



LUND UNIVERSITY
School of Economics and Management

Master's Program in Innovation and Global Sustainable Development

Mr. Zenawi's "green legacy" – promoting inclusive growth?

A case study on Ethiopia's late Prime Minister's speech about Africa's role in the transition to a green economy

by

Macha Epp

ma6651ep-s@student.lu.se

Abstract: The current state of our environment is alarming. Increasing natural disasters worldwide and rising pollution levels made a conventional economic growth model illogical to abide by. Alternative growth models are of actuality, with the *Green Economy* being the most popular. Defined by UNEP (2011) as a “*low carbon, resource efficient and **socially inclusive***” economy (p.9), it raises interest among the scholar community since it molds economic growth together with both sustainable and human development. Governments actively address the issue and the related State Discourse is rich of numerous speeches. This thesis attempts to answer: *to what extent is a State's discourse on a green economy conducive to social inclusiveness*, and placed the focus on Ethiopia. The advances of green economy prospects in the developing, low-income world were of interest, as it became obvious that different geographical realities hide behind the green economy label. The dichotomy between the Global North and South illustrates importance of a context-specific approach to a green economy. The empirical data consisted of Ethiopia's late Prime Minister, Mr. Meles

EKHS34
Master's Thesis (15 credits ECTS)
May 2019
Supervisor: Teis Hansen
Word Count: 16,547

Zenawi's, speech at the Sixth African Economic Conference in 2011. We ran it through two main analysis processes. *Scriven's discourse analysis framework of argument analysis* was used to highlight the speech's main arguments, their construction, and portrayed meanings. The findings of this empirical analysis were compared to four green economy discourses from the Global South according to *Death* (2015), which revealed the green resilient discourse for Ethiopia. Though it shows that the vulnerable resource base needs resilience-building, the oppressive authoritarian political system hinders possibilities of achieving social inclusiveness. This leaves one to question the validity of "discourse" in advocating for a green economy. We are in need of micro, regional, sectoral, and even more local practical solutions if a green economy is to be fully integrated, and if it is to comprise and benefit all stakeholders in a society.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Teis Hansen, for guiding me through this research and providing constructive feedback. I would also like to say a big thank you to my family and friends for the support.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Outline of thesis	4
2. Theory: Literature review	5
2.1. Definition of a green economy	6
2.2. Suitability of a green economy in developing countries	7
2.3. The importance of agricultural transformation in developing countries, with particular focus on Sub-Saharan Africa and Ethiopia	9
2.4. Relevance of inclusive growth for developing countries	11
2.5. Literature review conclusion	14
3. Methodology	15
4. Analysis: Ethiopia’s State discourse	20
4.1. CRGE Strategy: main points of reflection	20
4.2. Empirical results: Mr. Zenawi’s Speech: “Green Growth and Structural Transformation in Africa” through the lens of Scriven’s argument discourse analysis framework	23
4.2.1. Skepticism towards a green economy	24
4.2.2. Establishing a synergy between a green economic structural transformation and a green agricultural development	25
4.2.3. Sense of hope through a set of proposed solutions	26
4.2.4. Sense of collective action	28
4.2.5. Conclusion	28
4.3. Death’s (2015) Global South discourses in action: highlighting the limitations to Mr. Zenawi’s 2011 speech to inclusive growth	28
4.3.1. Green resilience	29
4.3.2. Green growth	34
4.3.3. Green transformation	38
4.3.4. Green revolution	39
4.3.5. Conclusion	39
5. Discussion of results	41
6. Conclusion	46
6.1. Future research	49
7. References	50
8. Appendix	57

List of Figures

Figure 1. Aspects of the agricultural sector in Sub-Saharan Africa	10
Figure 2. Scriven's framework of argument analysis	17

1 Introduction

Climate change is not a new phenomenon, but its consequences are increasingly visible to the human eye through environmental shocks worldwide. This escalating phenomenon has arguably raised awareness and the sense of urgency for a transformational change in the functioning of national economies, from conventional growth models towards a greener and more sustainable economic model. Countries around the world are gearing their economies towards a green economy. Defined by UNEP (2011), such an economy is characterized as a “*low carbon, resource efficient and socially inclusive*” one (p.9). This concept raises interest among the scholar community, since it molds economic growth together with both sustainable and human development.

Though a new and multidimensional concept, as a component of a green economy as per UNEP’s definition, the concept of social inclusiveness will make up the focal interest of this thesis. The World Bank defines it as: “*the process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society – improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity*” (World Bank, 2019).

The green economy concept is well-known in developed countries, qualified by Death (2015) as the Global North, where it re-emerged after the combination of climate and financial crises in the 2000s. People began demanding for a better allocation of resources in their economies and grew aware of their environmental impact. As a result, countries such as Germany and Sweden, are known for their innovative advances in “ecological modernization” (Death, 2015, p.2208) today.

Related advances in developing countries are however often dismissed, and the green economic transformation is also taking place in the Global South, as Death (2015) calls it. His paper titled “*Four discourses of the green economy in the global South*” offers four different ways to interpreting a national strategies’ narrative, which explicitly seeks to understand the implications of the State in a green trajectory.

Behind the same label of a green economy appear different geographical realities. We will focus on that of the global South, composed of developing countries. In other words, it can be hypothesized that a 1-size-fits-all approach to implementing a green economy is not attainable. This is especially true for developing countries, where certain political situations hinder the possibility of reaching a green economy as per UNEP's (2011) definition.

Developing countries' demands for a green economy require particular attention to the agricultural sector, due to its pivotal role as an engine of growth (Jordan, 2017; Abegaz, 2004). This sector is directly impacted by increasing environmental disasters that mainly come as a consequence of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from developed industrialized countries.

Communities in developing countries depend on their surrounding environment and land for food, water, housing equipment, and for their subsistent income. In this respect, there is a clear interdependence between people's livelihoods and their environment. For this reason, a green economic transformation is of great actuality in the developing world.

However, scholars evoke the challenge of reaching such an economy in an authoritarian environment, a common political feature in most developing countries. The State's discourse does indeed include the concept of a green economy and gives the impression that the concern is covered and attended to at the power level. However, communal empowerment remains limited, leading to an *exclusive* growth trajectory where mainly those close to the State reap the benefits. This is a paradox, given that it is precisely those rural communities that depend on land that should theoretically benefit the most from a green trajectory, as per UNEP's green economy definition. It thus came to evidence that available literature does not explore to what extent a State's employed narrative towards a green economy is conducive to inclusive growth.

This thesis will explore this aspect and analyze a State discourse, in particular the 2011 Speech by the Ethiopian Prime Minister, Mr. Meles Zenawi, at the Sixth African Economic Conference (see appendix A).

The research will attempt to answer the following question: to what extent does a State's discourse on a green economy show compatibility with inclusive growth? This will be investigated from the standpoint of the Ethiopian State, with Mr. Zenawi's speech being the empirical material.

Ethiopia is indeed a relevant focus for this thesis. With 85% of its population engaged in smallholder subsistence agriculture (Järnberg et al., 2018), it fits in the core of the issue. It is a pioneer in putting a green economic transition in motion in Ethiopia through its CRGE (Climate Resilient Green Economy) Strategy, initiated in 2012. This Strategy has three aims: "boosting agricultural productivity, strengthening the industrial base, (and) fostering export growth" (FDRE, 2011, p.1).

Reconciling the concept of boosting agricultural productivity with the green economy concept highlights the possible limitations of the said discourse. A strong improvement in agricultural productivity is needed for a successful green economic structural transformation (Girmay, 2015), and the main factor for this productivity remains the population. This will be a challenge to social inclusiveness. Through this Strategy, Ethiopia aims to reach a middle-income status by 2025 while decarbonizing its economy.

The CRGE was initiated after the Prime Minister's convincing speech that evoked Africa's pertinent role and capability in the said transition to a green economy. He advocated for such a new concept in Ethiopia, a country submerged by poverty, has a history of famine, and is mainly made up of subsistence farmers. One could assume that a green economic trajectory would aim at benefitting these rural farming communities. However, it will be questioned whether Ethiopia's authoritarian regime guarantees this. Indeed, such a State does not equate economic growth to democracy, and remains very much entrenched in an oppressive political system, with no current prospects to opening up (BTI, 2018).

The Discourse Analysis will be the empirical methodology used in this thesis. It will explore to what extent the green economy discourse that the Ethiopian State holds is compatible to inclusive growth, while focusing on the agricultural sector.

Scriven's framework of argument analysis will serve as the framework of the discourse

analysis. It will highlight the speaker's main points and contradictions, in the attempt to extract their meanings and implications to our main focus: inclusive growth. Analyzing the implementation and implications of various policies stated in the speech are beyond the scope of this thesis. Rather, the emphasis will be placed on the arguments, the way they are constructed, and the meanings they portray.

Mr. Zenawi's speech will be thoroughly tested, and therefore accordingly judged by the extent to which inclusivity is implied by the State. In this respect, the first 50 lines will be used for the empirical analysis because of their dedication to the transformation of the agricultural sector in the process of a green economic transformation.

1.1 Outline of thesis

The thesis will be structured as follows:

Chapter 2 will first go through the literature review that defines concepts and addresses existing debates on the suitability of a green economy in a developing country and the impact on its agricultural sector.

Chapter 3 will then outline the methodology, comprising of the empirical discourse analysis and of a review of Death's (2015) four global South green economy discourses.

Next, Chapter 4, the analysis, will dive into the discourse analysis using Scriven's framework of argument analysis, and follow up with Death's (2015) paper as prior-mentioned. This will investigate in what green economy discourse category Ethiopia fits into, and consequently what implications it has on social inclusivity.

Finally, Chapter 5 will consist of a discussion on the findings from the analysis. It will emphasize the main overarching points from Mr. Zenawi's discourse that hinder reaching social inclusiveness as of today in Ethiopia.

This will lead us to come to a conclusion on our research question.

2 Theory: Literature Review

Scholars agree about the necessity of a dynamic and transformative change from a conventional fossil fuel driven economy to a green and low-carbon emitting economy. Since the Paris Agreement in climate in 2015, this concern has been placed to the forefront of policy negotiations. Nevertheless, as recognized by Biber et al. (2017), there exist “large gaps between what scientists and politicians agree society must undertake, and what current laws and policies provide for” (p.606). It is inevitable that our society has grown used to fossil fuels, and our global economy is unfortunately trapped into a pattern of producing and consuming these fuels (Biber et al., 2017, p.607). Gebremariam et al. (2018), Jordaan (2018), and Neely (2010) agree that although Africa is paradoxically “expected to catch-up with the rest of the world” (Gebremariam et al., 2018, p.155), it is knowingly less developed than most of this “rest of the world”, and as claimed by Neely (2010), it is a fact that already-developed and “industrialized countries are the primary GHG emitters” (p.25). Jordaan (2018) thus evokes the morality behind this needed transition to a green economy, even though there is evidence of certain African leaders’ awareness of the importance of dealing with this climate crisis (p.299).

Within this literature review, the concept of a green economy will be defined. The suitability of this green economy in developing countries will then be explored. Following this, the focus will be on the literature pertaining to agricultural transformation and intensification in the context of these developing countries, in order to highlight the primary importance of the agricultural sector in these countries. Finally, the literature review will end by outlining scholar views on the relationship between a green economy and inclusive growth, in order to understand to what extent an agricultural transformation, in light of a green economy, plays a role in poverty alleviation and acts to enable social inclusiveness.

2.1 Definition of a green economy

Being the case study for this paper, Ethiopia's CRGE focuses on the promotion of a green economy. It thus is important to have a clear comprehension of what is meant by this term. Scholars argue that the green economy entails the process of decarbonization, and evoke a nuance between two. A green economy is defined as growth that "reconciles economic growth and capitalist development with ecological sustainability" (Death, 2015, p.2207). According to Martinez-Covarrubias et al. (2017), the difference between a "green economy" and "decarbonization" is that low-carbon economies still "generates carbon emissions and considers only two aspects of sustainable development, namely, economic and ecological" (p.18). It is consequently suggested that the low-carbon growth trajectory is a mere mechanism to reaching the ultimate goal of a green economy, which not only strives for a restorative economy, but also offers potential economic, environmental and social benefits that improve both "sustainable development" (p.18) and human development (Baranova et al., 2017, p.2). In any case, both these terms suggest the promotion of wealth and efficient resource allocation. Death (2015) clarifies that the notion of a green economy was brought back to discussions and was re-legitimated in light of both climate and financial crises in the 2000s (p.2209). There was the urge for policies to better allocate resources in the economy and to exert more importance to environmental externalities. Gultekin et al. (2018) provide a list of what a green economy entails, comprising of the following (p.853):

- "New green technologies
- Renewable energies
- Decreasing carbon emissions
- Increasing sources efficiency
- New green jobs
- Reducing air pollution
- Cleaning water resources
- Increasing social equality with economic and social development"

In this instance, the idea of inclusivity and rural development is reflected by the last point, and adds consistency to this thesis' scope.

2.2 Suitability of a green economy in developing countries

To personalize this literature review to the case of developing countries, before specializing it to the African continent, scholars have outlined the various discourses that arise around the concept of the green economy, which subsequently give rise to a certain North versus South dichotomy. Death (2015) is a prominent scholar in this respect, where his paper titled “*Four discourses of the green economy in the global South*” serves as an introduction to how this concept can be perceived in the developing South. He admits that there exists an imbalance between developed and developing worlds, including the necessary actions in the activation of a green economy, which follows the discourses of green resilience, green growth, green revolution, and green transformation.

