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Abstract

Even though the German political foundations were the first international institutions to work in the field of political party development, remarkably little is known about the concepts, goals, strategies and results of their activities in post-authoritarian states and ‘new’ democracies. Although the ‘golden age’ of mass parties in modern western democracies is now part of history as “in each of the long established European democracies, without exception, the absolute numbers of members have now fallen” (Mair and van Biezen 2001:6) the German political foundations’ party assistance still refers to this type of political party. While internal party democracy still seems to be an important component of especially European parties, most of the party leadership of the so-called ‘new’ democracies refuse to democratize the internal decision-making process in their respective parties.

In the current research about party organization and democracy promotion (Burnell 2000; Carothers 2006), party assistance has not been an issue for a long time. Hence, we do not know much about the effect of party assistance on the internal party democracy of political parties in post-authoritarian states. Therefore, by concentrating on the party assistance of the two German foundations Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) in Kenya and South Africa, this paper addresses three types of questions:

- How institutionalized are political parties in Kenya and South Africa and what opportunities do they offer their party members to participate in the internal decision-making process?
- What are the outcomes of party assistance by the German political foundations?
- How can the party assistance of the German political foundations be developed further?
Introduction

„Strategies to establish and consolidate democracy that ignore the central role of parties cannot hope to be successful, no matter how much attention they pay to other vital matters such as building civil society and the institutions of good governance“

(Burnell 2004:6)

In fact, the German political foundations’ party assistance is underdeveloped – there are rarely departments to develop consistent concepts for a sustainable party assistance, or a budget for this position. Moreover, there are neither country-reports nor instruments that measure the influence of international party assistance on the development of internal party democracy empirically (Erdmann 2006; Burnell 2008).

This paper argues that it is crucial that party assistance draws on the level of party institutionalization (Basedau/Stroh 2008; Randall/Svåsand 2002) to have an impact on political party development and the parties’ internal party democracy. Against the background of this hypothesis and based on empirical research in Kenya and South Africa¹, this paper analyses

• the party institutionalization and the opportunities that political parties in Kenya and South Africa offer their members to participate in the internal decision-making process as well as

• the party assistance of the German foundations concerning the development of internal party democracy in Kenya and South Africa.

The paper follows the assumption, that the higher the level of party institutionalization the higher their impact on the democratic transition (Mainwaring/Scully 1995; Sandbrook 1996; Merkel 1997; Randall/Svåsand 2002a; Basedau/Stroh 2008)² (recognizing that there is to some extent an interdependence between party institutionalization and the level of

¹ The author conducted qualitative research and interviews with the executives of the ‘Party Assistance’ and ‘Sub-Saharan Africa’ divisions of KAS and FES in Bonn/Berlin (Germany) as well as with former resident representatives. In Kenya and South Africa interviews have been conducted with the resident representatives of KAS and FES, party members and members of the National Executive Committees, members of the Parliamentary Groups as well as representatives of the youth and women leagues of the political parties which are supported by KAS and FES. Moreover NGOs and cooperation partners of the German foundations as well as scientific researchers of the University of Nairobi, University of the Witwatersrand/Johannesburg, University of Cape Town have been dialogue partners.

² E.g. on the basis of a 12-country study in Latin America Mainwaring and Scully (1995) found out, that a high degree of institutionalization of party systems supports a democratic consolidation.
What is party institutionalization?

While some authors do not distinguish between *party* institutionalization and *party system* institutionalization (Kuenzi/Lambright 2001) or confuse these concepts, this paper focuses on *party* institutionalization in the meaning of the conceptualization developed by Randall and Svåsand (2002a):

“(…) the process through which they [political parties; *added by author*] become institutionalised is not identical with the party’s development in purely organisational terms. Rather we suggest that institutionalization should be understood as the process by which the party becomes established in terms both of integrated patterns of behaviour and of attitudes, or culture. We suggest further that it is helpful to distinguish between internal and externally related aspects of this process. Internal aspects refer to developments within the party itself; external aspects have to do with the party’s relationship with the society in which it is embedded, including other institutions” (Randall/Svåsand 2002a: 12). Randall and Svåsand “take [the] four elements of systemness, value infusion, decisional autonomy and reification as constituting the core of the process of party institutionalization, that is the process through which the party becomes established as an institution (Randall/Svåsand 2002a: 14). But the authors also mention, that “institutionalization in terms of the four variables will increase the party’s prospects for survival, it is certainly no guarantee against regression or de-Institutionalization” (Randall/Svåsand 2002a: 15).

