

# **Ethiopia and the United States: Hot and Cold Relationship – A Challenge to the Future of Ethiopia**

By Tecola W. Hagos

April 10, 2010

## **Part Two**

### **III. Ethiopia – National Security**

Franklin D. Roosevelt's Presidency spanned over a period of thirteen years, March 4, 1933 to April 12, 1945. He was by far the longest serving President of the United States in the history of that nation. In other words, he was the presiding world leader during the Italian occupation of Ethiopia and the liberation of Ethiopia and the aftermath of that event in history. Much of Ethiopia's modern history of the time was affected to some extent by decisions (of action or non-action) of Roosevelt's Administration much of which was reversed by the successor Administration of President Harry Truman. It is to be recalled that Haile Selassie visited with Roosevelt in February 1945 at Bitter Lake, Suez Canal, aboard the Battle Ship *USS Quincy* and expressed his desire that the United States support the reunification of Eritrea with Ethiopia. [Zewde Reta, 15] [Getachew, 39] [Pittsburg Post-Gazette, Feb 20, 1945] Haile Selassie accepted an invitation to meet with Roosevelt. [Spencer, 159-60] The logistic must have been mind boggling. Actually, it was a US military aircraft that flew the Emperor to Egypt in order to meet Roosevelt.

At the time the Emperor was fighting for his sovereign power and control of his government. The British who helped him in ousting the Italians ended up controlling key Ministries and running the economy of the country. Britain was toying with the idea of making Ethiopia its protectorate since 1941. The Emperor needed a friendly country with no such colonial legacy in order to counter the *encroachment* of the British Government. In the aftermath of the Second World War, the United States, as a close partner of Britain, acted in the best interest of the two countries except in one situation where the United States saw its foreign relations interest distinctly different than that of Britain. Britain was a colonial power and as such its interest was to hold on those colonies and if possible add more territories under its control using the new terminology of "trustship" substituting for the old concept of "protectorate" dressed in new respectable United Nations system.

There is in the United States Government's hands an alleged infamous letter from the Prime Minister of Britain to the President of the United States suggesting that Ethiopia posed a great danger to the Western nations meaning the "White" race and that it ought to be destroyed. A number of scholars seem to have heard about the existence of such a letter, but none seem have any access to the document. I have even heard people mentioning that Professor Vestal having talked about the existence of such document somewhere in the labyrinth of the State Department or the White House archives.

The most significant policy of the Government of the United States that had a long term design and effect on Ethiopia was the decision to federate Eritrea with Ethiopia in 1952. The Roosevelt administration early on was positively inclined in the integration of Ethiopia with its old province of the area baptized by the Italians in 1890 as "Eritrea" that

was occupied by force since 1890 by Italy. Although Italy claimed on paper dominance and ownership, the area was not fully controlled by the Italians, for most of Kunama, part of Akale Guzai, and part of Afar area continued their traditional contact with their mother country through out the Italian occupation of the area. In fact, the State Department's position during the Roosevelt Administration entertained the idea of dividing Eritrea into two parts whereby the lowland area of Beja would be incorporated with the Anglo Sudan, and the rest of Eritrea that included the highland areas of Hamasien, Serie, Akale Guzai and the Afar coastal areas would be returned back to Ethiopia.

It was President Truman, in all probability the least knowledgeable President about the historical significance of Ethiopia, who opted to defer to the military strategists, and reversed the Roosevelt era policy to respect the territorial integrity of Ethiopia that recognized the independence and development of Ethiopia to be beneficial to both Ethiopia and the United States. Truman's first Secretary of State was James F. Byrnes, a Southerner from South Carolina, who does not seem to have shed his racist views. And later Dean G. Acheson as Truman's second successive Secretary of State had helped design the policy of the United States toward Ethiopia and the Arab Middle East. Acheson was immersed mainly in organizing NATO, with some global responsibility for the implementation of Truman's "Point Four" program to help "underdeveloped areas of the world."