Resilience is said achievable by “technocratic interventions by states and development institutions, together with empowered communities who can draw on their own sources of resilience” (Death, 2015, p.2212), but has the set-back of further encouraging the agricultural sector’s monetization, and thus “strengthening the bureaucratic and coercive capacity of state institutions” (Death, 2015, p.2213).

Growth however views climate change as opening up economic opportunities and for leapfrogging, which will be discussed further down. In the *transformation* discourse, economic growth remains central, where the environment itself is seen as a means for development. Interestingly, Faccar et al. (2014) brings three distinguishing features to green growth discourse, involving the incremental, reformist, and transformative approaches (p.644).

The incremental discourse associates economic development and growth under one roof, which implies physical capital accumulation (Faccar et al., 2014, p.647). Essentially, Faccar et al. (2014) argues that because the incremental view focuses on technological innovations, this will reduce environmental impact while providing new jobs, which concurrently will benefit the national economy (p.648). Ultimately, this is seen as a “weak interpretation of sustainable development” (Faccar et al., p.648), given that the exploitation of natural resources is permissible, forasmuch as other capital, such as financial, is increasing.

The reformist however not only puts importance on sustaining the environment, but also seeks to reform the economy through innovations, all the while “adapting to environmental changes” (Faccer at al., 2014, p.648). In other words, protecting the environment is considered an engine of growth. Nevertheless, reformists focus mainly on the “relative” decoupling of “economic progress from the consumption of natural resources” (Faccer et al., 2014, p.650).

Finally, the transformative approach values both the “market and social equity” (Faccer et al., 2014, p.650), and confronts the reformists by the promotion of an absolute decoupling. Considering this, it is interesting to allocate, for instance, which of the above discourses proposed by the two scholars is most appropriate to developing countries.

As noted by Barbier (2015), a green economic growth will only be relevant in developing countries if it is consistent with the country’s development goals, which according to this scholar is poverty alleviation (p.2). The scholar continues to explicitly point to this advantage of green growth, which could accordingly “lead to poverty reduction, economic growth, reduced vulnerability to climate change and natural disasters, greater energy security, and more secure livelihoods...” (Barbier, 2015, p.2). Although green growth has these potential advantages, it is notwithstanding that, as admitted by Barbier (2015), such a growth “could undermine short-term economic growth and development” (p.1) of any developing country. This is relevant given the already-evoked challenges developing countries face, and especially considering that such countries tend to be strongly dependent on “the exploitation of land and natural resources” (Barbier, 2015, p.1), resulting in their respective difficulty for economic and production diversification, at least in the short-term. UNEP (2011) agrees, “greening will necessitate the loss of income and jobs in the short and medium term to replenish natural stocks” (p.45), but this is said to be a minor cost to pay to avoid the total loss of employment and thus income.

2.3 The importance of agricultural transformation in developing countries, with particular focus on Sub-Saharan Africa and Ethiopia

It was thus stated by scholars that being at the center of developing countries' development goals, poverty alleviation would, among other benefits, ensure more secure livelihoods. Because of this, it is interesting to understand scholars' perspectives on the need to transform the agricultural sector in developing countries, as a part of the transformation to a green economy. This will help us to understand whether the existing discussions show compatibility between the agricultural sector's transformation and poverty alleviation, and therefore see if there are prospects of improving social inclusiveness in the growth trajectory.

As outlined by Barbier (2015), one cannot simply ignore the omnipresence of agriculture and natural resources in developing countries. With the expected exponential population increase and urbanization on the African continent (Echeverri, 2018) in the coming years, there will be more stress and demand on land. This is highlighted by Jaleta et al. (2016) who admit that the agricultural sector's performance "must grow at a higher rate than population growth" to provide for the increasing population (p.513). This shows that agricultural intensification is unavoidable, which leads to what Neely (2010) claims to be the biggest challenge: "intensification of agriculture (that) is environmentally sustainable" (p.23). At this point it becomes crucial to define the term of agricultural intensification.

The FAO (2004) defines it as being "technically defined as an increase in agricultural production per unit of inputs" (FAO, 2004). Gebremariam et al. (2018) evoke that amelioration in innovations in the agricultural sector will further "increase agricultural productivity, enhance food security, ensure inclusive growth and reduce poverty" (p.154). However, it is this existing poverty that renders agricultural intensification to be difficult, as previously implied by Barbier (2015). In this respect, Jaleta et al. (2016) and Neely (2010) agree and respectively stress the importance of agricultural management and capacity building, which makes up the focus of the thesis. It is noted that land management improvements, which assimilates exercising more sustainable and intensive agricultural methods, have the ability to theoretically lessen GHG emissions (Neely, 2010, p.24). As cited by Neely (2010), "sustainable agriculture should be a fundamental component of green growth" (p.31). Here, Neely's (2010) report supports that green growth could create new jobs,

as previously mentioned, where it is claimed that it could “create dynamic new industries, quality jobs, and income growth” (p.31). In fact, the scholar continues to defend that “sustainable agriculture should be a fundamental component of green growth in developing countries” (Neely, 2010, p.31). As seen on figure 1, agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa, which includes Ethiopia, is mainly used for subsistence living, meaning that intensification is required in the sector if it aims to support for the growing population, and to subsequently spread the benefits of green development to these rural communities.

Consequently, efforts in agricultural transformation that includes intensifying the sector, which have historically been neglected (Girmay, 2015), could lead to more inclusivity.

	Sub-Saharan Africa
Diversity within sector	Low
Recent growth in the sector?	No
Key factors, features and trends	Women account for 60 to 80 percent of workforce. Persistent stagnation due to investment poverty, macroeconomic factors, weak institutions. World's poorest region. Agriculture is largely subsistence based.
CDE and Sectoral Growth issues	Overcoming stagnation Barriers: urban-biased policies, low rural population density, fast population growth. Runaway natural capital depletion. Growth will come from intensification.

Figure 1: Aspects of the agricultural sector in Sub-Saharan Africa (Neely, 2010, p.18)

2.4 Relevance of inclusive growth for developing countries

It becomes important to highlight the concept of inclusive and exclusive growth, especially since UNEP (2011) defines a green economy as being an economy that is “low carbon, resource efficient and socially inclusive” (p.9).

Defining *inclusiveness*, *social inclusiveness*, or *inclusive growth* deems difficult according to scholars. This is why de Mello and Dutz (2012) highlight the challenges to reaching inclusive growth. They define “inclusive growth” as “growth that is both sustainable and broad-based in terms of employment opportunities” (de Mello and Dutz, 2012, p.16). It is emphasized that good governance plays a crucial role in ensuring inclusive growth, given that the government regulates institutions (ibid). The latter then unconsciously decide “how social actors act” (de Mello and Dutz, 2012, p.20). Defined by the World Bank, “social inclusion” is “the process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society – improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity” (World Bank, 2019). In this respect, scholars do globally agree that inclusion in general leads to equalizing the opportunities that individuals have across society.

UNEP’s (2011) report adds that a green economic path not only restores natural capital that would increase economic growth, but would also be a “source of public benefits, especially for poor people whose livelihoods and security depend on nature” (p.9). The important role of agriculture and natural resources is thus highlighted by UNEP (2011), where it is clear that such a green trajectory’s benefits should be distributed to smallholder and rural communities. Both Gebremariam et al. (2018) and Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) make allusions to this, stating that although most developing countries, such as Ethiopia, mostly consist of exclusive communities, the planned agricultural intensification could act to be more inclusive. Indeed, as cited by Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018), “ill-functioning institutions, market imperfection, clientelist and social exclusive communities, patriarchal households and patrimonial and/ or marketized states” (p.217) are what tend to make up the political foundation of most developing countries, which makes it easier for them to follow a conventional growth model. Ultimately, in the realm of creating a more inclusive

environment, where the benefits from green growth would be distributed to everyone, Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) interpret this as alleviating poverty; they claim that sustainability-provoking policies need to be complementary to poverty eradication. Ocampo (2019) advocates the “large synergies between poverty alleviation and the green economy” (p.14). Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) define poverty alleviation as “the ability of human beings to lead lives they have reason to value and to enhance the substantive choices they have” (p.218), which suggests that having such a goal with green growth could lead to more inclusivity in the distribution of benefits that come with it. However, Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) bring a very pertinent point, being that an economic transition that is led “solely by principles of resource efficiency might result in a low-carbon world in which socio-economic inequalities prevail” (p.222). In other words, having resource efficiency as the enabling factor leading to green growth will not act to empower rural communities, who are usually excluded. Gebremariam et al. (2018) confirm Ramos-Mejia’s (2018) outlook on this interplay, where innovations in the agricultural sector, and hence agricultural intensification, is key to food security, inclusive growth, and thus poverty reduction (p.154). The UNEP (2011) report further confirms that “green economy can reduce persistent poverty” (p.9), where sustainable agricultural practices would especially aid subsistence farmers given land fertility and water conservation improvements that come along with it.

As can be noted, scholars illustrate this interplay between agricultural yield with inclusivity and poverty, where a given environmental shock logically creates a setback to the farmer’s income. This suggests that farmers would undeniably benefit from agricultural transformation and intensification (Jordan, 2017; Gebremariam et al., 2018), where it could make them more resilient against such shocks, and thus make such a green growth more inclusive given that the results would benefit these smallholders that are usually excluded. Neely (2010) provides more insight on this and explicitly states that “the environmental performance of the agricultural sector is affected by population and social dynamics” (p.24). In other words, she emphasizes this existent interrelatedness between agriculture and the related social dynamics by revealing the “multifunctional nature” of agriculture (Neely, 2010, p.22). Agriculture “operates within different physical and social systems” (ibid), where capacity and resilience building through agricultural intensification theoretically leads to, to

name a few: “rural employment, the strength of local economies, health of rural culture, food security, and improvement in farm animal welfare” (p.22).

If these are the results from improving the resilience of rural communities to environmental shocks, then it can only be insinuated that such would lead to more inclusive growth. However, there remains the issue of pursuing this agricultural intensification in a sustainable fashion.

Khor (2011) highlights that “conserving natural resources in places where poor communities live is an important component to sustainable development” (p.81), and thus on their prospect of a green economy. In other words, the environment is used by poor communities for their subsistence livelihoods, which is why Khor (2011) continues to stress the pertinence of placing such communities on a pedestal where they should be the “main beneficiaries” of such a green economy that Ethiopia is heading towards (p.81). Baye (2017) agrees with Khor (2011) and brings the discussion to a question of property rights; if land-owners do not have the security over their rights over their land, this diminishes their incentives to seeking for more innovation, sustainable and efficient ways of using their land, thus cancelling out the vision of agricultural intensification. As stated, “a more secure tenure system provides the necessary incentives for farmers to manage their land more efficiently and effectively” (Baye, 2017, p.428). In his paper, Khor (2011) addresses “the link between livelihoods and living conditions of rural communities and the environment” (p.81), where he stresses the reliance of poor communities on their surrounding environment by evoking that these communities depend on their natural resources for food, water, energy, and for their housing equipment. Baye (2017) and Khor (2011) hence provide arguments that oppose the discursive decoupling of humans to nature.

Scholars agree on the fact that the slightest change in the environment has an effect on the living conditions for rural communities, and thus that these communities should arguably be the main winners of a green economy (Khor, 2011; Baye, 2017), further reinforcing the need for inclusivity.

2.5 Literature review conclusion

As stated by scholars, the benefits of a green economy range from cleaner air and water, to new “green” jobs and higher social development. Social inclusiveness is in the scope of a green economic growth trajectory. Scholars thus emphasize the interrelatedness of a green economy, poverty alleviation, and social inclusiveness.

Scholars also evoke discourses’ inherent power to “guiding change (and) understanding dominant narratives” (Järnberg et al., 2018, p.419), which is something that is of essence when it comes to developing countries. This is reflected through Death’s (2015) paper, “*Four discourses of the green economy in the global South*” that highlights the different aspirations that come with various existing green economy discourses in developing countries. So, although scholars generally evoke a positive outlook on the necessity of agricultural transformation as a part of the transition to a green economy, it is interesting to have a look at the surrounding discourses, in order to understand how a State talks about the issue shapes the possible outcomes.

What seems to be missing in existing literature is the degree of inclusivity present in a State’s discourse when talking about transforming the agricultural sector in light of a green economic transformation, which is what this paper will explore.

3 Methodology

As mentioned previously, the discourse analysis will be used as the qualitative approach to answer if the Ethiopian State green growth discourse aims at an inclusive growth, while placing the focus on the agricultural sector's necessary respective transformation. As Järnberg et al. (2018) claim, "Given the power inherent in discourses and their importance for guiding change, understanding dominant narratives is critical for the study of development trajectories and transformation." (p.419).

Phillips and Hardy (2011) define "discourse" as the "interrelated set of texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception, that brings an object into being" (p.3). "Discourse analysis" is thus defined as being "interested in ascertaining the constructive effects of discourse through the structured and systematic study of texts" (Phillips and Hardy, 2011, p.4).

Discourse analysis relies on the context of the text it is interpreting to come to a conclusion (Phillips and Hardy, 2011). In this respect, any discourse analysis will have a "constructivist" view because it seeks to understand the respective social, cultural or historical context of what it is analyzing.

This approach inevitably implies reflexivity and subjectivity in order to come to conclusions; it can lead to both generalizations and over-interpretation., which is a potential limitation to this study. Although these risks are hard to completely exclude, extra attention was placed to drawing conclusions in the interpretation phase of the discourse analysis in this thesis.

As pointed out by Phillips and Hardy (2011), we are ourselves confined in our conclusions by the "arenas of academic publication" (p.9). Literature from the literature review will be used to support and challenge the findings from the following discourse

analysis of Mr. Zenawi's speech, which means that our conclusions will be inevitably somewhat drawn based on the scope of previous research.