Basedau and Stroh (2008) modified this model of party institutionalization and developed an Index of the Institutionalization of Parties (IIP) along the abovementioned four criteria. They understand “the institutionalization of political organizations as a process of progress in four dimensions: *roots in society, level of organization, autonomy,* and *coherence* [emphasis added]. In other words, institutionalization is the process of growing external and internal stability as well as value-infusion” (Basedau/Stroh 2008: 22). The author connects these criteria and indicators (compare table 1) to the political parties of Kenya and South Africa as well as to the political party assistance of the German foundations in Kenya and South Africa. After describing the internal party democracy and the party institutionalization in Kenya and South Africa as well as the special opportunities of the German foundations in the field of party assistance, this paper tries to find out if their aims, strategies and methods relay to the four dimensions of institutionalization – and therefore to the level of institutionalization of its specific ‘partner-party’.
### Table 1: Criteria and Indicators of Party Institutionalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roots in society:</strong></td>
<td>Party age relative to independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The party has stable roots in society</td>
<td>Party age relative to beginning of multiparty period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in electoral support in last and second last elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Links to civil society organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy:</strong></td>
<td>Number of alternations in party leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notwithstanding its societal roots, the party is relatively independent from individuals within and societal groups outside the party</td>
<td>Changes in electoral support after alternation in party leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisional autonomy from individuals and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popular appreciation of particular party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization:</strong></td>
<td>Membership strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an organizational apparatus which is constantly present at all administrative levels and acts in the interest of the party</td>
<td>Regular party congresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material and personal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationwide organizational presence, activities beyond election campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence:</strong></td>
<td>Coherence of parliamentary group (no defections or floor-crossing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The party acts as a unified organization; the party tolerates a certain level of intraparty dissidence</td>
<td>Moderate relations between intraparty groupings (no dysfunctional factionalism)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare Basedau/Stroh 2008:26

**Party Institutionalization and Internal Party Democracy of Kenyan and South African parties**

Political parties play an essential role in democracies. The relevant literature offers numerous functions of political parties: they work as the central actor in between society and government (Sartori 2005 [1976]), aggregate and articulate interests and public opinion, develop programmes, recruit people for executive and legislative positions as well as exercise control over government (Lipset 2000; Randall/Svåsand 2002a; Erdmann 2004; Catón 2007; Basedau/Stroh 2008). This established catalogue of party functions can be adopted for the African context as long as modifications e.g. of the cleavage model or the stronger inclusion of informal politics are considered. Without a doubt the implementation of these functions by political parties in transition countries varies significantly from ‘modern democracies’ (Basedau/Stroh 2008). "Probably the most obvious and possibly the most
serious negative consequences of the problematic party development common to so many new or struggling democracies is the inadequate representation of citizens’ interests. Leader-centric parties with weak organizations, low policy capacity, and vague ideologies are poor at articulating and aggregating the interests of citizens” (Carothers 2006: 11). “Troubled parties also do damage to democratization through poor fulfillment of their governmental function. When parties come to power or at least participate in government, they tend to import their internal pathologies into government. Party elites used to working in hierarchical, personalistic, and untransparent organizations carry those habits into the government roles they assume” (Carothers 2006:12).

While the parties in Kenya act within a country which is, referring to the Freedom in the world 2008 Country Report, “partly free”, the South African political parties have an economic, constitutional and political “free” environment. While Kenya represents a country which is still struggling with the process of transition towards democracy, South Africa can be seen as in the final stage of the consolidation process. By comparing the political parties in Kenya and South Africa alongside the criteria of party institutionalization (compare table 1) one can say, that the major functions of political parties are poorly fulfilled by especially the Kenyan parties and that even the established parties in South Africa are lacking party institutionalization.

