

Politics and Democracy in Evolving Societies

Politics is one of the greatest innovations in mankind's history. It deals with coordinating human activities being undertaken to support their lives using scarce resources. It was put to action for the first time when clans in pre-civilization society agreed to co-manage overlapping gathering (fruits and roots) and fishing areas to avoid unnecessary skirmishes among them (Lewis Henry Morgan, 1877). This is consistent with Thomas Hobbes' (1588-1679) theory arguing for government as preferred entity in civilized society to natural state (Hobbes, Leviathan, 1651). Scarcity of resources is therefore at the core of politics. Applied democratically, it enables society of diverse desires and aspirations to forge common goals and strategy for the benefit of all involved. Strategy is used here to mean set of policies designed to run the governmental machine to make achieving societal goals at least cost possible. This includes fostering citizens to unleash their natural talents to serve themselves and contribute to society in the way they know best.

Designing common goals is not surprising as members of society share the desire to live happily. However, the issue of strategy is often, if not always, controversial and convergence of competing ideas to a shared strategy requires the will to obey for the common good and skillful negotiations among rival parties. Democracy has decisive role in devising such shared strategies and ensuring that society enjoys peace, stability and prosperity (PSP). Only politics with democracy permits representative government where each reasonable citizen stands or advocates in the political space for her/his best interest including voting at any level; voices are aggregated unbiased; the majority wins and governs. Reasonableness requires accepting the democracy's requirement that individual interests are within the

confine of the common good. Among reasonable citizens, collective wisdom is always superior to any other alternative.

Unfortunately, society is not advancing in politics as it does in other aspects of life. Yes, mankind that started out living in caves and under tree-shades completely vulnerable to nature and gathering roots and fruits eating them in their natural state has now advanced technologies enabling it to at least, partially control nature transforming production and distribution processes and controlling epidemics. When it comes to politics, however, mankind's advancement is only in armaments or war technologies. Given that politics is a social science invented and used by society to bring understanding among competing social groups and avoid potential skirmishes, advancements in war technologies shows at least lack of understanding of politics. Thus, politics is rarely applied correctly or democratically primarily because it is often used in the best interest of influencers, not of the people. Influencer is a general name I use to refer to so called politician. Political distortions or undemocratic political practices began in pre-civilization tribal societies where despite the best intention to serve members of the community well under the guise of egalitarianism, decisions regarding political participations were left to tribal chiefs and elders [Lewis Henry Morgan, 1877]. The Oromo Gada system in Ethiopia, for example, excluded women from political participation and limited men's participation only to the 40 to 48 age group. Because pastoral societies were classless or without private property, political distortions were of little consequences.

Egregious political distortions commenced with civilizations marked with emergence of private property and agricultural economy. Ever since, the rise of

monarchism, intellectualism, imperialism, and recently revised tribalism have each pulled political orientations away from democracy. It will not be far from the truth to say that contemporary political practices in large part are not attuned to the original intent that gave rise to it. Undemocratic practice of politics always entails unbearable costs on society. The tensions, skirmishes, and full-fledged wars around the world are testament to this fact. The sad thing is that such wars do not serve the people at all. In fact, the people are suffering from the wars influencers wage for power to secure their own benefits.

There are two foundations of government in history so far – one based on kinship (ἡγεμονία) and the other on citizenship (πολιτεία) [Lewis Henry Morgan, 1877]. Under the first system, individuals are known through their family, clan or tribe, hence the lowest social unit is family. The building blocks for the second system are citizenry and geographical territory. Thus, individuals under this system are known to society through their relations to property and geography. This also means in the second system, the lowest social unit are individuals.

The choice between the two foundations of government depends on the prevailing social and economic conditions, hence mankind does not make its history according to its wishes. The kinship-based government dealt with individuals through their relationship to their family, clans or tribes so the lowest unit of count in the system was family that make up the clan or tribe. This means no individual was recognized independent of her/his family, clan, or tribe. This system of societal organization was practiced during the early stages of mankind, that is starting from savagery and extending to the upper stage of barbarism. The society relied upon gathering, hunting, and herding animals or pastoralism practicing agriculture only for self-consumption at the dawn of civilization.