Based on research, Scriven's framework to Discourse Analysis deemed the most appropriate to analyzing a speech. As stated by Kumar and Pallathucheril (2004), it "provides a useful framework for investigating meanings and structure of arguments" (p.832), and it is especially recognized in identifying "an argument's context and structure in policy-related text" (ibid). Scriven's framework thus proved effective in deconstructing the meanings behind Mr. Zenawi's speech.

Further, this type of discourse analysis is particularly relevant for the political language expected in a Prime Minister's official speech, for example, because it helps to uncover the insinuations that are relatively frequent in political language, such as in a Speech (Gasper, 2000). It seeks to highlight if certain language features are employed repeatedly or if patterns are visible, with a purpose of evoking a meaning and emotion towards a specific issue. According to Gasper (2000), Scriven's framework "gives balanced attention to elucidation of meanings, analysis of structure, and evaluation of cogency" (p.3).

Figure 2 represents Scriven's discourse analysis in a more comprehensible manner. While steps 1 to 4 are rather empirical, the remaining steps provide room for interpretation. It is clear that analyzing one single speech from Ethiopia's State concerning its green growth trajectory may not be sufficient to come to an irrefutable "scientific" conclusion. Nevertheless, the personality of the speaker, his official function, the timing of the speech, and the discourse analysis itself provide sufficiently objective findings, that allows us to point the extent to which the State, represented by Mr. Zenawi, encourages inclusive growth to rural communities in his vision of a green economy through his various argumentations.

The full analysis can be found in the appendix B.

ARGUMENT SPECIFICATION	ARGUMENT EVALUATION
1. Clarify meanings [of terms]	5. Criticize inferences and premises
2. Identify conclusions, stated and un-stated	6. Consider other relevant arguments [including possible counter-arguments]
3. Portray structure [the relation of conclusions to grounds and warrants]	7. Overall evaluation [based on the balance of strengths and weaknesses, and in comparison to the alternative stance(s) one could instead adopt]
4. Formulate unstated assumptions [i.e. those required to move from the grounds to the claims]	

Figure 2: Scriven's framework of argument analysis (Gasper, 2000, p.9)

Mr. Zenawi's 2011 speech at the Sixth African Economic Conference was chosen as the focus of this thesis and is thus the object of the discourse analysis. This particular speech was chosen as it is intrinsically linked to the developments in Ethiopia. The country is experiencing one of the fastest economic growths in the world, but it remains a low-income country submerged in poverty and subsistence agriculture. Additionally, it was important to use a speech from Mr. Zenawi because he was at the forefront of promoting a green economy in the African continent that is submerged in poverty and experiencing devastating consequences of climate change. Mr. Zenawi was in the leadership when the CRGE Strategy was initiated, thus making this speech of his particularly important.

In this speech, Ethiopia's then Prime Minister, Mr. Zenawi, articulates Africa's role in the transition to a green economy, and provides first-hand insight on the approach that a developing African continent has towards such a multidimensional concept, all the while keeping the focus on the management of natural capital and its agricultural sector.

The purpose of this Conference was to bring together experts of the African continent onto this platform to facilitate an exchange and communication on new and better eventual growth patterns for this continent, with the prospect of reaching the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals). As cited by UNECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa), this platform "assists the policy formulation efforts as well as providing better

intervention in sectors critical to the promotion of growth and better living standards for the people of Africa” (UNECA, 2011).

Considering the ramifications of a discourse analysis, as commented on above, it can be deduced that Mr. Zenawi’s speech will reveal further insight as to what he implies through a green economic structural transformation. Thus, given that this discourse analysis will focus on Zenawi’s urgency to fix the vulnerable resource base, it will provide an alternative way to approaching his arguments and their consequence to social inclusiveness. However, it is important to note that because this speech was spoken in 2011, perhaps Ethiopia’s current Prime Minister, Mr. Abiy Ahmed’s, narrative on the green economy is more conducive to social inclusiveness. Nevertheless, as stated before, Mr. Zenawi’s speech in particular was chosen, being the African leader known for his green legacy.

The empirical findings from Scriven’s framework will be linked to the different discourses surrounding the green economy in the global South described by Death (2015).

Death (2015) has identified four types of discourses related to the green economy and coming from the Global South: green **resilience**, green **growth**, green **transformation**, and green **revolution**. These four green economy discourses of the global South confirm of the existence of different discourses on the matter, and highlights the multidimensionality surrounding a “green economy”.

As stated in the introduction, under the umbrella term of a “green economy” lies different realities, that can be divided into global North/ developed countries versus the global South/ developing countries. For this reason, classifying Mr. Zenawi’s discourse into the different global South discourses on the green economy will clarify Mr. Zenawi’s approach towards this growth trajectory, and help understand the implications for social inclusiveness.

This comparison is very relevant given that Death (2015) focuses on the green economy discourse from national strategies in the global South, which falls within the scope of this thesis. He admits that the interpretation of a green economy lies in “national green economy strategies” (p.2208), where the role of the State is argued to be at the root of the

trajectory of the country's green economy, which all have different implications on social inclusiveness of different stakeholders and actors in society.

This methodology does not come without its limitations. This thesis does not evaluate the policy implementation process in Ethiopia – the focus remains on the discourse that is used on a green economic transformation. This could be seen as a limitation because by default this study does not show *how* and *if* certain policies are being implemented. Nevertheless, analyzing a State's discourse is interesting because it reflects how it perceives a problem from a top-down approach, and therefore allows for deductions to be made as to what effects its perception can have on its subsequent policies.

4 Analysis: The State's Discourse

This section consists of the analysis of the empirical material, being Mr. Zenawi's speech, following Scriven's framework of argument analysis.

This chapter will begin by summarizing Ethiopia's CRGE Strategy's ambitions towards its agricultural sector, while examining to what extent social inclusiveness is integrated in the vision of growing as a green economy. It will then proceed with the actual empirical discourse analysis of Mr. Zenawi's speech in line with Scriven's framework, followed by its application to Death's (2015) four different national strategies' green economy discourses in the global South.

Because a green economic structural transformation needs to be context specific, it is inevitably interpreted in different manners. Therefore, attempting to apply the speech's discourse to the various global South narratives on the green economy offered by Death (2015) will not only give a better understanding the type of discourse that the Ethiopian State has on a green economy, but will also examine the implications it has on integrating and empowering rural communities and on social inclusive growth.

The analysis will conclude by identifying in what global South green economy discourse the Ethiopian State fits in. Consequently, the combination of the empirical findings from the speech using Scriven's framework to Death's (2015) proposed discourses will further allow concluding to what extent this is conducive to social inclusiveness, which is an element of UNEP's green economy definition that is being tested throughout.

4.1 CRGE Strategy: its aims for the agricultural sector

Ethiopia's late Prime Minister, Mr. Zenawi, initiated the CRGE in 2011. Its vision is to "achieve middle-income status by 2025 in a climate-resilient green economy" (FDRE, 2011, p.1) all the while maintaining its economic growth as one of the fastest in the world.

Linked to Ethiopia's GTP (Growth Transformation Plan), this vision combines three main goals:

- 1) "Boosting agricultural productivity,
- 2) Strengthening the industrial base,
- 3) Fostering export growth" (FDRE, 2011, p.1)

This document clearly states that following the conventional growth development trajectory would be challenging financially, and that it would lead not only to increasing GHG emissions, but also to a "lower quality of life and health problems" (FDRE, 2011, p.17), and would jeopardize both the country's resource base and risks of locking it in old technologies. The plan to undergoing a green growth constitutes of four pillars, being:

- 1) Agriculture
- 2) Forestry
- 3) Power
- 4) Transport

For the purpose of this thesis, the CRGE's agriculture and forestry section will be evoked, where these two pillars aim at restoring natural capital and improving the production of both crop and livestock, in the attempt of improving food security as well as smallholder's incomes. As will be seen with Mr. Zenawi's speech discourse analysis in the following section, the focus does remain on the efficient use of resources, just as in this CRGE strategy, where the former states:

"It represents the ambition to achieve economic development targets in a resource-efficient way that overcomes the possible conflict between economic growth and fighting climate change" (FDRE, 2011, p.19).

This thus not only stresses the pertinence of resource efficiency, but also attempts to mold the concept of economic growth with that of growing Ethiopia's resilience against environmental shocks, which is another commonality with the subsequent speech.

Agriculture is explicitly intended to "*remain the core sector of the economy*" (FDRE, 2011, p.22), which is inevitably omnipresent in the State's discourse given the high employment in this sector. This is in fact introduced as an evidence, where it is written that

“agricultural development will continue to be the basis for economic growth” (FDRE, 2011, p.9), with no proposed prospects for diversification. Additionally, the strategy confirms that a sustained growth of this sector will lead to higher household incomes and food security. In fact, the Strategy specifies that this income increase should be felt *“particularly in rural areas”* (FDRE, 2011, p.37). This goes in line with scholars’ views in chapter 3, where they advocate, *“poor rural communities should be the main beneficiaries of the green economy”* (Khor, 2011, p.81). However, although the CRGE implies inclusiveness, this concept is not explicitly written in the Strategy, and thus allows for the deduction that social inclusiveness, which is part of UNEP’s (2011) *“green economy”* definition, is overlooked.

Nevertheless, this does not mean that mentions of benefits of a green economy, other than economic, are not accounted for. The CRGE shows awareness of the *“cultural or social barriers to implementation”* (FDRE, 2011, p.113) when thinking about initiating large projects, such as re-forestation, but this is only briefly stated in the report, and does not explain the details or the specific considerations that should be taken. Apart from potential rising household incomes, other benefits are not cited in this Strategy for rural communities.

On another note, the CRGE explicitly shows awareness that if Ethiopia strives for rapid economic growth and continues with the unsustainable use and misallocation of resources, it might *“jeopardize the very resources it is based on”* (FDRE, 2011, p.16). In other words, given the growing population, growth aspirations, and demand for products deriving from the agricultural sector, maintaining an inefficient use of the agricultural sector’s resources will lead to an *“over-exploitation of natural resources”* (FDRE, 2011, p.16). The CRGE insists that it is not the surface area of land that needs to increase for there to be an output improvement, but it is the productivity of the existing land that needs to be improved, which makes reference to agricultural intensification. This is expressed as the following: *“Building a green economy will require an increase in the productivity of farmland and livestock rather than increasing the land area cultivated”* (FDRE, 2011, p.23).

One could say that showing awareness that a new economic model is required to sustain the resource base and make it more resilient does not exclude the possibility for a more socially inclusive green growth. As stated before, benefits of an agricultural transformation within a green economy could improve the opportunities for rural

communities in society with a potential income increase, which also favors poverty alleviation. Therefore, a green economy would imply more efficient use of agricultural resources and avoid their exploitation that tends to favor an exclusive economic growth.

It can thus be seen that the CRGE Strategy concentrates on a green economic structural transformation for the purposes of sustaining its high economic growth performance. Focus is placed on improving the agricultural sector's productivity and efficiency, with no constructive mention of the impact this may have to rural and farming communities, both on a social and cultural level, beyond that of a potential improvement in household income. These stakeholders are thus not included in the decision-making process of this Strategy, nor are they fully integrated when considering the implementation of certain projects.

4.2 Empirical results: Mr. Zenawi's 2011 Speech: "*Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa*" through the lens of Scriven's argument discourse analysis framework

This section is a commentary of the discourse analysis done on Mr. Zenawi's speech. It is conducted in a linear manner as per the speech's structure. Following the speech linearly, the following main ideas were found, which will make up the structure of this section of the thesis: skepticism towards a green economy, establishing a synergy between a green economic structural transformation and a green agricultural development, sense of hope through a set of proposed solutions, and a sense of collective action. The line numbers, relating to the different lines of the speech, are used to cite this section. A table of the analysis decomposition is found in the appendix B, where the line numbers are identified for reference.

Spoken at the opening of the Sixth African Economic Conference on October 25th, 2011, Mr. Zenawi held the speech entitled, "Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa", where he shows his awareness of the Continent's needed transition to a green

economy. He evokes “3 good reasons why green growth is and can not but be but an essential element of Africa’s structural economic transformation” (16), being that of agriculture, renewable energy, and technological trends. For the purpose of this thesis, the first point, concerning the agricultural sector, along with the general introduction, will be investigated through a linear discourse analysis, using Scriven’s framework.

4.2.1 Skepticism towards a green economy

The speech’s introduction sets the scene, where Mr. Zenawi immediately turns the attention to the skeptics of a green economy. It is highlighted that this topic is indeed an “*apt if provocative one*” (4). In other words, the assimilation of a green economy with economic structural transformation is considered to be a relevant topic, all the while sparking debates. This juxtaposition of the terms “apt” and “provocative” has the effect of highlighting the contrast in opinions that is reflected in society. Indeed, it is stated that most Africans are, and should be, focused on the “structural transformation of our economies” (4-6), where this is cited to be of central and “fundamental” (5) importance. This introduces the primary tensions between conventional and sustainable growth paths. By using the word “mere” (6) that holds a negative connotation in front of GDP, Mr. Zenawi perhaps reveals his opposition to following a conventional growth path. He continues to address the skeptics with a set of questions following each other, consisting of “*Why should we...*” (11) and “*Why shouldn’t we...*” (12). By listing these questions, and first using “should” and in the second question creating a contrast with “shouldn’t”, Mr. Zenawi creates opposition to what changes the green economy would imply, against what African countries have been doing for years. Indeed, it is questioned why this developing continent has to deviate from its conventional growth pattern for one that is “more expensive” (12).

