



Full length research

The Epitomizations of Anoole and Menelik II Monuments in the Age of Reconciliation in the Ethiopian Polity: Challenges and Opportunities

Mulualem Daba Tola

*Ambo University, College of Social Sciences and Humanities,
Department of Journalism and Communication
Email: mulualem@daba@yahoo.com, Mobile Phone: +251910740139*

Received October 14, 2018

Accepted March 28, 2019

Published June, 2019

Abstract

The narratives of civil war histories have been reproduced by the victims and perpetrators side at different focal points. Accordingly, Anoole and Menelik monuments are the face of one coin in representing the war history took place during the monarchical regime in Ethiopia. The overriding purpose of this study was to examine the epitomizations of Anoole and Menelik II memorial monuments, and their challenges and opportunities in the process of today's reconciliation process in the Ethiopian polity. The study employed textual analysis, document analysis and in-depth interview as tools to generate data. In-depth interview was employed with seven participants from academic and political spheres to triangulate the textual analysis. Besides, four currently closed down non-government magazines which gave high coverage on the issue of both monuments, and documents from Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau and Addis Ababa City Governance were selected and analyzed qualitatively. The result of the study reveals that the design, history and the political manifestations of both monuments were the main challenges in the process of reconciliation between perpetrators and victims. On the other hand, monuments are symbols that represent social, cultural, and political terms of one country. They have power to define and transfer of an identity of society. Accordingly, Anoole and Menelik II monuments create an opportunity to represent and transfer the historical narratives took place between major ethnic groups (Oromoo and Amhara) in Ethiopia to the next generation. Lastly, the study makes suggestion as to how the challenge could be changed to prospect and the symbolization of both monuments might be preached for the generation to come.

Keywords: *Anoole, Architecture, Epitomization, History, Menelik II*

Corresponding author E-mail: mulualem@daba@yahoo.com

Author agrees this article remain permanently open access

Introduction

Among African countries, Ethiopia has long history of architectural civilization. Since the heyday of Aksumite period (4thC-7thC A.D) different obelisk, edifices, rock-hewn churches and monoliths were curved as kings' home,

funeral or for religious purposes. For instance, the Axum obelisk which was erected around 4thC A.D by subjects of the kingdom of Aksum, Tiya monuments and the largest edifice 'Ta'akha Maryam' were taken as one of Ethiopian ancient architectural civilizations

(Doresse, 1959; Phillipson, 2004 and Finneran, 2012). The present Ethiopia has passed through three different political ideologies from Monarchical period to the FDRE. The modern Ethiopian Empire building was started by Tewodros II (1855-1868) and was completed by Menilik II (1886-1913). Due to several internal and external problems, the monarchy period ended and the last monarchical emperor, Haile Silasse, disposed by *coup d'état* and the Derg military junta which followed socialism political ideology came to power in 1974. Mengistu Hailemariam emerged as the undisputed leader of the *Derg* after the Provisional Military Administration (PMAC) was done away with. However, due to a wide-scale drought, and a massive refugee problem, the resistance movements spearheaded by the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF), and the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) finally brought down the military junta and established the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) on May 28, 1991 (McClellan, 1978; Bahru, 1991; Marcus, 1994; Aalen, 2002; Merera, 2003; Turton *et.al.*, 2006).

In these consecutive regimes, political actors constructed several monuments that represent and strengthen their regime in various parts of the country. Among several statues constructed in Ethiopia, the issues of Anoole and Menelik II statues have been the point of controversy among the people. The statue of Emperor Menelik II which is located at Addis Ababa in front of St. George Cathedral church was erected for the good deeds of emperor Menelik II in 1930 by the emperor of Haile Silasse. On the other hand, Anoole memorial monument was erected during the incumbent government at Hetosa, Arsi Zone, Oromia Region, on 6 April, 2014 as a tribute to the Arsi Oromo's who were the victims of Emperor Menelik II's war of conquest in the 1880s'. Therefore, it is important to examine the epitomizations of these both monuments challenges and opportunities in the current reconciliation process of the major ethnic group in the Ethiopian polity.

