

Another December, another Injustice against the People of Eritrea

Ghidewon Abay Asmerom

December 29, 2009

December 23, 2009 is another day in Eritrean history “which will live in infamy” as far as the United Nations goes. The UN, at the behest of the U.S., once more has chosen to punish Eritrea to appease the minority regime in Ethiopia. On December 2, 1950, the same UN had passed another callous and unjust Resolution 390 A(V). That Resolution declared “Eritrea shall constitute an autonomous unit federated with Ethiopia under the sovereignty of the Ethiopian Crown.” More than 65,000 Eritrean freedom fighters and four times as much civilians had to pay the ultimate price to undo that UN injustice. The current resolution has also clearly shown that to the Security Council resolving the “border dispute between Djibouti and Eritrea” is of far more importance than the 12-year old Eritrea-Ethiopia border issue. A border conflict that took thousands of lives. A border with a virtual demarcation that Ethiopia has yet to implement. According to numerous Security Council resolutions, Ethiopia was required to accept and agree too an “expeditious implementation” and “without conditions” the final and binding Decision of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission (EEBC). However, the Ethiopian regime, thanks to the veto-shield it acquired by duping U.S. Africa diplomats, has refused to abide “promptly by all EEBC Orders.” Eight years of refusal is no “prompt” but the Security Council hasn’t said a word. Talk of double standards and glaring injustice! It is also a clear manifestation of how the United Nations does its business; definitely it is not there serving the interest of the majority of innocent inhabitants of our planet. Of course, the Security Council voting system is at the heart of it all. According to one power index calculation (the Shapley-Shubik), the theoretical power of a permanent member of the Security Council is “roughly 100 times the power of a nonpermanent member.” When one permanent member is the lone superpower of the world, as the U.S. is today, even the other four permanent members have no practical power. It is with this in his mind that former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, John Bolton, unapologetically expressed the prevailing reality of the United Nations.

The UN: Tool of the Powerful

“The point that I want to leave with you in this presentation is where I started. **There is no United Nations!** There is an international community that occasionally can be lead by the only real power left in the world; that is the United States, **when it suits our interest, when we can get others to go along.** And I think it would be a real mistake to count on the United Nations as if it is some disembodied entity out there that can function on its own.... **This kind of mindless creation of the United Nations as something different than what is in the United States interest is not going to sell her or anywhere else.... The United States makes the UN work when it wants it to work,** and that is exactly the way it should be, because **the only question, the only question for the United States is what is in our national interest. And if you don’t like that, I’m sorry, but that is the fact.**”-- John Bolton, Speech at The Global Structures Convocation, Feb. 3, 1994. Emphasis mine.

Many of those who opposed John Bolton’s nomination to be U.S. Ambassador to the UN were not troubled as much with the above statements as they were with a couple of sentences from the same speech: “The Secretariat Building in New York has 38 stories. If you lost 10 stories today it wouldn’t make a bit of difference.” Why? Democrats or Republicans, liberals or neoconservatives, the role

they want the UN to play is the same: it should be just an instrument of their foreign policies. No body should blame them. The real question is: is this kind of behavior in the long-term interests of the U.S.? Will bullying UN members to toe the line of one or two diplomats help the U.S.? This is the irony of it all. The talk from Washington is one of engagement, reconciliation, and partnership, what is being observed at the UN on the other hand is the opposite. If you thought unilateral decisions, and intimidations is a Republican trait, think twice! The way Boutros Boutros Ghali was booted from the United Nations is a prime example of how the liberals behave at the UN.