Along these lines, Mr. Zenawi sarcastically refers to a green economy pejoratively as “*the green thing*” (13), which reflects the impersonal touch that is apparently embedded within the African continent regarding the prospects of a green economy. This serves as an introduction to the type of hostile discourse of the green economy that exists in Africa. Likewise, given that this growth trajectory is referred to as an “untried course” would imply that it is because a green economy is an unknown experimental path that the general African population dismisses it. In addition, these two questions also set the foundation for the debate of whose responsibility it really is to initiate this green transition. This debate is in fact raised

by several sources, such as Neely (2010), Kartha et al. (2018), and Rootzen (2015), who agree that countries that have previously emitted the most emissions should be the ones who should hold the responsibility today in initiating the green transition.

The above hints to a certain detachment between the African population and the concept of a green economy. They do not feel responsible to fix the effects of climate change, and they see other priorities as more pertinent, such as “*growth and transformation*” (13). The common narrative of skepticism that can also be found in literature suggests that green economy skeptics’ narrative in Africa is not unique.

4.2.2 Establishing a synergy between a green economic structural transformation and a green agricultural development

Mr. Zenawi continues to try to validate the need for a green economic structural transformation, all the while promoting green developments in the agricultural sector. The Prime Minister therefore attempts to demonstrate that the green economy can be synergetic to structural transformation, namely through the green development of the agricultural sector.

The speaker immediately puts this sector on a pedestal in this speech referring back to agriculture as being the growth engine, by assimilating the idea of “structural economic transformation” (19), being something familiar to Africans, as being achievable only through the transformation of agriculture, as seen through the following: “*We cannot even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without transforming our agriculture*” (19). It is clear that agriculture, including farmers and pastorals, rely on their land for living. In fact, it is clearly articulated that since agriculture plays such an intricate role in Africa’s economy, “*embarking on a green path of agricultural development will of necessity mean that green development becomes a pillar of our overall goal of economic transformation*” (45-48).

Mr. Zenawi thus suggests that it is inevitable and non-negotiable for green agricultural development to become part of Africa’s economic growth. This comes without saying that certain urgency is immediately placed upon the need to fix the resource base that the concerned sector has to offer. Words holding negative connotations, such as “plagued” (20), “cleared” (21), “vulnerability” (22), “exposed” (24), and “threatened” (25) are used to describe the situation of the resource base in Africa, which ultimately hampers agricultural productivity and intensification. There is arguably an imagery of something being sick and in

need of being nursed back to health, with the words “plagued” (20) and “rehabilitated” (28). The latter is also a term that is usually used for humans; so using it to describe the state of natural resources is a form of personification, and perhaps creates more of an impact on the general audience.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Zenawi offers a slight reality check when claiming that these negative impacts that have overcome the resource base were created by both “*others and by our own mismanagement*” (20-21), when referring to Africa. This brings contrast to the introduction of the speech, where it was suggested that Africans are not responsible for the degradation of their land, where it is underlined that “*we did not create global warming*” (8-9). This also suggests that agricultural practices need to be changed, which thus makes an advance to agricultural transformation and the intensification of its practices. It also allows for the audience to question themselves, and sends a message to those working with land to reassess their methods.

Mr. Zenawi attempts to contextualize the previously inconceivable effects of global warming by giving examples using the above-mentioned pejorative words. In addition, using words such as “massive” (22, 34) stresses the immensity of the damages that resonate onto the resource base. Therefore, the enumeration of the consequences that climate change has had on the land creates a negative accumulation, which Mr. Zenawi contrasts by providing a set of solutions.

4.2.3 Sense of hope through a set of proposed solutions

Mr. Zenawi therefore proceeds with a sense of urgency coupled with a set of solutions that evokes hope for the general public. He continues to list instructions as to what needs to be put in place to fix the agriculture’s resource base’s vulnerability. He chooses to start the two following sentences using an anaphora of “we need to...” (25, 26). This stresses the idea that action cannot be delayed, and sets the tone for the coming instructions. This tone of urgency is further reflected by the repetition of “act and act quickly” (25), which creates an atmosphere of alert. Mr. Zenawi thus recommends to “*improve the moisture retention capability of our soil, recharge our under ground water resources and increase the flow of our rivers*” (26-27). Listing these necessary outcomes serves to create an effect of accumulation and hence stimulate the audience to urge for action, especially given that these

instructions are expressed as imperatives, through the words “improve”, “recharge” and “increase”, thus implying that there is no room for debate.

According to Mr. Zenawi, it is the combination of “*massive re-afforestation, water management and soil conservation programmes*” (34) that will spark the process of green development, and will resolve the above-listed imperatives. He makes it clear that the current resource base is not sufficiently resilient, and therefore lists the above-mentioned instructions as to what should be incorporated into policy measures in agriculture. This section makes it very clear that no development will be possible without the resource base, which is referred to as being both “vital” and a “central” role to the economy. Not only will it stimulate economic development, but Mr. Zenawi makes a point that perhaps renders most “vital”, as he says, which is that of the possibility of farmer’s incomes consequently increasing. He arguably makes his argument more ‘materialistic’ and relatable, but it is only logical that programs that can improve the livelihoods of the people will sound more convincing to the audience. Knowing that most of Ethiopia’s population is engulfed by subsistence farming, the prospect of an income increase can only win more votes for a green economic structural transformation.

Mr. Zenawi not only brings a sense of hope with his solutions, but also reassures that such programs do not “require much additional money” (37), and states, “*all it requires is the political will and social mobilization*” (37-38). This idea is repeated by stating that these aspirations are “*something that we can do with the resources and technology at our disposal*” (44-45). This continues to give hope to the general public because it renders agricultural transformation feasible because resources to improve the resilience of the agricultural sector are already at disposal, which implies little needed investments. Mr. Zenawi continues with this positivity by presenting the creation of a carbon sink, which is the added reward from the offered program mentioned-above, as the “icing on the cake” (39). In other words, the speaker uses this metaphor to symbolize the fact that there are many other benefits that can arise by transforming the agricultural sector.

It is interestingly only at the end of this section of the speech on agriculture that Mr. Zenawi evokes his country with: “we in Ethiopia” (48). It is as if everything said before this

point served to show everything that has already been taken into consideration in Ethiopia, and thus places the country ahead of everyone else. Likewise, it is noted that “15 million hectares of degraded land” (49-50) have already been re-afforested, where numerical values has the effect of providing an added validity or achievement that is undeniable, consequently further idealizing Ethiopia’s progress.

4.2.4 Sense of collective action

Nevertheless, it is important to mention that Mr. Zenawi does mold a sense of collectivity throughout his speech. Through the use of “our” or “we”, he creates an image of himself as an assembler, and attempts to unite all actors of a country by making everyone feel concerned. By repeating such words, the speaker thus incites people to think of themselves as a collective community, and thus works to stimulate collective action. He illustrates the need for a synergetic relationship between the people and nature. This is also reflected through his statement that “mobilizing the labor of our people” (36), and thus working together, is sufficient to transforming their agriculture. Likewise, Mr. Zenawi’s on-going metaphor of this agricultural transformation being a “path” (40, 41, 46) encourages the audience to look towards a positive future.

4.2.5 Conclusion

Through the prism of Scriven’s framework of discourse analysis, it is interesting to note Mr. Zenawi’s alertness towards the urgency behind climate changes’ consequences on the land and resource base, and the connected solutions. It is undeniable that the evident discourse is gearing the African continent in general for an economic structural transformation towards a green economy. However, the same question remains: to what extent does this discourse show compatibility between a green economy and inclusive growth?

The following section will attempt to provide more clarity on the type of discourse that Mr. Zenawi articulated, and understand the implications to the question of inclusiveness.

4.3 Death's (2015) Global South discourses in action: highlighting the implications to Mr. Zenawi's 2011 speech to inclusive growth

To attempt to contextualize the discourse analysis findings, it will be viewed through the prism of four types of discourses on the green economy that are present in the Global South according to Death's (2015) paper. As a reminder, these refer to: green **resilience**, green **growth**, green **transformation**, and green **revolution** discourses. These are somewhat interlinked, where the ultimate aim remains to diminish the poor population's vulnerability to environmental adversities (Jones et al., 2013, p.3), but it is their way of approaching this problem that is different.

This section will explore how Ethiopia's State discourse, represented by Mr. Zenawi's speech, fits into Death's (2015) proposed discourses, and thus to what extent social inclusiveness is respectively integrated. As defined by UNEP (2011), a green economy is one that includes social inclusiveness, along with resource efficiency and low-carbon. Social inclusiveness is defined as: "*the process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society – improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity*" (World Bank, 2019). This section will thus help to answer the research question, which is to understand to what extent the Ethiopian State's green economy discourse answers to social inclusive growth. Literature extracted from Chapter 2 will be used to bolster the argumentation, and will serve to argue the extent to which social inclusiveness is integrated within each discourse.

4.3.1 Green resilience

Green resilience is defined as an "*attempt to ensure the sustainability and stability of the economy and social life in the face of peak oil, changing climates, food and water insecurity and loss of biodiversity*" (Death, 2015, p.2212).

As observed in the speech, the respective policy suggestions and sense of urgency are indeed emerging on the basis of land and resource mismanagement and climate change, thus rightfully placing Ethiopia in this discourse where the "resilience" discourse resonates from the imminent environmental risks. Likewise, Ethiopia being consistently assimilated to

famine and drought further justifies the need for its resilience-building discourse in its national strategy.

Death (2015) advocates that *resilience* is achieved through the coexistence of a technocratic state and empowered communities (p.2212), where these actors should shape their forms of resilience. This is reflected through the speech, where Mr. Zenawi highlights the need for the mobilization of labor (36), and explicitly states, when referring to green developments: “*All it requires is the political will and social mobilization*” (38).

A technocratic state is one that is made up of experts in different fields that take final decisions. Although Ethiopia does not qualify as a technocracy as per Death’s (2015) requirement, but as an authoritarian regime, the speech evokes the necessary political will and puts forward the imperative need for social mobilization. This is visible through the repetition of imperatives, such as “*we need to act...*” (25) or “*we need to improve...*” (26). This evokes a spirit of collectiveness, and groups the different actors in society together to take action. As stated under the discourse analysis, it is true that Mr. Zenawi succeeds to create a sense of collective action that is required to reach the green economy that he hopes for Africa, as seen with the repetition of words such as *our* or *we*.

Regardless, according to Death (2015), a limitation to this resilience discourse is that it arguably strengthens “the bureaucratic and coercive capacity of State institutions at the expense of local communities” (p.2213). Death supports this argumentation by using the example of the State providing micro-insurance to rural communities against environmental disasters. Such initiatives could in fact further monetize the agricultural sector and increase the grip that the State has on rural communities who would be the main beneficiaries of such an initiation. Understandably, this would not favor social inclusion in the process of transforming the agricultural sector in a green economic transition, but would favor the extractive nature of the State. Because Mr. Zenawi’s speech discourse has similarities to the characteristics of a “green resilience” discourse, and following the logic of the argumentation, one can argue that such initiatives as micro-insurance, though not explicitly stated in the speech, could be of occurrence in the country.

Speaking of a bureaucratic State, the CRGE Strategy itself is a project implemented from a top-down approach. In fact, Jones et al. (2013) agree that there is a “top-down nature of the consultation process” (p.18) behind the CRGE strategy and thus in the discourse that holds the Ethiopian State vis-à-vis a green economy in general.

Thus, as a logical continuation with the rest of this paper, such a consultation process does not leave room for inclusivity. It is precisely the exclusivity that reigns around this green transition that leads to rural communities being excluded from the consultation processes, thus leading to the misrepresentation of local and rural communities in decision-making. This seems inefficient given that their long and traditional knowledge to land use could only benefit the respective agricultural transformations that come with a green economy. In other words, the “needs and priorities” (ibid) of a large share of stakeholders in Ethiopia are not taken into account in the formation of, for example, this national strategy towards “greening” their economy. This makes it questionable whether the apparent discourse’s solutions are feasible for all members of the community, and renders the “green resilience” discourse that is an apparent feature of Mr. Zenawi’s speech’s discourse as rather exclusive rather than promoting social inclusion.

Under the name of collective action, Mr. Zenawi indeed proposes a set of solutions that “*need*” to be undertaken by the collective in order to mitigate climate change impacts, where he states: “*We need to improve the moisture retention capability of our soil, recharge our under ground water resources and increase the flow of our rivers*” (26-27). It should be noted that these suggestions revolve on the need for a better management of resources as a whole. He also cites a re-afforestation program as vital to avoid future droughts, for instance. This reflects the State’s awareness of the required changes needed for agricultural transformation that stem from the changing climate. This is consequently seen as a step forward in reinforcing the country’s land resilience towards unexpected environmental episodes, and therefore places Mr. Zenawi’s speech under the realm of the “green resilience” discourse.

In fact, the speech uses the word “vulnerability” to define the state of Africa’s general resource base as a consequence of long-term land mismanagement. This word connotes a sense of hopelessness towards the environment, suggesting that resilience and capacity

building is relevant. Mr. Zenawi also uses the term “sustainable” as his end-game, which is in line with the resilience discourse, where the suggested upcoming actions have the aim of rendering the agricultural sector and its natural resources sustainable in the long-term, and thus resilient.

However, the proposed solutions cited above are relatively broad, and do not target smaller farming communities. Looking back at the definition of social inclusiveness, the apparent discourse does not stress the improvement of the “terms on which individuals and groups take part in society”. Specific small-scale solutions would have added tangibility to Mr. Zenawi’s approach, and would have made the proposed solutions more applicable to smallholders. In this respect, listing these broad solutions does not integrate all communities into benefitting from a greener economy because it is unclear what precise actions are to be taken on a more individual level.

