

ጉጅለ ስድሪን ሃለባቶምን

ዝኸበርኩም ደለይቲ ፍትሒ ኤርትራውያን ኣሕዋት፣ ኣብ ዝሓለፈ ጊዜ ብተኸታታሊ ንክልተ እዋን <መሪሕነት ኤ-ዲ-ኪ ሓደራ ከይትህመሉ ብምስምስ ዕርቂ> ብዝብል ኣርእስቲ ኣብ ልዕሊ ኪዳን ብስም ዕርቂ ንዝተኣልመ ሽርሒ ኣመልኪተ መጠንቀቕታ ኣቕሪቦ ምምባሪይ ዝዝኸር ኢዩ። ስለዚ ቦቲ ዘቕረብክዎ መጠንቀቕታታት ተስፋ እገብር ግርም ኣመት ረኺብምሉ ክኾኑ። ካብኡ ሓሊፉ ግን ኣብቲ ዘቕረብክዎ ዳሕረዎይ ጽሑፊይ፣

http://www.assenna.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3052:2010-09-27-22-12-16&catid=53:2010-05-10-22-41-45&Itemid=100598 ኣቶ ጳውሎስ ወዲ ባዓታይ ብስም ህዝቢ ኤርትራ እናነገደ ዝኣከሮ ገንዘብ ጌሩ ብኸመይን ንመንን ከም ዝግሱብን ከም ዝኸትብን ገሊጸ ነይረ፣ ከም ውጺኢቱ ክኣ እንሆ ድሮ እቶም ሰብ ኢንታ ከስቆርቁሩ ጀሚሮም ኣለው። ነቲ መልሶም ንምንብብ ኣብዚ ጠውቁ፣

http://www.assenna.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3065:2010-10-01-19-22-03&catid=53:2010-05-10-22-41-45&Itemid=100598 እንተኾነ ናይዞም ሰብ ኢንታ ጽቡቕ ነገር <ኣብ ውሽጣዊ ጉዳይና እንታይ ኣእተወካ።> ድኣ ኢዮም ዝብሉ ዘለውምበር፣ ድኣን ይእተዉ እቲ ዝተመጠዎም ገንዘብ ህዝቢስ ኣይክሓድዎን። ስለዚ ሕጂውን በዚ ኣጋጣሚ ደጊመ ከብርሃሎም ዝደልዮ ነገር እንተሎ፣ ኣብቲ ኣቶ ጳውሎስ ወዲ ባዓታይ ብስም ህዝቢ ኤርትራ ዝኣከሮ ገንዘብ ጌሩ ክጥቀመሎም ዝፈተነ ድኣ ኢዮ ዝተሃረብኩ እምበር፣ ኣብ ውሽጣዊ ጉዳይኩም ዝኣተኸዎ ነገር ከም ዘዩልዎን፣ ብሕጂውን ዘእትው ምክንያት ከምዘይብለይን እናኣረጋገጽኩ ናብቲ ቀንዲ ናይ ሎሚ ዛዕባይ ከተኩር እፈቱ።

መገቢ ጽሑፊይ እምባኣር ከምቲ ኣብ ኣርእስቲ 'ጉጅለ ስድሪን ሃለባቶምን' ኢሉ ጠቐሰዮ ዘለኹ፡ ኣብዚ እዋንዚ ጉጅለ ስድሪ ካብ ውሽጣዊ ዝተረኸበ ሓበሬታ ከምዘረጋገጸ፡ ኣብ ክልተ ሪኡቶ ተኸፋፊሎም ኣብ ቅልውላው ከምዝርከቡ እዩ ዝሕበር። እቲ መገቢ ምክንያት ኮይኑ ዘሎ ክኣ፡ ብሰንኪ እቲ ንመትከላት ሰብኣዊ መሰላት ኢና ንቃለስ እናበሉ ብግብሪ ግን ኣብ መንጎ ደምበ ተቓውሞ ሌላን ጉሌላን እናፈጠሩ ሻራነት ብምዝውታሮም ዝነቐለ ኢዩ። ኩሉ ከም ዝፈልጦ ጉጅለ ስድሪ ኣብ ዋዕላ ንደሞክራሲ ለውጢ ካብ ምስታፍ ነብሱ ድሕሪ ምግላሉ ቅድምን ድሕርን ዋዕላ ማዕረ ማዕረ ሰልፌ ደሞክራሲ ህዝቢ ኤርትራ ኣንጻር ኪዳንን ዋዕላን ውጽኢቱን ክኹንንን ክነቅፍን ኢዩ ክርኣ ጸኒሑ። ይኹንምበር ሕጂ ኣብዚ ዝሓለፈ ቁሩብ መዓልታት ግን ካብ መንጎኦም ግንብ ዝብሉ ለባማት ተረኺቦም ኣለው።

ቅድሚ ናብቲ ጉዳይ ምእታው ኣብ 'ጉጅለ ስድርን' 'ጉጅለ ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላምን'፡ ብሰንኪ ዝኸሓነ ውልቃዊ ጽልእም ንመትከላት እቲ ምትእኸኻብ ንዕጺጸም ኣንጻር ኪዳንን ዋዕላን ዝተሰለፉ ቀንዲ ተዋሳኔቲ ባእታታትን መንነቶምን ቁሩብ ክጠቓቕስ ክፍትን።

1. ዶክተር ጋይም ክብርኣብ፣- ድርብ ኣባልነት ዘለዎ መስራትን ኣባልን ስድሪን መስራትን ኣባልን 'ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላም'(Eritreans Citizens for Peace)
2. ኣቶ ዳዊት መስፍን፣- ድርብ ኣባልነት ዘለዎ፣ መስራትን ቀንዲ ኣመሓዳርን 'ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላም' (Eritreans Citizens for Peace)
ልዕሊ ኹሉ ክኣ ኣባል ሰልፌ ደሞክራሲ ህዝቢ ኤርትራ ናይ ምርምርን መጽናዕትን ሓላፊ።
3. ወይዘሮ ሰላም ኪዳን መስራቲት ኣባልን ጸሓፊትን 'ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላም' (Eritreans Citizens for Peace)

4. ኣቶ ሱሌማን ኣደም፡ ድርብ ኣባልነት ዘለዎ መስራትን ኣቡ-መምበር ስድሪን፡ መስራትን ኣባልን 'ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላም' (Eritreans Citizens for Peace)

5. ኣቶ ዓብደልራሕማን ሰይድ ኣባል ፈጻሚ ኣካል ስድርን ኣባል ነበር ምንቅስቃስ ፌደራልያ (ብኣቶ በሽር እስሓቕ ዝምራሕ)

6. ኣቶ ጳውሎስ ተስፋ-ጊዮርጊስ (ወዲ ብዓታይ) መስራትን ላዕለዎይ ሓላፍን መዋልን 'ኤርትራውያን ዜጋታት ንሰላም' (Eritreans Citizens for Peace) ኢዮም።

ግርም እምባኣር ናብቲ ኣብ ላዕሊ ዘመንጎኹዎ ክመለስኩም መንቀሊ ኣብዚ ቀረባ እዋን ዝተኸሰተ ፍልልይ ሓደ ኣብ መርቡብ ሓበሬታ ስድሪ ብስም ቦርድ ምስ ሰልፊ ደሞክራሲ ህዝቢ ኤርትራ ዝወገነ ካብ መትከላትን ዕላማን እቲ ማሕበር ዝወጸ ጽሑፍ፡ (ነቲ ጽሑፍ ንምንባብ ኣብዚ ጠውቁ)፤

http://www.cdrie.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=87:eritrean-people-deserve-a-better-opposition&catid=34:english-articles&Itemid=53 እሞ ኸኣ እዚ ኣብ ላዕሊ ዘሎ ጥብቆ ብኣባል ስድሪ ዘይኮነ፤ ማለት ካብቲ ማሕበር ወጸኢ ዝኾነ ውልቀ-ሰብ ቢኢሜል ዝተላእኾ ኣቶ ረድኢ ዓይቡ መስራትን ኣባልን ስድሪን ዘልዓሎ ሕቶ ኢዮ ዝጅምር።