The tribal system gave way to civilization with the commencement of, among others, agricultural production in-excess-of self-consumption. The surplus production opened opportunities for division of labor. Some become artisans producing tools to meet the

need for improving agricultural productivity to increase production and others become merchants working as middlemen between producers and those who need artisan and excess agricultural products. This division of labor and availability of economic opportunities liberated individuals from their families, clans, and tribes. With the new freedom, individuals begin moving from one tribe to another in search of economic opportunities changing the social make up of the society. Even those who chose to stay within their tribe alter what they do for living adopting new economic ventures. As stated earlier, this was possible due to the qualitative change in the lowest social units from family to individuals. This change made it possible for governments to form primarily based on citizenship and territory serving both natives and new arrivals who did not have legal protections under tribal constitutions equally such as the Gada system.

The Four Sources of Political Distortions

The frame of reference for democratic politics is what clans practiced at the early stage of mankind – representative democracy. Everyone with voting age votes on their representative (the clan chieftain) who vote on their behalf at committee meetings of chieftains. At the time, everyone of voting age voted and the one-person one-voice rule was observed without exception. Clans were classless society making voting simple in that voters did not have to wrestle with prioritizing preferences among multiple factors that complicate voting challenging for today's voters. Community members were also active in observing how their representatives perform replacing those who they think did not represent them well with newly elected members [Fredrich Engels, 1884]. Political distortions began with tribal societies where politics was practiced based on traditional values. The gada system, for example, excluded women from political participation. However, the main distortions were injected into the political space

over the years with monarchism, intellectualism, imperialism, and revised tribalism as elaborated below.

1. Monarchism

Monarchism is simply a political system with kings or queens as the head of the society. The issue is how one becomes to be a first king or first queen and how they serve the people once they ascend into power. Agricultural production more than self-consumption, artisan and trade activities and in most cases inter-mixing of tribal societies give rise to the need for a new political system. Individuals with some influence under the tribal system and possibly with some wealth see opportunity for accumulating more wealth through acquisition of land, materials, and taxing others' economic activities, trade for example, and they become kings/queens to assume power over citizens. All kings/queens with few exceptions (see Intellectualism below) ascended to power using this method.

The five Oromo monarchy states (Gera, Gomma, Guma, Jimma, and Limmu-Ennarya) of the Gibe region that mushroomed in the early 1800s provide great examples of recent experience. War lords (Aba Dulas) in the Gibe region of southwest Ethiopia who gained prominence because of their roles in wars over Aba Bokus (community leaders) emerged as kings shortly after the 1800s following the transformation of the Oromo community from pastoral to agrarian mode of life [Bahru Zewde, 2001]. Following the emergence of monarchical states, the Gada system lost vitality in the region which contributed to increased Islamization of the community, according to Guluma Gameda, 1993. According to Abreham Alemu Fanta (2015, pp 216-220), the powerful Bakare Godana family

formed a monarchic state in Leqa Neqemte dismantling the traditional gada system and attributed the downfall of the gada system to class stratification due to mixed agricultural economy and trade accumulation of wealth and power in the hands of the Abba Dulas as well. So, monarchism is a natural progression necessitated by the transformation of pastoral to civilized societies driven by material changes in economic and social conditions.

Kings/queens ascend to power in such undemocratic venue and the people lose their democratic rights as long as there is no change in the political system. This loss of democratic rights was cemented using faith as a tool. People were taught to believe that the dynasty families are god chosen and they must be subservient or obedient without questioning the power of kings/queens.