President Eisenhower, seems not to have reciprocated even more so than Truman to appreciate the unique strategic and historic importance of Ethiopia. He allowed the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles to neglect the most crucial geopolitics emerging nation in the Horn region of Africa, and when in active mode to follow through the idea of keeping Eritrea as one unit in a federated state with Ethiopia for a time until such future period that the United State would claim it as its satellite state and thereby control the Afar costal area and the territorial waters on the Red Sea. Such anti-Ethiopia policy was what was kept under lock by the United States Government from scrutiny to this day. However, such lukewarm relation ship with Ethiopia did not inhibit Dulles from making a statement that seems on the surface supportive of Ethiopia. John Foster Dulles said, "From the point of view of justice, the opinion of the Eritrean people must receive consideration. Nevertheless, the strategic interests of the United States in the Red Sea Basin and world peace make it necessary that the country be linked with our ally Ethiopia."

This was a period that is often glossed over by historians and political scientists writing on Ethiopia and the United States. We all are scratching history fruitlessly to get to the truth of what exactly was discussed and adopted in the inner sanctum of the United States Government on the destiny of Ethiopia. It seems to me all these years, no scholars, or politicians, or reporters never truly had access to the files and documents concerning Ethiopia. In fact it is extremely unusual that there is total blackout on such crucial historical documentation.

It is precisely that rogue and illegal design that was fully realized forty years later during the Clinton Administration creating an independent Eritrea illegally by the use of force

with the collaboration of Meles Zenawi, who fully worked to promote the independence of Eritrea with both the United States and the Eritrean People Liberation Front (EPLF). EPLF leaders and supporters never tire to say how long they struggled for their freedom, and unknowingly telling us also that they were not really good fighters if a relatively under equipped and under funded military of the Ethiopian government could hold them at bay for thirty years. Even then EPLF's victory could not have been possible without TPLF's engagement of the Ethiopian Army. EPLF would never have succeeded to win against the Ethiopian Army in a thousand years.

What is ironic is the fact that it was Ethiopia that committed its modest resources on behalf and in support of the interest of the United States first. After the reestablishment of diplomatic relationship and exchange of Ambassadors for the first time in 1949, a year later in 1951 Ethiopia sent its heroic soldiers to serve in Korea in support of the policy of the United States. They served from 1951 to 1954. Ethiopia sacrificed its brave sons (121 dead and 536 wounded) in that military engagement supporting the United States. [Getachew, 45] Nothing comparable had happened from the American side up to that point in time or later. Unlike the United States, the honorable Korean people and Government erected a monument to the brave Ethiopian soldiers that sacrificed their lives safeguarding Korea from the ravages of communism.



**Ethiopia Monument**

<b>Location</b>	Geunhwa-dong, Chuncheon, Gangwon Province
<b>Date of Building</b>	May 7, 1968

**Monument Contents**

This is dedicated for the warriors of the Ethiopian Empire who had rendered great services to protect the freedom in Korea during the Korean War.

The 1950s and 60s were critical for Ethiopia's effort to develop its resources and find solutions to the many social issues and ills, from illiteracy to democratic governance with the perennial abject poverty for ninety percent of the population. Once again the United States played very minor and often obstructionist role against the long term interest of Ethiopia all the way to 1974 when it finally left Ethiopia pushed out by Mengistu Hailemariam. I contend that most of the blame for such cursory and light-weight economic and diplomatic relationship with the United States was the fault of the Ethiopian Government and to a lesser extent the half-hearted gesture of relationship by the United States Government officials. Essentially, Ethiopia's diplomatic effort and mode of operation was based on appeasement and personalized contact with the leadership of foreign states. Such approach is disastrous especially when dealing with bullies like the United States and nouveau-rich primitive Arab leaders. In a way, Ethiopia's diplomatic approach to this day fits well with the characteristics of its leaders

that of Haile Selassie and his functionaries, the *Mahel Sefaris*, who were Haile Selassie's bureaucratic dependants, and also the Mengistu's diplomats, and now that of Meles Zenawi.