ኣቶ ረድኢ እቲ ዝወጸ ጽሑፍ ነቲ ናይ ማሕበርና ተልእኾን መትከልን ዝጸረጸ እዩ ይብል። ከምኡ-ውን እቲ ጽሑፍ ነቲ ዋዕላ ንዲሞክራሲያዊ ለውጢ ዕላምኡን ሽቱኡን ዘይፈልጥ፡ እቶም ኣዳለውቲ ብሕልፊ ንኪዳን ኣብ ሞንጎ ኣባላቱ ክገብሩን ዘይኸኣለን ደገፍ ዘይረኸበን ኢሉኳ እንተወቐሰ፡ ኣቶ ረድኢ ስድሪኸን ንኣባላቱ ነቲ ዋዕላ ንኸድግፍ ዝገበር ምትብባዕ ኔሩዶ? ኢሉ ይሓትት። ከምኡ-ውን ብዛዕባ እቲ ጽሑፍ ኣባላት ስድሪ ብማሕበርም ክሕበሩ እኳ እንተነበርም እቲ ጥብቆ ናይቲ ጽሑፍ ብኣባል ናይ ስድሪ ዘይኮነ ባእታ ከምዝተልኣኸሎም እዩ ዝሕብር። እቲ ተረኺቡ ዘሎ ሓበሬታ ብሓደ ገዲም ካድረ ናይ ሰልፊ ደሞክራሲ ህዝቢ ኤርትራ ከምዝተሰደደ እዩ ዝንገር። ኣቶ ረድኢ ንረብሓ መንዩ እዚ ጽሑፍ እዚ ተጻሒፉ ኣብ መርቡብ ሓበሬታ ስድሪ ዝተዘርግሐ? ኢሉ-ውን ሓቲቱ እዩ።

ብድሕሪዚ ኣቶ ብርሃነ ገብረንገስ ኣበጋስን መስራትን ስድሪ-ውን ነቲ ኣቶ ረድኢ ዘልዓሎ ሕቶታት ከምዝድግፎን ንዊሻ እዋን ቅሳነት ከለእዎ ከምዝጸንሐን ብሰንኩ ድማ እቲ ውሽጣዊ ኣሰራርሓ ናይ ስድሪ ባህ ስለ ዘይበሎ ዳርጋ ነብሰ-ምድሰካል ጌሩ ከምዝጸንሐ ይገልጽ። ንኣቶ ረድኢ ኣዝዩ ኣገዳሲ ሕቶታት ብምሕታቱ የመስግኖ። ንኣባላት ስድሪ ድማ ነቲ ዝተሓተተ ሕቶታት ክዛተይሉ ይላቦው። ኣቶ ብርሃነ መልሲ ናይ ዶር ጋይም ክብርኣብ ከምዘሰደመሞ-ውን ይገልጽ። እቲ ስድሪ ዘይ ሻራውን ናጸን ዝኾነ ማሕበር እዩ ዝብል መርገጽ ቦቲ ተጻሒፍ ዘሎ ጽሑፍ ከምዝተጣሕሰን ገለ ኣባላት ካብቲ ኣብ ሞንጎኡም ዝገበር ዘሎ ክትዕ ብዛዕባ ናይ ስድሪ ተልእኾ መምርሕን ዕላማን ንጹር ተረድኦ ከምዘይብሎም ይሕብር። ብሓፈሻ ስድሪ ብዛዕባ ኣብ ኣዲስ ኣበባ ዝተኸየደ ዋዕላ ዘለዎ መርገጽ ሻራውን ብዕሊ ርእይትኡ ኣድልዎ ከምዝገበረን እዩ ዝገልጽ።

ኣቶ ብርሃነ ነቲ ብብጻቱ ኣካየድቲ ሽማግሌ ስድሪ ዝካየድ ዝነበረ ኣሰራርሓ ክጻወር ስለ ዘይኸኣለ ካብቲ ተመሪጽሉ ዝነበረ ናይ ኣካየድቲ ሽማግሌ ቦታ ብፍቓዱ ከምዝወረደውን ይሕብር። ብሓፈሻ ስድሪ ሸውዓተ ኣመሓደርቲ ሽማግሌ እኳ እንተነበሩ፡ ብድሕሪኡ ኣቶ ስምኡን ወልደሃይማኖት-ውን ገዲፍዎ ከምዝኸደን ኣቶ ሃብቶም ዮሃንስ-ውን ብዘይ ኣገባብ ኣደስኪሎም ከምዘለው ኣብ መርቡብ ሓበሬታ ተሓቢሩ ከምዝነበረ ኩላህና ንዝክር እዩ።

ስድሪ ኣብዚ እዋንዚ ኣርባዕተ ኣካዩድቲ ሽማግሌ ኣለዎ። እሳቶም ከኣ፡ ኣቶ ሱሌማን ኣደም፡ ወ/ሮ ጸዳል ዮሃንስ (ኣፍቲ ኣስቴር ዮሃንስ)፡ ዶር ዮዕብዮ ወልደማርያምን ኣቶ ዓብዱልራሕማን ሰይድን እዮም።

ኣቶ ብርሃነ ነቲ ዘዛርብ ዘሎ ጽሑፍ ካብ መርበብ ኢንተርነት ስድሪ ከልግስዎ ይጽውዑ፡ ከምኡውን ነቶም ኣካዩድቲ ሽማግሌ ኣንቀጽ 5 ናይ ስድሪ ቻርተር ክውከሱን ንስድሪ ካብቲ ተምሰረተትሉ ራእን መትከልን ከዩርሕቑዎ ይላቡ።

ወሲኹ ናይ ኣቶ ተወልደ እስጢፋኖስን ፕሮፌሶር ኣርኣያ ደበሳይ ሪኢቶ ኢሉውን ብኸምዚ ዝስዕብ ጌሩ ኣስፊርዎ።

ሀ- ኣቶ ተወልደ እስጢፋኖስ (ኣባል ስድሪ)፣ ካብዚ ዝኸይድ ዘሎ ክትዕ፡ ኣባላት ስድሪ ብዛዕባ መትከልን ዕላማን ስድሪ ንጽር ተረድኦ ከምዘይብሎም እዩ ዘርእይ። ስድሪ ካብ ዝኾነ ንጥፊታት ፖለቲካን ጸግዕነት ናይ ፖለቲካ ወደባት ክርሕቕን ናጻ ኾይኑ ክሰርሕ ኣለዎ። ኣብ ሕቶ ፍትሒ፡ ደሞክራሲ፡ ትምህርቲ፡ ማዕርነት፡ ወዘተ.. ግን ተሪር መርገጽ ወሲዶ ክቃለስ ይግባእ። ከምኡውን ይብል ኣቶ ተወልደ፡ ገለ ኣባላት ስድሪ፡ ስድሪ ምስ ገለ ናይ ፖለቲካዊ ውደባት ዝተሓጋገዘ ምንቅስቃስ ወይ ማሕበር እዩ ዝብል ጌጋ መረዳእታ እንተሊዎም ኮይኑ ይጋገዩ ከምዘለው ይሕብር። (ኣቶ ብርሃነውን ነቲ ሓሳቡ ከምዝደግፎ ይገልጽ)

ለ- ዶር ኣርኣያ ደበሳይ፣ ድማ ከምዚ ይብል፡ <ካብዚ ዘካትዕ ዘሎ፡ ብስድሪ ዝተጽሓፈ ኣሰካፊ ጽሑፍ ተማሂርና ንመጻኢ ኣብ ነውጽኦ መግለጺታት ክንጥንቀቕ ኣለና። እቲ በሊሕ ብርዕና ኣንጻር ኢሳያስ ኣፈወርቂን ተሓጋገዞቱን እንበር ናብቶም ነቲ ስርዓት ንኸልግሱ መስዋእቲ ከፊሎም ዝቃለሱ ዘለው ክኸውን የብሉን፣ ዋላውን ዕቃባታት ኣብቲ ዝገብሩዎን ዝወሰዱዎ ስጉምታትን እንተለና> ይብል። <ከምኡውን እቲ ካብ ስድሪ ዝድለ ነቶም ዝውቀሱ ዘለው ጉድለታት ሃናጺ ሓገዝ ኣበርኪትካ እቲ ዝድለ ዘሎ ቅነዕ ውሳኔታትን ስጉምታትን ከመዝግቡ ምግባር እዩ> ይብል። (ኣቶ ብርሃነውን ነቲ ዝበሎ ክምዘሰማምዓሉ ይገልጽ)።