Roots in society

• The party system of Kenya is more influenced by ethnical cleavages than the South African. The first criteria ‘roots in society’ therefore shows, that Kenyan parties which are clearly referring to one ethnic group are in a special sense more (sometimes to strong) ‘rooted in society’ than those who are referring to political programmes and their manifesto.
• Especially the partner parties of FES and KAS in Kenya are relatively young in relation to the beginning of the multiparty period (ODM 2005 / LDP 2007; DP 2002) whereas the foundations’ partners in South Africa were founded in 1912 (ANC) and 1975 (IFP). Because of its image as liberation movement the ANC has strong roots in society, whereas IFP is only rooted in the region of Kwazulu-Natal.
• Especially LDP and ODM in Kenya and IFP and ANC in South Africa do have Youth Leagues. But with exception of IFP all of these Youth Leagues are working outside of their mother party and do not have a voice in the party.

Autonomy

• Personalization and the dependence on one powerful political patron is the deficit concerning nearly all Kenyan parties and to some degree the South African IFP as
well. Especially the Kenyan parties are lacking internal party democracy.

- Only the strong ANC with its focus on programmatic discussion and accepted alternations in party leadership seems to be less determined by this structural deficit (compare the current change in the presidency from Thabo Mbeki to Kgalema Motlanthe). Especially since September 21st, 2008, when Mbeki resigned from its presidential chair and the party leadership changed, the electoral support seems to change. The split of the ANC in two parties was the result.

**Organization**

- Concerning the Kenyan parties you will not find a strong membership nor regular party congresses, comprehensive material and personal resources or a nationwide organizational presence with party-activities beyond election campaigns. The partner parties of both German foundations in Kenya are still less institutionalized concerning the criterion ‘organization’.
- This dimension demonstrates the obvious gap between the process of party institutionalization in Kenya and South Africa, as latter has political parties which have in general an organizational apparatus which is constantly present at all administrative levels and act in the interest of the party.
- But: by comparing ANC with IFP, it is obvious that there is even a different degree of organization in the well organized ruling party and the less structured opposition party, which has its rather narrow base in the region of Kwazulu-Natal and Gauteng.

**Coherence**

- The party system of Kenya – especially since the 2007 Kenyan elections and the following setback of the countries transition towards democracy – is fragmented and floor crossing impacts on the coherence of the parliamentary groups. Political Parties - especially the smaller and opposition parties like ODM or DP - have lost members of parliament (MPs) and seats as result of floor crossing. While floor crossing has also been quite usual after the South African National Assembly elections in 1999 and 2004 (Kotzé 2007), by now the constitution has been amended to outlaw this notion. Therefore the danger that such an action may release doubt on the loyalty of MPs, not only to their parties but also to the electorate, has been contained.
- A dysfunctional factionalism is one of the outstanding deficits even within the ANC (as well as within the other analyzed parties).
The Party Assistance Response by the German ‘Stiftungen’

To strengthen the internal party democracy of political parties as well as their capability to support the democratic consolidation of transformation states and young democracies, numerous Western institutions and organizations are working in the field of party cooperation and party assistance. This includes the American *National Endowment for Democracy* (NED), the International Republican Institute (IRI), the *National Democratic Institute for International Affairs* (NDI), USAID or the *Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy* (NIMD) / *Center for Multiparty Democracy* (CMD) and the *Westminster Foundation for Democracy* (WF). Out of the organizations that are funding and assisting political parties, the German political foundations possibly have the longest experience – especially in the region of Sub-Saharan-Africa, where they have even been active before most of the countries became independent. Out of the Western organizations working in the field of foreign relations, development policy and political party assistance, the German political foundations take up a special position. They are neither fully nongovernmental nor governmental organizations. This gives them special opportunities in the field of party cooperation and party assistance: While they are nearly as independent as NGOs in carrying out their projects they are at the same time securely state-funded by the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (but still only to a moderate degree, subject to ministerial controls).