In Ethiopia, with the coming to power of the EPRDF different new statues have been erected to signify various historical occurrences in view of preserving them for the posterity. In doing so, the normative narratives of the already existing monuments are being deconstructed and rearticulated as a result of which these symbols have essentially become sites of elite contestations over the right interpretation of the Ethiopian political history. Such representational struggle is best exemplified by the way various elite groups are advancing contradictory historical narratives in relation to the Menelik II and the newly erected Anoole monuments. The controversies over the two monuments emanate from contradictory readings of the nature of the modern Ethiopian state and the role of elites that had spearheaded the nation building project in the modern Ethiopian history. This being the case, this study needs to explicate the unraveling epitomization of political history that has been reflected in the two juxtaposed monuments which chronicle about the reign of emperor Menelik II and its challenge and opportunity in the embryonic reconciliation process of the two major ethnic groups in modern Ethiopian political history. Therefore, the objective of the study is to examine the epitomization of Anoole and Menelik II memorial monuments and their challenges and opportunities in the current process of reconciliation process the Ethiopian polity.

Research Methodology

Research Design

As Creswell (2009:9) states, "advocacy/participatory or critical realism inquiry needs to be intertwined with politics and political agenda." This study has political theme. Hence, it falls under critical realism paradigm. It also employs qualitative research method. As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) notes, "qualitative research consists of a set of interpretative, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings and memo to the self." Having taken all these vital points into

J. Equity Sci. & Sust. Dev.

consideration, a qualitative approach was used in this study to examine what both Anoole and Menelik II monuments are symbolizing in the process of embryonic appeasement in the Ethiopian polity.

Primary Data Source

Informants from academic, political and Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau were used as primary data sources. From academic domain, three participants from three departments (History, Political Science and Fine Arts) were selected to get professional explanations on the history, socio-political and design of both statues. From the political domain, three participants from Oromo People Democratic Organization (OPDO), All Ethiopian Unity Party (AEUP), and Blue Party were selected as they had different political narratives on the epitomization of Anoole and Menelik II monuments. Lastly, one participant from Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau was selected to get relevant information about the purpose of Anoole monument construction.

Secondary Data Source

Official documents and magazines were used as secondary data sources. With this regard, official documents from Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau, and Addis Ababa City Government Office were used as secondary source of data and four (4) currently closed down private magazines (*Fact, Inqu, Addis Guday, and Lomi*) were used as secondary source of data. The data were collected starting from magazine from Anoole inauguration (8 April 2014) up to the last publication of the selected magazines (5 August 2014) due to the repetitions of the story angle and unrelated stories coming in the publications, only directly related stories were selected.

Sampling Techniques and Data Collection

Purposive sampling method was used to select both primary and secondary source of data. As Cohen *et al.* (2005) notes, purposive sampling is one of the most common sampling strategies in which participants are selected depending on their importance to a particular research question. In-depth

interview involves conducting an intensive individual interview with a small number of respondents to explore their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation. It can be used in the place of focus group discussion when key informants are not included in the focus group discussion or /and when key informants are not interested in discussing the issue freely in the group (Gunter, 2002; Gray, 2004; Wimmer and Dominick, 2006; Boyce *et al.*, 2006). Document analysis is often linked to hermeneutics, an approach which seeks to analyze a text from the perspective of the person who penned it, whilst emphasizing the social and historical context within which it is produced (Jonathan, 2003). Thus, the official documents from Oromia Culture and Tourism office, and Addis Ababa City Governance on Menelik II and Anoole statues were used as potential data to trace the historical background in which these statues were erected and the intention of the concerned bodies for their constructions. As Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009) stated that textual analysis is an identification and interpretation of a set of verbal or nonverbal signs. It encompasses various things from clothing to books to food to architecture and it compels one to think about something other than itself. Therefore, the main textual data used in the study were Anoole and Menelik II statues due to they are parts of texts that carry interpretative meanings, and the researcher uses the description written over the statues as the source of data.

Method of Data Analysis

Some of the data gathered through the aforementioned tools were in Amharic and Afan Oromo. Hence, before the categorization and analysis procedure, the researcher transcribed them and translated into English. Then the data were categorized into themes based on the aim and the objectives of the study and thematic interpretative analysis was made. Lastly, the researcher has also tried to correlate the findings of the in-depth interview, document analysis vis-à-vis textual analysis and qualitatively discussed.

Results and Discussion

Historical Narratives of Anoole and Menelik II Monuments

Normative Historical Narratives

The major historical narratives of Menelik II statue revolves around the commemoration of emperor Menelik II contributions for the modern Ethiopia. These contributions can be seen from three different perspectives. First, the emperor made series of military conquests to the southern and western parts of the country and built the modern Ethiopian Empire. This expansion process is taken as the major contribution of emperor Menelik II in the modern Ethiopian history. However, it should be noted that the process of building an Ethiopian empire was made in two different ways: peaceful and forceful. The emperor took both peaceful and forceful measures in order to make different independent kingdoms subjugate their power. For instance, Kawo Tona of Wolaita subjugated his power under coercion while Abba Jifar of Jimma and Kumsa Moroda of Wellega peacefully submitted and maintained some of their powers.