ሐ- ዶር ዮዕብዮ ወልደማርያም፣(ኣባል ኣካዩዲት ሽማግሌ ስድሪ) ንኣቶ ረድኢ ንመጀመርታ ጊዜ ብግሉጽን ቃልዕን ንናይ ውሽጣዊ ኣሰራርሕኦም ብዘምልከት ኣዋግሪ ሕቶታት ዝሓተተን ስክፍትኡ ዝገለጸ ኣባል ምኃኑ ኣሚኑ፡ ግና ይብል እቲ ዝወጸ ጽሑፍ ንርእይቶ ኣባላት ሽማግሌ ጥራይ ዘይኮነስ ንናይ መብዛሕትኦም ኣባላት ስድሪ ኣብ ልዕሊ ኪዳንን ዋዕላን ውጺኢቱን ዘለዎም ርእይቶን ሓሳባትን ዘንጸባርቕ እዩ ይብል።

እዚ ከምዚ ኢሉ እንከሎ ብወገን እቶም ናይዚ ሽግር ፈጠርቲ ዝኾኑ ሰባት ናይ ምክልኻል ቋንቋኦም ብኸምዚ ዝስዕብ ክቕርብዎ ፈቲኖም፣-

ዶር ጋይም ክብርኣብ፣
ስድሪ ከም ሲቢክ ማሕበር ንረብሓ ህዝብን ንህዝብን ተባሂሉ ዝግበር ጉዳያት ክምርምር፣ ርእይቶ ክህብ፣ ክቃወም፣ ክጠንቕቕ፣ ከምክትን ክኹንን ከምዝኸእል ይሕብር። እቶም ኣብ ኣዲስ ኣበባ ዝተጋበኡ ዋዕለኛታት ሕልዎምን ቀልጦምን ምስ መወልቶም ኮይኖም ነቲ ኣብ ኣስመራ ዘሎ ስርዓት ምትካእ እዩ ይብል። ስለዚ ስድሪ ሓላፍነቱ እዩ ነቲ ንኹሉ ዝገብሩዎን ዝሓስቡዎን ክቆጸጸር፣ ድኽመቶምን ዝኾነ ውዲትን ሕግኹ ዝንባሌኦምን ከቃልዕን ንህዝቢ ከተጠንቕቕን ይብል። ምስኡ ኣተሓሳሲሩ ዶር ጋይም ነቶም ነታ ተዛርብ ዘላ ጽሕፍቲ ዝጸሓፉ ኣካዩድቲ ሽማግሌ ስድሪ ክምስገኑ ይግባእ ክኣ ይብል።

ደር ጋይም ነቶም ኣብ ኣዲስ ኣበባ ዝተኣከቡ ዋላ ዝጠቓም ለውጢ ከምጽእ ዝኸእል ዛዕባ ከምዘይነበሮምን እቲ ዋዕላ ፍሹል ከምዝኾነ ይገልጽ። ነቲ ወጺኡ ዘሎ ጽሑፍውን ንጠቕሚ ህዝቢ ኢሉ እዩ ተዘርጊሑ ይብል። ብሽም ተቓዋምቲ እዮም ኢልና ክጋገዩ ከለው ዓይንና ዓሚትና ነሕልፈሎም ምኽንያት የለን ይብል። ነቶም ዝቃወሙ ዘለውውን ዘይተጠርነፉ ብቕዓት ዘይብሎምን ስልጣን ኣብ ቢያቲ ተጌሩ እንተዘይተዋሂቦም ባዕሎም ተቃሊሶም ለውጢ ከምጽኡ ዝኸእሉ ኣይኮኑን ይብል። እንተተዋሂቡዎምውን ክዕቅቡዎ ዝኸእሉ ኣይኮኑን ይብል። ከምኡውን ብቐሊሉ ነታ ሃገር ኣብ ኩናት ሕድ ሕድ ከእትውዋ ከምዝኸእሉ እዩ ዝገልጸም።

ሙብዛሕትና ለውጢ ብዝመጸ ይምጸእ ብዘየገድስ ኢና ንብል። እቲ ብድሕሪኡ ክመጽእ ዝኸእል ጸገማት ኣይንገሪኦን ኢና፡ እንተኾነ እቲ ዘድሊ ለውጢ ነታ ሃገር ዘረጋግኣን ሰላምን ቅሳነትን ዘምጽእ እንበር ብሃይማኖትን ብሄራትን ዘናቐት ክኸውን የብሉን ይብል። ህዝብና ናይ ሃይማኖት፣ ዓሌትን ብሄርን ፖለቲካ ኣብ ኣርብዓታት ብእንቢታ ነጹጉዎ እዩ፡ ኣብ መጻኢውን ኣብ ኤርትራ ቦታ የብሉን ይብል።

ኣቶ ዓብደልራሕማን ሰይድ (ቦሓሽም) ፣- <ሰላማት ኣያ ብርሃነ ገብረንጉስ፡ ካብተን ከልተ ኢሚልካ ከምዝተረዳእኩዎ፡ እቲ ጉዳይ ብዛዕባ እቲ ብስድሪ ተጻሒፉ ዝወጸ ጽሑፍ ኣይኮነን። ነገር ምፍሕታር ባእስን ክስን ግብረ መልስን ሓጋዝን ሃናጽን ኣይኮነን። ኣብዚ ከምዚ ዓይነት ኩነታት እቲ ዝሓሸ እቶም ኣካየድቲ ሽማግሌን ኣባላት ስድርን ነቲ ዝመጽእ ዘሎ ናይቲ ማሕበር ጉባኤ ንኸዳልው እንተዝግደፍ ምሓሸ። ክስታትካ ብጭብጥታት ኣሰኒኻ ኣብቲ ጉባኤ ንኸተቅርቦ የተባብዓካ> ይብል።

ኣቶ ሱሌማን ኣደም (ኣቦ መንበር ስድሪ)፣ < እቲ ብዛዕባ ዋዕላን ውጽኢቲን ዝተጻሕፈ ጽሑፍ ንኣባላት ስድሪ ንኸካትዕሉ ዘይኮነ ተጻሒፉ፡ ኣካየድቲ ሽማግሌ ቦቲ ዝተወሃቦም ስልጣን መሰረት እቲ ዝመስሎም እዮም ዝገብሩ ዘለው> ይብል። <እዚ ድማ ስጋዕ እቲ ናይ ስድሪ ራእይን ተልእኾን ዘይተጻረረ እቶም ዝተመርጹ ሽማግሌ ንክመርሑን ክውስኑን እዮም ዝምረጹ እሱ ድማ ኢና ጌርና> ይብል። <ብዝኾነ ኣባላት ብዛዕብኡ ክሓቱ ይኸእሉ እዮም> ይብል። ስዒቡውን ስድሪ ናይ ዝኾነ ወገን ጸግዒ ከምዘይወሰደ ይሕብር። ነቲ ኣብ መርበብ ኢንተርኔት ስድሪ ወጺኡ ዘሎ ኣካታዒ ርእሲ ዓንቀጽ ድማ ባዕሉ ከምዘውጽኦ ይኣምን። ስድሪ ናይ ሲቢክ ማሕበር ምዃኑ እኳ እንተኣመኑ፡ ኣብቲ ዝካየድ ዘሎ ናይ ፖለቲካ ክትዕን ጉዕዞን ግን ነጢፉ ክዋሳእ ምዃኑ ይሕብር። እቲ ወጺኡ ዘሎ ጽሑፍ ድማ መቀጻልታ ነቲ ስጋዕ ሕጂ ክገብሩዎ ዝጸንሑን መርገጽ ስድሪ ኣብ ልዕሊ ዋዕላን ውጽኢቲን ዘረጋግጽ እዩ ። ብዛዕባ መርገጽ ስድሪ ኣብ ልዕሊ ዋዕላ ክገልጽ ከሎ፡ ስድሪ ኣብቲ ካብ መስርሕ ምቕርራብ ጀሚሩ ብዙሕ ጌጋታት ዝነበሮ ኣብቲ ዛዕብኡ ገጽር ዘይነበረ ኣብ ቃንኡን ኩለንትንኡን ፈላላይ ዝነበረ ዋዕላ ኣዲስ ኣበባ ክሳተፍ ድልየት ከምዘይነበሮ ይሕብር። ኣብቲ ዝወስድዎ ስጉምቲ ድማ ተጽዕኖ ናይ ዝኾነ ናይ ደገ ሓይሊ ከምዘይነበረን ናይቶም ኣካየድቲ ሽማግሌ ምዃኑ የረጋግጽ።