In the field of party assistance they are concentrating on following five major approaches:

- Supporting of an ideologically close party (partisan approach);
- Supporting supra and inter-party dialogues (cross-party dialogue);
- Promoting institutional development (institutional approach);
- Supporting transnational cooperation between parties from the same region/continent (international cross-party collaboration)
- Supporting the civil-society environment (civil-society approach).

Since the period of multi-partyism in Kenya and South Africa most of the German foundations are offering partisan support to several political parties and support cross-party dialogues and international cross-party collaboration. Nevertheless they are still focusing on long-term partnerships with ideological affiliated parties. Based on their ideological and

---

3 In contrast to e.g. NDI or IRI which are less autonomous because their projects have to conform to guidelines set by the US government (Mathisen/Svåsand 2002).

4 Compare Erdmann (2006) as well as the empirical research / interviews with the Regional Representatives of the German political Foundations the author conducted in Kenya and South Africa.
value-orientated strategy only three German foundations ‘found’ a ‘partner’ or ‘sister party’ in South Africa and Kenya and are concentrating on a partisan approach (Friedrich Naumann Stiftung; Konrad Adenauer Stiftung; Friedrich Ebert Stiftung)\(^5\) (compare table 2).

### Table 2: German Political Foundations and their partner parties in Kenya and South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Political Foundation</th>
<th>Partner Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAS Kenya</td>
<td>Democratic Party (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Rainbow Coalition (NARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES Kenya</td>
<td>Orange Democratic Movement (ODM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Democrats of Kenya (UNDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forum for the Restoration of Democracy – Kenya (FORD-K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS Kenya</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAS South Africa</td>
<td>Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES South Africa</td>
<td>African National Congress (ANC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS South Africa</td>
<td>Democratic Alliance (DA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors’ compilation

A unique selling point of the German political foundations\(^6\) in Kenya and South Africa in comparison to other NGOs or institutions working in the field of party cooperation is their long tradition within the countries\(^7\) (Mair 2000) and the networking between different branches in the region. “In the course of their long-term presence abroad, each foundation has managed to create a close-knit network of contacts which it can place at the disposal of its affiliated party (...). (...) the foundation’s contacts can be instrumental in the creation and maintenance of transnational party cooperation. As such, a political foundation fulfils its international role in the interest of its affiliated party, although this is not its primary concern. The extent to which political foundations and political parties work harmoniously can vary

---

\(^5\) By now the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation is dealing with this issue as well, as it is taking into consideration to strengthen the cooperation with the ANC and the unions (traditional cooperation-partners of the FES) in South Africa.

\(^6\) Focusing on KAS and FES

\(^7\) Even if there is as well a difference of this tradition when comparing FES and KAS: “There are marked differences among the foundations not only in functional concentration but also in regional terms. (...) the FES has permanent offices with field representatives in 21 African countries, 17 Latin American countries, 14 Asian countries and eight Eastern European countries; the numbers for the KAS are 14 in Latin America, 13 in Asia, ten in Eastern Europe countries, nine in sub-Saharan Africa, eight in North Africa/Middle East;” (Mair 2000: 135).
considerably, depending on such variables as the individuals involved and the political role of the respective party” (Bartsch 2001: 207).

Erdmann (2006) complains, that “none of them [the German political foundations, added by author] has compiled a policy or strategy paper which is available to the public, none of them has executives or departments that are responsible for party assistance, none of them has a budget dedicated exclusively to party assistance, none of them states very clearly what party assistance as such consists of, none of their party assistance programmes has so far been examined by political experts, none of them has analyzed its collaboration with political parties in the seventies and eighties and, ultimately, none of them has, as a result of all this, any systematic and institutionalized knowledge of the matter as such”. Even though one has to say, that by now foundations like KAS and FES in Sub-Saharan Africa give more attention to a sustainable, systematic cooperation with the political parties. They developed guidelines or handbooks (Hess/FES 1996; KAS 2008) and are able to define their individual approach, their motives and concepts concerning their party assistance. For example the KAS created a position for this field and brought forth a publication about the guidelines of their party assistance worldwide (KAS 2008). FES even published a description about their cooperation with political parties and liberation movements in Africa from the 1970s until the 1990s (Vinnai 2007). They ran an internal workshop and edited some assisting papers for all Resident Representatives concerning strategies and methods in political party assistance in the last year⁸. But “based on the realization that they operate in a very sensitive environment the foundations regard public attention as potential source of friction” (Mair 2000:128) and therefore literature about the democracy promotion and party assistance is rather limited (Carothers 2006; Rechmann, personal communication 26.09.08).