Emperor Haile Selassie made several serious national policy errors during his long reign of fifty years. He failed to reform the antiquated land holding system, and also kept using harmful and degrading cultural norms. To wit, dressed in one of the most expensive three piece woolen suites and wearing custom made leather shoes, he would let his newly appointed Ministers kiss his feet in a somber ceremony. He implemented the type of education meant to create bureaucrats who would serve his immediate needs and not the long term needs of the nation. He poured the nations modest wealth into one urbanization project of Addis Ababa. The effect of such diversion of the wealth of the nation to one area had a devastating effect that is still being felt to date in most parts of Ethiopia. The much needed vocational technology oriented education was never truly promoted. And his final error in attempting to shade his past and work with the new emerging young soldiers, who had mobilized their supporters right under his nose, costed him his Throne and his life.

It is fair to start by asking what exactly did the United States do during that crucial period in the modern history of Ethiopia from 1950 to 1974, the second half of the century old relationship with the two nations. There were a couple of Treaties and half a dozen technical assistance agreements. The United States support also was extended to military hardware assistance and the training of military personnel. I hear all references pointing to education assistance, military cooperation, infrastructure, and capacity building efforts in diverse areas. None of the efforts of the United States was worth such exaggeration, for the effort was very limited in its reach, especially when seen in light of the types of programs and attention the United States Government exerted in Egypt, Germany, Japan et cetera. Alemaya Agricultural College and some further assistance in setting up other training facilities and providing educational tools such as books, laboratory equipment et cetera are development programs often cited by officials and academics alike. The college started out very small graduating its first eleven students with BSc degrees in 1958. All in all those efforts in context of the size of the country and population, and the obvious needs of the people is miniscule.

We need make a clear distinction between the period from 1950 to 1974 and the period from 1992 to date when we discuss the involvement of the United States Government with Ethiopia. For example, the amount of money provided by the United States for the entire period of the reign of Haile Selassie was less than the amount of money it provided in a year to the Government of Meles Zenawi as budgetary supplement and other funding for development, and that does not even include the half billion dollar worth of food item provided by the United States every year for almost the last eighteen years. It is clear that the United States is spending a lot of money in Ethiopia these days. However, one may ask how beneficial is that form of generosity to the Ethiopian people. Many Ethiopian scholars criticize the United States Government as a supporter of the oppressive often brutal Government of Meles Zenawi. I see the problem being our own making and we

should not blame the United State or anybody else for our lack of resolve and courage in fighting our own corrupt and oppressive government.

Haile Selassie being a traditional man with a heightened sense of self-importance was thorn between the pull of modernity and the inertia of the tradition of Ethiopia he grew up with. In the end he was an outcast from both systems and a failure in each. He was neither modern nor fully traditional. At times it is very embarrassing to see him dressed in a French Marshal's uniform at official functions; he must have looked comical to his foreign guests or hosts from the West. He was the single most obstacle for political and economic reform of Ethiopia. He caused tremendous harm to the state of Ethiopia and the people of Ethiopia due to his stubborn hold on absolute power with very limited changes in education, social relationships, productivity et cetera judged by the massive needs of the people of Ethiopia. I acknowledge his pioneer work in almost all spheres or sections of development. But that was not enough. There in lays his failure, too meager changes, enough to wet the appetite of a fraction of the population that led to premature revolutionary takeover of Government by those few.

#### **IV. Carter, Bush, and Clinton: The Fiasco**

##### **A. Carter and Bush: the groundwork**

What is of utmost interest to me is to observe how far the 1903 relationship of equals initiated by Skinner, even at a time when the United States was in the throes of Jim Crow segregationist social, political, and legal turmoil, would deteriorate to such an extent now, at a time when the United States had overcome most of its racial problems and elected a Black man for President, between Ethiopia and the United States is no longer of equals, but a relationship where the United States has total dominance over Ethiopia. Skinner writing from contemporaneous observations of the Ethiopian society in 1903, wrote with great respect and appreciation of the people of Ethiopia. [Skinner, 1906] It is legitimate to ask about the causes that drove once proud people into begging shamelessly for food and into exporting our women to the Middle East to become domestic maids with all the abuses one can imagine by primitive and savage societies in the Arab world. This is not to say that every official of the United States was disinterested or dismissive of the people and State of Ethiopia.