The “too Independent” Boutros Ghali

The Egyptian Boutros Boutros Ghali was denied another term in office, according to President Bill Clinton because Boutros-Ghali was “a good Secretary-general but too independent.” (Unvanquished, p. 290). According to Edward Gnehm, Madeline Albright’s Deputy at the UN at that time, what the “U.S. had against Boutros-Ghali” was that “He would not do what we wanted him to do as quickly as we wanted him to do it.” (Ibid p. 291) Boutros Ghali was not an independent man by any standard. He “has done nearly all the U.S. wanted—even if he squawked about it,” was how the Washington Post put it. His problem was that he had given the appearance of independence in talk though not in practice. He was also foolish enough to gently ask Secretary of State Warren Christopher and U.S. Ambassador to the UN Madeline Albright the following:

“Mr. Secretary, Madame Ambassador, I am deeply aware that the U.S. is the major actor on the world scene. I know that I must have U.S. support if I am to succeed. I will always see and try to deserve that support. But **please allow me from time to time to differ publicly from U.S. policy.** This would help the UN reinforce its own personality and maintain its integrity. **It would help dispel the image among many member states that the UN is just the tool of the U.S.** ... I was sure that Christopher and Albright would understand my point of view. I was completely wrong. My words appeared to shock them. Christopher and Albright looked at each other as though the fish I had served was rotten. They didn’t speak. I was horrified and quickly changed the subject.” Ibid p. 198

His major transgression, however, was that he had released a UN report on the “Qana shelling of the UN compound” defying the wishes of Clinton officials who wanted to see no report at all. The “Qana shelling” was an incident where “a UN member state had launched an attack on a UN peacekeeping post,” and more than a “hundred refugees were slaughtered in the attack.” The UN investigation found that this attack was premeditated. Boutros Ghali had to pay for this transgression. It mattered less that he had 14 Security Council members backing him; the nature of the Security Council didn’t allow any better solution. He was red-carded. He was “too independent” to get another four years. Earlier, to give the appearance that Africans were not for him, the U.S. had put an “all-out pressure on African countries to repudiate” his candidacy for a second term during the Yaoundé OAU Summit. Contrary to U.S. wish, the Summit endorsed Ghali’s candidacy for a second term. Since the decision of Africans was not in U.S. interest, the “African initiative” was ignored. That is, the UN Security Council was blocked from acting on “an African initiative.” Even today, the UN Security Council did not act on another “African initiative”; that of suspending the warranty against Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir. Why? Because it didn’t coincide with the wishes of those who muscle the UN into compliance. In other words, paraphrasing Bolton one can also say “There is no African Union! There is an African community that frequently is dictated by the United States,

to serve its interest. The United States makes the African Union work when it wants it to work, and that is exactly the way it is. I'm sorry, but that is the fact."

As it is in 2009, so it was in 1950

The U.S. authored 1950 UN declaration dishonestly told the world that it recommended its unjust solution: "Taking into consideration (a) the wishes and welfare of the inhabitants of Eritrea..." For the record, the wish of a super-majority of Eritreans was for independence. This means the UN decision had nothing to do with "taking into consideration the wishes and welfare of the inhabitants of Eritrea." The UN Resolution also said it decided to federate Eritrea with Ethiopia taking into consideration "the capacity of the people for self-government." Let it also be remembered that Ethiopia was in no better position to govern itself let alone governing Eritrea. Eritrea had more than enough ability to govern itself. In fact, Eritreans were the ones who hammered Ethiopia's modern diplomacy into shape. Furthermore, no other African colony was denied independence or forced into federation with its neighbor, like Eritrea was condemned to be, because of lack of "capacity of the people for self-government."

The other UN consideration was: "(c) The rights and claims of Ethiopia based on geographical, historical, ethnic or economic reasons, including in particular Ethiopia's legitimate need for adequate access to the sea. Recognizing that the disposal of Eritrea should be based on its close political and economic association with Ethiopia." This is a ludicrous argument repeated ad nauseam to this very day. Ethiopia is surrounded by five countries (British Somaliland, Djibouti, Italian Somaliland, Kenya, and the Sudan) besides Eritrea that can give Ethiopia "adequate access to the sea," countries to which Ethiopia can have equal "geographical, historical, ethnic or economic reasons." How come Kenya was not federated with Uganda, Tanganyika with Rwanda-Burundi, or the Sudan with Chad so that the landlocked colonies of Africa can have "adequate access to the sea?" What this showed then was that "access to the sea" for landlocked countries was not the real reason. There are several landlocked nations in Europe and several of the "Stan" nations of the former USSR are landlocked, however, the Security Council didn't recommend federating them with their neighbors at the time they asked for their independence. On the other hand, when it came to Eritrea, this lame reason is raised time and again. In my opinion, the whole Eritrea-Djibouti dispute is a sham designed to help Ethiopia capture Assab through Djibouti. I believe this is all what the fuss, including the action of the Security Council is all about. The sponsors of Resolution 1907 don't want Eritrea to guard its border with Djibouti. They know if Ethiopia is to occupy Assab, it would not be easy through the Bure plains. They had witnessed the effective resistance the indomitable Eritrean Defense Forces showed June of 1998, as well as June of 2000. If it can be done, they calculated, they have to do it through an undefended border. The plan is for Ethiopia to try through Djibouti, and when and if it succeeds, they will provide it with a veto shield at the Security Council.