Furthermore, not only do these solutions remain broad, but it is also visible that Mr. Zenawi’s discourse remains focused on bettering resource management as the way to fix the resource base’s vulnerability. He explicitly states that a history of resource mismanagement is at the root of the vulnerability of the resource base today, as seen with: *“Our agricultural sector is plagued by problems created by others and by our own mismanagement”*. It is interesting to note that Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) note that an economic transition that is led “solely by principles of resource efficiency might result in a low-carbon world in which socio-economic inequalities prevail” (p.222). In other words, resource efficiency improvements are not immediately equal to inclusivity. In effect, behavioral or habit changes with respect to how resources should be managed is not covered by Mr. Zenawi’s speech, although it is admitted that a past of resource mismanagement is at the root of today’s vulnerable resource base. Therefore, referring back to UNEP’s (2011) definition of a green economy, not only would Mr. Zenawi’s discourse challenge the attainability of social inclusiveness, but it would also challenge the validity of the role that “resource efficiency” plays as a criteria to a green economy. As we focus on evaluating the compatibility between a green economy and inclusive growth, the question of resource efficiency remains outside of the scope of this thesis. One could nevertheless argue that the degree of social inclusiveness that comes from prioritizing resource efficiency and management is dependent on the political system, and is thus dependent of the degree of transparency and accountability present in the country.

Concisely, the primary limitation of the “green resilience” discourse to social inclusiveness, when assimilating it to Mr. Zenawi’s speech, is that although the proposed solutions to build up the resilience of the resource base from climate changes is evoked, these remain broad and fail to specify small-scale solutions that would be applicable by small rural farming communities, and consequently arguably does not hold the spirit of social inclusiveness.

Mr. Zenawi’s discourse did not prove to account for providing stability to social life based on the definition of the *green resilience* discourse to “ensure the sustainability and stability of the economy and social life...” (Death, 2015, p.2212). Mr. Zenawi’s discourse does account for providing a sustainable and sustained economic growth performance, where the rhetoric is centered on sustaining agriculture’s productivity as the main growth engine. Although the part about ensuring a stable social life is clearly not prioritized, his statement that agricultural transformation would act to “improving the income of our farmers” could potentially show the contrary. Indeed, earning more income creates stability and security in people’s livelihoods. It is also theoretically true that through the resilience and capacity building of the land and resource base as proposed through Mr. Zenawi’s solutions would help farmers to successfully adapt to both droughts and floods, and should thus stabilize and sustain their income earnings. As Mr. Zenawi articulates: “As a result of the global warming that has already happened we have become more exposed to strange combinations of drought and flooding” (23-24), which exposes the threat that everyday rural and farming communities face: droughts and floods. Nevertheless, emphasis is definitely not placed on this, and the State’s discourse fails to assimilate its arguments to social aspects of individuals’ livelihoods. As stated by Neely (2010), because of the multidimensional nature of agriculture, the sector’s resilience-building can improve “rural employment, the strength of local economies, health of rural culture, food security, and improvement in farm animal welfare” (p.22). However, this train of thought is not explored in Mr. Zenawi’s discourse because he fails to consider the benefits of agricultural development as an element of a green economic transition beyond the income benefits, where the social and cultural importance of agriculture to the individual is ignored. Accordingly, the cultural and social implications on rural communities that certain projects within the frame of agricultural transformation are not considered.

Though some aspects of his discourse does link to “resilience”, the speaker’s lack of connection to individual actors in society cancels out prospects of attaining the above in practice. In short, the discourse fails to account for how specific individuals’ livelihoods are weakened by climatic changes and in what way they can build resilience on a small-scale.

Thus, although Mr. Zenawi’s speech discourse does evoke the vulnerabilities that exist to the population as a consequence to climate change and suggests certain solutions, which fits in this “green resilience” discourse, a few challenges to inclusive growth remain. Firstly, the broad proposed solutions by Mr. Zenawi to strengthen the natural resource base does not render applicable for small rural communities. Secondly, the top-down approach held by the State in the consultation process for the green economic transformation does not enable the participation/ incorporation of various stakeholders across society. Ultimately, though the *green resilience* discourse is applicable to Ethiopia’s State green economy discourse, of which Mr. Zenawi’s speech, the above limitations prove difficult to reach an inclusive growth. Therefore, and referring back to UNEP’s *green economy* definition, if this type of discourse does validate a *low-carbon* and *resource efficient* economy, the *socially inclusive* element however remains debatable.

4.3.2 Green growth

Death (2015) defines the *green growth* discourse as extracting economic opportunities from climatic changes, instead of viewing them as threats, and is “forever in search of new opportunities for profit” (p.2214).

By definition, the main challenge of this *green growth* discourse for social inclusive growth is that it brings everything back to the cause of improving economic performance. Although Mr. Zenawi does put the agricultural sector and the resource base on a pedestal, the narrative always finds its way back to: “*agriculture is the main stay of our economies*” (45). It is thus clear that because agriculture is the main engine of economic growth, which is only understandable as outlined earlier in the thesis, any measures of agricultural transformation as

per the green economy transition must generate some degree of economic growth. Developing countries, including Ethiopia, cannot afford to do otherwise. In this sense, the *green growth* discourse is rigged, given that it somewhat dismisses UNEP's definition of what a green economy is to achieve. By gearing all agricultural transformations towards a positive economic growth outcome, one might not place resource efficiency as a priority, nor will one ensure social inclusiveness. In fact, as warned by Death (2015), this discourse continues to maintain and legitimize "ecologically damaging growth patterns" and "big infrastructural projects like dams and intensive commercial agriculture" (Death, 2015, p.2219).

In fact, this discourse is said to be complementary to combatting climate change because it gives the State the opportunity "to play an entrepreneurial role in society" (Death, 2015, p.2214). In other words, such a discourse implies that the State has the power to direct its investments towards, for instance, new green technologies, etc. – it consequently sets the ground for a top-down approach to decision-making for how to achieve an agricultural transformation to reach a green economy. However, because Ethiopia State has authoritarian and exclusive power over decision-making, this entrepreneurial role that it has will probably not be prioritized to investing towards the social integration of rural stakeholders in society. This is precisely what is found in Mr. Zenawi's discourse, which fails to account for the social dimension behind gearing for a green economy while engaging in green agricultural transformations, and prioritizes economic performance improvements. Therefore being given such an entrepreneurial role gives an element of subjectivity to the State to go through with policies that it personally deems necessary, and that may not be conducive to social inclusion in the growth trajectory.

This train of thought follows the logic of this paper thus-far, where even the proposed set of solutions are set by the State itself, through its entrepreneurial stance, and do not provide small-scale solutions for rural farming communities.

Perhaps Mr. Zenawi's repetition of the possibility for farmers' income to benefit from a green economic structural transformation is an element that links the speech's discourse to that of *green growth*. In other words, this potential income gain for farmers resulting from green developments, such as water management, re-afforestation and soil conservation programs, can be interpreted as a new economic opportunity arising from the existing

vulnerable state of the resource base. After all, an income increase theoretically results in higher GDP per capita, which thus reflects higher economic growth of the country. This income increase does suggest inclusive growth because it implies the prospect of poverty alleviation, and could thus provide more opportunities for certain disadvantaged communities to integrate better in society and thus benefit from a green economy. As evoked by scholars in the literature review, poverty alleviation would enhance food security and thus empower more rural and excluded communities to grow. Referring back to the definition of social inclusion, an income increase could improve the opportunities for poor rural communities in the society.

Nonetheless, though the possibility of monetary benefit for farmers is briefly noted, Mr. Zenawi fails to admit the short-term set backs that come with an economic structural transformation towards a green economy. As stated in the literature review, there is a risk of temporary income and employment loss in the beginning stages of such a transition. Indeed, smallholders remain highly dependent on land and natural resource exploitation mainly because the majority of the population is in subsistence agriculture and poverty, and rely on land for survival. In this respect, agricultural performance can experience short-term production loss because farmers may not be able to diversify their production immediately. UNEP (2011) also agrees of the risk for short-term income and employment loss “to replenish natural stocks” (p.45). This is especially the case for the agricultural sector, where natural capital has been depleted after years of mismanagement. For this reason, a transition to a green economy will inevitably involve, what one can call, transitional costs and a temporary slow-down in economic performance, which is not accounted for in the State’s discourse. Failing to mention this immediately excludes stakeholders from decision-making, and thus does not favor an inclusive growth.

However, a point of reflection would be that the context of the Sixth African Economic Conference in 2011 made it irrelevant to cite potential setbacks. The aim of the Conference was to show what opportunities would arise from a green transition, and not the costs.

On another note, this “green growth” discourse envisions reaching high economic growth and development through “green technologies and investments as one way to ‘leapfrog’ older and more inefficient industrialization paths” (Death, 2015, p.2214). In this

respect, the positive outlook of this type of discourse is that it arguably overlooks the conventional growth approach that today's already industrialized countries have followed, where the climatic changes incentivizes developing countries to seek for less conventional growth models. Trying to leap over the conventional growth model does commit to UNEP's (2011) definition of a "green economy", where it would lead Ethiopia onto a path to reducing the country's economy carbon output, which would also imply bettering the resource efficiency. However, as before, social inclusiveness remains uncertain.

The notion of "leapfrogging" is explored by Govindarajan et al. (2012). They point to five existent gaps between developed and developing countries, which play to the advantage of the latter. These consist of performance, infrastructure, sustainability, regulatory, and preferences gaps (Govindarajan et al., 2012, p.6). With respect to this green growth discourse, it is the sustainability gap that can be taken advantage of through Mr. Zenawi's discourse analysis, where environmental vulnerabilities are highlighted and respective solutions are proposed. As Govindarajan et al. (2012) state, green solutions are the "only way poor countries can sustain economic growth" (p.8). This is because if all poor countries in the world continue with existent unsustainable consumption and production methods, the final outcomes will be "environmentally unsound (and) catastrophic" (Govindarajan et al., 2012, p.8).

Accordingly, this idea of "leapfrogging" can be noted in Mr. Zenawi's discourse through his proposed solutions. For example, programs such as "re-afforestation, water management and soil conservation" can all fall under the category of filling in the sustainability gap suggested above, and can qualify as "leapfrogging" because these are steps theoretically required to make the transition to a sustained low-carbon green economic growth according to Mr. Zenawi's discourse, which is not something fully accomplished anywhere else in the world. However, "leapfrogging", as per the "green growth" discourse, implies the implementation of green technologies. Yet Mr. Zenawi clearly states that the agricultural sector's green development "*does not require any new technology*". In other words, it appears as though he looks to maximize the utility of the resources already present at hand. This refers back to the imperative of improving the way resources are managed, as already said.

Ultimately, it seems as though Mr. Zenawi's speech's discourse does not fully qualify under the "green growth" discourse because it appears as though it makes abstraction on the need to introduce new green technologies, at least not in the agricultural sector. However, this does not come without saying that new green technologies may be involved in the solutions proposed by Mr. Zenawi. This however is not made explicit in the speech, but this may be because the experts in the Conference have the knowledge to know the details behind such solutions.

4.3.3 Green transformation

The "green transformation" discourse is interpreted by Death (2015) as promoting "*progressive, ecologically sustainable and transformational*" (2217) approaches. The growth model itself is to be transformed, which "*involves explicitly political interventions*" (p.2216) in the process of this structural transformation.

Mr. Zenawi's discourse links to the "green transformation" green economy discourse because it does evoke "ecologically sustainable" solutions to the agricultural sector and resource base. This is where this "transformation" discourse proves similar to that of "resilience", because Mr. Zenawi's discourse undeniably shows the awareness for the imperative need to build up the resistance and capacity of the resource base. His discourse also makes it clear that it aims for a sustainable outcome. It is therefore needless to say that Mr. Zenawi's discourse connects to that of "green transformation" with its appraisal of "ecologically sustainable" actions towards the green development of agriculture and a green economy, which is centered on the "rehabilitation" of the resource base.

Mr. Zenawi's speech further fits in this discursive category, where he states: "*All it requires is the political will and social mobilization*" (37-38). However, if political will and intervention is what is needed to achieve a green economy, one can almost immediately conclude that inclusive growth will be difficult to reach in light of the authoritarian political system in Ethiopia, as already previously outlined. Indeed, given the top-down approach to policy intervention in this green transition, it is clearly articulated by Jones et al. (2013) that "fair distribution of benefits" (p.19) will by no means be achieved in a "strong centralized political leadership" (Jones et al., 2013, p.19). This also relates back to the need for the participation of rural communities, and to take into account their preferences when exploring suitable actions for the green development of the agricultural sector, and of agricultural

intensification (Carswell, 1997). Once again, the commonality between the various discourses here proposed by Death (2015) is that there is a lack of integrating rural communities in both the decision-making process and in the benefit sharing of the outcomes of a green economy.

When comparing these findings back to the definition of “social inclusiveness”, the same conclusions can be derived as for “green growth”. Society’s “disadvantaged” groups’ opportunities to take part in society remain on the outskirts. This goes back to the issue of the broadness of the scope of Mr. Zenawi’s proposed solutions, which are more geared towards enhancing the final economic performance instead of socially integrating various actors and stakeholders that make up the society. In addition, the centralized political system hinders a fair resource and benefit allocation in society.