Almost all the Secretaries of States that had any diplomatic involvement with Ethiopia had written their memoirs or autobiographies, but only few took the trouble to devote some pages to the oldest nation on Earth with whom the United States Government had contact for a period of time of over a century. For example, Henry Kissinger devoted some pages with a degree of seriousness than any democrat President Administration official on Ethiopia. It is true that Nixon turned down the request of Haile Selassie for military assistance at a time when Somalia was being armed to the teeth by the Soviet Union. Kissinger at the time was National Security advisor to Nixon. What Kissinger wrote later seems to contradict that fact of Nixon's erratic and irrational refusal to assist Ethiopia when requested by Haile Selassie in person. The explanation for such refusal may be due to the brewing Watergate scandal that finally pushed Nixon out of office.

I am not trying to shift blame on to an innocent party for all the ills that befell Ethiopia. One must not deny the fact that we Ethiopians are responsible for much of the crises facing us now. I have written repeatedly in the past that our main problem is our ignorance and lack of technology sophistication. But saying that just is not enough; we need to understand also how we were caught in the web of deceptions and conspiracies of other nations. Often we lacked the resolve and courage to deter mediocre leaders from among ourselves from gaining power and deterring us from our progress.

President Carter often stated that human rights considerations guided his decisions dealing with national crises. That was the reason given for his cancellation of military assistance including delivery of weapon already paid for at a crucial time when Somalia was attacking Ethiopia during the early stage of the Military government of Ethiopia. The real reason was later revealed by scholars to be something else—an immoral opportunism by Carter. “On February 24, 1977, President Carter announced the United States was cutting off all military aid to Ethiopia because of its human rights violations. The unstated reason was the U.S. desire to cooperate with Saudi Arabia to lure Somalia's from the Soviet camp, an effort which was ultimately successful.” [Bard] Here is a clear example of an asinine decision by the United States Government that is stilted. Rather than strengthening a well established and existing relationship with Ethiopia, the Carter Administration opted out for some other exotic relationship with a small country that was out there in someone else's sphere of influence. Years later Somalia would descend into chaos and lawlessness, and in early October of 1993 its Somali militia would fight the United States in pitched battles and drag through Mogadishu streets naked bodies of United States soldiers killed in such fights.

Despite his many admirable qualities and his sense of justice and support of those disfranchised peoples, such as the Palestinian people, Carter has been less than honest or upright when it comes to the people of Ethiopia. For example, his release of his Report on the Ethiopian National Election of 2005 just recently is a telling incident how he undermined the struggle of the people of Ethiopia for freedom and responsible government. He played games with us Ethiopians from 1976 to date, for over thirty years. I met Carter both in Ethiopia in 1992 and later in the United States. I found him to be one of the most congenial Americans I have ever met in such a formal setting. He was both generous in his time as well as his reception with clear questions and clear answers. It is true that he continued to do great inspiring volunteer work both in the United States and in the World at large. My criticism is limited to his activities in the politics of Ethiopia.

Both Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush promoted the agenda of keeping the world safe from communism projecting most of their attention to end the Cold War with the Soviet Union. They found in Mikhail Gorbachev, a rustic man who has a jaded view of the West, a willing partner. After the political dance with Gorbachev, the United States stood alone as the single Super Power in the World, at least for few years in late 1980s. The outcome so far seems to be very complex, and not as clean as asserted often; the United States did not win by a knockout and the World is a much changed place far different than what those American leaders anticipated. It was during the Presidency of Reagan, as well as that of Bush, that the main setup for the destruction of Ethiopia as a

nation, not just to get it out of the tight grip of the Soviet Union, was put in place with specific assignments to the Department of Defense, the CIA and the State Department. Reagan's Secretaries of State were Alexander M. Haig (1981-1982) and George Pratt Shultz (1982-1989). Those men were not concerned about the value of Ethiopia in the regional politics of the Middle East and the Horn.