Most of the parties in Kenya assess the assistance of the German political foundations more “structured”, coordinated and long-lasting compared to other, especially American, institutes like IRI, NDI or USAID. While the latter are acting more as financial donors⁹, the parties recognize the German foundations’ methods like annual follow-up workshops or individual long-term trainings. Especially parliamentarians of the South African ANC value the party assistance of FES before the independence of the country and during the phases of democratization and consolidation (Merkel 2003) after 1990. But by now different parties - especially in South Africa – want to have a stronger say in setting topics for workshops or trainings. Kenyan political parties pointed out, that the composition of participants in regional multi-party workshops with cross-party dialogues is ambivalent and that some topics being discussed or advises being made would not fit into each parties necessity. Therefore some

---

⁸ Compare interviews of the author with the Resident Representatives of KAS and FES in Kenya and South Africa.
⁹ e.g. NDI is financing the headquarter of the Democratic Party in Kenya.
parties - especially from Kenya - would appreciate a party assistance which is more specific to their level of organization, coherence, autonomy and roots in society. Nearly all Resident Representatives of the German political foundations in Kenya and South Africa concede, that it is necessary to adjust their party assistance to the level of the parties’ institutionalization. Even if they are modifying topics of workshops on this note, the addressee – several Kenyan and South African political parties – still judge certain trainings or topics as not relevant for themselves or not dealing with the existing problems.

What are the outcomes of party assistance by the German political foundations? Some findings from a comparative analysis in Kenya and South Africa.

By analyzing the methods of the foundations’ party assistance and – as one particular element – the promotion of internal party democracy in the course of time, different ‘phases of party assistance’ can be identified. These phases are structured alongside the transition process of each country.

The example of the cooperation of FES with ANC during the last 30 years clearly shows different phases of party assistance and, referring to members of the party as well as MPs (personal communication, September/October 2008), significant effects on the development of the parties’ internal party democracy and the institutionalization of the ANC:

The challenge for FES changed from supporting a liberation movement which could only work in exile in the 1970s and 1980s to cooperating with today’s ruling party. Therefore the aims of this party assistance changed from supporting democratic civil society dialogues in the 1980s to funding of the organizational apparatus and material resources like office equipment and security services as well as supporting the rule of law and social market economy in the 1990s. Furthermore it changed to work not only with the party but with the ANC parliamentary group and to improve the acceptance of the ANC in the Western hemisphere. Likewise the methods and issues changed: First they simply consisted of education measures concerning the future development of South Africa and scholarships for ANC-representatives in Germany in 1983. Four month after the release of Nelson Mandela, he visited FES and SPD (Social Democratic Party) in Germany to thank for their support. After the FES established an office in Johannesburg in 1993 they arranged workshops and trainings with the party as well as with the parliamentary group to encourage the ANC to implement a social market economy and a federal state system and to strengthen the unions (Vinnai 2007; Golaszinski, personal communication 22.08.2008; Vinnai, personal communication 25.08.2008; Rechmann, personal communication 26.09.2008). By now, the comparatively successful story of party cooperation with the ANC is again at a changing point: today FES has a partner-party which is performing relatively well in the four
institutionalization criteria ‘roots in society’, ‘autonomy’, ‘organization’ and ‘coherence’. However, the last criterion, concerning the level of intraparty dissidence and internal party democracy (compare table 1), led to the current split of the ANC into two parties: ANC and COPE. Therefore party assistance in this case has been pushed into a next phase, where aims, methods and issues not longer have to concentrate on the first three criteria, but should focus on the promotion of the coherence and internal party democracy.