4.3.4 Green revolution

The “green revolution” discourse was found to not be relevant to the interest of this thesis or to the motivations of Mr. Zenawi’s speech, and is for this reason not elaborated on. Ethiopia’s apparent State discourse on the green economy does not relate to the “green revolution” discourse’s potential. This is mainly because whereas Death (2015) categorizes this discourse as attempting “to build new societies” and “*build greener coalitions for radical and revolutionary change*” (p.2218), this endeavor is not highlighted by Mr. Zenawi’s speech discourse. It could be argued that the pure essence of this Conference is to bring all African countries together to gear for a green economic structural transformation, which would be in line with the “green revolution” discourse of a green economy. However, a limitation is that Ethiopia severely lacks any activist groups that promote a green economy. In fact, research shows that solely the CRGE Strategy exists to advocate for such an economy.

In this respect, it can be argued that social inclusion is ignored once again, because using this “green revolution” discourse would have aimed at bringing different actors of society collectively together to fight for change, and suggests a more bottom-up approach, which is something that is missing in the speech.

4.3.5 Conclusion

Using Death's (2015) four green growth discourses of the global South to attempt to conceptualize Mr. Zenawi's speech allowed for us to say that it exerts a "green resilience" discourse. The speech shows awareness of the history of neglect towards resource management, and proceeds to enumerate the ways in which the resource base in Africa in general is vulnerable to climate change. Because Mr. Zenawi supports this with a set of solutions, his "green economy" discourse holds characteristics of a "green resilience" discourse. This type of discourse not only seeks to fix the resource base's resilience towards environmental changes, but also has the goal of providing a stable economic and social life environment. It suggests that social inclusiveness, which is a characteristic of a "green economy" according to UNEP's (2011) definition, is implied by this discourse.

However, taking into account Mr. Zenawi's provenance from an authoritarian country changes the direction of this discourse. As a summary, the "green resilience" green economy continues to challenge social inclusiveness, which is reflected through the following elements.

First of all, Ethiopia is not a technocratic state and does not have empowered communities, which are criteria for "green resilience" (Death, 2015). This questions Mr. Zenawi's credibility in his speech, where he evokes that "political will and social mobilization" is needed, but he does not evoke the existent obstacles to this.

Secondly, the broadness of the solutions evoked in Mr. Zenawi's discourse to improve the resource base's vulnerability does not account for the social inclusion of various stakeholders, given that small-scale solutions are not proposed, which does therefore not provide equal opportunities for everyone.

Thirdly, as admitted by Death (2015), "green resilience" in a developing country unfortunately tends to further strengthen a State's bureaucratic capacity, because of the possibility for the State to favor initiatives such as micro-insurance. The top-down nature of the implementation process behind the introduction of a green economy in Ethiopia further excludes the integration of various stakeholders. This can lead to poorly tailored reforms in the agricultural sector that does not have the interest of rural communities at its core.

Finally, although the prospect of possible income improvement to farmers does favor social inclusiveness, Mr. Zenawi's discourse does not go beyond this direct materialistic

benefit; various social, and even cultural, aspects that would favor the overall social inclusiveness of communities in the green development of the agricultural sector in light of the green transition, is neglected.

5 Discussion of findings

This study focused on the discourse of a green economy in a country's national strategy. It was found that Mr. Zenawi's speech's green growth discourse resembles most to the "green resilience" discourse category, which ultimately showed that social inclusiveness is definitely not a priority to reach.

Linking Mr. Zenawi's speech's discourse to the "green resilience" green economy discourse allows us to point at the following.

Firstly, "green resilience" discourse is defined as an "attempt to ensure the sustainability and stability of the economy and social life in the face of peak oil, changing climates, food and water insecurity and loss of biodiversity" (Death, 2015, p.2212). Indeed, Mr. Zenawi makes a connection between the devastating consequences of climate change and the resource base's vulnerability in order to call for a green economic structural transformation, which includes the green development of the very popular agricultural sector. This is theoretically positive for social inclusiveness because it suggests more sustained yield for farmers, and thus an improvement from their current subsistent income. However, the discourse takes no account of the social dimension to such a green economic structural transformation. It therefore fails to consider the repercussions to individuals' livelihoods, beyond that of a potential income increase in the long run.

Secondly, this study showed the effect of an authoritarian system on the degree of social inclusiveness possible in a country. As observed, Mr. Zenawi's speech stresses that a combination of political will and social mobilization is sufficient to initiate a green agricultural transformation in light of an economic restructuring to a green economy. However, for this coexistence to work, the political system must be prone to integrating all of society's stakeholders. As stated by the BTI report (2018), there is a difficulty to conceiving the association of a democracy and economic growth. It is said that the Ethiopian State "seeks to ensure rapid economic growth without opening up the political process, under oppressive

conditions” (BTI, 2018, p.4). In fact, those that challenge the State’s “development policies and programs” (BTI, 2018, p.6) are marked as its enemy, thus reducing hopes for liberalization and democracy, and consequently rendering the fight for more social inclusiveness ever-more difficult. Along these lines, the State tends to promote, for instance, “outdated agricultural policies” (ibid), which in effect hinders hopes to improve the sector’s productivity and leaves Ethiopia in the state of food insecurity and famine.

In fact, it can be found that this is nothing new. Its history of land reforms left the land in poor condition. With the accumulation of underutilization of land, the favoring of large and capital intensive farming operations, and prioritizing production instead of income redistribution, the State’s actions towards the production and consumption trends of its land has historically been limited to the benefit of the few, where resource distribution and agricultural surplus tended to be allocated to those with higher rankings (Cohen et al., 1976). It is essentially the country’s lack of financial capital that continues to hinder its potential to investing into sustainable farming technology. Because of this, the State allowed for “foreign companies to acquire big farm lands” (Baye, 2017, p.427), which understandably did not place smallholders’ preferences first. Belete et al.’s (1991) detailed study of the progression of growth of the different components that make up the agricultural sector concludes that “inappropriate agricultural policies and the dearth of investment in the smallholder sectors which dominates the national economy” is what hampered the agricultural development of Ethiopia (p.173), and continues to have its effect.

This is where it becomes important to re-state that different geographical realities behind the conceptualization of a green economy is what challenges UNEP’s (2011) definition of the concept, which includes social inclusiveness. This definition is difficult, and even unrealistic, to strive for in developing countries. One can argue that the political system hinders prospects of social inclusiveness, where the discourse associated with it remains geared primarily towards enhancing economic performance.

Although UNEP’s (2011) definition implies a “low carbon, resource efficient and socially inclusive” one (p.9), not all these criteria are met subsequent to the analysis of Mr. Zenawi’s speech, which represents Ethiopia’s State narrative on the cause.

Being a global organization, UNEP's goals for a green economy fail to accommodate for every country's context-specific requirements. In line with this thesis' focus, the global South's preconditions differ from those in the global North, especially on the political grounds, which insinuates that not all of UNEP's green economy requirements are in the scope of developing countries' achievements as of today. These countries that make up the global South, such as Ethiopia, have not yet reached the right preconditions to completely fulfill the green economy's requirements. We believe that Ethiopia may be an illustration that certain policies do not matter at an early stage of development. Perhaps the inclusion of rural communities into the process and outcome of a green economy will come to be in the future, when the country will have gained the enabling factors to successfully have "social inclusiveness" as one of their development goals.

It is, for example, established by the literature that a green economy can only come to existence in a developing country if it does not interfere with the country's fundamental growth and development goals (Barbier, 2015). As seen through the discourse analysis, economic performance is prioritized over social inclusiveness. This was seen where although solutions are provided to improve the agricultural sector's resilience and productivity, the discourse revolves around the fact that "*agriculture is the main stay of our economies*" (45), which is used as the reason to go through with the speech's proposed solutions.

Given that developing countries cannot afford to sacrifice their development goals, it is inherent that the State places considerable efforts to alleviating poverty. Poverty is arguably at the heart of the problem of a lack of social inclusiveness in the country. As seen in chapter 2, Ramos-Mejia et al. (2018) define "poverty alleviation" as "*the ability of human beings to lead lives they have reason to value and to enhance the substantive choices they have*" (p.218). When comparing this definition to that of "social inclusiveness", similarities can be seen, where both are about improving the opportunities of disadvantaged communities in society. Therefore, based on the findings of the discourse analysis and its assimilation to a green resilience discourse, the State should aim to highly prioritize poverty reduction in Ethiopia, which is a focus that the Speech is missing. As noted throughout, an agricultural transformation as per a green economic transition, acts to desensitize rural and farming communities to the effects of climate change on their land, and render them more resilient. This in turn should provide more security to their livelihoods, more stable incomes, and

therefore give them more opportunities and ability to participate in society. This notion was further brought forward by UNEP (2011), who advocate that a green economy has the ability to reduce “persistent poverty” (p.9). The argument stems from the same source as above, which is that of adopting sustainable agricultural methods that improve the land’s resilience – a green economy thus not only brings about environmental benefits, but also social ones. Consequently, a take-away from this thesis is that it is an undeniable fact that achieving social inclusiveness is only possible if the goal of alleviating poverty is at the core.

It is now worth to dedicate a few words to consider the audience of Mr. Zenawi’s speech, being a gathering of experts on the African economy, with the purpose of discussing new or alternative growth paths for African countries.

As was observed throughout the analysis, the focus remained greatly on improving the agricultural sector’s performance as well as stimulating Ethiopia’s economic growth. As stated, Mr. Zenawi’s discourse does not cover the social implications or the temporary setbacks that could result from a green economic structural transformation and that could hinder social inclusiveness of rural communities in the short-term. However, considering the audience of the speech, the discourse was probably biased and conscientiously focused on the positive outcomes of a green economy in order to inspire the African continent’s policy makers to make this economic structural transformation.

Considering these findings of Mr. Zenawi’s speech discourse analysis along with the summary of Ethiopia’s CRGE Strategy, it is clear that social inclusiveness is far from prioritized by State representatives, whether it be in spoken form or in official writing respectively. It becomes interesting to compare these two main sources from the State to see whether the conclusions derived from the discourse of Mr. Zenawi’s speech, concerning the green development of the agricultural sector in the realm of a green economy, are complementary to those in Ethiopia’s official CRGE Strategy.

A few similarities are visible when comparing the two. Both focus on the need to boost productivity and yields, namely of the agricultural sector. This goes hand-in-hand with the fact that a green economy could increase household incomes, where theoretically if

agricultural productivity and yield increase, farmers will have more to sell, and thus will generate more income. This is also in line with what Ethiopia wants to achieve by 2025 in light of its green economic transformation, which is to reach a middle-income status. Additionally, both maintain the focus on agriculture as the main growth engine of the country. As stated, “80% of employment is still in agriculture” and represents 40% of Ethiopia’s GDP (FDRE, 2011, p.6). Likewise, in his speech, Mr. Zenawi confirms, “agriculture is the main stay of our economies” (Zenawi, 2011, p.2). Given that no real prospects to diversifying Ethiopia’s economy are provided, the agricultural sector’s contribution to the country’s economic performance is non-negotiable.

Nevertheless, a big difference exists between the CRGE and the speech. Whereas the speech does not take into account the social or cultural implications to rural communities that exist when initiating a certain project under the label of a green economy, such as re-forestation programs, the CRGE Strategy does. Even if brief and relatively scattered, the CRGE does show the awareness of various economic, social, or environmental benefits that certain actions can engender. However, these are often related to the potential consequences that could arise from, for example, the abatement of forest to make space for new, more energy efficient infrastructure, technology or buildings. Therefore, this minimalist account for the social aspect in the process of greening the economy is not assimilated to the agricultural sector’s transformation.

This discussion highlighted the main outcomes derived from the empirical analysis of Mr. Zenawi’s speech. Accordingly, it makes room for policy recommendations as to how the State could mold its discourse into more practical actions, which would be conducive to a green economy and integrate more social inclusiveness in the growth process. Suggestions are found in the following conclusive chapter below.

6 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to explore to what extent Ethiopia's State green economy discourse, in the form of a speech, is complementary to social inclusive growth, while focusing on the agricultural sector.

We referred to UNEP's (2011) definition of a green economy as a "low carbon, resource efficient and socially inclusive" economy (p.9). The focal point of this thesis is social inclusiveness, and was defined by the World Bank as "the process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society – improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity" (World Bank, 2019). The thesis was narrowed down to investigating the degree of social inclusiveness apparent in a State's green growth discourse, because it is only logical that those rural communities that are the most dependent of their surrounding environment reap some of the benefits that come from this alternative growth model.

We used Scriven's framework of argument analysis, being a form of discourse analysis, in order to understand the meanings behind the arguments of Mr. Zenawi's speech, and to be able to draw conclusions. This was performed in a linear manner on the first two pages of the speech, where Mr. Zenawi addressed agriculture and forestry. This thesis focused on this sector, given that the country's population consists of 85% of subsistence agriculture. It was relevant to understand how Ethiopia conceives to transform this sector in light of its transformation to a green economy. We reviewed how Ethiopia's green economy vision is "officialized" in its CRGE Strategy, with the aim of reaching a middle-income status and a decarbonized economy by 2025.

We finally linked the findings of the discourse analysis to Death's (2015) four green growth discourses from the global South, in the hope that it would provide an insight to the subsequent implications on social inclusiveness in Mr. Zenawi's speech. We reviewed green

resilience, green growth, green transformation, and green revolution, and their implications for social inclusiveness were further evaluated using literature gathered throughout this thesis.

It was concluded that Mr. Zenawi's speech, which represents the Ethiopian State's discourse for the purpose of this thesis, portrayed the *green resilience* discourse of a green economy.

The green resilience discourse unveiled that the State does connect its proposed actions towards a green agricultural transformation to the devastating climate change consequences on the resource base of the agricultural sector. The discourse creates a clear sense of urgency, and sets a boundary between the negative past of poorly managed resources, versus the prospect of a rehabilitated and sustainable agricultural sector, and thus towards a green economic trajectory.