Second, Menelik II made a great war to expand his territory, Shewa and lastly built the modern Ethiopia Empire in 1889. The Emperor gained a victory over Fascist Italy in defending the Ethiopian territory from colonization. Thus, an equestrian statue of Menelik II was constructed to commemorate the battle of Adowa. Several scholars (Getachew and Paulos, 2005; Marcus, 1994; Markakis *et al.*, 2011) also stated the battle of Adowa is one of emperor Menelik II heroic deeds to keep the sovereignty of Ethiopia from fascist Italy. Third, emperor Menelik II did a lot to modernize the Ethiopian empire and seen as father of modernization. The emperor was the first person who introduced different modern technologies and built infrastructures in Ethiopia. The normative narratives of Menelik II statue, therefore, emphasize on the contributions of emperor Menelik II in building an Ethiopian empire. Particularly, equestrian statue of Menelik II constructed to commemorate the battle Adowa which was regarded as a historic battle for black Africans

(Kebede, 1928; Mirror of Addis Ababa, 1950; Tekletsadik *et al.*, 1983; Bahiru, 1991; Addis Ababa city administration, 2005;).

Deconstructive Historical Narratives about the Reign of Menelik II

Menelik and his soldiers with modern firearm fought and lost many battles to conquer the Arsi Oromo during the process of building modern Ethiopia. The war took almost five years (1882-1886) and ended with the defeat of Arsi Oromo at Azule 6 September 1886 (Ezekiel, 2014). Hence, the deconstructive theses about the reign of Menelik II emanates from the Menelik war of conquest and its consequences.

The major deconstructive thesis that is reflected by Anoole monument on the reign of Menelik II emphasizes on the abolishment the *Gadaa* system. *Gadaa* is uniquely democratic political and social institution that governs the life of every Oromoo from birth to death (Gadaa, 1988). It is an example of traditional African form of democracy that it is lately registered by UNESCO in 2016. Menelik II and his army, however, did not simply bring the *Gadaa* system to an end. Arsi Oromoo fought and defeated Menelik force many times as *Gadaa* was the source of their courage and strength. Thus, the emperor force planned a new strategy that helps them to eliminate *Gadaa* system for once and for good from Arsi Oromoo. As official document from Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau (2006) shows, it was the period of Arsi *Gadaa* power transition, 'Roobaale' to 'Birmajii' when Menelik II and his soldiers lastly decided to end the *Gadaa* system. This last war (September 6, 1886) was designed by RasDarge in the name of making peace at Anoole. As informant from Oromia Culture and Tourism office says:

Anoole was a symbolic site of Arsi power and what is reverently referred to as 'Arsooma', a custom by which the Arsi Oromo made laws, deliberated on war and peace, elected their leaders and settled their inter and intra-clan disputes. It is the superglue that held the Arsi tightly together.

After the Arsi Oromoo gathered at Anoole, the Menelik army surrounded the people and proposed two options; either to accept the Menelik rule or to sacrifice their life to maintain their *Gadaa* system. After a long controversy, the Arsi Oromoo decided that to accept the Monarchy rule, but governed and administer by their *Gadaa* system. As Baxter, Hultin and Triulzi (1996) also stated the conquest of Abyssinians over the indigenous Oromo people suppressed the Oromo socio-political system, *Gadaa*. This shows the *Gadaa* system is inseparable from the life of Oromoo. It is difficult for Oromoo people to be detached from *Gadaa* like change or remove skin. The Arsi Oromoo lost their life and body part for the continuity of *Gadaa* system.

The second deconstructive narrative emphasizes on long-lasting psychological damage of Arsi Oromo during Menelik II war of conquest. Emperor Menelik II and his army made an inhumane act at the last war of conquest to traumatize the Arsi people not to resist again. They mutilated the hands of men and breasts of women of Arsi people in order to they lack the audacity and became psychologically weak to fight back. As document from Oromia Culture and Tourism office (2006) also mentioned,

The act of hand and breast mutilation happened at the end of war in 1886. RasDarge and Menelik's army ordered those in attendance at the "peace" gathering to enter a narrow pass one by one. Then, the right hands of all male and the right breasts of the women were cut off. The mutilated hand and breast also tied to the neck of the victims. This act happened to frighten the Arsi people who defeated Menelik II army for several time (Translated).