ብዛዕባ እቲ ዝወጸ ጽሑፍ ክዛረብ ከሎ፡ ብወገን ስድሪ ንህዝቢ ብዛዕባ እቲ ዝተኻየደ ዋዕላን ኣተገባብሩኡን ጥራሕ ዘይኮነ ብዛዕባ ሓፈሻዊ ዛዕባታት ሃገራዊ ረብሓ ክገልጹሉ ከምዘለዎም ስለዝኣመኑ ምዃኑ ይነግር። ነቲ ብዋዕላ ዝወጸ ኣዋጅ ክገልጽ ከሎ መሰረት ሓድነትናን ሉኣላውነትናን ዝፈታተንን ዘዳኸምን እዩ ይብል። ነቲ መሰል ብሄራት ስጋዕ ምግንጻል ዝብል ድማ ሓደገኛ ውሳኔ ስለዝኾነ ንህዝብና ካብ ሓደጋ ክንከላኸለሉ ይግብኣና ይብል። ብዛዕባ እቲ ኣብቲ ዋዕላ ተመስሪቱ ዘሎ ኮምሽን ዝተዋህቦ ሓላፍነት ከም ኣብ ውሽጢ ዓመት ባይቶ ምቕምን ምንዳፍ ኮንስቲቲዩቲሽንውን ስክፍታ ከምዘለዎ ይገልጽ። ብዛዕባ ተራ ናይ ኢትዮጵያ ኣብቲ ዝካየድ ዘሎ ንጥፊታት ናይ ኤርትራውያን ተቃዋምቲ ውድባትውን እንታይዩ ኢሉ ይሓትት።

መደምደምታ፡-

ዝኸበርኩም ደለይቲ ፍትሒ ኤርትራውያን ኣሕዋት፣ እዚ ኣብ ውሽጢ ስድሪ ኣጋጢሙ ዘሎ ቅልውላው ኣዚዩ ብዝተጸምቐ ኣገባብ ከምዚ ኣብ ላዕሊ ቀሪቡ ዘሎ ኮይኑ፣ እንተኾነ እቲ ኩሉ

ናይ ኢመይላት ምምልላሶም ብቋንቋ ኢንግሊዘኛ ከምዘለዎ ኣብ ታሕቲ ኣለኩምሞ ባዕልኹም ኣምቢብኩም ፍረዱ። ካልእ ኣብዚ ቀሪቡ ዘሎ ሓበሬታ እቲ ቅልውላው ብዝተወሰኑ ግለ-ሰባት ዝተፈጥረ ድኣምበር ብዘሓት ብቕንዕና ዝሰርሑ ከምዘለውን ክስሓት ኣይግባእን። ስለዚ በዚ ኣጋጣሚ ብወገይ ነቶም ብቕንዕና ንሻራውን ወጋንን ኣካያይዳ መሪሕነትኩም ነቐፍኩም ናብ ቅነዕ ማኣዝን ንምምላስ ትቃለሱ ዘለኹም ብልቢ እናኣድነቕኩ ደገፊይ ብምግላጽ ዓወት እምነዮልኩም።

ዓወት ንደሞክራሲያዊ ለውጢ!
ኣስመሮም ሃይለ
03/10/10

ምምባብ ቀጽሉ

Salamat Ustaz Abdulrahman Sayed, the EC and All members,

(Although this reply was drafted to be posted early last week, in recognition and the spirit of Eid ElFitr and Kudus Yohannes, I decided to delay until today)

1- Abdulrahman thank you for your response to the emails we exchanged on the subject of CDRiE's editorial on the Addis NCDC meeting. I assure you that I, too, am not interested on a tit-for-tat or on 'not constructive' arguments. On the other hand I don't agree with you if you think that the useful contributions of all those who participated in the discussion as unhelpful or unconstructive tit-for-tat argument. Frankly, I am disappointed by the unfriendly, terse, dismissive and condescending tone of your response.

2- In contrast to Chairman Suleiman's earlier attempt to explain the situation in detail and inviting us to freely air our opinions, your message gives the impression of your desire to stop or restrain discussions on this important subject. I consider this effort, to curtail discussion on the desirability of the editorial and the other points raised as unconstructive, unhelpful and contrary to the spirit of CDRiE - it is un-CDRiE like. In my humble opinion, 'organizing a congress' should not take precedence over discussion by the members of

a subject which is pertinent to the core principles of the organization. In any case the two - the discussion and the organizing- could easily go hand in hand.

3- From email exchanges we had last week, no doubt, the editorial has been found to be controversial by many 'highly respected CDRiE members'. Some even suggested Skype or paltalk discussions on the subject amongst the members. One, namely Elias H/S in turn suggested "the EC to appoint a committee to look into the matter thoroughly and come up with recommendation that would satisfy the majority CDRiE members". Strange enough the EC refused to react positively to any of these suggestions.

4- It is now evident that there is a major misunderstanding by some members of the unique twin qualities of CDRiE - that of its nonpartisan and neutral nature. These two pillars are amongst the ones that make CDRiE different from many so called Civic organizations. And these two have been the victims of the editorial. Dr. Araya and Tewelde have a clear understanding of these traits. Both have succinctly clarified their understanding of the terms as used in CDRiE's Charter. Here below are excerpts of some of their statements:

A) Tewelde: in his last posting wrote, quote "... . The current misunderstanding occurring several years into CDRiE's life is symptomatic that something is still not clear. Therefore it is critical that we reaffirm what CDRiE stands for so we all have a common understanding as we move forward. I am of the opinion that CDRiE's stature will be greatly enhanced if it stays neutral -- neutral to politics and political parties but not neutral to questions of justice, democracy, education, equal opportunity etc. CDRiE will be more productive and will have more credibility by staying neutral." Further he said "..... are we learning our lessons or do members have mismatched assumptions about what CDRiE is all about? CDRiE being or appearing to be a

mass organization for any political party is the last thing I want to see." (Emphasis mine)

B) Dr. Araya: In his last posting about the editorial he said quote"... The lesson we need to draw for the future is that we need to be careful with the statements we issue. We should be directing our sharp arsenal, our pen, towards PIA and his entourage and not against those who are committed to end his ruthless regime, no matter how much reservation we might have with their approaches and the steps they take. The challenge on CDRiE is to constructively help these groups to do the right thing, and that is only possible if we maintain a healthy relationship with all the opposition groups"(Emphasis mine)

5- As one of the founders of CDRiE my stand on this point of nonpartisanship and neutrality is well known to all past and present members of the EC and many of the founding members. I was always for nonpartisanship and neutrality as described above. This was the major bone of contention which forced me to resign from the EC; Indeed, I did this with a heavy heart.

I must admit the reason why I withdrew from the EC was nothing but because of my strong principled difference in understanding between me and some of the EC members of the role of CDRiE as an impartial and neutral organization. Of course, this neutrality only deals with the opposition. Every fair minded member knows how much I had dedicated myself and how much I loved playing my role in the initiation and in all the attempts that followed to attain its intended mission.