The process created tension well before the birth of Christ between reason Socrates (470-399 BCE) advocated for and whatever faith societies practiced at the time. The tension lingered for centuries until faith triumphed over reason and threw society into the age of darkness. During the age of darkness which stretched from the 6th to the mid-14th century, no one was asking the authorities legitimacy. In fact, Christianity and later Islam began playing decisive role in politics annihilating reason for centuries. The only exception was Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 ADE) of Italy who was a priest of the catholic church and a philosopher. Aquinas resuscitated reason for a brief time in the 13th century. Unfortunately, he used reasoning to justify his church teachings leaving society to linger in darkness until the humanist movement of the renaissance (ተሐድሶ) in the 14th century began focusing on understanding humanism. [Humanists](#) turned away from religion and focused on issues such as education and literature that foster

realizing the full potential of a persons both for their own good and for the good of the society at large.

Renaissance created curiosity in thinking minds which led to discovery about a century later but most importantly to the enlightenment movement in political philosophy of the 17th and 18th centuries. Enlightenment thinkers such as John Locke underscore for the first time since faith's triumph over reason the importance of reason and science leading to the demand for separating politics and religion. This principle was instituted into the United States' constitution prohibiting the use of religious test as qualification to an Office or Public trust (Article 6). The first amendment to the constitution further clarified the provision prohibiting congress from making laws related to religion. Yet, religion is still a formidable anti-democratic force in the United States.

2. Intellectualism

In this instance, those who consider themselves intellectual devise some strategy to grab political power in some undemocratic way. A good example from history is the rise of the Athenian government in the 600 BCE. According to Friedrich Engels [The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, 1884], there were four tribes in Attica area living in separate territories independent of each other. All four tribes were at the upper stage of barbarism producing some grains and doing their own affairs according to their constitution without consulting with the Council of the People in Athens.

The division of labor between agriculture, handcrafts, trade, and shipping was conducive for individuals to move from one area to another in search of economic

opportunities and intermixing tribes. With such intermixed communities and new economic activities, the tribal constitution failed to provide legal protection to the new arrivals and accommodate the demand for legal services associated with agriculture, handcraft, and trade, contract law for example.

A new constitution was introduced in the Council of the people in Athens that retained applicable articles of tribal constitutions and introduced new ones to accommodate the new social and economic conditions. The new constitution fused the four tribes together forming a single nation which was more advanced than the American Indians' confederacy by neighboring tribes. Confederacies do not meet the needs of the new society as they do not provide ground for a strong unity and central government, the problem that besieged the original 13 states confederacy of the United States.

The distortion from democracy arose when the new constitution grouped the society into three classes: farmers, artisans, and nobles, and vested the right to hold office only to nobles excluding farmers and artisans which turned out to be the only purpose of forming groups.

3. Imperialism

Imperialism relates to one country imposing undue influence over another sovereign country through either "diplomacy" or use of military force. The incentive for the dominating country is to benefit from looting resources (direct colonialism) or through non-competitive transactions (neo-colonialism). Neo-colonialism manifests itself with or without subordinate government in other countries. Subordinate governments can be either protectorate where former

colonizers have direct control or poppy government where former colonizers influence the government in their favor indirectly.

Below is a summary of the history of imperialism. The summary includes, in a nutshell, the colonizers’ incentives to subjugate other countries and the effects of their actions on indigenous people to the degree that the issue for the indigenous people especially at time of direct colonization was survival, not democracy. What the European Union that include former colonizers (France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands), Britain and the late comer United States are doing under the guise of human rights against Ethiopia and democracy with regard to Ukraine is absolutely undemocratic.

Brief History of Colonialism.

Phase of Colonization	Players	Form of Relationship	Benefits	Benefits obtained via	Form of Settlement	Comment
Pre-Exploration ¹ (12 th to late 15 th centuries)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venice • Genoa 	Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precious metals (Gold and Silver) • Spices (nutmeg, cumin, pepper, cinnamon) 	Trade	No settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venice defeated Genoa by 1380 becoming the only player
During Exploration (Late 15 th to mid-18 th centuries)	Portugal and Spain	Sort of direct colonization	Precious metals (gold and silver), slaves, tropical products, spices	Setting up posts and forts to control world trade	White settlers along coastal lines	Indigenous people remain undisturbed self-sufficient small communities based on subsistence agriculture

