively utilized it can guarantee growth. Negative ethnicity on the other hand is but an impediment to the development of society.

In the case of developing nations which are multi ethnic in nature, such as Kenya, sustainable national development is of prime importance for a number of reasons. First, it ensures appropriate allocation of scarce resources so that equitable development is realized within available means. Secondly, the diversity of ethnic groups in most of them calls for a coordinated attempt at satisfaction of the peoples desires in aggregate so that they can feel as integral citizens of their country (Magaga & Ogalo, 2012) [17]. Satisfaction of the people's desires reinforces nationality and instills a sense of unity and pride among the populace and legitimacy to the incumbent government. Thirdly, a national approach is essential as it ensures no ethnic group is left out of the mainstream development process. In addition to that, regional and ethnic disparities may lead to regional and ethnic conflicts which are a hindrance to national development. Although they eventually require a regional planning approach by dictating the flow of national

resources to depressed areas. They are better pre-empted if approached through a national context because a deliberate national policy would ensure that certain areas are not left out of the development process. Finally, a national approach allows for the planning of national development in consideration of available political, human and cultural resources in Kenya (Were & Amutabi, 2000)

The central thesis of developmentalism is that social change occurs according to a pre-established pattern, the logic and direction of which are known (Venkatasammy, 2015). Ideally, national development is based on the unique cultural bedrock of a nation. The socio-political and economic advancement and improvement of a nation are expected to arise from cultural accommodation because culture is an expression of national aspirations and achievements. Kenya provides a good case study of how ethnicity and politics have impacted on national development and more importantly the unequal distribution of resources (Yieke, 2010). Presidents Kenyatta and Moi presided over discriminatory regimes in which dissenting leaders and their ethnic groups were subjected to economic deprivation that saw major infrastructural projects carried out in regime-friendly regions. But this did not result in significant economic developments in regime-friendly regions including those that produced the presidents since the infrastructure developments were of a substandard quality and were marred by scandals, yet more infrastructural developments were promised during presidential campaigns.

Bayart (1993), developed the argument that when states are seized by an ethnic group, upward mobility is preserved for members of such ethnic groups who end up using state machinery and protection in pursuit of self-interest instead of national development. In the case of Kenya, an overzealous pursuit of self-interest led to the loss of trillions of Shillings in major corruption scandals like Anglo Leasing, Goldenberg, Grand Regency, Triton, and Kemsa-Covid scandal to mention but a few. Interestingly, ethnicity has prevented the individuals involved from facing criminal prosecutions and many of them are still walking free, bathing in ill-gotten wealth (NCIC, 2012). Such individuals have often used the ethnic card in their defense claiming that their ethnic groups are being targeted ironically in scandals where the members of the groups had little or no benefits.

The establishment of devolved governments has become synonymous with devolved corruption as political leaders together with their cronies in the county governments misappropriate public funds for personal gains. County executives have engaged in the overpricing of equipment like wheelbarrows and pens as well as infrastructure projects (KHRC, 2018) [12]. In ethnic homogenous counties, nepotism is rife while in heterogeneous counties, ethnicity has taken over. In essence, the national government together with county governments have merged to form a rapacious state where nepotism and ethnic identities are used as benchmarks in the awarding of tenders and state contracts, this has done a blow to national development.

However, with the establishment of the Office of the Auditor General under the new constitutional dispensation, a number of scandals and misappropriation have been revealed to the public. There have also been pockets of good practices in which county governments have endeavored to provide essential services to the locals. A good case in point

is Makueni County which was given a clean bill of health in 2018 with regards the proper utilization of county funds. Other counties, especially in the former North Eastern province, that were initially marginalized, have also endeavored to provide the much-needed essential infrastructure and services. In short, there have been significant improvements in various sectors like health, education, and industry in regions that had been previously neglected.

Even though the situation is slowly changing as a result of a historical handshake that gave rise to the Building Bridges Initiative (BBI), the public and private sectors are still dominated by members of ethnic groups allied to the top political leadership. The impact of such dominance of politics and economy by a small number of ethnic groups has resulted in the ethnicization of public institutions and enterprises as evident in the National Cohesion and Integration (NCIC) reports of 2012. The report has often painted a grim picture of ethnicization of public service, four out of 42 ethnic groups in Kenya sat in 58% of the positions in the public sector. Corruption, little or no accountability, blatant disregard of merits and impunity become tolerated because of ethnic cronyism in the public sector.

Community Based Approach to National Development
Socrates, the ancient Greek philosopher, set the agenda of reflectively questioning common beliefs and explanations carefully distinguishing those beliefs that are reasonable and logical from those which, however appealing, may be to our native ethnocentrism, even if they serve our vested interests, may lack adequate rational foundation to warrant our belief (Lewis & Chris, 2008) [16]. The deeply rooted problem of negative ethnicity, what Francis Bacon refers to as the idol of the tribe, is a real intoxication of the minds of the citizenry and should be subjected to rational analysis and appropriate action taken to pave way for national integration and by extension sustainable development in Kenya.