To the chagrin of many of the members, in order to maintain CDRiE's unity I did my best to keep silent and bury my concerns within myself before and after I left the EC. I took this stance, partly because I was hoping that the EC would come back to their senses and refrain from applying their hawkish tendencies. I sincerely hoped they would move to the center. Sadly, I was wrong and the result turned out to be more contrary to my expectations. The EC finally moved much further to the right. In fact I am afraid if continues the same route it could end up being part of the problem in the muddled

waters of the Eritrean Diaspora politics.

6- However, it is encouraging to note that many members do see the role of CDRiE in exactly the same way I do. Dear friends, the original mission of CDRiE and the role it was meant to play are clearly stated in Article 5.1. For many of you I am sure it is very clear and it should not have been a subject for misunderstanding. Here it is:

Articles 5 - Governing principles of CDRiE

1. On carrying its activities towards realization of its aims, CDRiE shall be nonpartisan with regard to its standing on the Eritrean body politic. In this regard, CDRiE shall be guided by neutrality, objectivity and professionalism. (emphasis is mine)

The framers of CDRiE's Charter knew exactly what they wanted CDRiE to be and expressed their intentions clearly. Allow me to be a little bit pedantic if I stress that they knew the words:

Nonpartisan means: unbiased, impartial, unprejudiced, independent, neutral, external and nonaligned;
and Neutrality means: impartiality, a neutral stance, detached, objectivity, refusal to take sides and nonaligned status.

Please note that CDRiE's neutrality is only in reference to the 'Eritrean body politic' i.e. only when it comes to the friction, clash or tug-of-war between and amongst the opposition groups. CDRiE's commitment to any and every thing Eritrean as opposed to or in relation to other nations (Ethiopia, Sudan etc) is the *raison d'être* of its existence hence, there is no space for neutrality or debate.

All of us, the founding members, discussed freely and arrived at the above description of the role expected of CDRiE in the Eritrean body politic if it was going to act as a unifier of the divided opposition.

How did the change come about then? I would let every member muse over it if he/she cares about the wellbeing of CDRiE.

7- It is worth remembering that the perception of CDRiE's role in the

society was completely misunderstood from the very beginning. Some accused CDRiE of sympathy with the GOE others said we were against EDA etc. Without dwelling too much on this it is clear to every concerned CDRiE member that there is the perception that CDRiE is not an impartial or a neutral organization. You all know that perception plays a more defining role than reality especially in societies like ours. The fact that more could have been done to dispel this perception was one of the contentious issues that sapped my energy when I was in the EC. Sadly, after I left the EC, Simon and Habtom also left for various reasons and the EC has been reduced from 7 elected officers to only 4. Thus it could be stated that the 4 on their own may not have time to spare to fight the perception. But on the flip side you could say they should not have had the time and the dare to take it all the way out from neutrality to open favoritism.

8- Dear CDRiE members, like the EC officers and you, the reason why I have resorted to detailing the above is simply because I love CDRiE and its original sacred and unique mission. Except love I have no malice towards none, especially to the EC. If I sounded like that please accept my apologies. Now I have an honest appeal addressed to you and the EC.

A) To the EC

I) As many of us have concluded the editorial has been controversial. Thus, the wise thing to do for the EC is to remove the editorial from cdrie.net, at least until the EC convinces the majority of the members otherwise.

II) Please assure us that we still uphold CDRiE's original principle. If not let us know if we are having second thoughts and want to change our non-political and civic status. I for one would like to know why the EC is having a difficulty in understanding the letter and spirit of what our Charter i.e. Article 5 stands for.

III) Above all, please do not discourage discussion on

any important subject and especially on the interpretation and understanding of the articles in CDRiE's Charter.

IV) The reason why the discussion should continue (before the GOC) is if you do not give us a satisfactory answer to 8AII above, in a democratic setting, all members should be given the freedom to participate in a dialogue on the points between now and the GOC. I say this taking into account the fact that most of CDRiE's members, like me live outside the UK and may not be able to attend the Conference in person. Thus any discussion that does not include a sizable number of members may be legal but may not really represent all. It could be judged simply unfair. That is why I plead with the EC not to dismiss the requests by some members for Skype, Paltalk and email discussions before the GOC.

Personally, I do not think that preparations for CDRiE' General Conference will be affected by the discussion. On the other hand, I believe introduction of such discussion (which is rare in CDRiE culture) would enrich the understanding of CDRiE's vision and would encourage participation by members.

B) To the members:

I) The subject that some of us have been discussing in the last few days is an important matter that requires serious discussion by all concerned. Every one of us should participate and should not be left only to the few individuals.

II) Of course, I would request you not to change the discussion into an argument or into a personal clash. Let us not second guess on the motives or intentions of others. Above all let us not lower our discussion to the level of the political parties or that of hgdef whose motto is "those who are notwith us are against us; or those who are not with Isayas (or the leader) are against Eritrea"

III) I assure you that those of us who have presented our comments and/or our suggestions (Redi, Tewelde Araya myself and others) are simply stating that 'something is still not clear' within our CDRiE. We are at the same

time inviting everybody to help clear the problem or misunderstanding in a calm and collected manner. We want all members and the EC to be on the same page and to go forward in unison towards CDRiE's intended mission and vision. Please take an interest and join in the discussion about the future of CDRiE as a neutral, impartial and nonpartisan Eritrean Civic Organization

I thank you all for reading my comments. I apologize to those whom I may have inadvertently offended by my frankness and/or naïveté. I also hope that you will all take my appeal seriously.

Best regards to all
Berhane G Negus

From: Bohashem <bohashem@gmail.com>
Meeting

Salamat Aya Berhane G/Negus,

It is clear from your last two emails that the issue here is not about CDRiE.Net's editorial. Delving into tit-for-tat allegations and counter allegations is not and will not be helpful and constructive. In such a case, it is best that the EC and the membership are left to organise CDRiE's general organisational congress (GOC) as already announced in our last e-newsletters. A General Congress Preparatory Committee has already been set up and will soon be engaging and informing members of the details and logistics to the upcoming event, which is only few months away from now.

As you may be aware, the main business of the GOC is, among others, to review the EC's performance during its tenure, and to measure its successes and failures against CDRiE's stated mission and vision. To this end, you are highly encouraged to substantiate your allegations with evidence and present it at the congress. I am sure this way you will be contributing a great deal to our internal organisational democracy and efficiency as well as paving

the way for the future EC to improve and do better than the current one.

With Best Wishes
Bohashem

On Sat, Sep 4, 2010 at 11:23 PM

Dear Suleiman and All

Thank you very much for favoring us with a reply. As they say good things come last. But most of all I thank you for your generous comments and welcoming me back to CDRiE's discussions. My apologies for not having been active in the fraternal communications of the last few months. To be frank, this time too, I was saddened but not that much surprised by the editorial. In fact, more than the editorial it was Dr. Gaim's comments which knocked me off my snoozing sofa back into CDRiE's cauldron. When I read Gaim's earlier email consoling Redi not to despair, I was honestly expecting a different approach and less radical than the EC's usual stand. Unfortunately, it was not going to be.

Again, I for one am grateful for your detailed coverage on the subject. I prefer not to engage into a detailed point by point rebuttal. For if I do I may need to refer to materials from my days as a member of the EC - according to my experience I consider some of them as privileged info. of the EC. Thus suffice to say that I have no problem agreeing with most of the general points you raised.

Still I am not yet convinced of your interpretation of the core point which is "CDRiE's principle for neutrality and non-partisanship". The editorial is but a small by product of this interpretation. To cut to the chase I would go to the extent of accusing the EC, contrary to

the mission and aims of CDRiE, of having been overtly partial in favor of one political group against another opposing group in the EDA. This, my friend Suleiman, is the heart of the problem. Precisely principle of neutrality and reconciliation is the understanding which I always had and that Redi, Tewelde, Araya and many others have repeatedly advocated. Impartiality, neutrality and non-partisanship are the cornerstones in which CDRiE's foundation is built upon. The on-going expression of the unfavorable reaction to the editorial is proof that the EC has over-stepped its mandate. If you and the EC are genuinely not convinced about the interpretation and you are sensitive to the members' wishes, as has been suggested by our friend Elias Habtesselasie you should pass the matter to a task force.