Industrialization (mid-18 th to 20 th centuries)	1 st Industrialization ² (1760s)	Portugal, Spain, Britain, France, and The Dutch	Direct colonization	Commercial agriculture, mining, forced labor, raw materials such as wool, cotton, etc. and food (wheat, coffee, meat, cocoa, butter, tea)	Commercial production, mining, market (selling and purchasing)	White settlers moved from coastal to inner lands expropriating lands for settlement, commercial agriculture and mining.	Introduced money economy through tax and land rental payments.
	2 nd Industrialization ³ (1880s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portugal • Spain • Britain • France • The Dutch • America • Italy 	Direct colonization/ Neo-colonization	Money, business, and private land economy	Controlling all economy	White settlers moved their citizens en masse to occupied countries displacing indigenous people	Direct colonization was mainly in Africa, Asia, and Pacific Islands following the 1885 scramble for Africa conference
Post-Industrialization ⁴ (late 20 th century to date)		Portugal, Spain, Britain, France, The Dutch, America, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Japan	Neo-colonialism		Protectorate, Poppy government		

¹The southern coast of Arica was discovered in 1488 and America in 1492. In 1494, Portugal and Spain partitioned the world among themselves by the 1494 treaty of Tordesillas.

²The invention of steam power and iron production in the early 1800s in Britain made machine production mainly textiles possible for the first time. The invention spread to Europe and America. Colonizers moved from coastal lines to inland displacing indigenous people developing commercial agriculture and mining ventures using forced labor. The situation also created wage-seeking labor. Colonizers sell their products in colonized markets from home and purchase raw materials and food items for home consumption. They employed protective trade

policies discouraging imports from indigenous companies in colonized countries. India, for example, became importer of cotton products from Britain after the latter imposed prohibitive import tariffs from India.

³Steel production, electricity and petroleum made cost-effective production possible in the late 19th and 20th centuries. Colonizers adjusted their policies to the new situations to intensify their exploitation. They moved their citizens to colonized countries as settlers confiscating lands by either killing indigenous people off or forcing them into reserves or transforming the remaining into lifestyles that best serve their needs. Colonizers established effective administrative machines with the help of local elites; developed or modified existing legal systems; established peace-keeping instruments and imposed their languages and cultures.

⁴Following the first world war, 85% of the Earth's surface was controlled in some way by colonial powers. Currently, spheres of influence, special commercial treaties, imposing undue influence on debtor nations are but few ways of controlling former colonies by the colonial powers.

Two prominent lessons from the colonization story;

1. Colonizers are doing what they do for their own economic benefit including fighting among themselves, the seven-year (1756 – 1763) war between Britain and France, for example, wedged for controlling North America. This war was preceded by Austrian Succession war (1740 – 1748) among European powers over rich Silesia. There was, of course, America's war of independence (1775 - 1783) against Britain. The rivalry among powers is

still wedged for sphere of influence, markets and new investment opportunities.

2. Colonizers change their policies and politics to maximize their benefit arising from new economic conditions. For example, as outlined above under imperialism, when the steam power and iron production made machine production possible (1st industrial revolution), colonizers moved from living in coastal areas of colonized countries to inland displacing indigenous people and expropriating their land for commercial agriculture and mining. Similarly, when steel production, electricity and petroleum altered production processes (2nd industrial revolution), colonizers moved their citizens in droves from their home countries to colonies as settlers confiscating more lands by killing some and forcing other indigenous people into reserves. This migration alleviated economic hardships in their home countries and expanded production and markets around the world.

4. Revised Tribalism

Tribes are communities whose membership is determined based on actual or perceived kinship or blood relationship. Tribalism is the feeling of association or attachment arising out of loyalty to one's tribe. The traditional tribal system is the third stage of societal evolution after family and clans. It is, therefore, a collection of clans forming out of phratries such as the Oromo Irecha based on a real or perceived blood relationship. Phratries are large number of clans gathering occasionally solely for spiritual purposes with no political significance.

