

Appendix 8. Reactions to views of some Western scholars

We now examine briefly how some political and social scientists write about Africa with a view of helping Africans understand their ways. Emphasis here will focus on those views that appear to be quite controversial. I will specifically refer to comments made by Richard Joseph and John W. Harbeson on the work of Paul B Henze, and by Getatchew Haile on a piece by Siegfried Pausewang. The reader is encouraged to read the original comments of the critics.

Regarding Paul B Henze's controversial views.

The self congratulating Henze, who mentioned "energetic effort by Europeans and Americans to promote democracy throughout the world," has the strange and elusive concept of proposing different democracies for different geographies, and different priorities for the democratization of regions " where societies have evolved in ways unfamiliar to the countries of the North Atlantic." [URL2] Little does Henze seem to remember that according to classical history democracy originated elsewhere and much before those in the North Atlantic were even colonized and made aware of civilized behavior. At any rate, we may have an appreciation of Henzean fallacies on the formulation of democracy in Ethiopia as indicated below.

Formulation A

It appears that Paul Henze has a special type of democracy for Ethiopia that may be called the Newspeak. [URL3] In

the Newspeak democracy the division of Ethiopia into language groups (called ethnic groups) is the way to go. This Newspeak formulation is debatable as it is not a widely accepted theoretical formulation for acquiring democracy, and certainly will not work in Ethiopia where the people have been intermarried for centuries, and where there are over 80 different language groups. See propagation of language.

Formulation B.

Apparently, Paul Henze goes further and supports a Stalinist and ethnic-centered group to rule over Ethiopia, as he showers the TPLF/EPRDF with praises of how they brought democracy. In reality they are structurally unable to allow the majority participate effectively in a democratic process beginning with the election process through the legislative process to the implementation process of otherwise legally permissible activities.

It appears then that Paul Henze uses smoke and mirrors to arrive at his observations and blurs realities with his Formulation B, while brandishing Formulation A as the only alternative for democracy in Ethiopia. [URL3 and URL5] One wonders why Henze worked so hard what appears to be against the interests of one of the oldest independent countries on earth.

Regarding the controversial views of Siegfried Pausewang.

Siegfried Pausewang is worried that if CUD were to come to power it would yet be the ascendancy of a minority party, though he offers no proof to substantiate his notion

of CUD as a minority party. Reportedly [URL5] Pausewang wrote " Should they [the donors] intervene to make EPRDF step down and bring CUD in power? That would undoubtedly only bring another minority government into power. For if really an uncontested count could prove that CUD had won, CUD would owe this result to massive protest votes. There is no question that many peasants (and others) voted not for CUD but against OPDO or other local member parties of EPRDF."

Pausewang's worries are hopefully allayed by the able response given him by Professor Getatchew Haile. [URL4] I only mention Pausewang's worries here to point to the illogical Pausewang's assumptions that lead to Pausewang's fallacies, which include the following.

1) If intervention by donor countries results in the stepping down of a tyrannical minority party (EPRDF) only to be replaced by another (CUD) party, which Paueswang does not proclaim as being a majority party, then the intervention is not worth it. Amazing!

2) If Ethiopians make a choice, and they reject the bad one then the election of the good one is irrevocably tainted. Neither should the vote of the people that elected the CUD be respected, particularly when Pausewang could assume that the vote was merely a rejection of the EPRDF. Amazing!

Notwithstanding Pausewang's wrong assumptions, and Pausewang's fallacies, tyranny is bad because people's lives are wantonly destroyed by it. Tyranny is therefore

unacceptable under whatever guise it might appear. Donor countries that directly finance the budget of a tyrannical regime indirectly perpetrate the wanton destruction of life, limb, and property of Ethiopians. However, they may put it, Zenawi's tyrannical rule, treasonous surrender of the maritime territories and properties to a rebel group, and forcible division of Ethiopians into homelands has no parallels in Ethiopian history except in brief times of occupation by alien forces.

References

URL1- <http://countrystudies.us/ethiopia/3.htm>

URL2. http://muse.jhu.edu/cgi-bin/access.cgi?uri=/journals/journal_of_democracy/v009/9.4henze.html

URL3- <http://www.andenet.com/art-dec17-2.htm>

URL4- <http://www.andenet.com/art-dec16-1.htm>

URL5- <http://www.andenet.com/art-dec31-1.htm>

HG, 1/2/2006