My best regards to you and your family. Ramadan Mabruk!
Berhane G Negus

From: Suleiman Hussein <slmn.hussein@gmail.com>

Dear Berhane, Redi, Gaim and all, First of all, let me say that I am extremely delighted to see a heated debate going on in CDRiE forum. More important is the fact the debate is around a core CDRiE principle, i.e. our mission.

Since the recent editorial is what triggered this debate, I will address some of the issues raised by Redi and other colleagues. But before that, let me thank Redi for initiating the debate.

Let me also thank Dr. Gaim for his very articulate and detailed comment. The same goes to all those who have taken time to send their comments. Regardless of whether agrees or disagrees with the content of the editorial, it is good to see CDRiEs exchanging views on a current issue and suggest ideas that they consider is consistent with CDRiE mission and mission. I should also thank Berhane for his detailed comment. Berhane, your input was missed for a long time and now that we have you back, I hope we will not miss you again. While I disagree with some of the points you made, I have great respect to your opinion and above all, your contribution and commitment

to CDRiE. After this brief introduction let me take to the editorial:

1. The editorial was not put for discussion. I agree. But isn't issuing an editorial or any public statement for that matter, a prerogative of the EC as long as it does not contradict the vision and mission of the organisation it is elected to lead? Disagreeing with its content and ask for explanation is fine and this is what has been going on. Of course it would have been much better if the tone was different as Berhane has rightly said but nevertheless, discussing is much better than not. It would have also been better to say with which point or points one disagrees rather than generalise. I will come back to this point and address the editorial from a general perspective.

2. The editorial contradicts our mission. This also fine except that the burden is on who thinks it is so to spell out how and in which way does the editorial contradict CDRiE mission. Let me quote the CDRiE organisational charter which says:

Articles 5 - Governing principles of CDRiE

1. In carrying its activities towards realization of its aims, CDRiE shall be nonpartisan with regard to its standing on the Eritrean body politic. In this regard, CDRiE shall be guided by neutrality, objectivity and professionalism.

2. In view of the fact that the core aim of CDRiE is related to issues of human rights and democratization, CDRiE shall be guided by the main regional and international human rights treaties. Specifically, CDRiE shall be governed by accountability, openness, and tolerance.

The above quotation was also quoted by Berhane and I am using it here because I agree with him on its relevance to our discussion. Some colleagues have also mentioned the principle of neutrality in dealing with Eritrean civic and political organizations. While it's healthy to continuously check on the EC to make sure that it is leading the organization in a manner consistent to its mandate as stipulated in the organizational charter, The

EC has never taken sides or favoured one side against the another. With our own initiative, we have approached organizations like Tadamun and the National Salvation Front. With the later, we were able to develop a very warm relationship. When a delegation of their leadership was on working visit to the UK a couple of months ago, we took part in a meeting they called with community leaders and we also had a high level bilateral meeting. This was the second of its kind in one year. This year CDRiE was even invited to take part in the annual Kassel festival. As for Tadamun, I personally sent an official letter to Mr. Hussein Khelifa congratulating him on his election as the new chairman and inviting for a dialogue. In no different manner, we also developed a good relationship with EPDP and this was consistent with our mission too. What I find sad here is that this particular relationship is put under constant check and spotlight as if to suggest we should have refrained from opening a channel of communication lest we are considered partisan. Where did this perception come from then? I understand those outside CDRiE who started a vilification campaign before we even had any contact with any political organization. This was simply because we CDRiE highlighted by way of its founding documents the principle of pursuing non violent means of struggle as the best way to establish a sustainable democracy in Eritrea. Since one of our core principles was behind all or most of the attacks directed towards us, we had no choice but to stand for our principle without at the same time engaging in a tit for tat campaign. Did we succeed, I think we did to a great extend. Some of the organizations with whom we have close relationship today, had a completely different view of us last year. Could have we done things better? No doubt about it. As a nascent organization, we still have a lot to learn from and the kind of debate we are having now is one of those learning processes. In CDRiE we are blessed with membership of a very high caliber.

3. The editorial was sent by an external source. It is possible but nothing wrong with that. Many people who liked the editorial sent the link to their contacts. I even received one and probably from the same source as Redi. This is in spite of the fact that I personally uploaded the editorial on our website. The fact remains that it was posted on our website before anyone knew

about it and immediately thereafter, the link was sent through our Google group. If this wrong, please let me know?

4. The EC is too political and partisan. Here too, I would confidently say no. Why? I believe that becoming partisan is taking sides in a conflict. The EPDP and the rest of EDA are clearly in a conflict before even the process of national conference has started.

Did we issue any statement favouring one against the other? My answer is a definitive no. Why then some of our members think otherwise? For me this is another proof for the need to have a continuous internal debate on issues relevant to our mission. Let us continue the debate like the one we are having now. Is stating a position on an important issue of national interest the same as taking sides or be partisan? Wasn't CDRiE formed to become a civic organisation which is politically proactive without becoming political, i.e. aspiring for political power? What did we mean by that? I think here too, we need a thorough internal debate. The recent Addis conference is of such significance to our cause that one way or another, we had to make our position clear in a manner we believed to be consistent with our mandate and mission.

What is now coming into public knowledge proves the point I am trying to make but I agree with the call to conduct an internal debate. We at the EC feel that even the editorial did not come out of the blue but is consistent with positions held previously. Few months ago, the issue was discussed at the EGS board. Our position then and our position now is the same. We had always been of the opinion that CDRiE should not be part of conference that is clearly flawed in its process, ambiguous in its agenda and divisive in its tone. All these were communicated regularly by way of our monthly newsletter that we work so hard to produce monthly. At no point was any objection made known to us. In fact those of us who happen to be in London and who have the advantage to hold regular meetings had the opportunity to discuss the issue of national conference. After a fruitful debate, we felt that we were all of the same opinion. Unfortunately, and I am sorry to have to say it here, Redi never attended any CDRiE meeting since the founding conference.

My dear colleagues, in what follows, I would like to briefly discuss the editorial from the content point of view. Please bear with me, I will try to keep it brief;

The editorial is about the recent conference and not about those who participated or boycotted it. The fact that EPDP and some others boycotted it is completely irrelevant. We would still have the same position even if all EDA organisations were in Addis on the 31st of July. In May 2008 we went through a similar situation. At the time, CDRiE was not yet formally launched. The four organisations that later merged to form today's EPDP were all in Addis taking part in the conference but that did not prevent us from deciding to stay away from the conference. We may have this debate about EDA as much as we want and it is ok to have different view about it. The only reason I am bringing it here is to make one point. For right or wrong, we have always made our decisions completely independently. We would also continue to do so until the end of our mandate. No external party is factor in our making decisions on behalf of CDRiE. The EC is only accountable to CDRiE members.

Going back to the editorial, here is what lead us believe it was necessary to address the wider Eritrean public on issues of national interest. Not only the process leading to the conference inflicted further damage to the already divided opposition but the conference itself came with resolutions and signals that have the potential of undermining the foundation of our national unity and territorial integrity. It was clearly a platform where strange ideas such self determination up to secession were promoted in broad light as if the problems of our county can be reduced to that of self determination of nationalities. We thought that this dangerous attempt to transform the Eritrean political landscape should not go unchecked. As a civic organisation not interested in petty politics, it is our role and duty to play the role of a watch dog and warn our compatriots before it is too late. Do we agree that this dangerous? If yes, how do deal with it? If no, how do see it then? I would like to hear comments on this specific issue.

Another issue of concern and which was highly present during the discussions in Addis is that of national assembly. This is the same as a government in exile. Isn't it? Do we want to have two competing governments claiming to represent our nation or do we need an opposition that is effective enough to become the vehicle for positive change in our country? What does government in exile mean any way and what does this imply to the future of our country? Finally, wasn't this what the final communiqué says? Wasn't the drafting of a constitution entrusted to the newly formed commission? Is this the mandate of an opposition?