Tribal societies lived independent of each other, each self-sufficient based on pastoral economy and some agricultural products produced for self-consumption at the upper stage of barbarism. Tribal societies are part of the pre-civilization history of mankind whose system of government depended on kinship (ዝግጥሚያ), one of the two foundations of government in history. The other foundation emerged with civilization and is based on geography and citizenship (ስገላጭ) (Lewis Henry Morgan, 1877). The politics of tribal societies served their economic (free land and herding) and social (kinship) conditions. Because tribes are families, tribal constitutions are something like family affairs that do not have the latitude to accommodate new economic and social conditions (see Intellectualism above). Today's multi-tribal societies around the world are the natural outgrowth of tribal societies adjusting to ever changing (dynamic) economic and social conditions. Multi-tribal societies are mixed and blended societies with the latter increasingly dominating traditional tribal societies.

Revised tribalism is a movement based on tribal affiliation and with the goal of maintaining, in fact, at least in the Ethiopian case, reconstituting, traditional tribal societies working against the natural forces (evolving economic and social conditions) that fuse traditional societies randomly into an ever evolving mixed and blended multitribal or multi-cultural (ሕብረ-ብሔር) societies. For politics to serve such mixed and blended society best, it has to be adjusted to the new social and economic conditions. Thus, economic changes trigger social changes, and the two changes call for political adjustments to meet the new societal needs. This means, political adjustments to randomly evolving social

and economic conditions are natural and hence essential features of societal evolution.

However, revised tribalism operates under the assumption that societal change over time (evolution) is akin to unitary transformation (Hamiltonian equation) in quantum mechanics. This means that changes in tribal societies over time does not alter their transformation parameters ($\rho H \rho^\dagger$) essentially making today's population of a given tribe comparable to its counterpart centuries ago or centuries into the future. So, there is no need for political adjustment to new economic and social conditions throwing the society to bifurcated social groups within each tribal zones and perpetual conflict among imagined tribal groups. The unitary transformation assumption renders revised tribalism anti-democratic in four ways.

First, the assumption forms the basis for the tribalists' argument for a non-changing community as illustrated in their primordial or Benedict Anderson's (1983) "imagined communities" theories. If this assumption holds, then the Amhara of today would be similar in all respects to the Amhara population centuries ago or vice versa. Substitute any social group's name (Tigre, Oromo, Wolayta, Somali, Sidama, Gamo, etc.) for Amhara and the argument applies to each equally. However, our own life experience shows us that this assumption is far from the truth. Simply, the Oromo population of today is not akin to the Oromo population of the 19th century. At least some of today's Oromo population is blended with many other tribes representing identity change in a significant way. Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) is one of given identity defining elements. Given means no one can choose what DNA to have. So, if someone is born to a Sidama and an Oromo couple, that person's identity is Sidama and Oromo.

She/he cannot be either Sidama or Oromo alone. No one has the right or the ability to prevent two individuals from different tribes from becoming couples – it naturally depends on their choice. In fact, marriage has been an inter-clan affair since pre-civilization clan societies banned intraclan relationships. So, the Oromo population of the 21st century is not akin to its counterpart in the 19th century. So tribalists cannot reconstitute their imagined traditional communities from the current population and any attempt to do so is anti-democratic as it infringes individuals' natural rights to be themselves.

Second, tribal societies' mixing, and blending is a natural outcome of individuals' response to emerging economic conditions. The new social and economic conditions require political adjustments to serve the interests of the new society best and allow progress in all aspects of life (see Intellectualism above). However, tribalism limits political rights to tribal membership leaving out non-members without legal protection. This alters the purpose of politics fundamentally by not only excluding non-members from political participation but also by opening up the possibility for non-resident tribal members to participate in the politics of a region as is happening in the Harari groups of Ethiopia. Allowing non-resident tribal members to participate in politics while excluding non-tribal member residents from participating in the politics that affects their lives is fundamentally an anti-democratic practice.