Thus, the mutilated hand mutilated breast holding monuments was constructed to portray what exactly happened at Anoole. However, the act of mutilation is one of the points of controversy. As *Inqu* (April, 2006.Vol.2, No.29) and informants from opposition parties (AUEP and Blue party) mentioned that the mutilation

of hands and breasts as false and popular history. On the other hand, informants from OPDO and Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau strongly opposed the fictitious history of Anoole amputation. In fact, political actors pronounce the modern Ethiopian history from the agenda of their political manifesto. However, Arsi oral history is full of cold-blooded massacre and mutilation at Anoole. This history told and retold by grandmothers and grandfathers for generations. Several scholars (Greenfield, 1965; Holcomb and Ibssa, 1990; Alamayo, 1901; Keller, 1995; Sorenson *et al.*, 1993; Abbas, 1995; Mekuria 1996) also witnessed the atrocious act of Menelik II army made on Arsi, Bale, Harar, and southern parts of the country during the conquest process.

The third deconstructive narrative over the reign of emperor Menelik II emphasizes on the economic crisis of Arsi people. As an informant from Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau says, "Menelik II and his soldiers exploited the Arsi Oromo's natural resources, took a large number of cattle and make them slave labor on their own land." Stressing this, Alamayo (1901: 349) also argues, "During the protracted war of conquest and the pacification that lasted for several decades, vast amounts of property belonging to the conquered people was confiscated or destroyed, and millions of head of livestock were looted." Hence, the Arsi people became economically weak and dependent on the Menelik army who already controlled their resource.

Design of Anoole and Menelik II Monuments

Symbolism of an Equestrian Statue of Menelik II

An equestrian statue of Menelik II is one of the three monuments first erected in Ethiopia. The monument portrays emperor Menelik II in his coronation robes riding glamorously on his horse *Abba Dagneu* looking to the north where the victorious battle of Adwa took place was the second monument erected statue in the capital city of Ethiopia (Mirror of Addis Ababa, 1950 and Addis Ababa City Administration, 2005).



Figure.1 An Equestrian Statue of Menelik II at 'Arada Goirgis', Addis Ababa.

As an informant from Fine Art department said, the crafting of equestrian kinds of monuments began at Greece and mainly erected in the monarchical period for the commemoration of kings and their victory. Similarly, Menelik II monument was erected in Ethiopia to commemorate both the military and civic achievements of the emperor Menelik.

An informants from Blue party and *Inqu* (April 2006, Vol 6,) magazine mentioned an equestrian statue of Menelik is a symbol of liberty, victory and freedom for all Ethiopian and other black people. The statue epitomizes the Ethiopian people heroism and patriotism for the rest of the world. However, the depiction of Menelik II statue has been deconstructed as it not an inclusive and

representative of all ethnic groups particularly affected by the conquest of emperor Menelik II in the process of building the modern Ethiopian empire.

Symbolism of Anoole Memorial Monument

Anoole statue was erected in Hetosa, Arsi zone, Oromia region on April 6, 2014 as a tribute to the Arsi Oromoo harshly affected by the conquest of Menelik II. The design of Anoole statue, *mutilated hand holding mutilated breast* directly depicts the mutilation of Arsi Oromoos' right hands of men and right breast of women during the Menelik II war of conquest. Connotatively, the word '*Right*' symbolizes the '*Moral*' '*Ethics*,' '*Ownership*,' and '*Victory*'. The design depicts the maltreatment of emperor Menelik II army.



Figure.2. Anoole Memorial Monument at Arsi Hetosa, Oromia Region

Therefore, Anoole monument is as symbol of freedom or independency from past domination of the imperial system. The monument also has similar connotation with other statues constructed in African countries that are epitomizing their freedom and/or independence after the end of colonization. As document from Oromia Culture and Tourism office (2006) and informant from OPDO mentioned Anoole statue depicts the 'Unity'

and 'Courage' of Arsi people to fight against any external power that undermine its socio-political system.

However, the design of Anoole statue was the main cause of discord among the elites over the representation of the reign of Menelik II in the Ethiopian polity. As informant from Fine Art department explains, "When horrific histories are depicted artistically through

statues/monuments, artists should transform, not translate the history like photographic form” (personal interview 10 April 2015). *Jano* (April, 2006, Vol.2, No.29), and *Lomi* magazine (April 2006, Volume, 102,) magazines also mentioned the design of Anoole statue inculcates vengeance than preaching forgiveness, tolerance, and peaceful coexistence among the society. Opposing this, informant from OPDO argues that Anoole statue is the direct depiction of the fact. Hence, reshaping the design of Anoole statue from its current portrait is perceived as the reformation of the history. History whether it is good or bad the coming generation should know and take lesson from it.