Last but not least is the reference made to the host country which has become an integral part of any opposition activity since several years? What is new here is the recent surge in ethnic based organisations with their secessionist agenda. Just days before the main conference, two mini conferences about the right to self determination of nationalities up to cessation were held in Mekele and Smara, in the Afar Killil. Both conferences were planned and financed by EPRDF who even brought two scholars, one Ethiopian one Canadian, to give lectures on the subject. Isn't it right to ask what exactly is the role of the Ethiopian government in what is going on within the opposition camp? Since any healthy relationship is primarily based on mutual respect, i don't think it is wrong to ask questions. The same way we sent a letter of appreciation to PMMZ following the decision of his government to allow Eritrean to live outside the designated camps, we should be able to express our concerns openly and frankly.

I hope the above would positively contribute to the ongoing discussion which should go on to include other important issues such as our upcoming organisational congress as well as the strengthening and consolidation of CDRiE.

To all those who contributed with their suggestions and comment, I say again thank you.

Regards,

Suleiman

On Sep 3, 2010, at 3:27 PM, Simon <simoxen2001@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear all,

My apologies to Redi for not getting timely attention to his issues! The editorial was written by the EC and I agree with Ato Berhane that explanation should have come from the EC. Dr. Yebio, Tewelde and Amal responded in their individual capacity. Thank you all! Gaim, thank you very much for your detailed note! It is like a paper and it worth the wait. The same goes to Ato Berhane. But, communication in writing is not enough to address issues of this nature. Even though nothing of extraordinary proportion has happened, I'd like a paltalk/skype discussion on this issue to address it comprehensively. I've 4 pages long reaction but I still think it is in adequate.

What do you think?

Simon

2010/9/3 BerhaneGNegus <ashkerit2@aim.com>

Selamat Redi, Gaim and All.

Redi I would like to join all those who commended you for your dedication to CDRiE from its inception and now for raising such a serious issue. This very question is the one which has been haunting me for a long time. Hence my silence. By the kind of reactions your question engendered, I am glad to witness that you have helped to uplift the discussion to a level and seriousness that the originators of CDRiE intended it to be. Of course I wish the discussion was of a different tone than the one we are dealing now. Dr Gaim's response also caught me by surprise. Attached please find my input. The question you raised is so crucial that all the other members old and new should partake in earnest in the discussions and let them contribute their piece to define CDRiE's position.

I wish all the best for CDRiE.

Best regards
Berhane

-----Original Message-----

From: gaim kibreab

Sent: Thu,

Sep 2, 2010 7:01 am

Subject: [EritreanCitizens] '1765' RE: Response to Redi's
and Tewelde's comments and a succinct reflection on the
Ad dis Ababa Meeting

Dear all,

This is a belated response to the debate on CDRiE's
Editorial on the Addis Ababa Conference. I would like to
thank Redi, Tewelde, Yebio and
Amal for initiating and keeping the debate alive. In
view of the length of my intervention, an attachment
would have been more appropriate but I have chosen to
adopt this format as the debate is internal to CEDiE.

Dear Redi,

The thing I like about your stance is that on top of
being guileless, you thrive in playing a 'devil's
advocate.' Unfortunately, such qualities are in short
supply among the civically and politically active members
of our diasporic communities. Keep it up, but also bear
in mind the following caveat-'The road to hell is paved
with good intentions.'

Let me briefly address the issues you raised in your

commentary on CDRiE's editorial on the Addis Ababa Meeting.

1.You wrote, "The Editorial contradicts our mission."

- However, you did not spell out how and in what way it does that. The *raison d'être* of any civil society organisation committed to public causes is, among many other things, to scrutinise, criticise, oppose, warn against, counteract and, if necessary, condemn the follies of those in power and those who aspire to take their place.

- If their dream becomes true, those who convened the Meeting in Addis and their 'Big Brother', the Sponsor, are hoping to effect regime change and replace the incumbent in Asmara.

- Hence CDRiE, as a civil society organisation, has a duty and responsibility to scrutinise their actions, expose their follies, weaknesses and conspiratorial proclivities, as well as warn our people of the potential dangers.

- Our people have been let down by the leaders of the PFDJ in a very bad way and there should be no room for complacency any more. CDRiE's Executive Committee should therefore be congratulated on their bold, albeit, mildly framed Editorial.

2.You wrote, "the editorial says 'Not only was it unable to identify the goals and objectives of the so-called conference, but it was also unable to rally its member organisations behind the idea of a national conference. In whose interest was editorial written? Why do members of the organization get the link from external sources? Did the writers rally their members?'"

- It is very clear to any critical and non-partisan observer that those who convened the Meeting had no viable agenda for change based on civic citizenship. The Editorial is therefore right to call the 'spade' by its name.

· You wonder, "In whose interest was the editorial written?" This is a rhetorical question. You know the answer yourself.

It is written in the interest of the Eritrean public cause.

· You also wrote, "Why do members of the organization get the link from external sources?" I will leave this question to the EC.

· You also wondered, "Did the writers rally their members?" Unless I am mistaken, the EC is mandated to issue editorial and other statements as it deems fit provided it complies with our organisation's constitution. Nevertheless, the EC's alleged failure to rally its members cannot be a justification of the EDA's failure to rally its own members.

· I think the reason the EC raised this point is not as an expression of grievance but rather as a point of principle. The Addis meeting's failure is not solely measured by the absence of some member organisations, but more importantly by the dearth of common purpose of the member organisations.

· What do the different organisations that constitute the EDA have in common with each other except a common enemy they want to unseat from power? In fact, they don't even seem to have a common understanding where the realm of the enemy begins and ends. They don't even characterise the regime in Asmara in the same way.

· The removal from power of a government, which has deliberately destroyed most pre-existing formal and informal institutions and arrested the emergence and consolidation of new ones, by opposition groups that lack common vision and purpose is, to say the least, lethal or dangerous.

3. I think it is important that we, the members of CDRiE,

encourage our EC to warn us and our people that every group that is opposed to the PFDJ and clamours for regime change is necessarily free from bigotry and parochialism. It is only then we will be able to distinguish between those who are committed to the common good of our people and those determined to sow seeds of division and disharmony.

4. Any civil society organisation that is unable to distinguish between 'wax and gold,' to borrow Donald Levine's captivating metaphor, is not worth its name.

5. We should avoid turning a blind eye or become oblivious to the follies of the opposition just because we want to get rid of the repressive regime in Asmara. What happens the hour or even the minute after is much more important than the mere act of removing the incumbent. Whether the opposition groups divided and incompetent as they are will ever be able to defeat the regime in Asmara is highly contentious unless they are served power on a plate. If that were to happen, they are unlikely to be able to maintain it. They may rather plunge the country into a fratricidal civil war.

6. Most of us seem to be excessively obsessed with the notion of change without considering the potential pitfalls that may ensue as a result. May be some of the opposition groups are not bothered about what may happen the day after as long as their arch enemy in Asmara is brought to his knees. Is this the kind of change our people have been striving for?

7. The change we seek should be one that is able to bring about political stability, human dignity, prosperity, respect for the sanctity of rule of law and human life, maintain national unity and promote human rights, social justice, gender and all other forms of equality, civic but definitely not ethnic or faith-based citizenship, as well as participatory and democratic decision-making. It is on the basis of these core values that we should judge whether a political group deserves our support or opposition.

8. Our people had defiantly rejected the anti-politics of religion, ethnicity and tribalism in the 1940s and the groups that are trying to turn the wheel of history are unlikely to have any future in Eritrea otherwise the risk of our martyred brothers and sisters turning in their graves will be high.

A Brief Comment on Tewelde's intervention

Tewelde also wrote on the subject:

"I must admit I don't know the players and the nuances of opposition politics but I agree with Redi that CDRiE, as a civic organization, should not align itself with any political group. We may still have our personal preferences but in order to be effective and relevant, CDRiE should remain neutral at all times."

I agree with you that CDRiE should avoid aligning itself with any political group. In principle, this is a highly valid point of view. A civil society organisation that aligns or affiliates itself with a political group ceases what it claims to be.

Nevertheless, the EC's criticism and its critical scrutiny of the Addis Meeting is not the same as aligning itself with a political group.

In my view, the EC's editorial is based on principle rather than on support or opposition to any political group.