A Community based approach is an anthropocentric proposition to development and its related concerns. It calls for social action, which gives individuals and groups the opportunity to take action and address social, economic and political issues affecting communities (Weitz, Carlson, Nilsson & Skanberg, 2017) This is a continuous effort to establish solutions that benefit the community and enact collective action to empower individuals and agencies to support and improve the lives of vulnerable communities (Bhattacharyya, 2004) [2] Community development has been identified as a core perspective in working with disenfranchised and marginalized communities faced with broad social issues resulting from unjust policies and planning at global, national, state and local levels. The failure of neo-liberal policies and the social democratic welfare state in meeting human needs has become evident in the last four decades and the current 21st century where widening gaps between the rich and poor, an increase in hunger, poverty, crime and social unrest is evident in most of the world.

Arguably, in Kenya, community development approaches can promote conflict mitigation efforts by propagating values of democratic life like tolerance, moderation, compromise and respect for opposing points of view (Le Blanc, 2015) [15]. Community based approaches can promote platforms for strengthening democracy in actions by

providing new diverse forms of interests and solidarity for sustainable national development. Arguably, this approach can help in addressing the development challenges related to negative ethnicity so as to foster social cohesion, national integration and ultimately sustainable national development in the country. Community based approach is operationalized through entrenching its key principles, namely, the principles of human orientation, ownership, participation, empowerment and sustainability.

The Principle of Human Orientation
To address the problem of negative ethnicity which is a threat to sustainability in Kenya, people must be at the center of their development. Development efforts must first of all be about human persons and be seen to be aimed at addressing their physical and abstract needs by significantly promoting their self-esteem, self-reliance and human dignity in general. Human dignity is promoted when people are recognized as capable of making their own decisions and taking responsibility for the same (Shahazalal & Hassan, 2019) [27]. Involving all ethnic communities meaningfully in the development agenda leads to the attainment of the abstract needs. These in return fosters a sense of belonging and ownership which enhances sustainability. This approach elevates the focus on development agenda over and above the trivialities of negative ethnicity and liberates the process from the idol of the tribe. It has great potential of de-ethicizing Kenya and in effect promote a cohesive, resilient and tolerant nation.

The Principle of Ownership
Promoting a sense of ownership is indeed one of the ways of fostering human security. In this case, communal property is the extent to which the individuals in question identify with what is owned and it is usually determined by the degree of ownership that the community claims for itself (Franck & Rainer, 2012). The principle of ownership dictates that members are actively involved in process of development, from initiation to implementation. This principle promotes self-determination, awareness and collective action as key tenets of cohesive societies (Shahazalal & Hassan, 2019) [27]. The principle can be used to promote bottom–up strategies that are aimed at facilitating social transformation in Kenya. This would in effect foster sustainability.

Neglecting communities in this process and a skewed approach to development has only increased the gap of inequality, resulting into regional disparities which have often led to regional conflicts, a factor that has undermined sustainable national development in Kenya. These inequalities have brought about the notion that a tribe that ascends to power makes it easier for the people from a given region to benefit more on matters of employment amongst other needs of the society. This has negated the spirit of universalism and promoted egocentrism. The thrust of this paper is to establish how ownership as a community-based approach can be utilized in order to promote social cohesion and national integration for sustainable national development in Kenya.

At the center of any development initiative or discourse, people must own the process from beginning to the end (Franck & Rainer, 2012). In Kenya, development has largely been top down as opposed to bottom-up process; which would enable people to identify, plan for and own development initiatives. Ethnicization of development in

Kenya since independence has exacerbated polarization of the many ethnic groups. Ethnicity in Kenya has promoted corruption, embezzlement of resources, skewed development, ethnic nationalism and ethnocentrism which are against the spirit of cohesion in Kenya.

Ethnicization of politics in Kenya has however promoted 'negative form of ownership' where certain tribes feel more entitled to power and resources than others. The election cycle in Kenya is marred with betrayal and violence. This form of ownership has widened poverty levels, inequality in the development of certain areas in Kenya and heightened corruption and insubordination in the country (KHRC, 2018) [12]. As a panacea towards inclusion, social cohesion and national integration, Kenyans need a country where credible election process can take place where democratic institutions are well managed, supported and nurtured. In regard to the above, people can only own and have confidence in such institutions if credibility is enhanced and adopted. There is also need to provide roles for various stakeholders in the operationalization of the national cohesion and integration process and establish how these stakeholders can be mobilized to play their roles effectively and efficiently.