Nonetheless, when taking a closer look, the discourse's sense of hope is cut short because of the broadness of the solutions proposed by Mr. Zenawi. Maintaining large-scope and macro solutions do indeed connote hope for the future. What it does not do, is offer micro and small-scale solutions for rural farming communities to adopt on their smaller production scales, given their reliance on their land and resource base for subsistence living.

There is a lack of inclusiveness omnipresent in the speech, which creates an invisible boundary between those at the "top" and those at the "bottom". The obvious top-down approach in policy and decision-making in Ethiopia hinders prospects for social inclusiveness, at least in the short-term. As prior-hypothesized, the country finds itself at a stage where it cannot yet afford to sacrifice particular resources of its economy to social welfare and inclusiveness. Ethiopia is presently experiencing high economic growth, being one of the fastest growing economies in the world, but remains a low-income country. One could expect that once it successfully reaches a middle-income status by 2025, it could consider sacrificing time and resources into improving "the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged" communities in Ethiopia, which is part of the definition of social inclusiveness (World Bank, 2019).

We could not but address policy considerations with the purpose of enabling the

improvement in social inclusiveness while on the path to a green economy.

We believe that a first step must be to integrate greater local and rural knowledge into the decision-making process of a green economic structural transformation. In other words, there is a need for a more bottom-up approach to the implementation of a green economy. Improving various stakeholder involvement in decision-making, especially rural and farming communities, would favor smallholder empowerment and would theoretically act as an incentive for them to improve their production methods, resilience, and final yield. We do envisage the challenge of integrating smallholders and rural communities in the benefits of agricultural transformation, as part of the green economy requirements, as this stems from deeper social, economic, and political issues. However, this was not in the scope of this thesis, but could be an extension for further research.

A second step to consider is to implement smaller-scale agricultural transformations, since those proposed in the speech do not seem tailored to low-income rural communities. This would enable these communities to engage in agricultural practices that favor a green economic transformation from a micro-level. Similarly, the State would benefit from investing in human capital and education for all members in society, with particular attention to those located in the rural outskirts. This would abide by the definition of “social inclusiveness”, where spreading awareness of the importance of enhancing agricultural productivity through efficiency and intensification practices, would act as a step towards improving the opportunity of currently disadvantaged communities, and would give them the tools needed to embark on a sustained production path. Investing in human capital by interacting with rural communities would stimulate climatic awareness, risk management, and resilience building, which should further enable more sustainable agricultural practices, thus in turn shaping better managed agricultural skills and create more “comprehensive green growth policies and measures” (AfDB, 2012, p.158).

Undeniably, the Ethiopian State discourse remains set on the narrative of *agriculture as the engine of growth*, with no true dedication to social inclusiveness. This being said, scholars agree that rural communities should be the main beneficiaries of a green economy given their primary reliance on their land for their subsistence income. Although African leaders are showing awareness of the importance of dealing with the evolving climate crisis,

their preconditions are not yet conducive to tend to the issue of social inclusiveness when following this trajectory. One could thus argue that as long as social inclusiveness is not integrated within the growth strategy, Ethiopia's aim to reaching a middle-income status by 2025 will be challenging to achieve, where poverty will remain an important burden.

While it is necessary to have written strategies and policy documents advocating a green economy, the ultimate and powerful challenge is to bring this to a practical level. Even if a strategy, a document, or a speech employs a hopeful discourse towards a green economy, this means little if not applied to more regional, sectoral, and local levels. And vice-versa, the latter needs to be framed and monitored within a long-term vision, supported by this strategic reflection. In effect, the discourse coming from higher-levels of authority, such as State representatives or even NGOs, for instance, need to be applied to small-scale practical solutions, and need to be tailored accordingly. This is the only way that social inclusiveness will be reached in the frame of a green economy, where local stakeholders will have the opportunity to take part in society and gear towards a green economy together.

6.1 Future research

Admittedly, focusing on discourse analysis to extract the meanings behind the arguments of a speech, and to ultimately interpret their implications to the green growth trajectory towards social inclusiveness, leaves prospects for future research. The qualitative method used in this thesis illustrates that there needs to be more incentives to socially include disadvantaged communities into society. Whereas streaming to fight persistent poverty, as a development goal would play to the advantage of social inclusiveness, as mentioned in the discussion, the question remains as to what specific realistic policy measures should be adopted. In addition, given that it was suggested that an investment in human capital and education about sustainable agricultural practices could enhance the attainability of social inclusiveness in a green economy, it would be interesting to further investigate whether this knowledge improvement would actually inhibit rural communities to change their behavior and adopt new farming and agricultural methods. Ultimately, it would be interesting to use the State's discourse analysis as a stepping-stone to further explore developing country's institutional capacities towards a green economy.

References

Abegaz, B (2004). Escaping Ethiopia's poverty trap: the case for a second agrarian reform. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 42, 3, pp.313-342. Cambridge University Press.

AfDB (2013). *Towards Green Growth in Africa*. African Development Report 2012. African Development Bank Group.

Baranova, P. (2017). Transition to a Low-Carbon Economy: On the Cusp of Emerging Challenges and Opportunities. *The Low Carbon Economy: Understanding and Supporting a Sustainable Transition*. Pp.1-14. Palgrave Macmillan.

Barbier, E (2015). Is Green Growth Relevant for Poor Economies? *Fondation pour les études et recherches sur le développement international*. Development Policies, Working Paper, 144.

Baye, T (2017). Poverty, peasantry and agriculture in Ethiopia. *Annals of Agrarian Science*, Volume 15, pp.420-430.

Belete, A; Dillon, J; Anderson, F. (1991). Development of agriculture in Ethiopia since the 1975 land reform. *Agricultural Economics*, 6, pp.156-175. Elsevier.

Biber, E; Kelsey, N; Meckling, J (2017). *The Political Economy of Decarbonization: A research agenda*. Volume 82.

BTI (2018). Country Report: Ethiopia. Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index (BTI).

Carswell, G. (1997). Agricultural intensification and rural sustainable livelihoods. In IDS working paper, Vol. 64, Brighton: IDS.

Cochrane, L; Bekele, Y (2018). Contextualizing Narratives of Economic Growth and Navigating Problematic Data: Economic Trends in Ethiopia (1999-2017). MDPI: 6, 64.

Cohen, J; Goldsmith, A; Mellor, J. (1976). Rural Development Issues following Ethiopian Land Reform. Africa Today: Vol. 23, No. 2, Tensions in the Horn of Africa, pp.7-28.

Creswell, J. (2013). Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. London: Sage Publications.

de Mello, L.; Dutz, M. (eds.) (2012). Promoting Inclusive Growth: Challenges and Policies, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Death, C (2015). Four discourses of the green economy in the global South. Third World Quarterly, Volume 36, No.12, pp.2207-2224. Routledge.

Dunning, H. (1970). Land reform in Ethiopia: A case study in non-development. UCLA Law Review, Vol. 18: 271.

Echeverri, L (2018). Investing for rapid decarbonization in cities. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Volume 30, pp.42-51.

Faccer, K; Nahman, A; Audouin, M. (2014). Interpreting the green economy: Emerging discourses and their consideration for the Global South. *Development Southern Africa: Volume 31, No. 5*, pp.642-657.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2004). *FAO Ethics Series 3: The Ethics of sustainable agricultural intensification*. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/j0902e/j0902e00.htm#Contents> . (Accessed 29 March 2019).

FDRE (2011). *Ethiopia's Climate-Resilient Green Economy*. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa. Available at: <http://www.ethcrge.info/crge.php> .

Gaspar, D (2000). *Structures and meanings: a way to introduce argumentation analysis in policy studies education*. Working paper 317. Institute of Social Studies.

Gebremariam, G; Tesfaye, W (2018). The heterogeneous effect of shocks on agricultural innovation adoption: Microeconometric evidence from rural Ethiopia. *Food Policy*. Volume 74, pp.154-161.

Girmay, G (2015). *Smallholders Subsistence Agriculture: Why Ethiopia is Still Here?* *American Research Journal of Agriculture: Center for Rural Development, College of Developmental Studies, Addis Ababa University*. Original Article: Volume 1, Issue 3, 2015.

Govindarajan, V; Trimble, C (2012). Reverse innovation: a global growth strategy that could pre-empt disruption at home. *Strategy & Leadership*. Volume 40, Issue 5, pp.5-11.

Gultekin, O; Erenoglu, B (2018). A research on policies for green economy in developed and developing countries within the scope of sustainable development. *Challenges of the Knowledge Society. Economic Sciences*.

Jacobs, M (2012). *Green Growth: Economic Theory and Political Discourse*. Center for Climate Change Economics and Policy, Working Paper No. 108. Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, Working Paper No. 92.

Jaleta, M; Kassie, M; Tesfaye, K; Teklewold, T; Ranjan Jena, P; Marenya, P; Erenstein, O. (2016). Resource saving and productivity enhancing impacts of crop management innovation packages in Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics* 47, pp.513-522. International Association of Agricultural Economists.

Järnberg, L; Kautsky, Elin; Dagerskog, L; Olsson, P (2018). Green niche actors navigating an opaque opportunity context: Prospects for a sustainable transformation of Ethiopian agriculture. *Land Use Policy*, Volume 71, pp.409-421.

Jones, L; Carabine, E (2013). Exploring political and socio-economic drivers of transformational climate policy: Early insights from the design of Ethiopia's Climate Resilient Green Economy strategy. Overseas Development Institute. (Working paper).

Jordaan, A (2018). Building Resilience in Africa Through Transformation and a Green Economy: Challenges and Opportunities. *Rethinking Resilience, Adaptation and Transformation in a Time of Change*. Pp.299-320. Springer.

Khor, M. (2011). Challenges of the Green Economy Concept and Policies in the Context of Sustainable Development, Poverty and Equity. In *The Transition to a Green Economy: Benefits, Challenges and Risks from a Sustainable Development Perspective*, edited by UN-DESA, 69–97. New York: UN-DESA, UNEP, UNCTAD

Kumar, S.; Pallathucheril, V. (2004). Analyzing planning and design discourses. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, Volume 31, pp.829-846.

Martinez-Covarrubias, J; Garza-Reyes, J (2017). Establishing Framework: Sustainable Transition Towards a Low-Carbon Economy. *The Low Carbon Economy: Understanding and Supporting a Sustainable Transition*. Pp.15-32. Palgrave Macmillan.

Mballa-Ngamougou, T (2013). Constructing Meanings of a Green Economy: Investigation of an Argument for Africa's Transition towards the Green Economy. International Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands.

Moore, M; Riddell, D; Vocisano, D. (2015). Scaling Out, Scaling Up, Scaling Deep: Strategies of Non-profits in Advancing Systemic Social Innovation. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship* Issue 58.

Neely, C. (2010). Capacity Development for Environmental Management in the Agricultural Sector in Developing Countries. *OECD Environment Working Papers No.26*. OECD Publishing.

Ocampo, J (2019). The Transition to a Green Economy: Benefits, Challenges and Risks from a Sustainable Development Perspective. Report by a Panel of Experts to Second Preparatory Committee Meeting for United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development.

Phillips, N.; Hardy, C. (2011). What is Discourse Analysis? Discourse Analysis. Sage Research Methods.

Ramos-Mejia, M; Franco-García, M-L; Jauregui-Becker, J. (2018). Sustainability transitions in the developing world: Challenges of socio-technical transformations unfolding in contexts of poverty. Environmental Science and Policy, pp.217-223.

Reda, A.A (2004). Discourse Analysis on the Ethiopian Government's National Action Program to Combat Desertification. Bachelor of Science Thesis, Environmental Science Programme, Department of thematic studies, Campus Norrköping.

UNECA (2011). African Economic Conference 2011: Green Economy and Structural Transformation. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Available at: <https://www.uneca.org/aec2011> (Accessed 27 February 2019).

UNEP (2011). Towards a green economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication: A Synthesis for Policy Makers.

World Bank (2019). Understanding Poverty: Social Inclusion. Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/social-inclusion> (Accessed 18 April 2019).

Zenawi, M. (2011). Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa. Key Note Address at the Sixth African Economic Conference. Available at: https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/uploaded-documents/AEC/2011/speech_by_he_meles_zenawi-1.pdf

Appendices – Appendix A

Figure 1. Mr. Zenawi's Speech

Excellencies

Ladies and Gentlemen

1 I am honoured to welcome the participants of this august gathering to Addis and to
2 express how pleased I am to join you today.

3 The topic of your discussion for this year's gathering Green Economy and Structural
4 Transformation in Africa is an apt if not provocative one. Many people I am sure would
5 agree with you that the fundamental issue for us Africans is that of structural
6 transformation of our economics and not mere growth of our GDP. Green economy is
7 however an altogether different thing.

8 I am sure many Africans will ask what green economy has got to do with us. We did not
9 create global warming and nothing we do is going to affect its future trajectory much.
10 We are unlikely to be the source of new technology green or otherwise. So what indeed
11 has green economy got to do with us? Why should we think of introducing green
12 technologies which could be more expensive than the alternatives? Why shouldn't we
13 simply concentrate on growth and transformation and leave the green thing to those
14 who created the problem in the first instance and who can afford to embark on a new
15 and largely untried course?

16 I can think of three good reasons why green growth is and cannot but be an essential
17 element of Africa's structural economic transformation and none of them have much to
18 do with what we as Africans can or should do to mitigate global warming.