Comparing this case with the phases of party assistance, the FES went through with their former partner party in Kenya, Kenya African National Union (KANU), one can see the effect of the level of party-institutionalization on such a cooperation. Furthermore this example shows the failure of a foundations party assistance. FES was confident firstly that KANU represented a Kenyan way towards the consolidation of democracy and secondly, that they would be an influential force for achieving socio-economic development. But later on they had to realize that KANU in fact reversed the transition process:

Until Jomo Kenyatta passed away in 1978, KANU has only been an ‘election platform’ without any organization or inner-party democracy. The next president, Arap Moi, initiated first contacts with FES. With the aim of stabilizing the country and supporting the transition towards democracy, FES developed a consulting-agenda for KANU which included in a first phase issues concerning the organization and autonomy as well as the party’s links to civil society: The according “Memorandum” (Vinnai 2007:62) was signed by the general secretary of KANU, Robert Matano, in February 1980 in Bonn/Germany. It consists of a proposal for the development of a functioning party headquarter, a plan to strengthen the party’s organization, the inclusion of a women league within the party as well as the education of party cadres. In April 1980 a German graphic designer, who already contributed to the election campaign for the German SPD, went to Kenya to develop a ‘corporate identity’ (Treydte, personal communication, 22.08.2008; Vinnai 2007) of KANU, including a proposal for the party’s development and for a party newspaper. Furthermore he designed a KANU campaign button – the black rooster. FES delivered 10.000 campaign buttons, 13000 calendars, sheets of writing papers and envelopes. They completed the rebuilding of the party headquarter and delivered office and electronic equipment. Nevertheless, the cooperation started with delays and in the following years elections within the party have not been held. Therefore FES did not have ‘counterparts’ inside the organisation. In September 1983 Arap Moi tried to prevent a political crisis in Kenya not by inner party elections but by rescheduling the parliament elections to an earlier date. Even though the leadership of KANU effectively aimed at reducing the influence of the party members in the region and opposed regional workshops, FES was focusing on issues like ‘party at the grass roots’. Because FES and KANU could not find a common denominator the cooperation could not develop further
and Moi transformed the party into a system of clientele which made an inner party democratization process or an open debate impossible. Because of this step backwards concerning party institutionalization, FES broke up the party cooperation with KANU and focused on workshops with special target groups like the unions or local councillors (Vinnai 2007). After this disappointment FES was unwilling to cooperate with one of the new parties emerging in Kenya as “these parties do not have very much in common with political parties in Europe and North America. Many of Africa’s parties lack a clear ideological orientation, a firm political programme, internal democratic procedures, accountability, a credible leadership and popular support (…) Those few parties who enjoy broad popular support and have a committed membership either represent certain region or ethnic groupings or are dominated by a powerful political patron” (Mair 2000: 134). As a result of the negative experience with supporting exclusively the ruling party, FES Kenya changed its approach from a ‘one-party strategy’ to a ‘multiparty-strategy’. Only in the last years FES identified some new partisan cooperation partners: UNDA, ODM, FORD-K and LDP (compare table 2).

These cases show the dependence of party assistance on the level of institutionalization of political parties. Objectives that were completely satisfactory in one stage of the party institutionalization can be less important within a few months. Therefore this paper argues that if the influence of the institutionalization of a party would be considered more when it comes to identifying strategies, methods and topics, party assistance could lead to political parties with a stronger internal party democracy which contribute further to the transition towards democracy.

How can the party assistance of the German political foundations be developed further?

Even though the Germany foundations (KAS and FES in Kenya and South-Africa) by now are paying more attention to a sustainable, systematic cooperation with the political parties, their methods could be improved by following the special characteristics of the current phase of the transition process as well as the level of party institutionalization. As actually nearly all of the party leaders in Kenya and a lot of them in South Africa refuse to democratize the internal decision-making process of their party, party assistance should consider this lack of “will of internal party democracy”. But how can party assistance effect on the internal party democracy of those ‘unwilling’ parties?

This paper argues that the promotion of internal party democracy and the party assistance in general could be developed further by orientating their methods and issues toward the level
of party institutionalization.