And the Secretaries of State during George Bush's single term presidency were James Addison Baker (1989-1992) and Lawrence Sidney Eagleburger (1992-1993). Eagleburger was a long time deputy to Baker, and his becoming of Secretary of State for less than a year was simply an administrative expediency to make matters easier in confirmation hearings and continuity at State Department because Baker had to leave office. As you may imagine none of those Secretaries of State had any particular interest in Ethiopia. All of them were hawks to a varying degrees, but capable individuals who should have appreciated the strategic importance of Ethiopia in the Middle East, but they did not. I found no evidence to the contrary. I read their papers in their books as well as books written about the period by experts and journalists.

I found nothing that attests to the fact that Ethiopian interest was ever taken seriously by those Government officials. On the other hand sources are replete with instances showing how United States officials favored Arabs for any number of reasons including race. Most importantly they were in conflict of interest to a serious degree—for Bush, his many oil concerns, and for Shultz, Bechtel, for example. Many individuals in the Executive Branch of Government were using the revolving-door and were involved in investment and business deals that touched the petrodollars of the Arab World. However, none of them promoted the idea of getting Ethiopia away from the Soviet Union's sphere of influence with possible future enhanced relationship with the People of Ethiopia. What they aimed at was the destruction of Ethiopia. Period.

Except for South Africa, both Reagan and Bush were equally disinterested in African nations as members of the community of states. Of course, Western leaders were at all times interested in the wealth of Africa, such as the gold mines of Ghana, uranium of Niger, oil of Nigeria and Equatorial Guinea, et cetera. It seems to me they were the two most aggressive Presidents in recent memory. American policy was highly militaristic and they inadvertently or lack of foresight allowed the military to erode the power of the civilian United States Government. Neither was reputed to be an intellectual. It is their legacy that resulted in the present situation where the United States Military is making policy decisions that were reserved by the Constitution and long standing state craft to the civilian administration.

After consecutive Republican Presidents, the nation was ready to welcome anyone except a Republican Candidate, even an unknown to run for President of the United States. Bill Clinton came with the thinnest of credential folder than any one in the history of the United States. With no military service, Clinton was thought of as a "draft dodger" running to Europe to attend college. There are pictures of him at such time as a student, reflecting the dissonance of the time in his dress and general demeanor. His major political start was as Governor of Arkansas, a relatively small and insignificant Southern

State. His Presidency did uplift many disfranchised minority groups around the country, but it also had some major setbacks including an unfair impeachment.

### **B. Clinton and the Eritrean Independence**

In all probability President Bill Clinton had done the most harm to Ethiopia's sovereignty and territorial integrity more than any living President of the United States. It is the Clinton Administration that finally nailed the coffin on Ethiopia. It is true that George Bush's Administration had set the stage for the takeover of the Ethiopian Military Government of Mengistu by the TPLF led guerrilla movement. State Department medium level official functionaries, such as Herman Cohen, were on the scene—officials who seem to have supervised the destruction of the Government of Mengistu Hailemariam. The ground work was done by subversive infiltrators, such as Gayle Smith who served with the TPLF and Don Connell who served with EPLF. At one point both were either married or intimate with each other, and were part of the American effort to destroy the Ethiopian Government and Mengistu and redesign Ethiopia if it survived that assault. Gayle Smith is also known by some as the “vanilla guerilla.” I prefer to liken her to Lara Croft—who seemed to think of life as an endless game of adventures and excitements without care what happened to the little people whose lives she trampled upon in her selfish pursuit.