Political Views on Menelik II and Anoole Monuments

Political Views on Menelik II Monument

Political views revolve around the epitomization of Menelik II monuments highly tied with extreme pan nationalist view. Extreme pan- nationalist view is the oldest view in the Ethiopian nationalism that has been dominantly articulated by the Amhara and Tigray elites. This view sees Ethiopia as the country which had a long political history and ancient society welded by its history and devotion to Christian faith. This ideology has hegemonic discourse that considers Ethiopia as one ethnic, one language, and one religion state and through this it intends to create strong Ethiopian nationalism (Markakis, 2012; Vaughan, 2003; Clay and Holcomb et al, 1986).

This view reveres the normative historical narratives about the reign of Menelik II that embodied in Menelik II monuments. As an informant from Blue Party said the statue of Menelik II represents the political achievement of emperor Menelik II in the process of building the contemporary Ethiopia. In this process, Menelik II made internal and external wars and showed strong leadership. As a result, extreme pan nationalist view represent Menelik II monument as symbol of a great Ethiopian nationalism and emperor Menelik as political architect created the present Ethiopia.

On the other hand, an extreme pan nationalist view condemns the construction of Anoole monument that deconstruct the reign of emperor Menelik II in the Ethiopian polity. In this regard, *Addis Guday* (Vol. 8, No.214, April 2006) and *Inqu* (Vol. 6, No.116, April 2006) mentioned that Anoole is a symbol of disintegration and distortion of Ethiopian nation. It initiates revenge among victims and perpetrators. In addition, Informant from AEUP says, “Anoole statue encourages ethnicity than nationality. The intention of ethnicity negatively affects the Ethiopian strong nationhood and creates animosity among the major ethnic groups” (Informant from AEUP, 2006). Consequently, this view opposes the deconstructive theses rearticulated over the reign of Menelik II that is represented by Anoole monuments and considers it as an emblem of radical racist and secessionist’s political ideology.

Political Views on Anoole Monument

Anoole monument highly tied with extreme ethno-nationalist view. This view has emerged to deconstruct the extreme pan-nationalist view and construct the corrective political narratives in the political history of modern Ethiopia. This view considers the Menelik war of conquest as the process of colonization. As Greenfield (1965) stated emperor Menelik II conquest of Arsi Oromoo had the same in common as colonialists from Europe did in other parts of Africa. The extreme ethno-nationalist view firmly stated that Menelik II army took part in the scramble for Africa by competing with other European countries along Ethiopia’s borders. A document from Culture and Tourism Bureau (2006) also assert that the conquest of Menelik II is seen as internal colonization for the conquered people. As a result, the conquered ethnic groups need to undergo decolonization like other African countries colonized by western colonial empire. This political view is predominantly pronounced by elites from the conquered ethnic groups by Menelik II army. Consequently, it supports the construction of strong ethno-nationalism.

Extreme ethno-nationalist view represent Anoole monument as symbol of resistance and scarifies of ArsiOromoo made towards any unfair, injustices and inequalities happened on Oromoo people. Thus, the monument is seen as one way of correcting the hegemonic political discourses over the reign of Menelik II and reconstructs political narratives in the current Ethiopian political geography as a quest for comparative political power. On the contrary, Menelik II monument is seen as a symbol of colonization. Thus, this view strongly the reign of Menelik as an exclusionist and the oppressed and marginalized groups need to have the right to self-determination. Menelik II monument also should be deconstructed and condemned. As participants from OPDO and Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau say the construction of Anoole statue is an outcome of the contemporary Ethiopia political system (ethno-linguistics based federalism). Hence, Anoole monument is considered as site for strong ethno nationalism.

An Incumbent Government View

An incumbent government (EPRDF) considers Anoole statue from the perspective of giving recognition for the past ethnic tyranny to maintain better and stable political environment. As participants from OPDO says,

In the process of nation-building, facts should not be denied whether they are good or bad. Unless consensuses are made on the past history, it is difficult to step forward as a nation. Therefore, the political agenda of Anoole statue construction is giving recognition for the Arsi people who suffered a humiliating defeat of the 'Neftegna' system. In doing so, the statue plays a significant role in the process of creating an integrated society through educating them from the past experience not to repeat it again in the future.