The Principle of Participation
Public participation is one of the fundamental national values and principles of governance articulated in article ten of the 2010 constitution of Kenya, alongside sustainable development. According to the World Bank, community participation has developed as one of the major channels of development especially related to local community development initiatives and viewed as a basis for local success. Participatory community development process provides an opportunity to the marginalized of the society to be included in the process of gaining power for improving their standard of living. Participation is involvement by a local population and, at times, additional stakeholders in the creation, content and conduct of a program or policy designed to change their lives (Jennings, 2000) [9].

Participation provides the decision-making process with a people-oriented approach to effect a two-way top-down and bottom-up communication process. This in effect, discourages alienation of majority and promotes social integration for sustainable development. Public participation thus discourages the ivory-tower mentality in development planning. It rather entails three societal processes: firstly, is the involvement of the people in the decision-making process; secondly, the eliciting of the contribution to development programs, and thirdly their participation in the sharing of benefits from the development process (Were & Amutabi, 2000). This in effect entrenches and helps in fostering ownership and sustainability. Moreover, participatory development involves local decision making and capacities to exercise and characterize the nature of an intrusion [3].

Accordingly, decision-making needs to be informed by indigenous values, concerns and environment for it to be sustainable and applicable. A people-oriented participatory approach is key for sustainable development since it creates constituency and legitimacy (Ndegwa, 1994) [20]

Participation enables one to gain a sense of belonging, feeling respected and valued for who they are. It engages each individual and makes them feel valued and it is essential to the success of a group or country. Participation

enables people to be treated in equal measure in society irrespective of their tribe.

Inadequate participation by the people in the development affairs of their country has exacerbated unequal distribution of resources, built resentment and created infrastructural inequalities within the country and the initial victims of the same have become the perpetuators of structural violence. Furthermore, this has aggravated alienation of the members of different ethnic affiliations and has led to regional disparities in terms of distribution of resources, which have been further aggravated by negative ethnicity (Kanyinga, 2014) [10]. Participation in development spheres should be used as a force behind involving all people regardless of their ethnic group, social class, and religion amongst other parameters. This would in effect mitigate negative ethnicity with its resultant negative effect of ethnic tensions, horizontal and vertical inequalities for sustainable development in Kenya.

The Principle of Sustainability
Globally, sustainability is a practice where human needs and actions are addressed in a way that is environmentally friendly and stable. It is a process basically concerned with addressing the community's current and future needs for long-term. This principle upholds values and enhances people's ability to have control over their lives and destiny. The process encourages people to meet their needs and aspirations in a self-aware and informed way which takes advantage of their skills, experience and potential (Weitz, Carlson, Nilsson & Skanberg, 2017). This principle can be embedded into community action plans in order to promote cohesive and tolerant societies thus addressing the problem of negative ethnicity towards the realization of national development in Kenya.

For the principle of sustainability to suffice, the Government and the people of Kenya need to encourage national cohesion and integration by shunning discrimination on ethnic grounds in all its forms and make a decisive move to promote inclusivity and social cohesion. Ultimately, for sustainable national development to be realized in Kenya, community development principles can play a critical role in addressing negative ethnicity and its impeding effects. Adopting an all-inclusive approach that upholds the dignity of the human person, fosters national integration and rallies the people behind their own development (Caselli, 2012) [3].

Conclusion
This paper examined the concept of ethnicity and the impact of ethnic consciousness on national development. It has been argued that while Kenya has made substantial progress in its development agenda, sustainable national development remains but a dream in the pipeline. The study established that the problem of negative ethnicity is deeply rooted in Kenyan history and has been a major impediment to the realization of sustainable national development. It has demonstrated how community-based approaches can mitigate against such effects and promote sustainable national development in the country.

The paper advances the notion that multi- ethnicity should not be a stumbling block to national cohesion and progressive development, but it could serve to the advantage of the nation and foster national development in the country. Ethnicity becomes a bane when there is willful marginalization of certain ethnic groups due to the

politicization of ethnicity by self-aggrandizing political elites who stir up ethnic emotions in a bid to capture and retain political power. It is postulated that Kenya can achieve sustainable national development by empowering its citizens with the knowledge of the benefits of ethnic diversity and by fostering inclusivity and a sense of belonging (nationalism).