Gayle Smith is now with the Obama Administration in the National Security Council staff, with an important function as Senior Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Global Development, Stabilization and Humanitarian Assistance. This is a very significant and influential position. I wonder how President Obama is ever going to get seasoned and unbiased foreign relations advice from such individuals who have more garbage and skeletons of past misdeeds in their closet of highly questionable involvements in the dirty politics of African guerilla leaders. The best thing for Obama is to start all over from scratch by first dumping his polarizing staff and assistants the likes of Gayle Smith.

There was no legal basis for the independence of Eritrea in 1993. In fact international norms both conventional and the specialized principle of *jus cogens* (international law and practices) indicate that the act of independence is an illegal act where it is achieved through the use of force when such struggle is an internal matter against a legitimate state, in this case Ethiopia a United Nations recognized Member State. Even if we step back to the colonial occupation and also consider later agreements with Italy, Ethiopia had never rescinded its sovereignty totally to Italy, for the 1900, 1902, and 1908 instruments to varying degrees may be used as evidence for the establishment of the intent of the Ethiopian Government that was never an abrogation of sovereign power over such territories. At any rate, as part of the 1947 Paris Treaty, all those international instruments have been rendered null and void due to the 1947 declaration of Italy foregoing all international obligations allegedly owed it by Ethiopia. The legal theory in support of my argument is valid, but this is not the place to go into details.

The approach for the Government of the United States should not have been to use legal hairsplitting to carve out some exception or to corrupt general principles of international law and practices in order to legitimize the activities of guerilla fighters declaring



independence of Eritrea in what is essentially an illegal act. It was all the work of President Clinton and his Administration that facilitated the *ashatir* against the beleaguered Ethiopian State. Clinton found a willing participant in that formulation of illegal declaration of independence in Meles Zenawi who should have protested vigorously against such declaration. However, it took another round of devious diplomatic maneuver to firm up a boundary delimitation and demarcation. The Eritrean independence declaration and its Membership in the United Nations did not result in automatic boundary delimitation and demarcation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. I assert that the expensive war fought by Ethiopia to repel Eritrean aggression was instigated for the purpose of settling the border question that was unresolved. Clinton's man on the filed was Anthony Lake who helped design the one-sided Algiers Agreement of 2000 that totally undermined the legitimate right of Ethiopia to its Afar territories and territorial waters on the Red Sea. The 2000 Algiers Agreement resurrected long dead instruments (1900, 1902, and 1908 agreements between Ethiopia and Italy) in order to benefit Eritrea:

**“Article 4 (2). The parties agree that a neutral Boundary Commission composed of five members shall be established with a mandate to delimit and demarcate the colonial treaty border based on pertinent colonial treaties (1900, 1902 and 1908) and applicable international law. The Commission shall not have the power to make decisions *ex aequo et bono*.”**

On that score alone of the fraudulent provision Article 4 (2), the 2000 Algiers Agreement was voidable even invalid.

I would give an “F” to each member of the Clinton's legal team that supported such screwed up legal basis both for the independence of Eritrea and later for the so called Algiers Agreement that resurrected long dead instruments with sole aim of supporting one party. It seems also they relayed on yet unresolved legal concept from Roman private transaction/property law of *uti possidetis* and steam-rolled on every other legitimate considerations.

“The boundaries in Africa are often characterized as artificial and arbitrary on the basis of the fact that they do not respond to what people believe to be rational demographic, ethnographic, and topographic boundaries. However, borders are always artificial because states are not natural creations. Therefore, it is important to judge boundaries--political creations--on the basis of their usefulness to those who created them.” [Hasani, ]

Not only was that form of use of an unresolved international law principle blatant professional dishonesty but also illegal. In a way it reflects also the moral corruption of Clinton himself, his trickster approach to solving real life problems and a cavalier attitude to the rights of minorities that he seems to look at simply as a bridge to overcome political problems with no depth of internal conviction—a useful tool to win elections. We have seen how quickly he showed his true feelings about race when he started attacking Obama on the question of his race rather than focusing on the issues in the Presidential campaign between Barak Obama and Hillary Clinton.