Thus, Anoole monument has taken as an exemplary site for fighting the political tyranny of monarchial system as favor to democracy and good governance among the Oromo people and the nation as well. Anoole

monument is seen as an emblem of ethno-linguistics based federalism in contemporary Ethiopian political system. On the contrary, *Inqu* (April 2006, Volume 6, No. 116, p.6) and *Addis Guday* (April 2006, Volume 8, No.214, p.14) magazines mentioned that Anoole monument as the space of political friction among the major ethnic groups (Amhara and Oromoo) in the country, and the huge money for the construction of monument was taken as government extravagance when the country is in the rampant economic situation and the society has the problem of infrastructural services.

However, as participants from OPDO and Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau clearly stated, construction of Anoole monument currently has two basic contributions. First, it benefits the society live nearby socially, economically and psychologically. Second, as the statue has its own museum and research center, it gives an opportunity for scholars to explore and investigate untouched issues about Oromoo people for the rest of the world.

Challenges and Opportunities Memorial Monuments

Currently, we all are watching the glimpse of hope that shows the cooperation and support between the major ethnic groups in our country on social and political issues. However, these major areas of discord (historical, architectural and political) over the epitomization of both monuments are the major challenges in the process of current reconciliation and cooperation in Ethiopia. These contradictions or misconceptions are fertile ground for some irresponsible or destructive body who want to put gas on fire and roast their corn. It is obvious that lack of peace, unity and collaboration are the source of underdevelopment. Thus, the representational struggles over both monuments can slower our country's plan to achieve the development goals and bring chaos among our society.

On the other hand, Anoole and Menelik II monuments have great impact on our society. Monuments as means of history telling instrument has social and political impact on

the society. Histories transferred through monuments guide the current nation and shape their future. They have been contributed in the process of nation building. As Mitchell (2013) states monuments were closely link to contemporary nation-building processes. However, the way nation has been built may vary depending on the time frame and political system. Menelik II monuments, for instance, is taken as symbol of unification. Emperor Menelik II used coercive strategy to unify the independent local states and then built an Ethiopian empire. Several scholars argued the coercive measure emperor Menelik II used as the left alternative for the emperor to build the current nation during the monarchial period (Marcus, 1994; Getachew and Paulos, 2005; Markakis *et al.*, 2011).

Anoole memorial monument particularly contributes in the current strong nation building process through recognizing and strengthening the ethnic group it represents. The unity of Arsi Oromo and their strong resistance of the conquest have been taken as an exemplary hub in the process of current unification of Oromoo people (Assefa, 2014). In addition, Aanoole monument has been perceived as an emblem and outcome of the contemporary Ethiopia political system (ethno-linguistics based federalism). As Larsen (2013:5) states that "since democracy does not function through command or coercion, requires instead a constant renewal of sets of symbols - symbols which appeal to people and instill in them a sense of belonging and identification." Thus, the construction of Anoole monument is taken as the outcomes of democracy and the federal structure. It also serves as systematic means of gaining political capital through creating the sense of inclusiveness among the victimized society. Moreover, Anoole and Menelik II monuments are important historical sites that educate our nation how much scarification was paid to keep our identity, language, unique administrative and socio-political system like *Gadaa*. In this way, these monuments can be the source of courage to keep our identity particularly for the generation to come. They are the symbol of resistance. They create the

sense of heroism, not to be surrender by any external body.

Conclusions

This study sets out to investigate how Anoole and Menelik II monuments serve as a site for both reproduction and re-articulation of historical relations of power in the Ethiopian polity. The study found that an equestrian statue of Menelik II and Anoole memorial monument are the face of one coin in the history of building the modern Ethiopia. Both monuments reflect the good and bad historical incidents took place during the reign of Menelik II. The normative historical narratives (heroism and patriotism of Ethiopians showed at the battle of Adwa) which revolve around Menelik II monument deconstructed by Anoole memorial monument which depicts the inhumane act (mutilation of right hand men and right breast of women) emperor Menelik made on Arsi Oromoo people.