I would like to congratulate Redi, Tewelde and Amal on initiating the discussion. The reason I did not comment on Amal's intervention is because I agree with all the points she raised.

In the following I will seize the opportunity to share with you a few questions I have about the Addis Ababa Meeting.

My succinct Reflections on the Addis Meeting:

I am acutely aware of the fact that the interests of the Eritrean people are inextricably interwoven with the interests of the Ethiopian, Sudanese, Somali and Djiboutian people. Notwithstanding this commonality of interests, inter-state relationships in the region have always been permeated by excessive interference in each other's internal affairs. This norm of mutual intervention in each other's domestic affairs has reached unprecedented heights in the post-border war period. Both the Eritrean and the Ethiopian governments are determined to effect regime changes in each other's capitals in order to replace the incumbents by their own quislings.

The Addis Ababa conference was conceived by its architects as harbinger of regime change in Asmara. By the same token, it is only a question of time before the government in Asmara reciprocates by holding a copycat conference of Ethiopian opposition groups in one of the Eritrean cities in the near future. The critical question that arises is:

should genuine democratic and participatory change-seeking Eritreans and Ethiopians avail themselves to being used as instruments or stooges by the two governments that are engaged in incessant struggles of mutual destruction without any regard to the consequences on the well-being and interdependent livelihood systems of the peoples of the two impoverished countries?

OR should they reject and expose the two governments' follies by taking a principled stand in favour of regional peace and stability?

Bearing this brief introductory remark in mind some of the many questions that Eritrean civil society organisations should raise in connection with the recent Addis Ababa conference are the following:

i. If my sources are reliable, the full cost of the meeting was made good by the Ethiopian government.

ii. It is a known fact that Ethiopia like its northern neighbour, Eritrea, is one of the poorest nations in the world where every penny belonging to the state should have high opportunity cost.

iii. Although it is not known how much the total outlay of the meeting was, for a poor country whose citizens live in abject poverty, there must be benefits to be had that outweigh the costs lest the Ethiopian government, as a rationale decision-maker faced with competing demands, would not squander its scarce resources.

If the Ethiopian taxpayers were to have a say, would funding such a meeting be their priority?

iv. The Ethiopian State like any other of its kind is neither a charitable organisation nor is it a neutral arbiter, especially in view of the unsettled border dispute and the prevailing state of no-peace-no-war. All states' behaviour is governed by self-interest. The decisions and actions of the Ethiopian government are therefore evidently driven by self-interest. What are these interests? Have they been spelled out to the leaders of the Eritrean opposition? Have the latter communicated these to the Eritrean people in a clear and transparent manner? To what extent are the interests pursued by the Ethiopian government compatible or detrimental to Eritrea's short, medium and long-term interests? I am not suggesting they are detrimental or beneficial. I am simply asking those who allege to be in the 'driving seat.'

v. Can the Eritrean opposition groups, who are dependent for their daily bread on the Ethiopian government's handouts and who lack any form of fall back position in

case the relationship based on patronage collapses, be able to negotiate on behalf of Eritrea on equal footing with the power that feeds them? Shouldn't this disconcerting fact give cause for concern?

vi. Can a political organisation that is dependent lock, stock and barrel on a self-interested external power and which lacks the means of generating revenues from alternative sources, including from its constituency be able to lead the process of democratic change by developing and implementing an independent political programme? Since there has been no such precedent in history, the burden of proof lies on those who want us to believe such a miracle is possible.

vii. A distressing issue that should give cause for serious concern and which may be a manifestation of the EDA's narrow-mindedness is its blanket endorsement of the divisive resolutions adopted by the tribal entrepreneurs who met at Mekelle a few days before the Addis Ababa meeting. The Mekelle, meeting attended by Eritrea's future tribal warlords in making, was a precursor of the Addis meeting. The tribal entrepreneurs were lectured in the rights of nationalities, including the right to secede by a Tigrean and Canadian consultants based on Joseph Stalin's dull theory of the 'national question.' To what extent was the Addis Ababa meeting informed by the sectarian resolutions of the tribal warlords in making? How can an alliance that endorses the resolutions of tribal entrepreneurs whose raison d'être is to fragment Eritrea and Eritrean society into minuscule tribal fiefdoms aspire to be a viable substitute to the regime in Asmara?

In conclusion, a movement or an alliance which on the one hand, draws no lessons from history and on the other, tries to turn the wheel of history backward in a rapidly globalising world is likely to end up in the museum of antiquity. However, unless Eritrean democrats are vigilant and guard against such

dangers, some irreparable damages may be inflicted on the cause the fallen heroes and heroines paid their precious lives for.

The two most important lessons people striving to replace the incumbents in Asmara should learn from history are firstly, there are no short-cuts to power. As people who suffered 65,000 deaths and more than 100,000 injuries, we should be able to realise the value of such an adage. Only individuals and organisations that are in a state of delusion would think that they can sustain power served to them on a plate.

Secondly, any political organisation or movement that is determined to bring about political change should not allow itself being used as an instrument in the two governments' ominous scheme of mutual destruction.

It is vital, therefore, that CDRiE and other like-minded organisations raise and debate the uncomfortable and disconcerting scenarios that have been unfolding in our region always bearing in mind the common good of the voiceless people of Eritrea and the region. A certain dose of humility is also necessary, namely, it is it is important to guard against speaking on behalf of the people. We should only speak from our own perspectives without pretending to know what our people think.

2010/8/31 Yebio Woldemariam

Dear Redi

This is the first time that the EC was challenged directly and in the open for the actions it took on behalf of CDRiE. In my opinion, I consider this as positive development in the long journey of CDRiE to evolving into truly civic organization ready to accommodate diverse views within it. I also choose to consider the present dialogue as a continuation of the debate/discussion albeit, universal (remotely connected to the situation at

home) that has been going on in CDRiE's Googlegroup in the past two years and in particular during the early months of this year. Although the discussion conducted failed to attract many and was confined to few members of our organization, namely Bee, Amal, Gaim, Tewelde and few others whose name escaped me, nevertheless it was passionate and educational for us to remember. Be that as it may, the most direct query one dealing with the inner working of our organization in relation to the political situation in Eritrea is raised by you (Redi) and you alone. Personally and as a member of EC, I appreciate you for questioning the wisdom behind the recent editorial regarding the NCDC in AA. In truth the EC as an executive body embodies the spirit and sentiment of it's members. To that effect it took the liberty to approve the editorial posted in CDRiE.net. Was that an appropriate statement at the time were unity of purpose and action is most needed? I leave that to members to discuss it thoroughly. Therefore, your query is not out of place.

At the time were communication through various electronic means is possible, it is up to the rank and file to discuss about our relationship with the political parties and civic organizations. The imperative of becoming active in the forthcoming "big" national conference and our role in influencing events by engaging with the Commission recently established in AA squarely lays in our hands. We are fortunate that our membership ranges from highly educated to moderately educated, old and young, Moslem to Christian.

Moreover, although we lack an equal representation of all the nationalities that Eritrea is composed of, I would say we have sizeable number of women whom I find very active and deserve leadership position in the next Board election.

It is therefore, incumbent upon members to become active in shaping our role with regard to the political situation in Eritrea and our relationship with the political organizations, Ethiopia, the Commission and host of other things that help bring an end to the tyrannical rule in Eritrea and peace within

our region.

Who said that medium of communication in the Googlegroup should only be in English? Tigrigna which I personally prefer more than English and Arabic can be used to relay messages with brief highlights of the theme in either of the three languages.

In conclusion let me state one fact; in a situation where there is no proper tool to gauge the felling of members (the entire or more realistically partial), the EC has no choice but use the wide guidelines put in CDRiE's mission and Charter to express it's views.

I therefore implore upon each and everyone of us to discuss issues mentioned in passing and strive to be true to ourselves before pointing fingers at the leadership which is basically the reflection of the entire membership, that is, how mature and committed it is Thank you again, Redi

Regards
Yebio

Dear Dr Yebio,

Thank you for the note. I don't believe I raised a controversial issue. The Editorial (author/s) raised the issues. The simple fact is the ed