Third, revised tribalism creates unnecessary physical boundaries segregating citizens into tribal groups. The groups become fake sub-political units giving rise to differences in political operations among themselves. A political unit is a

territory with its own political authority and organization that is more autonomous than a regional government within a political unit or a country. This means that a central government in a tribally bifurcated society will not be as potent as a central government with regional governments set solely for the purpose of devolving authority to local administrations. The boundaries are fake because they cannot be defined scientifically, that is to the satisfaction of all groups without harboring ill feelings about them by at least one of the groups. The problem is that there is no basis for attributing a given territory to a certain group in a society that has been in flux for centuries and none of the group can claim original ownership over the territory. The inability to attribute a territory to a certain group in an uncertain term lends a proper basis for the resentments over the fake boundaries making them perpetual source of skirmishes. Furthermore, they infringe on the natural rights of citizens to move freely within their country including establishing a fulfilling living in any part of the country. This means that citizens will be treated differently in different tribal regions which is inconsistent with democratic values.

Fourth, tribalism thwarts democratic processes in political spaces. The cardinal principle in democracy is one person one vote. But societies besieged with political discontent resort to a theory of representation as a solution to their dissatisfaction in politics. This option misses the fundamental principles in politics, that is politics does not know race, ethnicity, color, region, or tribe. It deals with only the use of scarce resources or economic opportunities, security, and maintaining internal order. Some may argue that politics also is

concerned with human rights. However, human rights relate directly or indirectly to denial of access to economic opportunities and hence are ultimately economic issues. The solution to political problems is to democratize the political space and tribalism stands against the process of democratization by demanding undue representation in the political space in violation of the one person one vote principle of democracy.

The demand for representation for the purpose of addressing political discontent does not work either because politicians ultimately act in accordance with political principles. If the political process operates democratically serving the citizens fairly, political discontents will be minimized, if not eliminated. But politicians often do not act democratically and do not serve the people fairly. There is no logical basis beyond the mere feeling that someone from one's tribe will represent him or her better than someone from any other tribe. So, political discontents continue as long as the political process is not democratized. This means that arguments for representation focus on the wrong solution, that is change of agents rather than change of the political processes.

Arend Lijphart argued in his 1968 book "The Politics of Accommodation" which he later doubled down in his 1977 book "Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration" that consociational democracy is better than majoritarian one. He based his argument on the fact that consociational democracy has worked well in the Netherlands which he considered stable and democratic. About 80% of the population in the Netherlands are Dutch, about 6 other ethnic groups making up the balance. The politics allows

representation in the government of each ethnic group based on agreements among elites from the different groups and hence consociational. Lijphart's theory however did not satisfy anyone including himself who are in search of theory of democracy (). The attraction of Lijphart's consociational democracy is the associated stability. But stability or absence of chaos or chaos like situations by no means implies democracy while the reverse is true. What Lijphart did not seem willing to acknowledge is the fact that with transformation of society from barbarism to civilization, the social unit which used to be family in tribal societies at the upper stage of barbarism changed to individuals. This is a qualitative change for two reasons. First, individuals in civilized society are known to society only through their connection to geography and property, not to family or clans or tribes. Second, for any economic, social or political analysis to yield meaningful results, it must be conducted based on individuals or citizens, not tribes. For example, achieving group freedom does not guarantee individual freedom while groups of free individuals are themselves free.

Thus, revised tribalism is an anti-democratic and anti-prosperity movement that strangulates and hampers society from progress in a way worse than the feudal system. In summary, tribalism perpetuates political problems by being impediment to democracy.

Summary

I provided in this piece a basic definition and core purpose of politics as a social science used by society primarily to avoid potential skirmishes by

creating understanding among competing social forces or groups. These sources of potential skirmishes are primarily economic intimately linked to citizens' survival issues. Other functions of government include securing the country from external threats, providing internal order, and developing and maintaining economic enhancements making wealth creation easier for citizens. Chief among the enhancements is adjusting politics to changing economic and social conditions, that is solving political problems. Political adjustments are economic issues because they break barriers to and smoothen processes for economic operations.