Besides, three contrasting and contesting political ideologies (extreme pan-nationalism, extreme ethno-nationalist, and incumbent Government) have been reflected on the political symbolization of Anoole and Menelik II monuments in the Ethiopian polity. With this regard, extreme pan-nationalism view considers Menelik II monument as the symbol of unity, patriotism and victory, but condemns the construction of Anoole monument for it is being thought negatively affects the unity and strong nation hood of Ethiopia. On the other hand, the extreme ethno-nationalist view claims that the Anoole monument is a way of correcting the hegemonic political discourses over the reign of Menelik II and asserts that Menelik II monument is a symbol of colonization. The incumbent government also sees Anoole as representation of the monarchical political tyranny and the strong resistance of Arsi Oromoo. Lastly, the study concludes that the controversies over Anoole and Menelik II monuments emanate from lack of national consensus. Therefore this study recommends, several monuments had been dismantled at different focal points after they were constructed by spending huge

money for they are just simply constructed for political purposes. Hence, the government should give due attention before construction of any monument and make genuine discussion with different stakeholders on the purpose, historical background and architectural design of any monuments. Besides, due to lack of national consensus, several monuments constructed in the period of EPRDF become causes of controversies. The purpose of their construction also looked as the way of creating ethnic tensions. Hence, the government should work hard to build national consensus in the country to minimize the disparity among different ethnic groups over the representation of different media texts including statues. Various media platforms also should cover the issue with package information based on scientific research. Broadcast media particularly should produce documentaries and organize different events on which professionals give scientific explanation in order to create awareness among the society on the representation and the role of the constructed statues.

Conflict of interest

The author didn't declare any conflict of interest regarding to this research work.

References

- _____. Addis Guday Magazine. April 2006, Vol. 8, No. 124, p. 14. Rose publishing P.L.C. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. Inqu Magazine. April 2006, Vol. 6, No. 116, p.6. Alemayehu publishing P.L.C; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. *Jano Magazine*. April 2006. Vol.2, No.29. Asnake publishing P.L.C. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. *Konjomagazine*. April 2006, Vol. 3, No.66, p.5. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- _____. *Lomi Magazine*. April 2006, Vol. 102, p.12. Dadimos publishing P.L.C; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Aalen L. (2002). *Ethnic Federalism in a Dominant Party State: The Ethiopian Experience 1991 2000*. Norway. Chr. Michelson Institute Development Studies and Human Rights. Alamayo Kano. (1901). *The Oromo: An Ancient People in the State*

- Tola, 2019
- _____. *Of Menelik*. Finfinnee. Oromia Culture and Tourism Bureau.
- Abbas Haji Ganamo (1995). *Menelik's Conquest as the Genesis of Ethiopian Crises. A case of the Arsi Oromo*. The Oromo Commentary.
- Addis Ababa City Administration Communication Office. (2009). *Lists Of Monuments in Addis Ababa*. (unpublished)
- Assefa Fissiha (2006). Theory Versus Practice in the Implementation Ethiopia's Ethnic Federalism. In Turton, D (ED), *Ethnic Federalism: The Ethiopian Experience in Comparative Perspectives* (pp 131-162). Oxford. James Currey.
- Bach J.N. (2014). EPRDF's-Building: Nation Tinkering with convictions and pragmatism. Retrived on 27 May 2014 from <http://cea.revues.org/1501>
- Bahru Zawde (1991). *A History of Modern Ethiopia, 1855-1974*. London. James Currey.
- Baird J (2005). *Looking at Ethiopia: History, Photography, and Power*. Florida. University Of Florida.
- Biiroo Oromiya Aadaafi Turizimii. (Jildii 1ffaa, Bitootessa 2006). *AADAIFI TURIZIMII*. Finfinne.
- Bonțeanu T. (2010). Political Myths and Symbols in Monumental Art in Central and South Eastern Europe 1880-1918. (Unpublished PhD Abstract.) Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
- Boyce C. and Neale P. (2006). *Conducting In-Depth Interviews: A Guide for Designing and Conducting In depth Interviews for Evaluation*. Watertown .USA: pathfinder International. Retrieved on February 10, 2015 from [http:// www.esfagentaschp](http://www.esfagentaschp).
- Clay J and Holcomb B (1986). *Politics and the Ethiopian Famine*. Cambridge. Mass Cultural Survival.
- Cohen L, Manion L and Morrison K. (2005). *Research Method in Education* (5thed). New York. Rutledge Falmer.
- Creswell J (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rded.). USA. Sage Publication.