References

1. Bayart JF. State in Africa. London. New York: New. Longman, 1993.
2. Bhattacharyya J. Theorizing Community Development Community Development,2004:34(2):5-34.
3. Caselli F, Coleman WJ. On the Theory of Ethnic Conflict. London: Westview Press, 2012.
4. Cashmore E. Dictionary of Race and Ethnic Relations. London: Rutledge, 1996
5. Clotte P. *"Human Rights Official Says Kenyans Want an Accountable Government"*. VOA. Archived from the Original on 20 December 2009. Retrieved 18 December 2020. East African Educational Publishers Ltd, 2002.
6. Elkins C. Imperial *Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya*. New York: Hennry Holt and Company Media, 2005.
7. Esman J. Ethnic Politics. (Ithaca: European Review of Applied Sociology,2018:11(16).
8. Franck R, Rainer I. "Does the Leader's Ethnicity Matter? Ethnic Favoritism, Education, and Health in Sub-Saharan Africa". American Political Science Review,2010:106(2).
9. Jennings N. Participatory Development and Managing Water Supply and Sanitation in Emergencies: Oxford, University Press, 2000.
10. Kanyinga K. The Democracy and Political Participation: A Review by Afrimap Open Society Initiative for Eastern Africa and the Institute for Development Studies (IDS), University of Nairobi: Open Society Foundations, 2014.
11. Kasomo D. Historical Manifestation of Ethnocentrism and its Challenges Today. Maseno University Journal,2012:1:32-41.
12. KHRC. Ethnicity and Politicization in Kenya, Nairobi, 2018.
13. Kinyatti M. *Mwakenya: The Unfinished Revolution*. Nairobi, the *Mau Mau* Research Centre, 2014.
14. Kioli FN. Ethnicity: The Legacy of Kenyan Politics from Colonial to Post-colonial Era. Maseno. Kitching. G. Class and Economic change in Kenya: The Making of an African Petite, 2012.
15. Le Blanc. "Towards Integration at Last? The Sustainable Development Goals as a Network of Targets". Sustainable Development, 2015, 23,
16. Lewis V, Chris M. The Power of Critical Thinking. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2008.
17. Magaga N, Ogalo W. "Devolved Ethnicity in the Kenya: Social, Economic and Political Perspective." European Review of Applied Sociology,2012:11(16):17-26.
18. Markhan S. History of Kenya's Trade Union movement to 1952. Nairobi: East African Publishing House, 1969.
19. Mazrui A. Conflicts in Africa. An overview. In A. Nhema & P. Zeleza (Eds.), the Roots of Miguel Tribe or Nation? Nation Building and Public Goods in Kenya versus Tanzania. World, 2009.
20. Ndegwa S. "Civil society and political change in Africa: The case of NGOs in Kenya" in, International Journal of Commonwealth Studies, 1994, 35(1-2).
21. Nyaura JE. Devolved Ethnicity in Kenya: Social, Economic and Political Perspective. In, European Review of Applied Sociology, 2018, 11(16).
22. Ochieng W. Historical Studies and Social Change in Western Kenya. Nairobi: East African Publishers, 2002.
23. Oduor M, Reginald J. "Research Methodology in Philosophy with an Interdisciplinary and Commercialized Africa Context: Guarding Against Undue Influence from the Social Sciences." *Thought and Practice*, a Journal of the Philosophical Association of Kenya, 2010, 2(1).
24. Otieno K, N Nyaburi N. "Ethnicity and Politics in Kenya's Turbulent Path to Democracy and Development", in Journal of Social Policy Conferences, 76:159-180, Politics,2019:56(3):327-62.
25. Rutten M, K Ombongi K. Kenya: Pre-colonial, Nineteenth century. (New York: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2005.
26. Sandbrook R. The Politics of African Economic Stagnation. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1985.
27. Shahzalal D, Hassan A. "Communicating sustainability: using Community Media to Influence Rural People's Intention to Adopt Sustainable Behavior". Sustainability,2019:11(3):812.
28. Southwall R. "Moi's Flawed Mandate: The Crisis Continues in Kenya". Review of African Political Economy, 1998, 25-75.
29. Throup D. Multi-Party Politics in Kenya: The Kenyatta and Moi States and the triumph *to NARC*. Nairobi, Kenya: Heinrich Boll Foundation, 2003.
30. Venkatasammy. "Ethnic Conflict and Development in Africa" in *Transience*, 2015, 6.
31. Wanyande P, Odhiambo C. (Eds.). The Politics of transition in Kenya: From KANU to NARC. Nairobi. Kenya, 2003.
32. Weitz. "Towards systemic and contextual priority setting for implementing the 2030 agenda". *Sustainability Science*, 2017, 13(2).
33. Were E, Maurice A. Nationalism and Democracy for People Centered Development in Africa. Eldoret: Moi University Press, 2000.
34. Wrong M. It is our Turn to Eat: The Story of a Kenyan Whistle Blower. Nairobi: Harper Perennial, 2009.
35. Yieke F. Discourse, Ethnic Identity and Violence in Kenya: The Case of the 2007 General Elections. In Rudolf de Cillia, Helmut Gruber, Michał Krzyżanowski, Florian Menz (eds.), 2010.
36. Young C. The Politics of Cultural Pluralism. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976, 467-8.