Concerning the criterion ‘roots in society’ one can sum up, that the Kenyan parties are more likely to have ‘ethnical roots’ than the South African parties. Therefore individual profiles of the possible ‘partner-parties’ regarding this indicator should be applied in party assistance of the foundations working in Kenya. The party assistance could improve by adapting its methods and issues to the level of the ‘democratic and pluralistic’ rooting of its partner party in civil society to contribute to a multiparty democracy.

To strengthen the roots of the political parties in the ‘young’ society – independent from different ethnic groups – party assistance (especially in South Africa) should consider to work closer with the Youth Leagues.

Furthermore we have seen that the party leaders – especially in Kenya – are refusing to democratize the internal party democracy. Personalization and the dependence on one powerful political patron is the deficit concerning nearly all Kenyan parties and to some degree the South African IFP as well. Therefore especially donors who are supporting parties which are dependent on individuals – like KAS South Africa or both foundations in Kenya - could improve by considering issues like ‘The independence of a party from individuals within and societal groups outside the party’.

If you look at the organization of the different parties in Kenya and South Africa, the gap between the level of party institutionalization in Kenya and South Africa is obvious. Latter has political parties which have in general an organizational apparatus that is constantly present at all administrative levels and act in the interest of the party. On the other hand, the East-African state posses plenty of parties which are “miniscule organizations, nicknamed “briefcase parties” (…), that consist of no more than a self-appointed leader and a few followers” (Carothers 2006: 6). Party assistance has to include these differences concerning the institutionalization of parties. ‘Best-Practice-Examples’ of party assistance from South Africa might not fit into the necessity of a Kenyan party. As well as assisting-methods applied on a well institutionalized ruling party might not work with an opposition party.

The party system of Kenya – especially since the 2007 Kenyan elections and the following setback of the countries transition towards democracy – is fragment and floor crossing impacts on the coherence of the parliamentary groups. Party Assistance – especially in Kenya - could be improved by picking up the topic ‘The impact of Floor crossing on Party Systems and Representative Democracy’.

An inadequate coherence and a dysfunctional factionalism is one of the outstanding deficits within the ANC as well as the other analyzed parties. MPs of the ANC stated, that issues like “higher toleration of intraparty dissidence” (personal communication, October 2008) is one topic which donors should pick up when arranging workshops or trainings – the importance of the party acting as a unified organization is “a challenge the ANC has to cope with at
moment”.
Referring to the relatively good ‘performance’ of the ANC concerning the criteria ‘roots in society’, ‘autonomy’ and ‘organization’, today FES has a strong, self-confident ‘partner party’ in South Africa. On the one hand their strategy of party assistance has to deal with the fact, that the power within the ANC has been shifted to the executive, by e.g. focusing on the parliamentary group. On the other side an upcoming issue is the nearly hegemonic position of the strong ANC in South Africa as well as in the region.
The case study of the cooperation of FES and ANC shows the necessity to relay party assistance on the party institutionalization. The aims, methods, strategies and issues of the past years have to be displaced by a new phase of party assistance: focusing on issues concerning the coherence within the ANC and its dominant position with the required majority to change the constitution.

Conclusion
Summing up these results, one may say that in general the political parties in South Africa are more likely to be further institutionalized and have a stronger internal party democracy than those in Kenya. Often there is a wide gap between the ruling party (parties) and opposition parties concerning the implementation of the decisive criteria of party institutionalization - roots in society, autonomy, organization and coherence. Therefore party assistance has to face different challenges. Even if the comparative analysis of the party assistance of FES in Kenya and South Africa showed, that methods and issues can already be ‘phased’ alongside the different phases of a democratic transition, the different level of each parties’ institutionalization is not yet reflected in the political party assistance of the foundations. Individual, up-to-date ‘party-profiles’ of the foundations’ partner-parties alongside the four mentioned criteria of party institutionalization, could be one approach to develop further their concepts and methods. Measures and topics of party assistance should fit into each parties’ necessity. By directly addressing the structural factors of each single party and taking care of the different kinds of party systems of each country, key determinants of problematic parties could be identified and it would be possible for party assistance to go “beyond the path of moderate reforms and develop more assertive or incisive methods” (Carothers 2006:219) to strengthen the internal party democracy.
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