J. Equity Sci. & Sust. Dev.

- Creswell J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rded.). USA. Sage Publication.
- Curl J. and Stevensen (2006). *A Dictionary of Architecture and Landscape Architecture* (Paperback) (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Doresse, J. (1959). The Greatness of Ethiopia: Legends & Reality. In UNESCO report October, 1959, *Africa's Lost Past: The Startling Rediscovery of a Continent* (pp 30-32). France: UNESCO.
- Encyclopedia of Art*. (2008). New York. McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. retrieved on 25 January 2014 from <http://www.encyclopedia.com>
- Ezekiel Gabissa (2014). *Contested Terrain: The Oromo and Ethiopian Studies*. USA. Lutheran University Press.
- Forest and Johnson. (2001). *The Politics of Public Space: What Can Political Science Contribute to the Study of Monuments?* Canadian Political Science Association. Montreal
- Gray D. (2004). *Doing Research in the World*. London. Sage publication.
- Greenfield R. (1965). *Ethiopia: A New Political History*. London. Pall Mall Press Ltd.
- Gunter B. (2002). *Media Research Methods: Measuring Audiences, Reactions and Impact*. London. Sage publication.
- Holcomb B and Ibsa S. (1990). *The Invention of Ethiopia: The Making of a Dependent Colonial State in Northeast Africa*. Trenton N.J. Red Sea Press.
- Johnson R. (2006). *The Digital War Hero: A Textual Analysis of the Production of Whiteness and Masculinity in Metal Gear Solid Series*. Retrieved on 9 September 2014 from [www.http://citation.allacademic.com//metal/p-mla-research/citation/2/0/3/8/0/pages203804-30.php](http://citation.allacademic.com//metal/p-mla-research/citation/2/0/3/8/0/pages203804-30.php)
- Jonson H.M. (1966). *History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day*. New Jersey. Prentice-hall.
- Keller J E. (1995). *The Ethnogenesis of the Oromo Nation and Its Implications for Politics in Ethiopia*. *Journal of modern African studies*. Cambridge University press.
- Leib J. (2002). *Separate Times, Shared Spaces: Arthur Ashe, Monument Avenue and the Politics of Richmond, Virginia's Symbolic Landscape*. London. Sage publication.
- Marcus H. (1994). *A History of Ethiopia*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Markakis J. (2012). *Ethiopia: The Last Two Frontiers*. Montreal. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*
- McClellan Ch. (1978). *Reaction to Ethiopian Expansion: The Case of Daresse 1895-1913*. USA. Michigan.
- Mekuria Bulcha (1996). *The Survival and Reconstruction of Oromo National Identity*. In *Being and Becoming OROMO: Historical and Anthropological Enquiries*. (Ed.) by Baxter P.T.W, Hultin J. and Triulzi A. (1996). USA. The Red Sea press, Inc.
- Merera Gudina. (2003). *Ethiopia: Competing Ethnic Nationalisms and the Quest for Democracy, 1960-2000*. Addis Ababa. Chamber Printing House.
- Pankhurst R. (1982). *History of Ethiopian Towns from the middle Ages to the Early Nineteenth Century*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Paul R. (1984). *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin Books.
- Phillipson D. (2004). *The Aksumite roots of Medieval Ethiopia, Azania*. *Archaeological Research in Africa*. 39:1, 77-89. Retrieved on 16 March 2014 from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00672700409480389>
- Sorenson J. (1993). *Imagining Ethiopia: Struggle for History and Identity in the Horn Africa*. New Brunswick. Rutgers University Press
- Tronvoll K. (2008). *War & the Politics of Identity in Ethiopia*. UK. James Currey
- Turner, V. (1975). *Symbolic Studies*. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 4. (1975). Retrieved on July 12, 2014 from www.annualreviews.org/journal/anthro/43/

Turton D. (2006). *Ethnic Federalism: The Ethiopian Experience in Comparative Perspectives* Oxford. James Currey.

USIP.(2007). The Urge to Remember the Role of Memorials in Social Reconstruction and Transitional Justice. *Stabilization and Reconstruction Series No. 5*. Washington, DC. Retrieved on 8 April 2014 from www.usip.org

Vanderstoep S. and Johnston D. (2009). *Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Jossey-Bass. USA

Vaughan S.(2003). *Ethnicity and Power in Ethiopia*.(Unpublished PhD Dissertation.) The University of Edinburgh, UK

Whelan, Y. (2001). *The Construction and Destruction of a Colonial Landscape: Monuments to British Monarchs in Dublin before and after Independence*. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 28, 4 (2002). Retrieved on 1 April 2014 from <http://www.idealibrary.com>

Wimmer D and Dominik R (2003). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction (7thed.)*. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

□□□□□□ □□□□ (1951 □.□.).
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□ □□□ (1939 □.□.).
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□