I also alluded to the core problem in politics, that is political distortions in the so-called civilized society due to monarchism, intellectualism, imperialism, and revised tribalism. The standard we measure distortions from is the one-person-one-vote clan representative democracy. Yes, clan society was simple as there was no private property and hence no economic classes. Yet, the two core requirements for democracy (one-person-one-vote and everyone rationally votes in his/her best interest) are critical in any society. The distortions have unbelievably pulled politics away from its core purpose and today politics is used everywhere in the world for the benefit of the few while the people suffer chronically. Both intra and inter-country skirmishes around the world both today and in history are one sure manifestations of lack of understanding of politics or greed driven aggressiveness on the part of at least one of the warring parties. The ever-yawning disparities between the rich and poor segments of society are other manifestations of undemocratic use of

politics. The political distortions and subsequent undemocratic practices of politics essentially leads to increasingly less participation of citizens in politics.

Some studies show that citizens around the world are continuously disappointed in politics because politics is not serving them well. The nonpartisan PEW research Center that calls itself fact tank conducted in 2018 an international survey covering 27 countries and reported that individuals in 26 countries attributed their discontent with democracy to their beliefs that they have no real chance of improving their standard of living (PEW Research Center). Cambridge University's Center for the Future of Democracy analyzed data on global attitudes towards democracy and reported that dissatisfaction with democracy across the globe (154 countries) increased from 47.9% to 57.5% since the mid-1990s (Lewsey, Fred). Dissatisfaction with democracy among citizens of developed countries alone rose from about 33% to 50% over the same period. Naturally, sustained dissatisfaction with democracy inevitably leads to citizens' disengagement from politics as PEW research Center itself ascertained with its survey data of 14 countries (Many around the world are disengaged from politics). Accordingly, concerns about the state of democracy across the globe are rising (IDEA).

Citizens attribute the increasing dissatisfaction with democracy and their subsequent disengagement from politics to, among others, poor economic performance.

Politics has always been misused in civilized society because power is a means of accumulating wealth. Despite its clear role in the pre-civilization society, politics has lacked clarity in civilized society Socrates was the first philosopher

Summary,

There does not seem to have hope even in the near future as philosophy and political science are out of gear or alignment with societal needs. Use the metaphor of a river crossing the Sahara Desert to illustrate how philosophy and political science failed society. What needs to be done is come up with new possibilities to syphon water from the river

References

Lewis Henry Morgan, 1877. Ancient Society by Lewis Henry Morgan. K. P. Bagchi & Company, New Delhi.

<https://ia801608.us.archive.org/1/items/in.ernet.dli.2015.174214/2015.174214.Ancient-Society.pdf>

Friedrich Engels, 1884. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.

https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/origin_family.pdf

Guluma Gemed, The Islamization of the Gibe Region, Southwestern Ethiopia from C. 1830s to the Early Twentieth Century. Journal of Ethiopian Studies, 26(2), 1993: pp. 63-79. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41966021>

Bahru Zewde, 2001. History of Modern Ethiopia 1855 – 1991, 2nd edition, Ohio University Press.

<https://www.ohioswallow.com/book/A+History+of+Modern+Ethiopia%2C+1855%E2%80%931991>

The Seven Years' War. <https://www.history.com/topics/france/seven-years-war>

Abreham Alemu Fanta, 2015. Ethnicity and Local Identity in the Folklore of the South-western Oromo of Ethiopia: a Comparative Study. VU University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Amsterdam.

Lewsey, Fred. Global Dissatisfaction with Democracy at a Record High. Center for the Future of Democracy, University of Cambridge.

<https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/dissatisfactiondemocracy>

PEW Research Center. Many Across the Globe are Dissatisfied with How Democracy is Working. [file:///C:/Users/berha/Downloads/Pew-Research-Center Global-Views-of-Democracy-Report 2019-04-29 Updated-2019-04-30%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/berha/Downloads/Pew-Research-Center%20Global-Views-of-Democracy-Report%202019-04-29%20Updated-2019-04-30%20(1).pdf)

IDEA (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance). Global State of Democracy Report 2021. <https://www.idea.int/gsod/global-report>