Clinton played a crucial role in the landlocking of Ethiopia. He even went to the extent of sending his wife as a good will ambassador to Eritrea, where she received some jewelry as gift. “In the early 1990s, US President Bill Clinton placed the nascent nation on a

throne, crowned the prince with the promise of stability, democracy and self-reliance. A partner in post-Cold War Africa was in the making. Shortly thereafter, first lady Hillary Clinton, along with top American brass, paid Afwerki numerous visits.” [Nielsen, “Eritrea: Alone against the world”] The short sightedness of the policy of Clinton toward Ethiopia is clear now. His premature support of the independence of Eritrea without giving proper weight to the historical connection of the people that comprised Ethiopia that included every group in Eritrea except the Rushdie’s (who are mainly squatters from Yemen and Saudi Arabia in rickety boats escaping hunger over the Century).

The close lives of such diverse people of Ethiopia and their interdependency is a historical fact. The racist disregard of that intimate history by foreigners had culminated in two oppressive fractured nations right now. Even in his book Clinton hardly mentioned his role in dismantling a viable ancient nation. There is a side remark about the role played by the United States about the Algiers 2000 Agreement in three lines. [Clinton, 619] There is much dishonesty about the facts surrounding the separation and independence of Eritrea, and the landlocking of Ethiopia. We see now that the policy of the United States has changed against Eritrea dramatically. Ironically, it is Mrs. Clinton, as the Secretary of State for Obama, who had undertaken the embarrassing task of having to give numerous warnings to Eritrea.

Finally, the United States Government pushed through the United Nations Security Council a sanction against Eritrea for breaching the peace in the region (Somalia), under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Sanctions are very serious matter indeed. Eritrea now is run by a dictator who is daily challenging the United States. The current animosity of the United States with Eritrea is a clear tragedy, a far cry from its fanatical support to separate Eritrea from Ethiopia. The landlocking of Ethiopia demonstrates the immaturity of the Officials of the United States, including President Clinton, in dealing with nations in Africa and especially with Ethiopia—a nation that had clear record of statehood for thousands of years and great supporter of the United States in its time of needs.

It amazes me that a progressive man, from a relatively rural setting from the hinterland of America, would have such hate of a people he hardly knew that he would go to such extreme to strangle over seventy million Ethiopians by landlocking them and cutting them off from their legitimate and historic right to their Afar coastal land and the territorial waters on the Red Sea. I have not heard or read from Clinton any valid argument to justify his wanton action, and the reason for his hate of Ethiopians and Ethiopia. However, on the other hand, I am elated how mature and statesmanlike Hillary Clinton is as Secretary of State despite the fact that in her book she has made some naïve statements in admiration of the so called “Eritrean independence struggle.” [H. Clinton, 405] The independence of Eritrea did not bring about neither peace or prosperity to Eritrea. However, despite the fact of a treasonous leader and corrupt economic system in place in Ethiopia, Ethiopia is developing its resources and fighting for better economic, social, and political system to be in place in the near future

There is no point in hiding my true feeling about President Clinton due to his most outrageous and insulting decisions to undermine the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ethiopia, despite the fact that he was accommodating the demands of Meles Zenawi to fracture and landlock Ethiopia, I am informed by astute observers. However, my admiration of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is based on her visible maturity on several fronts of her leadership at the State Department and the conduct of her international relations on behalf of the United States. I am extremely impressed in seeing how good a team player Clinton turned out to be. I think Hillary Clinton has all the elements to be the best Secretary of State that the United States had in a long time. I am betting that Hillary Clinton would bring about lasting solutions to our suffering corner of the World. She certainly outshines her husband, President Clinton, in very many public discharge of duty. **Ω**

**Tecola W. Hagos**

April 10, 2010

Washington DC

To be continued [Endnote will be provided at the conclusion of the article.]

### **Part Three**

#### **V. Bush and Obama: The Hawk and the Dove with Meles Zenawi:**

**The United States extremely generous**

#### **VI. Future Perfect for Ethiopia**

#### **Conclusion**