The real reason as to why the UN was forced to offer Eritrea as a sacrificial lamb in 1950 was shamelessly declared in clear words, words that every Eritrean have been reciting verbatim for years. The infamous words of John Foster Dulles:

"From the point of view of justice, the opinions of the Eritrean people must receive consideration. Nevertheless the strategic interests of the United States in the Red Sea Basin and considerations of security and world peace make it necessary that the country [Eritrea] be linked with our ally, Ethiopia."

Eritrea: “too Independent” of a Nation

The “Masters of the Universe” cannot stomach countries that are seen to be “too independent.” Any country or leader who shows any trace of independence is a target. Eritrea’s dilemma was this from the very beginning. It was “too independent” for the Americans, the Soviets, the Arabs, or even the Africans. That was why Eritreans had no one but themselves to champion their cause. The 1998-2000 war was also declared on them because they were seen marching on their own independent path. In other words, Eritrea was not going to be allowed to be “a Threat of a Good Example” for the region. In such a case the choreography is clear. The first army to descend on such a nation is the hired media; media that reports not on news it discovers on the ground, but news it invents. NGOs whose very existence is threatened by “too independent” nations are also there to help stir the pot. After these, every player is directed, one by one, to dance to the tune called by the “masters.” The Somalia and Djibouti issues vis-à-vis Eritrea’s involvement was classically and precisely conducted along this line.



The map on the right hints to what the evil dream of those who see Eritrea to be “too independent” is. It is from the Atlantic Monthly from January/February 2008. This map was the cover page of that issue and the reader can still see it at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200801/goldberg-mideast>.

The above map clearly shows what Ethiopia’s allies design for the Horn of Africa is. The design for Somalia (breaking it up into Somaliland, Puntland, Somalia, ...) is fait accompli; that for the Sudan (partitioning it into Sudan (North) and New (South) Sudan) is almost there; it is a matter of few months. What is remaining and proving hard to accomplish is the reoccupation of Eritrea by Ethiopia. As can be seen, the map has labeled Eritrea as “Ethiopian-Occupied Eritrea.” The author



tells that this map was the result of his conversation with several experts, not the result of his pure imagination. Is Resolution 1907 designed to make this map a reality? Preventing this map from becoming reality is what Eritreans are fighting for.

SUSAN RICE 2.0's in OS Bolton

Susan Rice, after engineering an unjust UN Resolution, which according to the Libyan Ambassador to the UN (whose country is the current Chair of the African Union) was “unrealistic and too hasty”, shamelessly told the world, in words eerily similar to the justifications of the 1950 injustice, “We did not come to this decision with any joy – or with anything other than a desire to support the stability of peace in the region. The United States stands with the people of Eritrea who have fought long and hard for their independence and to build a country in which we have great hope for the future.” What a shame! Susan Rice is not ignorant of history. She knew very well that Eritreans “fought long and hard for their independence and to build a country” because, like today, at another UN session, another U.S. diplomat like her, had engineered another unjust resolution that condemned Eritreans to war and destruction. Just as in December 1950, “the wish of the Eritrean people” was invoked to impose an unjust decision, in 2009 Susan Rice was disingenous enough to declare: “This was an African initiative.” We have seen above how an African initiative is conveniently dismissed everytime it didn't serve the whim of U.S. diplomats at the UN. To speak as if the resolution was the consequence of a decision taken by the African Union is of course hypocrisy of the highest kind. More than anyone else, Susan Rice knows the UN Resolution had nothing to do with the African Union initiative, or the Somali crisis. Beginning to end, this is U.S. Africa Diplomats project: from Susan Rice, to Jenday Frazer back to Susan Rice. Let it be noted that Susan Rice was the person who in 1998, as the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, “left a trail of death and destruction” in the Horn of Africa. According to Peter Rosenblum of Harvard Law School:

“The ‘new leaders’ of American policy, particularly Susan Rice and Gayle Smith, could be as brash and peremptory as their African homologues. ... Some of their detractors referred to them as ‘Thelma and Louise,’ recalling the characters from the 1990 film by the same name who liberate themselves from the world of male dominance and leave a trail of destruction before they drive off a cliff together ...Privately, much speculation remains about what actually happened to render the Rice-Smith intervention so politically disastrous.... ‘Susan had misread the situation completely,’ according to one State Department insider who observed the conflict with Albright. ‘She came in like a scoutmaster, lecturing them on how to behave and having a public tantrum when they didn't act the way she wanted.’-- Irrational Exuberance, Current History, May 2002.

What we are witnessing now is then **SUSAN RICE 2.0** back in OS Bolton (Operating System Bolton) for more death and destruction in the Horn. She thinks the UN is there to implement her project; it matters less whether it serves U.S. interests or not. Why President Obama is allowing her to get away with this is a cardinal foreign policy question all those who voted for Obama in hoping for change should ask. Is what Rice and her team doing at the UN in the best interest of the United States of America? I think not. Of course, SUSAN RICE 2.0 and her Ethiopian friends have mastered the art of making others own their dirty packages. In this case Uganda, who was only handed the dirty package, is shamelessly taking the credit as if conspiring to victimize another African country is worth a dime of credit. Ugandan officials are loudly claiming: “*We petitioned for sanctions on behalf of IGAD and it is gratifying that members of the UN Security Council adopted the resolution. We are going to demand for more stringent sanctions from the international community against that country. It's a spoiler.*” One can only imagine how much the leaders of the minority regime in Ethiopia are laughing at the Ugandans. The leaders of Ethiopia are experts at handing a dirty package to people and making them think they own it. As one of their own, Tesfaye Ghebreab, exposed them in his “yegazieTeNaw mastawesha” (Diary of a Journalist), the Ethiopian Prime Minister and his Minister

of Information are in the habit of writing articles and making gullible ministers put their photos and names on the articles claiming authorship of articles; articles they had nothing to do in authoring them. Such is the case with Uganda. Such behavior henceforth should be called "the Uganda Syndrom." As for this author, all what I can say is "Eritrea, forgive the likes of Uganda; for they know not what they are doing." Viewers can also watch for themselves the December 23 UNSC proceedings (<http://webcast.un.org/ramgen/ondemand/sc/2009/sc091223am2.rm>) to observe others "who know not what they are doing" making fools of themselves. Particularly watch the speech of the Ambassador of Djibouti. He used French, when he was addressing the problem in Somalia, and suddenly switched to English, at about the 30:49 minute mark of the video, to address the Eritrea-Djibouti issue. Could it be he was reading from a script handed to him by his handlers and he didn't get time to translate it into French? Is there any doubt why Eritrea insists calling the problem with Djibouti, an issue manufactured by Eritrea's traditional enemies? The whole issue is designed to give Ethiopia an advantage to occupy another sovereign Eritrean territory; this time a port. Otherwise, the Security Council cannot ignore the Elephant in the room (the unresolved Eritrea-Ethiopia border issue) while rushing with a threat of a sanction over the border issue with Djibouti.

As in December 2, 1950, so it is with December 23, 2009. The United Nations has once more been used as a tool to hand another unjust package to Eritreans. Surely, December 23, 2009 has joined December 2, 1950 as another day that shall "live in infamy." Another December, another U.S. packaged UN injustice against the people of Eritrea!