19 We cannot even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without
20 transforming our agriculture. Our agricultural sector is plagued by problems created by

21 others and by our own mismanagement. Much of our land has been cleared of tree cover
22 resulting in massive land degradation, soil erosion and vulnerability to both flooding
23 and drought. As a result of the global warming that has already happened we have
24 become more exposed to strange combinations of drought and flooding. The resource
25 base of our agriculture is very seriously threatened. We need to act quickly to stop or at
26 least radically mitigate soil erosion. We need to improve the moisture retention
27 capability of our soil, recharge our underground water resources and increase the flow
28 of our rivers. If we are to promote irrigated agriculture to adapt to the changes we have
29 to rehabilitate our degraded hills and mountains. We cannot hope to mitigate the impact
30 of droughts and floods without a massive reforestation of our hills and mountains. But
31 the impact of such a massive reforestation program will not be limited to its effect on
32 soil erosion and water management. The trees we plant would become vital sources of
33 new income for our farmers if we can sustainably manage and harvest them. Green
34 development involving massive re-afforestation water management and soil
35 conservation programs is thus centre to any hope of transforming agriculture and
improving the income of our farmers.

36 Much of such work can be done by mobilizing the labour of our people and does not
37 require much additional money. It certainly does not require any new technology. All it
38 requires is the political will and social mobilization. Such a programme would also
39 create a massive carbon sink in the continent, but that is as it were the icing on the cake
40 and not the main reason why we embark on such a path. The main reason why we have
41 to embark on such a green path of agricultural development is because that is the only
42 way we can sustain a meaningful agricultural sector in the current global environment
43 and because that is the only means we have to preserve the source base of our
44 agriculture so that we can then transform it. It also happens to be something that we can
45 do with the resources and technology at our disposal. Given the fact that agriculture is
46 the main stay of our economies, embarking on a green path of agricultural development
47 will of necessity mean that green development becomes a pillar of our overall goal of
48 economic transformation. That is why we in Ethiopia have embarked on green
49 development in agriculture including through the reforestation of up to 15 million
50 hectares of degraded land.

Appendix B

Figure 2. Mr. Zenawi's Speech – Discourse analysis breakdown using Scriven's argument analysis 6-step framework

Please see the 5 pages below –

Line number	Text	1. Clarification of Meaning	2. Identification of Conclusions	3. Portrayal of Structure	4. Formulation of Assumptions	5. Criticism of Inferences Premises	6. Other Relevant Arguments
3, 4	"The topic of your discussion for this years gathering Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa is an apt if provocative one. "	"Apt": relevant. "Provocative": causing anger.	Juxtaposing these 2 words creates a certain attractive contradiction- although the topic is relevant, it also generates a degree of anger	INTRODUCTION	Suggests that there exist conflicting views on the topic at hand		
4, 5, 6	" Many people I am sure would agree with you that the fundamental issue for us Africans is that of structural transformation of our economies and not mere growth of our GDP."	"Fundamental": necessary or central importance. "You": refers to the participants of this Conference. "Mere": another word for "only", can imply a negative connotation.	It introduces the primary tension between conventional and sustainable growth paths. By using the word "mere" in front of GDP growth connote a negative view towards conventional economic growth, and perhaps reveals Mr. Zenawi's stance		Highlights further existing differences concerning this topic - in this case it is implied that some do not agree that structural transformation of the economy is more important than GDP growth - Mr. Zenawi turns to the skeptics of a green economy		
6, 7	"Green economy is however an altogether different thing. "	"Different": creates a contrast	Highlights that the green economy entails something different to that of structural transformation or GDP growth.				
8, 9	"I am sure many Africans will ask what green economy has got to do with us. We did not create global warming and nothing we do is going to affect its future trajectory much. "	"Us": suggests an "Us vs. Them dichotomy". "Create": to make, to cause. "Trajectory": path.	The implied dichotomy and impersonal touch between the concept of the green economy and the African population.				
11, 12, 13, 14, 15	"Why should we think of introducing green technologies which could be more expensive than the alternatives? Why shouldn't we simply concentrate on and leave the green thing to those who created the problem in the first instance and who can afford to embark on a new and largely untried course? "	"Introducing": suggests an initiative. "Green thing": evokes a negative connotation towards the concept of a green economy - the word "thing" is very impersonal and perhaps stresses the unpopularity of the unknown. "Untried course": new, experimental path	Evokes the general public's tendency to be disapproving towards a new green economic path of which they do not feel concerned	The accumulation of the 2 questions following each other gives the audience room for reflection			
16, 17	"I can think of three good reasons why green growth is and can not be but an essential element of Africa's structural economic transformation..."	The purpose of this speech is finally expressed - Mr. Zenawi will attempt to persuade the African population of the suitability of a green economy in 3 main reasons. "Essential": necessary, important.	The link between a green economy and a structural economic transformation are implied to be possible and important for Africa.				

"... and non of them have much to do with what we as Africans can or should do to **mitigate global warming.**"

It is safe to say that although Mr. Zenawi previously showed his awareness that the concept of a green economy is mostly met with indifference because people see it as a way to revert the effects of climate change, which is something that they have not significantly contributed to, Mr. Zenawi manages to demonstrate that the green economy is also compatible and can be synergetic to structural transformation (as mentioned in the beginning of the speech)

Line number	Text	1. Clarification of Meaning	2. Identification of Conclusions	3. Portrayal of Structure GOOD REASON 1: <i>Agriculture</i>	4. Formulation of Assumptions	5. Criticism of Inferences Premises	6. Other Relevant Arguments
17, 18	"... and non of them have much to do with what we as Africans can or should do to mitigate global warming. "	"Mitigate": to alleviate, to avoid					
19, 20	"We can not even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without transforming our agriculture."		The agricultural sector's transformation is stated to be the most important in actually reaching a structural economic transformation, which is arguably what the majority of Africans seek to achieve.		An agricultural transformation could entail agricultural intensification		
20, 21	"Our agricultural sector is plagued by problems created by others and by our own mismanagement. "	"Plagued": very bad connotation, suggests a disease/infected. "Mismanagement": failure of efficiently allocating resources, perhaps neglected?	With the use of "others" and "our own", there arises the dichotomy of "Us vs. Them" again. However, here both parties are put on the same level, where the agricultural sector's problem comes from both parties.		Combining the "others" to "our" when talking about mismanaging the resources can be interpreted as Mr. Zenawi offering a reality check to his audience (and to the former skeptics who do not see why they need to be involved in this "green economy")		
21, 22, 23	"Much of our land has been cleared of tree cover resulting in massive land degradation, soil erosion and vulnerability to both flooding and drought."	"Cleared": empty, void. "Vulnerability": suggests weakness	The enumeration of the consequences that climate change has had on the land also creates an accumulation of the negative consequences that Africa is stuck in		Listing the side-effects of climate change on land in Ethiopia perhaps has the added-benefit to urge or incentivize the audience for action		
23, 24	"As a result of the global warming that has already happened we have become more exposed to strange combinations of drought and flooding."	"More exposed": lacking protection, a form of vulnerability. "Strange": suggests the unknown or unexpected					
24, 25	"The resource base of our agriculture is very seriously threatened. "	"Threatened": hostility	Suggests that natural resources, which is the essence of any structural economic transformation (as seen above, are being/ have been mismanaged.				

These solutions could be considered perhaps too simplistic in transforming agriculture?

The grouping of these sentences suggest a bit of hope, and imply that solutions can be found, such as with "moisture retention". The sense of urgency coupled with a possibility of finding solutions thus evokes some hope and can be argued to be inspiring for the audience.

The term "rehabilitate" is usually used for humans - using it to describe the state of the natural resources in Africa perhaps makes it more personal and understandable to the general audience.

Taking action is an imperative, non-negotiable, and required. The repetition of "act" puts emphasis on this action and on the immediacy of the situation

Suggestions of what needs to be done to improve the threatened resource base are given - providing solutions perhaps shows the audience that actions can be done, and can arguably break the certain "ice" and unfamiliarity with the green concept they might have

Forests/ hills/ mountains are the foundation and are conducive to a strong and resilient environment, that can then be used for sustainable green growth.

Policy measures are introduced, and it implies that the resource base today is clearly not resilient enough, and that necessary actions need to be done. Additionally, using the word "our" brings a sense of collectiveness.

This shows that environmental restoration has economic benefits, such as improving individual's income.

"Need": have to, imperative

This sentence begins again with "we need" - the use of an anaphora emphasizes the aspect of a necessity to be done collectively (due to "we"). Words such as "improve", "recharge", and "increase" hold positive connotations. They also serve as imperatives and instructions, which inspires confidence

"if": suggests a conditionality, and thus that it is up to us to decide and to commit to taking necessary action. "Rehabilitate": bringing someone/ something back to health - refers to therapy. "Mitigate": to avoid

"Massive": implies that the measures that need to be taken require extensive action and programs.

"Vital": again shows the inherent importance and benefits that will come from afforestation programs.

"We need to act and act quickly to stop or at least radically mitigate soil erosion."

"We need to improve the moisture retention capability of our soil, recharge our underground water resources and increase the flow of our rivers."

"If we are to promote irrigated agriculture to adapt to the changes we have to rehabilitate our degraded hills and mountains."

"We can not hope to mitigate the impact of droughts and floods without a massive re-afforestation of our hills and mountains."

"But the impact of such a massive re-afforestation programme will not be limited to its effect on soil erosion and water management."

"The trees we plant could become vital sources of new income for our farmers if we can sustainably manage and harvest them."

25, 26

26, 27

27, 28, 29

29, 30

30, 31, 32

32, 33

33, 34, 35	<p>"Green development involving massive re-afforestation, water management and soil conservation programmes is thus central to any hope of transforming agriculture and improving the income of our farmers."</p>	<p>"Massive": the repetition of this word throughout this set of sentences stresses the immensity of the required projects to fix or restore the resource base of agriculture in Ethiopia. "Central": essential, at it will increase their income. the core.</p>	<p>Not only does green development involve environmental restoration and a change in resource management, it also improves the livelihood of farmers (subsistence farmers) where it is predicted that it will increase their income.</p>	<p>A sense of community is again evoked by the use of "our", and this sentence further equates green development to a green economic growth. Additionally, the fact that the income improvement is mentioned shows the awareness that green growth cannot substitute the country's economic development goals.</p>
36, 37	<p>"Much of such work can be done by mobilizing the labor of our people and does not require much additional money."</p>	<p>"Requires": necessity. "Will": the desire. "Mobilization": the coming together for a greater cause, similar to collective action.</p>	<p>This sentence states that African populations can also take action towards reinstating its resource base in light of its green economy, and that, in theory, they have the fundamental means necessary.</p>	
37, 38	<p>"All it requires is the political will and social mobilization."</p>	<p>"Carbon sink": absorbing carbon. "Icing on the cake" is as it were the icing on the cake and not the main reason why we embark on such a path.</p>	<p>"Requires": necessity. "Will": the desire. "Mobilization": the coming together for a greater cause, similar to collective action.</p>	
38, 39, 40	<p>"Such a programme would also create a massive carbon sink in the continent, but that is as it were the icing on the cake and not the main reason why we embark on such a path."</p>	<p>"We have to...": another use of imperative, an instruction, shows assertiveness. "Only way"/"only means": emphasis that this is the sole path to follow to reach agricultural development. "Path": metaphor for a journey.</p>	<p>This suggests that the country has what it needs in terms of resources and technology to go through with its green growth ambitions, so there is no reason for it not to do so.</p>	<p>Shows that the green economy will sustain the agricultural sector in the context of today's climate and environmental situation. However, the focus remains on the preservation and management of agricultural resources and on limiting degradation, but the idea of sustainable intensification is not evoked.</p>
40, 41, 42, 43, 44	<p>"The main reason why we have to embark on such a green path of agricultural development is because that is the only way we can sustain a meaningful agricultural sector in the current global environment and because that is the only means we have to preserve the source base of our agriculture so that we can then transform it."</p>	<p>"It also happens to be something that we can do with the resources and technology at our disposal."</p>	<p>This suggests that the country has what it needs in terms of resources and technology to go through with its green growth ambitions, so there is no reason for it not to do so.</p>	<p>The fact the Mr. Zenawi suggests that the necessary action is feasible with the resources and technology that</p>
44, 45	<p>"It also happens to be something that we can do with the resources and technology at our disposal."</p>	<p>This suggests that the country has what it needs in terms of resources and technology to go through with its green growth ambitions, so there is no reason for it not to do so.</p>	<p>This suggests that the country has what it needs in terms of resources and technology to go through with its green growth ambitions, so there is no reason for it not to do so.</p>	<p>The fact the Mr. Zenawi suggests that the necessary action is feasible with the resources and technology that</p>

45, 45, 46,
47, 48

"Given the fact that **agriculture is the main stay of our economies**, embarking on a green **path** of agricultural development will of necessity mean that **green development becomes a pillar of our overall goal of economic transformation.**"

"That is why **we in Ethiopia** have **embarked** on green development in agriculture including through the re-forestation of up to 15 million hectares of degraded land."

"Given that": shows that it's an unnegotiable fact that agriculture has a big role to play in African countries. "Path": journey metaphor is evoked again.

"we in Ethiopia": narrows his arguments down to his country, Ethiopia, as the leading example in this green growth "path".

This undeniably states that a green economy and development will have to become the economic pillar because agriculture plays such an omnipresent and important role in African countries and to African communities.

By saying "agriculture is the main stay of our economies" refers back to the fact that subsistence farming remains the main form of farming in Africa, where most families remain dependent on agriculture for survival.

It's as if everything said before this sentence in general terms for Africa was actually all the things that are already being taken into account in Ethiopia -- perhaps everything before this was a subtle introduction to the progress that Ethiopia has done compared to the rest of the African continent.